

78

KRISHNAMURTI'S
TALKS

1952

(Verbatim Report)

OJAI, CALIFORNIA

gell

D.8.
8/-

KRISHNAMURTI'S
TALKS

1952

(Verbatim Report)

Copyright 1952 by Krishnamurti Writings Inc.

Published by
KRISHNAMURTI WRITINGS INC.,
OJAI, CALIFORNIA
MADRAS, INDIA
LONDON, ENGLAND

Translation and all rights reserved
Printed in India by G. S. Press, Madras

I

I think most of us are aware that some kind of change is necessary, not only in our individual lives, but as a group, as a race, as a nation. We see the importance of a radical change, a change that will bring lasting hope, that will give an assurance, a certainty, not of the mind, but of something which is above and beyond the mind. Surely, most of us feel—those of us, at least, who are serious—that within ourselves there must be this vital transformation; but transformation is not of the mind, because the mind can never solve any human problem. The more we investigate the process of thought and seek to resolve our problems by the sanctions of the mind, the greater are the complications; there is more and more degradation and suffering, and less of creative existence. Yet it is obvious that a vital change is necessary, and that is what I would like to discuss during the course of these talks: how to bring about, not a superficial reformation or a casual adjustment to some immediate challenge, but a change, a revolution, a radical transformation that will give us direct experience of something which is fundamental, eternal, not of time, and which may be called truth, God, or what you will. I feel this is the only essential study, the only fundamental inquiry, especially now that we are in a state of crisis, both individual and historic. To look for transformation to some philosophy, to some teacher, to some ideal or example, or to analyze our own complexities and try to do something about them within the field of the mind, within the field of time, is so utterly futile.

Let us see, then, if we cannot, during this and the subsequent talks, peacefully, tentatively and deeply go into the matter of how to change, how to bring about a real transfor-

mation within ourselves. One can see the importance, the necessity, the urgency of such a change; because mere reformation, superficial adjustment to an idea, to a particular end in view, is not a change at all. Most of us are concerned only with the immediate changes; we do not want to go more deeply, more fundamentally into the problem. Our desire for change is brought about through superficial thought, and in the process of our changing there is constant mischief in action. I am sure most of us are aware of this, and yet we do not know how to go beyond it; and, if I may suggest, I would like these talks to result in the discovery for each one of us, including myself, of how to touch that source which is not of the mind, which is not of time, which has nothing to do with any particular philosophy or political system, with any organized religion, code of ethics or social reform. Religion is the discovery of that which is unnamable; and if we can directly experience it and let that operate, let that be the impetus, the drive, then that will bring about this transformation which is so essential.

May I add here that there is a right way of listening. Not that you must accept or reject what I am saying, but you want to find out, do you not? Surely, that is why you are here—not to spend a pleasant afternoon amongst friends whom you have probably met after many years. You can do all that afterwards. You have taken the trouble to come, and you must be somewhat serious. The art of listening is not to be merely vague and receptive, but to find out what it is I want to convey. Together—and I mean this—together we can discover it, discover something which is not merely at the verbal level, something which is not an idea to be opposed by another idea, something which is not mere knowledge, which you cannot acquire, but which you and I

together can experience directly; something which is the only transcendental value, which gives you extraordinary confidence, a confidence that no theory, no political or religious argument can evoke.

So, these talks are not mere lectures for you to listen to and for me to expound, but let us undertake a journey together to find out for ourselves that which is not made up by the mind. I can invent, speculate, and so can you; I can put out some idea, and you can oppose it by another idea, a different argument; but surely, if I want to find something which is not of time, which is not of the mind, which is not merely the response to a particular challenge—if I really want to find out, I must go beyond the responses, the casual, superficial reactions.

To listen properly, then, is very important. We are discussing, talking over together problems which are very difficult and which face all humanity, every individual; and that requires a very subtle, hesitant, inquiring mind, a mind that is capable of going deeper and deeper, and not merely coming to a conclusion and adhering to it. So, if I may suggest, after each of these talks, go away by yourself, think about it, do not immediately get agitated and begin to talk about when and where you last met—you know the kind of superficial conversation that goes on.

What is important is to find out how to bring about a radical change in ourselves. I do not know if this is a problem to you. Probably it is not, because most of us are caught in inertia, in habit, in tradition; we have given ourselves over to a particular political or religious conviction, and we pursue that, hoping it will bring a lasting, fundamental change, a transformation, a revolution within us. Having committed ourselves to a certain pattern of thought, we pursue it for years, and we think we are changing. Surely, fundamental change is not to be found in the

pursuit of a pattern of thought, however noble, nor in compliance with tradition, nor in the acceptance of any idea, belief or example; but what is required is a change that is not of the mind. So, please listen carefully and do not immediately translate what I am suggesting into the pattern with which you are familiar, whether it is of some book which you have read, or of a particular society or religious group to which you belong. Let us put aside all those things and think of the problem anew.

Now, I see the immense importance of a fundamental change in myself. I may be ambitious, I may be greedy, I may tell lies. How are these things to be changed completely? I see that ambition is a very destructive process, both individually and collectively; though one must have sufficient, the whole spirit of acquisitiveness, the craving for more, more, more, the self-defences which ultimately end up in lying, deception, illusion—all this is creating havoc in the world. Seeing all these patterns, the reactions, the stupidity, the vanity, the prejudices in which we are caught, how is one to transform them, not just verbally but actually? Those of us who have experimented with these things have already tried several ways, have we not? We have disciplined ourselves through action of the will, we have followed teachers, leaders, worshipped authority; and yet, in spite of various kinds of effort to be free from these things, we remain shallow, empty. Our problems are still there in a different form. I may cease to be a liar, or give up being ambitious; but what? I may be very kind, affectionate, considerate, but that spark, that flame has still never been touched; that thing which gives a quality of life I have never known. So, until I touch that, until there is the experiencing of that, all superficial reformation, the outward capacity

to adjust, has very little meaning; because mere adjustment on the outside does not give that faith, that hope, that conviction, that certainty, that tremendous feeling of something eternally new. And I feel if we can touch that, then the change will have an extraordinary meaning. Surely, that is the search for reality, for God, or what you will. Without having touched that, we are doing everything in our endeavour to shape, to alter, to mould the mind. That is why, when so-called religions have failed, as they inevitably do, political parties become all important; they offer a vision, a conviction, a hope, and we jump at these things because in ourselves we have lost the source, the spring of that which is unnamable.

So, it is not a question of mere social reformation, superficial change, but of how to bring about an experience which gives lasting faith—if I can use that word “faith” without introducing all the superstitious sentimentality that goes with it; an experience which brings confidence stripped of all our stupidities and selfish arrogances, a confidence born of clarity, of that thing which cannot be destroyed and for which we live and die. There is a certainty, a peculiar quality which gives, not the superficial hope *in* something, but a feeling which is in itself the flowering of something beyond the functioning of the mind. It is *that* that we have to touch; and if we are really in earnest, it is our problem, yours and mine, to find it. Without touching that, we shall be everlastingly in misery, in confusion; there will be endless wars, perpetual conflicts between nations, races, groups, individuals; without that, there is no compassion, no love.

Now, you and I are not brilliant, we are not cursed with immense knowledge, we are ordinary people; perhaps there are some on the outskirts who are unbalanced, but that doesn't matter. Is it possible for

ordinary people, for you and me, to go into this and to experience, not something which the mind invents and then experiences, but something which is not of the mind at all? That is what we are going to find out—which may entail a great many denials, sacrifices, the putting aside of various personal ambitions, the desire to become great; for a mind that is caught in its own patterns of thought can never experience the eternal. If we are to inquire earnestly into this, we must study the mind—not the universal mind, or the mind of another, however great, but the mind that you and I have, with which we think, with which we operate and in the reactions of which we are caught. The mind is the only instrument we have, and without knowing how it works, merely to find out what is beyond the mind only leads to illusion; and most of us are caught in that illusion, especially the so-called religious people, the people who are seeking God.

So, if I want to understand, to experience directly something which is not of the mind, the first step is to understand the process of the mind, which is thinking. Only by penetrating, by going deeply into the process of thought, can thought come to an end. After all, our thinking has not led us very far; our ideas have not brought peace to the world or happiness to ourselves. Thought is a process of reaction, a conditioning of the past, and it is ever creating patterns which we instinctively follow. All that has to be understood, which means going into and dissipating the traditions, the prejudices, the particular patterns and peculiarities of the “me”, stripping the mind, laying it bare, so that it becomes really still. Such stillness is not induced, it is not cultivated, it cannot be brought about through discipline, because all those processes are still part of the mind. It is only a quiet mind, a still mind that can ex-

perience that which is not of the mind; and it is one of the most difficult things for the mind to be quiet. When the mind is as nothing, only then is there God. But we have cultivated the mind for centuries, it is the one thing that we worship, and therefore we have to understand the process of the mind. We will go into this at every talk. As we begin to discover, as we become aware of the process of our own thinking, through that understanding, through that awareness, there comes a tranquillity of the mind itself in which there is no longer any effort towards a particular end; and only then is the mind capable of receiving or experiencing something which is not a projection of itself. When there is the experiencing of that, however little it may be, then from *that* there is a transformation, from *that* there is a change—not the change of a shallow mind, which ends in mischievous action.

Question: Unity seems essential for the well-being of man. How is one to achieve this unity in a group or in a nation?

KRISHNAMURTI: How do we generally achieve unity as it is practised in the various nations? Superficial unity is brought about through propaganda, through education, through various forms of compulsion; you are ceaselessly reminded that you are an American, a Hindu, a Russian, a German, and so on. Through various forms of conditioning, religious, social, economic, climatic, we are forced to unite; and that, we feel, is essential. We think that if we are identified with a particular group and give our life to it, we shall establish unity.

Now, is unity of the mind? Is unity limited to a particular group or nation? When, out of economic necessity, or for any other self-protective reason, we identify ourselves with

any group or nation, is that unity? Or does all self-protective action bring about conflict within ourselves and therefore outwardly? When do we feel the sense of unity? When do you feel united with another? Surely, only when the self is absent. When the "me" and the "mine", my hurts, my prejudices, my tendencies—when all that is absent, then there is a possibility of unity with another. As long as the "me" is present, there is disunity, there is separation, is there not? Our education, our social distinctions, our economic, national and racial barriers all indicate the separateness of the "me"; the "me first" runs through it all, and over *that* we try to find unity. That is our problem, is it not? We try to establish superficial unity without love; and love is something which cannot be when the self is. With one hand we strengthen the self, and we try to find unity at the same time. There is a conflict between the "me" and the ideal, and therefore society, like the individual, is everlastingly in conflict.

So, unity cannot be brought about by any superficial means. No psychological training, no inculcation of ideas, no special form of education, however carefully worked out, can bring about unity until we really dissolve the separating element, that process in which the "me" is predominant. Surely, that is what we are going to find out: how to eliminate completely, if we can, the "me". Do not say it is impossible, that it cannot be done. Let us find out, let us inquire.

Question: Ever since I began reading you a number of years ago, I have been attempting to be complete, but I find that it eludes me. In what wrong process of thinking am I caught?

KRISHNAMURTI: Let us go into this matter as fully as we can and find

out for ourselves whether completeness is possible, even for a fleeting second, and what the experiencing of it implies.

Why do we want to be complete in ourselves? Because we are incomplete, we are insufficient, we are inwardly poor, miserable, we have innumerable conflicts; we want love, we want praise, we want peace, we want to be patted on the back, we want to be told what wonderful beings we are, we want to worship, we want somebody to help us. Being incomplete, we strive after completeness; we want to be self-sufficient, not dependent, inwardly rich, unfettered, without a shadow of sorrow, and so on and so on. But we *are* fettered, we *are* in sorrow; and without understanding what we are, we try to pursue something which we are not. The thing we are pursuing, which we call completeness, becomes an illusion; because, without understanding what we are, which is the fact, we pursue something which is *not* a fact. We think it is much easier to pursue that which is not a fact and imitate it, than to tackle and dissolve what we are. Surely, if I knew how to face this incompleteness, how to understand it, if I saw what are its colorations, its implications, those things which are not merely of the word—if I understood all that and knew how to deal with it, then I would *not* pursue completeness. So when, knowing that I am incomplete, I pursue completeness, there is a wrong process set going, because that pursuit is an escape into an idea, into a fancy, into an unreality. The fact is, I am inwardly poor, I am lonely, I am in conflict, in sorrow; my mind is petty, shallow; I indulge in mischief. That is what I am. Though occasionally I may have a glimmer of something which is not all this, the actual fact is, I *am* these things—it may be ugly, but it is so. Why can't I deal with it? How am I to understand it and go beyond it? That is the

problem, *not* how to be complete. If you say, "Well, I once caught a glimpse of something which is more than this, therefore I am going to pursue it", then you are living on the dead. As a boy I may have had an experience of something beautiful; but if I live in that, I am incapable of understanding the fact of what I am.

So, to go beyond what I am, I have to understand it, I have to break it down, and not try to become complete; because, when that which I am is not, there *is* completeness, I don't have to look for it. I don't have to look for light when I can see; it is only when I am caught in darkness, in misery, in travail, that I think of something beyond it. What is important, then, is to find out if I can understand the thing which I am. Now, how do I set about it? I hope I am making this very clear, because the pursuit of completeness is a wrong process altogether. If I pursue completeness, it will *always* elude me, for then it is an illusion, an invention of the mind. The fact is what I am, however ugly or beautiful. I can deal with the fact, but not with the illusion. So, how can I look at the fact in order to understand it and go beyond it? That is my problem. Have I the capacity to look at it? Can I actually see that I am poor, insufficient, and not invent ideas about the fact? The fact is one thing, and the idea about the fact is another. When I look at the fact, I am full of ideas about it, and the ideas frighten me, they prejudice me, they help me to run away from incompleteness through worship, drink, amusement, and other forms of escape. So, we have to understand the idea about the fact.

Let us say I am dishonest, ambitious, a liar, what you will. I am that. Now, can that be transformed without the idea? Please follow this; because the moment I introduce the idea of what it should or should not be, I am not bringing about a fundamental transformation, I am only

dealing with it superficially. But I want to deal with the fact fundamentally, to transform it with a different force altogether. If I deal with it superficially, I may cease to be ambitious, or jealous, or envious—but then what? I am still empty, I am still striving, I am still incomplete. I see, then, that when the mind acts upon the fact, it *cannot* fundamentally alter it; it can modify it, it can cover it up, it can move it to another place, but it cannot transform the fact and go beyond it.

So, is it possible to experience a fundamental change which is not a result of the mind? And how am I to bring about such a transformation in the thing which I have called ugly, or whatever it is, so that there is a different action altogether upon it which is not a calculated, self-assertive, self-deceptive action of will? I hope I am making myself clear. It is rather difficult to explain this.

Let us suppose I am ambitious, and I see all the implications of ambition as well as its obvious manifestations in society, in relationship, everywhere. I see that an ambitious person, like an ambitious nation, is destructive, shallow, bringing misery and conflict to others and to himself. Now, how am I to be free of ambition without controlling, subjugating, without trying *not* to be ambitious? That is the problem, is it not? If I struggle against ambition, I am still ambitious in a different direction; I am ambitious *not* to be ambitious because I think that by being free of ambition I shall achieve some other thing: peace, tranquillity, God, or what you will. So, how am I to be free from ambition without the exertion of will? For, the moment I apply will, it has a motive, it has a tail attached to it, an acquisitive tentacle; and yet I see the immense necessity, the urgency of really changing that thing which I have called ambition. So, I have to inquire into the problem of change, what change implies. Change brought about by the mind

is still very shallow, therefore there is always conflict in it. Then what am I to do? As it is a problem to me, because I really want to go into this and be free of ambition, I have to study, not ambition, but the question of change—whether change is in time, or from a point which has nothing to do with time. So, I have to discover or experience a state which is not of time. And can I experience that—a state which is not of memory, which is not of accumulated knowledge? Can I experience something eternal, which is beyond time? And if I can experience it, then the problem of change, of trying to resolve ambition, has completely gone.

So, what is important is not how to be complete, but how to bring about a transformation which is not of time; and that, as I said, we will talk over in all these meetings.

August 2, 1952

II

Perhaps we can continue with what we were considering yesterday afternoon: the problem of change, of fundamental or radical transformation, and how it is to be brought about. I think it is very important to go into this question fully, not only this morning, but in the subsequent talks that are going to take place. I do not know if you have further considered the matter; but the more one regards the problem, the more one takes it into consideration, the vaster and more complicated one discovers it to be. We see the importance and the absolute necessity of changing—changing ourselves in our relationships, in our activities, in the process of our thinking, which includes the mere accumulation of knowledge. Yet when one considers the implications of change, one sees how, though we

attempt to change ourselves, there is no radical transformation. I am using the word "transformation" in its simple meaning, not in any grandiose sense, the superphysical, and all the rest of it.

We see the necessity of change, not only in world politics, but in our own religious attitude, in our social relationships, in our individual, everyday contacts with the familiar, with each other; but the more we attempt to change on the small scale, the more superficial our thinking becomes and the greater the mischief in action. The closer we look at the problem, the more we are aware of this. Seeing the necessity of change, we project ideals, and according to that pattern we hope to transform ourselves. I am narrow, petty, superstitious, shallow, and I project the ideal of something vast, significant, deep; and I am continually struggling, adjusting, moulding myself according to that pattern. Now, is that change? Let us look at it a little closely. When I project an ideal and try to live up to that ideal, constantly adapting myself to a particular pattern of thought, does that process bring about the fundamental change which you and I recognize as essential? But first of all, do we in fact recognize that it is essential to bring about a fundamental change in our orientation, in our outlook, in our values, in our contacts, in the manner of our behaviour in the way of our thinking? Do we see the importance of that? Or do we merely accept it as an ideal and try to do something about it?

Surely, it is obvious to any person who is at all thoughtful that there must be a revolution in our thinking and in our action; because everywhere there is chaos, misery. In ourselves and outwardly there is confusion, there is an incessant striving without any release, any hope; and perhaps, being aware of it, we think that by creating an ideal, a projection outside of us of something which

we are not, or by following an example, a leader, a saviour, or a particular religious teaching, we can bring about a fundamental change. Of course, in following a pattern, certain superficial modifications take place, but obviously that does not bring about a radical transformation. And yet most of our existence is spent in that way: trying to live up to something, trying to bring about a change in our attitude, to change according to the pattern which we have projected as an ideal, as a belief.

Now, let us find out if the pursuit of an ideal really does bring about a change in us, or only a modified continuity of what has been. I do not know if this is a problem to you. If you are satisfied with merely trying to live up to an ideal, then there is no problem—though that has its own problem of constant conflict between what you are and what you should be. This struggle, this ceaseless effort to adjust to a pattern, is still within the field of the mind, is it not? Surely, there is a radical transformation only when we can jump, as it were, from the process of time into something which is not of time. We will go into that as we discuss.

For most of us, change implies the continuation of ourselves in a modified form. If we are dissatisfied with a particular pattern of ideas, of rituals, of conditioning, we throw it aside and pick up the same pattern in a different *milieu*, a different color, with different rituals, different words. Instead of Latin it is Sanskrit, or some other language, but it is still the old pattern repeated over and over and over again; and within this pattern we think we are moving, changing. Because we are dissatisfied with what we are, we go from one teacher to another. Seeing confusion about us and in ourselves, seeing perpetual wars, ever-increasing destruction, devastation and misery, we want some haven, some peace; and if we can find a refuge that gives us a sense

of security, a sense of permanency, with that we are satisfied.

So, when the mind projects an idea and clings to it, struggles towards it, surely that is not change, that is not transformation, that is not revolution, because it is still within the field of the mind, the field of time. To clear away all that, we must be conscious of what we are doing, we must be aware of it. And it *must* be cleared away, must it not? Because, with all that burden, with all that impetus of the mind, obviously we cannot find the other; and without experiencing the other, do what we will, there will be no change. But what generally happens? We say that individually we can do nothing, we are helpless, therefore let us do something politically to bring about peace in the world; let us have faith in the vision of one world, of a classless society, and so on and so on. The intellect worships that vision, and to carry out that vision we sacrifice ourselves and others. Politically, that is what is happening. We say that, in order to end wars, we must have one society, and to create that society we are willing to destroy everything—which is using wrong means to a right end. All this is still within the field of the mind.

Also, are not all our religions man-made, that is, mind-made? Our rituals, our symbols, our disciplines, though they may temporarily alleviate, bring about an uplift, a feeling of well-being, are they not all within the field of time? When we regard the political and religious ideals by means of which we hope to bring a change, to educate and discipline ourselves to be less selfish, to be less ambitious, to be more considerate, more virtuous, to renounce, not to acquire so much and so on—when we look at this whole pattern, do we not see that it is a process of the mind? The mind, which is also the will, is the source of effort, of intentions, of conscious and unconscious motives, it is the centre of the

“me” and the “mine”; and, whatever it may do, however far it may endeavour to go, can that centre ever bring about a fundamental change within itself?

I want to change, but not superficially, because I see that in the process of superficial change there is mischievous action taking place. So, what am I to do? Isn't that your problem also, if you are really serious about all this? One may be a communist, one may be a socialist, one may be a reformer or a religious person, but that is the core of our problem, is it not? Though we may have a hundred explanations of man, of his responses and activities, or of the universe, until we change fundamentally, no explanation has any value. I see that, not just casually, I see the importance of a radical change in myself. And how is that to be brought about? There is revolution only when the mind has ceased to function within the field of time, for only then is there a new element which is not of time. It is that new element which brings about a deep, lasting revolution. You can call that element God, truth, or what you will—the name you give to it is of no importance. But until I touch it, until I have a sense of that which will cleanse me completely, until I have faith in that which is not self-induced, not of the mind, obviously every change is a mere modification, every reformation has to be further reformed, and so on—infinite mischief.

So, what is one to do? Have you ever asked yourself this question? Not that I am asking you or you are asking me; but if we are at all intelligent, if we are at all aware of our own problems and those of the world, isn't this the first question to put to ourselves? Not what kind of beliefs, religions, sects, new teachers we should have—they are all so utterly empty and futile. But surely, this is the fundamental question that one ought to put to oneself; how to

bring about a change which is not of time, which is not a matter of evolution, which is not a matter of slow growth. I can see that, if I exercise will, control, if I discipline myself, there are certain modifications; I am better or worse, I am changed a little bit. Instead of being bad tempered, or angry, or vicious, or jealous, I am quiet; I have repressed all that, I have held it down. Every day I practise a certain virtue, repeat certain words, go to a shrine and repeat certain chants, and so on and so on. They all have a pacifying effect, they produce certain changes; but these changes are still of the mind, they are still within the field of time, are they not? My memory says, "I am this, and I must become that". Surely, such activity is still self-centered; though I deny greed, in seeking non-greed I am still within the self-enclosing process of the "me". And I can see that it leads nowhere, do what I will; though there may be change, as long as my thinking is held within the process of the "me", there is no freedom from struggle, pain.

I do not know if you have inquired into this. The problem of change is very important, is it not? And can this change be brought about through a process of thinking, through disciplines, through rituals, through various forms of sacrifice, immolation, denial, suppression?—which, if you observe, are all tactics, designs of the mind. However much the self, the "me", struggles to be free, can it ever be free? Whatever effort it makes, can it ever absolve itself from its own activities? If it cannot, then what is it to do? I hope you see the problem as I see it. You may translate it differently in words, but that is the core of our problem.

Now, since we do not see any outlet, any way of release from the process of the "me", we begin to worship reason, the intellect. We reject everything else and say that the mind is the only important thing, the more

intellectual, the more cunning, the more erudite, the better. That is why knowledge has become so important to us. Even though we may be worshippers of God, essentially we have denied God, because our gods are the images of our own minds; our rituals, our churches—the whole business is still within the field of the mind. We say, "Since there is only the mind, let us make man according to the mind, according to reason". Our society, our relationships, everything we do conforms to the pattern of the mind; and whoever does not conform is either liquidated or otherwise denied.

Seeing all this, are we not concerned to find out how we can jump over that intangible barrier between the process of time and the timeless, between the projections of the mind and that which is not of the mind? If that is really an earnest question which we have put to ourselves, if it has become an urgent problem, then surely we will lay aside the obvious activities of the mind: the ideals, the rituals, the churches, the accumulation of knowledge—we will completely wash them out of our system. It is through negation that we will find the other thing, not through direct approach; and I can negate only when I begin to understand the ways of my own mind and see that I seek refuge, that I am acquisitive, that there is not a single moment when the mind is really quiet. The incessant chattering, the images, the things that I have acquired and hold on to, the words, the names, the memories, the escapes—of all that I have to be aware, have I not? Because, with that burden, which is of time, how can I experience something which is timeless? So, I must purge myself completely of all that, which means I must be alone—not alone in an ivory tower, but there must be that aloneness in which I see all the processes, the eddies of the mind. Then, as I observe, as I become more and more

aware and begin to put aside without effort the things of the mind, I find that the mind becomes quiet; it is no longer curious, searching, groping, struggling, creating and pursuing images. All those things have dropped away, and the mind becomes very quiet, it is as nothing. This is the thing that cannot be taught. By listening a hundred times to this statement, you are not going to get it; if you do, then you are mesmerized by words. It is a thing that must be experienced, that must be directly tasted; but it's no good hovering at the edge of it.

So, when the mind is still, not *made* still by self-discipline, by control, by greed to experience something which is not of the mind, when the mind is really still, then you will find that there comes a state which brings a revolution in our outlook, in our attitude. This revolution is not brought about by the mind, but by something else. For this revolution to take place, the mind must be quiet, it must be literally as nothing, stripped, empty; and I assure you, it is not an easy job. That emptiness is not a state of day-dreaming; you cannot get it by merely sitting still for ten hours or twenty-four hours of the day and trying to hold on to something. It can come only when the mind has understood its own processes, the conscious as well as the unconscious—which means one must be everlastingly aware. And the difficulty for most of us is inertia. That is another problem which we will not go into now. But the moment we begin to inquire and see the importance of change, we must go into *all* this. That means we must be willing to strip ourselves of everything to find the other; and when once we have even a slight glimmering of the other, which is not of the mind, then that will operate. That is the only revolution, that is the only thing that can give us hope, that can put an end to wars, to this destructive relationship.

Question: How is one who is superficial to become serious?

KRISHNAMURTI: Let us find out together. First of all, we must be aware that we are superficial, must we not? And are we? What does it mean to be superficial? Essentially, to be dependent, does it not? To depend on stimulation, to depend on challenge, to depend on another, to depend psychologically on certain values, certain experiences, certain memories—does not all that make for superficiality? When I depend on going to church every morning, or every week, in order to be uplifted, in order to be helped, does that not make me superficial? If I have to perform certain rituals to maintain my sense of integrity, or to regain a feeling which I may once have had, does that not make me superficial? And does it not make me superficial when I give myself over to a country, to a plan, or to a particular political group? Surely, this whole process of dependence is an evasion of myself; this identification with the greater is the denial of what I am. But I cannot deny what I am; I must understand what I am, and not try to identify myself with the universe, with God, with a particular political party, or what you will. All this leads to shallow thinking, and from shallow thinking there is activity which is everlastingly mischievous, whether on a world-wide scale, or on the individual scale.

So, first of all, do we recognize that we are doing these things? We don't; we justify them. We say, "What shall I do if I don't do these things? I'll be worse off; my mind will go to pieces. Now, at least, I am struggling towards something better". And the more we struggle, the more superficial we are. So, I have to see that first, have I not? And that is one of the most difficult things; to see what I am, to acknowledge that I am stupid, that I am shallow, that I am narrow, that I am jealous. If

I see what I am, if I recognize it, then with that I can start. Surely, a shallow mind is a mind that escapes from what it is; and not to escape requires arduous investigation, the denial of inertia. The moment I know I am shallow, there is already a process of deepening—if I don't do anything about the shallowness. If the mind says, "I am petty, and I am going to go into it, I am going to understand the whole of this pettiness, this narrowing influence", then there is a possibility of transformation; but a petty mind, acknowledging that it is petty and trying to be non-petty by reading, by meeting people, by travelling, by being incessantly active like a monkey, is still a petty mind.

Again, you see, there is a real revolution only if we approach this problem rightly. The right approach to the problem gives an extraordinary confidence which I assure you moves mountains—the mountains of one's own prejudices, conditionings. So, being aware of a shallow mind, do not try to become deep. A shallow mind can never know great depths. It can have plenty of knowledge, information, it can repeat words—you know, the whole paraphernalia of a superficial mind that is active. But if you know that you are superficial, shallow, if you are aware of the shallowness and observe all its activities without judging, without condemning, then you will soon see that the shallow thing has disappeared entirely without your action upon it. But that requires patience, watchfulness, not an eager desire for a result, for a reward, for achievement. It is only a shallow mind that wants an achievement, a result. The more you are aware of this whole process, the more you will discover the activities of the mind; but you must observe them without trying to put an end to them, because the moment you seek an end, you are again caught in the duality of the "me" and the "not-me"—which is another problem.

Question: I read the Buddha because it helps me to think clearly about my own problems, and I read you and some others in the same way. You seem to suggest that such help is superficial and does not bring about a radical transformation. Is this a casual suggestion on your part, or do you mean to indicate that there is something very much deeper which cannot be discovered through reading?

KRISHNAMURTI: Do you read in order to be helped? Do you read in order to confirm your own experience? Do you read in order to amuse yourself, to relax, to give your mind, this constantly active mind, a rest? The questioner says he reads because it helps him to solve his problems. Are you really helped by reading?—it does not matter *who* it is. When I go out seeking help, am I helped? I may find temporary relief, a momentary crack through which I can see the way; but surely, to find help, I must go within myself, must I not? Books can give you information about how to move towards the door which will solve your problems; but you must walk, must you not? You see, that is one of our difficulties: we *want* to be helped. We have innumerable problems, devastating, destructive problems in which we are caught, and we want help from somebody: the psychologist, the doctor, the Buddha, whoever it is. The very desire to be helped creates the image to which we become a slave; so, the Buddha, or Krishnamurti, or X becomes the authority. We say, "He helped me once, and my goodness, I am going back to him again"—which indicates the shallow mind, the mind that is seeking help. Such a mind creates its own problems and then wants somebody else to solve them, or it goes to somebody to help it to uncover the process of its own thinking. So, unconsciously, the one who seeks help creates the authority: the autho-

urity of the book, the authority of the State, the authority of the dictator, the authority of the teacher, of the priest, you know, the whole business of it. And can I be helped, can you be helped? I know we would *like* to be. Fundamentally, can you and I be helped? Surely, it is only by understanding ourselves patiently, quietly, unobtrusively, that we begin to discover, experience something which is not of our own creation; and it is *that* which brings about help, which begins to clear the field of our vision. But you cannot *ask* for that help; it must come to you darkly, uninvited. But when we are suffering, when we are in real psychological pain, we want somebody to give us a hand; and so the church, the particular friend, the teacher, or the State, becomes all important. For that help, we are willing to become slaves.

So, we have to go into this problem of how we are caught in our own sorrows, we have to understand and clear it up for ourselves; for reality, God, or what you will, is not to be experienced through another. It must be experienced directly, it must come to you without any intermediary; but a mind that is seeking help, that is petitioning, that is asking, begging—such a mind can never find the other, because it has not understood its own problems, it has not studied the process of its own activities. It is only when the mind is quiet that there is light. That light is not to be worshipped by the mind; the mind must be utterly silent, not asking, not hoping for experience. It must be *completely* still. Only then is there a possibility of that light which will dispel our darkness.

August 3, 1952

III

The last two times we met, we were considering the problem of

change; and I would like, this afternoon, to go into the question of power, and whether power, as we know it, can bring about a fundamental psychological transformation within oneself. The difficulty in going into this problem lies, I think, in understanding the usage of words. That is one of our major difficulties, is it not? Words like God, love, discipline, power, communist, American, Russian, have a very specific psychological significance in our lives, and when they are touched upon, we react nervously, emotionally, there is a psychological response. So, if we are to go further into this problem of change, I think we also have to consider the fact that certain words have a psychological influence on each one of us. We have built about ourselves so many verbal barriers, and it is very difficult to transcend those barriers and see the significance that lies beyond the word. After all, words are a means of communication; but if particular words cause a neurological or psychological reaction in us, then it becomes very difficult to communicate. And surely, this is another of our difficulties: that in trying to understand the problem of change, we have to strip ourselves of all ideals; because, conformity to a particular pattern, however reasonable, however logical and well thought out, is not a change at all, is it? Change implies a complete transformation, not the continuity of a modified thought. So, there are many factors to be considered in this whole problem of how to bring about a fundamental change, not only psychologically, within ourselves, but also outwardly.

I see the necessity of certain changes in myself; and I can either deal with the problem superficially, or go into it very profoundly and find out what are its implications. When I see that I have to change, that it is a necessity, I generally exercise the will, do I not? Any process of change implies resistance,

the application of effort, which is will. With that we are familiar. That is, I perceive in myself a state which is socially not good, or a state which brings conflict within me, and I want to go beyond it; I want to break down that particular quality or condition, so I suppress it, or I discipline myself to resist it, which necessitates a certain power of the will. We are accustomed to that process, are we not? So we think power in different forms—social, political, economic, inward, spiritual and so on—is a necessity.

Now, is not this whole process of will a self-centered activity in which there is no release from the condition in which I am caught, in which the mind is held, but only a covering up and a continuity of the same thing in a modified form? And our education, our reforms, our religious thinking, our psychological struggles are all based on this process, are they not? I am this, and I want to become that; and in becoming that, I must employ a certain force of will, there must be resistance, control. And is not this process of control, of discipline, a self-centered activity which engenders a sense of power? The more you discipline, control yourself, the more there is of a certain concentrated activity; but is not that activity still within the field of the self, of the "me" and the "mine"? And is reality, God, or what you will, the outcome of self-centered activity? Yet do not all your religious books, your teachers, the various sects or societies to which you belong—do they not all imply, fundamentally, that change can be brought about through compulsion, through conformity, through the desire for success, that is, to achieve a certain result? But is not that whole process an activity of the "me" in his desire to be something more? And can we, realizing it, bring that process to an end?

I do not know if you see the problem as I see it. All this activity,

however reasonable, however noble or well calculated, is still within the field of the mind; it is the activity of the self, the result of desire, of the "me" and the "mine", is it not? And can the self, that consciousness which is always within the limits of the mind and therefore always in conflict—can that self ever go beyond itself? Will that self not always create conflict between individuals, and therefore between groups, between nations?

Now, it seems to me very important to understand this; but is it a problem to each one of us? We see that a radical change is necessary in society, in ourselves, in our individual and group relationships; and how is it to be brought about? If change is through conformity to a pattern projected by the mind, through a reasonable, well-studied-out plan, then it is still within the field of the mind; therefore, whatever the mind calculates becomes the end, the vision, for which we are willing to sacrifice ourselves and others. If you maintain that, then it follows that we as human beings are merely the creation of the mind, which implies conformity, compulsion, brutality, dictatorships, concentration camps—the whole business. When we worship the mind, all that is implied, is it not? If I realize this, if I see the futility of discipline, of control, if I see that the various forms of suppression only strengthen the "me" and the "mine", then what am I to do? Have you ever put yourself that question? I see that to exercise any power over myself is evil, it is merely a continuation of the "me" in a different form; and I also see that the "me" must entirely cease if there is to be peace in the world and in myself. The "me" as a person, as an entity, as a psychological process of accumulation, the "me" that is always struggling to become something, the "me" that is assertive, dogmatic, aggressive, the "me" that is kind, loving—that is the centre from which arise

all conflicts, all compulsion, all conformity, all desire for success, and it is only in bringing it to an end that there is a possibility of peace within myself and outwardly. When I realize this, what am I to do? How am I to put an end to the "me"?

Now, if this is a serious problem to each one of us, what is our response to it? Naturally, we cannot all give our replies; but we can see that any movement of the self in order to become better, nobler, any movement of suppression, any desire for success, must come to an end. That is, the mind, which is the centre of the "me", has to become very quiet, has it not? The mind is the centre of sensation, it is the result of memory, the accumulation of time; and any movement on the part of the mind to become something is still within the limits of the "me", of sensation. And can the mind, which is sensation, which is memory, which is tradition, which is the calculating machine of the "me", which is everlastingly seeking security, hiding behind words—can that mind, out of its own desire, by any exercise of its own will, come to an end? Can it cease by its own volition?

So, I must study my own mind, I must be aware of all its reactions—just be aware of my mind, without any desire to transform it. Is that not the first necessary step?—if I can use that word "step" without introducing the idea of time. To be aware of the process of my mind without condemnation, to observe the fact without judgment, to be merely aware of what is—is it possible to do that? Some may say "yes", some may say "no"—but what others say about this matter is of very little importance, is it not? You have to experiment with this, experience it; and is it possible to experience without building up images, symbols? That is, we generally experience only the things that we recognize, do we not? We are conscious of experiencing only when we recognize the experi-

ence; and if we are not capable of recognizing it, there is no experience. So, the factor of recognition is essential to what we call experience. Now, is God, truth, or what you will, a matter of recognition? If I can recognize something, it implies that I have already experienced it before, does it not? That which I have experienced before becomes a memory; and when there is a desire for the continuation of that experience, I project that memory and recognize it, experience it. That is, through memory, through recognition, through experience, I build the centre of the "me".

So, for most of us, it is extremely arduous to go into this problem of change and really bring about a transformation within ourselves. Can I change if I am constantly experiencing through the process of recognition, whether on the verbal level or the psychological level? That is, when I meet you for the first time, I do not know you; but the second time I meet you, I have certain memories of you, there is like or dislike, pain or pleasure. So, through the dictates of pain and pleasure, I say I have met you, there is a process of recognition. That recognition is established verbally or psychologically; and, if I am to go beyond and discover a state which is not mere recognition, recollection, memory, must not the centre of the "me", which is the process of recognition, come to an end? There is this entity as the "me" which is everlastingly craving experience, seeking more of what it has known, whether outwardly or psychologically; and as long as the "me" continues to exist, whatever I experience only strengthens the "me", does it not? Therefore I create more and more problems, endless conflict. And is it possible for the mind to be so still that the process of recognition ceases? After all, that is creation, is it not?

Please, in listening to these talks it seems to me that what is impor-

tant is, not to accept all this, but to let the significance of the words penetrate and see whether they have any validity, any truth. It is that quality of truth which liberates, not the verbal denial or assertion; and so it is very important to listen rightly, that is, not to be caught in words, in the logic of certain statements, or in your own experiences. You are here to find out what another says, and to find out you must listen; and to listen rightly is one of the most difficult things to do, is it not? Because, when I use words like "experience", "truth" and so on, you immediately have certain responses; certain images, symbols come up; and if the mind gets caught in those symbols, you cannot go beyond.

So, our problem is how to free the mind of this self-centered activity, not only at the level of social relationships, but also at the psychological level. It is this activity of the self that is causing the mischief, the misery, both in our individual lives and in our life as a group, as a nation; and we can put an end to it only if we understand the whole process of our own thinking. Can thought bring about a vital change? Up to now we have relied on thought, have we not? The political revolution, whether of the right or the extreme left, is the result of thought. And can thought fundamentally change man, change you and me? If you say it can, then you must see all the implications: that man is the product of time, that there is nothing beyond time, and so on and on. So, if I am to create a fundamental change in myself, can I rely on thought as an instrument to bring about that transformation? Or, can there be a fundamental change only when there is the ending of thought? My problem, then, is to experiment, to find out; and I can find out only through self-knowledge, through knowing myself, watching, being aware in moments when I'm off guard. It is only when I begin to

understand the process of my own thinking that I can find out whether or not there is a possibility of a fundamental change; until then, mere assertion that I can or cannot change is of little significance. Though we see the importance of a radical change in the world and in ourselves, there is very little chance of such a change as long as we do not understand the thinker and his thought. The economist and the politician are never revolutionary. It is only the truly religious person that is revolutionary, the man who is seeking reality, God, or what you will. Those who merely believe, who follow a pattern, who belong to a particular society, sect or group—they are not seekers, therefore they are not real revolutionaries. We can bring about a transformation within ourselves only when we understand the process of our own thinking.

Question: What do you mean by ambition? Would you consider any improvement of oneself ambitious? At what point does ambition begin?

KRISHNAMURTI: Do we not know when we are ambitious? When I want something more, when I want to assert myself, when I want to become something, is that not ambition? Can we say where it begins and where it ends? Is not all self-improvement a form of ambition? I may not be ambitious in this world, I may not want to be a leader with great political power, or a big business man with a lot of property, position; but I may be very ambitious spiritually. That is, I want to become a saint, I want to be free from all pride. Is not the very assertion of wanting to be something, the beginning of ambition? The desire *not* to be ambitious—is that not self-improvement, and therefore self-centered activity? If I am proud and, seeing the implications of pride, I cultivate humility, is not that cultivated humility a self-centered activity? And is that not ambition?

And if you are not to cultivate humility, then what are you going to do with pride? How is one to deal with it? The very desire to get rid of one thing in order to be something else—is that not a self-centered activity, which is ambition? Please see how extremely difficult it is, when you know what you are, not to struggle to be something else. This process of struggle, this trying to become great, or humble, or generous, is called evolution, is it not? I am this, and I am going through a struggle to become that. From thesis I proceed to antithesis, and out of that create synthesis. This process is called growth, evolution, is it not? Now, in that is implied self-centered activity, the improving of the self, the “me”. But can the “me” ever be improved? It may be improved within its own field; but if I want to go beyond and find out if there is something which is not of the “me”, will self-improvement help to bring about that discovery? So, being ambitious, what am I to do? Should I suppress ambition? And is not the very suppression of ambition a form of ambition which negatively strengthens the “me” and in which there is a certain sense of power, dominance?

I see that I am ambitious; and what am I to do? Is it possible to be free from it?—which does not mean that I must become non-ambitious. Is it possible to be free from ambition? I can think it out logically, see the conflicts, the ruthlessness, the brutality of ambition in my relationships, and so on. And will that help me? Will explanations of the perniciousness of ambition help me to be free from ambition? Or, is there only one way, which is to see all the implications of ambition without condemnation, just to be aware of the fact that I am ambitious, not only at the conscious level, but at the deeper levels of my own thinking? Surely, I must be completely aware of it, without any resistance, because the more I struggle against it, the more vitality I give

it. Ambition has become a habit with me, and the more I resist a habit, the stronger it becomes. Whereas, if I am aware of it, merely see the fact of it, does that not bring about a radical change? I am no longer concerned with suppressing ambition, or with putting it aside, nor am I satisfied with any explanation—I am directly concerned with the fact of ambition. So, when I look at it, what do I see? Is ambition mere habit? Am I caught in the habit of a society which is based on ambition, on success, on being somebody? Am I stimulated by challenge, by the sense of achievement, and without that stimulation do I feel lost, and so I depend on stimulation? Is it not possible to be aware of all this, to see the implications of it and not react—just see the fact? And will that perception not bring about a radical change? If I acknowledge that I am ambitious and see the implications of it, not only at the verbal level, but also inwardly, which means that I am aware of the influence of habit, sensation, tradition and so on, then what has happened? My mind is quiet with regard to that fact, is it not? My mind does not react to it any more: it is a fact. And the quiet acceptance of what is is a release from that fact, is it not?

Please do not accept this. Experiment with it and you will see. First be aware that you are ambitious, or whatever it is, and then see all your reactions to it, whether those reactions are habitual, traditional, verbal. Merely to oppose the verbal responses by another series of words, will not free you; or if it is tradition, in the mere cultivation of a new tradition or habit you will not find release. The very desire to suppress ambition is a trick of the mind to be something else—which is part of ambition. So, when the mind sees that any movement it makes with regard to a particular quality is part of the process of its own sustenance and security,

what can it do? It cannot do anything; therefore, it is immediately quiet with regard to that quality. It is no longer related to it. But this is an arduous task, is it not?

A revolutionary inward change is essential, and if we are to understand the problem of change, we must go into all this and study the problem of the "me" from different angles.

August 9, 1952

IV

In talking about the necessity of fundamental and radical change, should we not consider the problem of method, of the "how"? For most of us, the means, the method, the system becomes very important. We see that a change is essential, and so our minds immediately turn to the problem of *how* to change, how to bring about the radical transformation which is so obviously necessary. Let us for a moment consider whether the "how", the technique, is important. What happens when we are concerned with the technique, the "how"? The cultivation of the "how", the practice of a particular method with the intention of success, does that not induce inertia? Is that not one of the primary causes of inertia in ourselves? The moment I have found the "how", the system, I begin to practise it, which implies a conformity brought about by the desire to succeed, to achieve a certain result. So, for most of us, the "how" becomes very important: how am I to change, what system am I to follow, how am I to meditate, what discipline should I practise? Don't we ask this question all the time? Are we not constantly seeking the "how"?

Now, is that important—the "how", the method? And is it not far more important to be aware that the mind is demanding the "how", and to see why it is seeking a method? If you

want a method, a technique, you will find it, for every religious teacher offers a certain form of discipline, control, or a system of meditation. What happens in this process of self-control, in the process of trying to follow a particular discipline? I do not know if you have practised any disciplines. If you have, are you not aware that the mind is conforming to a pattern of thought? And in doing so, does not the mind produce its own limitations? Surely, though it is able to live and function within a certain field of thought and action, such a mind is bound by conformity, in which there is no freedom to experience anything anew. So, by practising a discipline with an end in view, by gradually conforming in the hope of success, the mind induces inertia, does it not? Obviously, that is one of our greatest problems: the laziness, the extraordinary inertia of the mind; and the more we want to break down this inertia, the more the mind inquires "how". That is why the "how" becomes so extraordinarily important for most of us.

If we do not seek the "how", the method, the technique, what are we to do? Suppose I see the falseness of this pursuit of the "how"; I see that to find and practise a method is mere repetition, which essentially dulls the mind. If I see that, see the falseness of it, then what happens? Then the mind is really watchful, is it not? To see the implications of practising any particular method, to be aware of the significance of it, not only at the superficial level, but fundamentally, deeply—does that not quicken the mind, is there not greater alertness? And is that not one of our problems when we are considering the question of fundamental change? Because, it seems to me that the desire for a method, the search for a technique which will bring about a radical change in ourselves, induces a slowing down, a deadening of the mind. A method, a technique may produce certain experiences; but are

not those experiences merely the result of a very careful training, are they not the projections of a mind which has constantly followed a particular pattern of thought and action? And is reality, God, or what you will, to be experienced through any pattern? Surely, it can come only when the mind is free of desire, the invitation to further experience.

So, when we are discussing the question of change, should we not inquire into this complex problem of technique, effort? If you watch your mind, you will see how quickly it falls into a particular habit of thought; because it has once experienced a pleasant sensation, a feeling of joy, there is a desire for its repetition, and so the mind cultivates it, practises a discipline, hoping to recapture that pleasure. And is not this repetition, with its desire, one of the primary causes of inertia? Through technique, through discipline, through a method, can there be a fundamental change? Is not this fundamental change brought about, not through any manipulation of thought, but only when the mind understands its own activities, its self-centered movements, and so comes to an end? For that, one needs constant watchfulness, not a discipline, a technique.

Perhaps some of you practise various forms of discipline, and so you may be listening rather guardedly, you may be resisting. You will say, "What shall I do without a discipline? My mind will be all over the place". But if you want to understand something which I am trying to convey, will you resist what I am saying? Or, will you try to find out the truth of the matter for yourself? Not that you should accept what I am saying; but do you not want to find out what is true in this affair? And to find out, your mind must not be in a state of resistance, in a state of fear. Because you have practised a discipline for a number of years doesn't mean that it's right; there may be the fear that, if you remove

the fence which you have so carefully built around yourself, the mind will overflow and get lost. And to find out what is true, one must obviously listen, not according to one's desires, promptings and wishes, but with an inquiring mind, a mind that is in a state of discovery. I think *that* brings about its own discipline, which is not the discipline imposed by the mind in order to achieve a certain result.

Take, for example, the problem of integration. We are in a state of contradiction at different levels. Each level is in conflict within itself and with the other levels of our being; there is conflict at both the conscious and the unconscious levels. Please follow this, do not try to feel integrated, or inquire how you are to arrive at the state of integration. If you will listen and not try to achieve a result, then perhaps the thing will come without your asking.

We are aware of contradiction at different levels within ourselves, and there are various methods of bringing about the so-called unification of these contradictions: analysis, hypnosis, constant introspection and so on, all of which entail a struggle to establish the integration of our whole being. I recognize that a sense of unity, a sense of inner completeness is necessary; and I also see that this integration cannot be brought about by avoiding contradiction, by enclosing the mind in a particular pattern of thought and action. A state of integration is obviously necessary, because only in that state is there freedom from conflict, which enables the mind to discover, to experience, to feel things out anew. If, seeing the importance of integration, of that state of inner unification, that state of completeness, I do not inquire how I am to get at it, am I not then aware of all the contradictions? And does not that awareness allow the unconscious, the deep layers of myself in which there are contradictions, to come out? There is no resistance. I

simply want to find out, and so I watch my dreams, my waking consciousness, every hint of conflict, every incident that awakens a contradiction. My concern is not integration, but to be aware of these contradictions in different layers, at different levels. So, what happens? Since I am not seeking a particular state, but am just being aware of the different contradictions in myself, observing them from moment to moment, does not this watchfulness bring about an integration which is not that of desire, not that of a mind which has *sought* integration? What have I done? I have understood conflict, not run away from it; I have let it come out from the very bottom of my being; and then, perhaps, one has a flash of this integration which is not induced, but which comes of itself. When there is a flash of integration, the mind proceeds to live in the memory of that experience and thereby sets going the machinery of imitation, conformity. That memory is not integration: it is merely a memory. So, one has again to be aware of how the mind, having experienced a sense of integration, instead of being integrated, now lives in memory. And so the question arises how to maintain, through memory, a living quality, which then becomes our problem.

So, when we consider the problem of change, we have to go into this question of memory, the cultivation of a particular habit or pattern of action. The mind can never be free when it is seeking or cultivating the "how". To listen to my own contradictions, to see that my mind is pursuing memories, cultivating habits in order to be secure, and is thereby held in the self-centered activity of the "me"—to be really aware of all that, without going with it or battling against it, is much more important, requires far greater energy, greater alertness, than to cultivate a particular pattern of discipline. Conformity obviously leads to inertia;

and as most of us worship success, in others and in ourselves, we naturally want to conform. Is it not one of our traditions to live in a state of conformity, in a state of discipline? Please do not think I am against discipline: that is not the problem. We are considering the question of change, revolution within ourselves; and can that revolution, that fundamental transformation be brought about through discipline? Obviously it cannot—at least for me, it cannot. Discipline can only make me more conforming, and conformity does not bring about a change. I have to understand why the mind seeks conformity; and can the mind ever be free from this pressure of tradition, not only the external, but the constant, self-created tradition which is memory? As we have seen, whatever the mind does, however erudite, however extensive, however cunning, however speculative it may be, it cannot produce a fundamental change; and a fundamental change is necessary, is it not? No reason, no logic, no discipline can bring about this lasting, radical transformation. It is only when the mind is quiet that there is a possibility of something else coming and transforming us. But we cannot seek it—it must come; and it can come only when the mind is capable of receiving it, which is when the mind is no longer thinking in terms of time. For all thinking is a process of time, is it not? We cannot put an end to thinking, but we can understand the movement of thought; and as long as there is a "me", a thinker apart from the thought, obviously we are thinking in terms of time. When the mind seeks to go beyond time through discipline, it only creates barriers, strengthens time.

So, when you listen to all this, is it not important to find out how you are listening? Is it not important to see your own reactions, to study your own mind and begin to know yourself? After all, what I am saying is

what each one of us is thinking, more or less; but we cannot go beyond the verbal level if we do not see the truth of this, and with patience and watchfulness become aware of the movement of our own thought. If we do that, then, perhaps, some other element, some other quality which is not of the mind, will come in; but it can come in only when there is no desire for it, when the mind is not caught in the process of recognition.

Question: Of all the spiritual teachers, you are the only one I know of who does not offer a system of meditation for the attainment of inner peace. We all agree that inner peace is necessary, but how can we attain it without practising a technique, whether of eastern yoga or western psychology?

KRISHNAMURTI: Isn't it too bad that there are teachers, spiritual teachers and followers? The moment you have a teacher and you become the follower, have you not destroyed that flame which must constantly be kept alive if you are to find out, to discover? When you look to a teacher to help you, does not the teacher become more important than the truth you are seeking? So, let us put aside the teacher-and-follower attitude, let us get it out of our systems completely, and regard the problem itself as it is affecting each one of us. No teacher can help you to find truth, obviously; one has to find it within oneself, one has to go through the pain, the suffering, the inquiry, one has to discover and understand things for oneself. But in becoming the follower of a particular teacher, have you not cultivated inertia, laziness, is there not a darkening of the mind? And, of course, the various teachers with their various groups are in contradiction, competing with each other, doing propaganda—you know all the nonsense round it.

So, the whole question of followers and teachers is ridiculous and childish. What is important in the question is this: is there a method, whether eastern or western, to attain peace? If peace is attained through practising a certain method, that which you have attained and which you call peace, is no longer a living quality, it is a dead thing. You know by formulation what peace should be, and you have laid down a path which you follow towards it. Surely, that peace is a projection of your own desire, is it not? Therefore, it is no longer peace. It is what you want, a thing opposite to that which you are. I am in a state of conflict, of misery, of contradiction, I am unhappy, violent; and I want a refuge, a state in which I shall not be disturbed. So I go to various teachers, guides, I read books, practise disciplines which promise what I want; I suppress, control, conform in order to gain peace. And is that peace? Surely, peace is not a thing to be sought after: it comes. It is a by-product, not an end in itself. It comes when I am beginning to understand the whole process of myself, my contradictions, desires, ambitions, pride. But if I make of peace an end in itself, then I live in a state of stagnation. And is that peace?

So, as long as I am seeking peace through a system, a method, a technique, I shall have peace, but it will be the peace of conformity, the peace of death. And that is what most of us want. I have had a glimmer of something, an experience which cannot be put into words, and I want to live in that state, I want it to continue, I want an absolute reality. There may be an absolute reality, or there may be experiences of greater and greater significance; but if I cling to one or the other, am I not cultivating slow death? And death is not peace. So, I cannot possibly imagine what peace is in this state of confusion, in this state of conflict. What I can imagine is the opposite; and that

which is opposite to what I am is not peace. So, a technique merely helps me to obtain something which is the opposite of what I am; and without understanding what I am, going into it completely, not only at the conscious but also at the unconscious levels—without understanding the whole process of myself, merely to seek peace has very little significance.

You see, most of us are lazy; we are so inert, we want teachers, monasteries to help us; we do not want to find out for ourselves through our own enquiry, through our own constant awareness, through our own experience, however vague, however subtle, elusive. So we join churches, groups, we become followers of this or that—which means there is a struggle on one side, and the cultivation of inertia on the other. But if one really wishes to find out, experience directly—and we can discuss what that experiencing is at another time—, then surely it is imperative that one put aside all these things and understand oneself. Self-knowledge is the beginning of wisdom, and that alone can bring peace.

Question: Can the mind ever be still, and should it be still?

KRISHNAMURTI: Let us find out. Why *should* the mind be still? And can I make the mind still? Is the "me" who is trying to still the mind an entity apart from the mind? Who is the "me" that is trying to control the mind? And who is the "me" that asks if the mind should be still? Is not the thinker, the questioner, part of the mind? Why is there this division in the mind as the thinker and the thought, the "me" and the "not-me"? Why is there this division? Please, that is the problem, is it not? I do not know whether the mind can be still, or whether it should be still, but I want to find out; and I shall find out only when I have inquired into who the entity is that is asking this question. Is he different from

the mind? For most of us, he is, is he not? There is the discipliner, the thinker, the controller, the experimenter, the observer apart from the observed, apart from the experience, apart from the thought. Having brought about this division, we then ask how the thinker is to control his thoughts; and from that arises the question of technique.

Now, is the questioner, the thinker an entity apart from thought? Please let us go into this, not for the sake of argument, not so that you can oppose my ideas by your ideas, but let us find out together what is the truth of this matter. First of all, we do not know whether the mind should be still, or even whether it is capable of being still; but before it can experience stillness, or find out if it is possible to be still, must not the mind bridge this gulf between the thinker and the thought? Who is this entity that is always trying to control, the censor, the judge that says this is right, that is wrong? Is he different from the thing which he is observing in himself? For most of us, he is different; he is an entity quite apart who is watching, guiding, shaping, controlling, suppressing thought. Now, *why* is this entity different, apart? But first of all, are you not aware that there is a different entity, the higher self controlling the lower?—you know, the whole business of it. There is in each one of us a thing apart which is guiding, shaping, watching every thought. We know that, do we not? Now, how has that separate entity come into being? Is it not the result of the mind, the result of thought? Obviously it is; it is not different from thought. If I had not thought about it, it could not exist; so it is a product of thought, is it not? And can that which is a product of thought be a spiritual entity, apart from thought? Can it be a timeless entity, something eternal, beyond the thought process? If it is a timeless entity, I cannot think about it because I can only think in terms of

time. But I *do* think about it, for it is I who have set it apart; I am related to it, therefore it is a projection of my own memory, a product of thought. It is not something apart from me, yet I have set it apart. Why? I see that my thoughts are transient, that everything around me is impermanent, that there is death, decay; everything is in movement, in a state of flux. So I say there must be something in me which is permanent, and I want that permanency; therefore I create the entity, the thinker, the judge who is apart from me. That is, thought separates and establishes part of itself as a permanent entity who is watching, guiding, shaping; and then the problem arises of how this entity, the thinker, is to bridge the gap and integrate himself with his thoughts. Till I really understand and solve this problem, it is *not* possible to have a still mind, or to find out if the mind can ever be still.

So, please just listen to what I am saying, and try to find out if it is possible for the observer and the observed to be one, for the thinker and his thought to be integrated. As long as they are separate, the mind cannot be still. As long as I am apart from my thought, as long as I am away from the experience and observing it, as long as I am conscious that I am still, there cannot be peace, there cannot be stillness. Until I understand and resolve this fundamental problem, to search for peace, or to ask whether the mind should or should not be still, has very little meaning.

So, I am broken up into various fragmentary states; and how is all that to become one? Can I *do* anything about it? That is, the thinker, the actor, the maker of patterns of action—can he do anything about it? And if he does, is there not then another fragment to be brought into focus and absorbed? As long as there is the maker of patterns, the thinker, can he bring about integration? Surely, it is impossible, is it not? So,

I have to find out how this separate entity as the thinker comes into being, I have to see how it accumulates memory, wealth, knowledge, property, flattery, insult—I have to be aware of the whole thing. It is when I am more and more aware of its reactions, its implications, that I begin to find out whether it is possible for this extraordinary integration to take place, this stillness which is not of the mind, which is not the product of discipline, of control, of conformity to a particular pattern of thought or action. What is that state? When the mind is no longer separating itself as the thinker and the thought, can it be called "still"? Is there not then a different kind of movement which is not of time, a different kind of becoming which is not of the "me" and the "mine"? We know stillness only as a reaction within the activity of the "me"; but is there not a stillness which is not of the "me"? But that state cannot possibly be conceived as long as there is a division between the thinker and the thought, as long as the thinker is trying to experience stillness. It comes only when the thinker is the thought.

August 10, 1952

V

May I request those who are so anxious to take photographs of me to refrain from doing so. I do not give autographs, nor do I want to pose for photographs, and please don't embarrass yourself by asking me about it.

If we can this evening talk over together this problem of fundamental change, I think it will be very profitable. As there are so many of us and we cannot discuss it individually, perhaps you will kindly listen to me and try to find out what I mean. I feel that this radical change demands a certain attitude of mind, a

certain state of consciousness; and I want to talk it over, so that you and I together understand both the problem and its resolution. I feel we have so far dealt with the problem of change merely on the level of active consciousness. We see that a change, a psychological change is necessary, and we set about to find ways and means to achieve that change. Such a pursuit is still on the level of active consciousness, on the superficial level of the mind, is it not? And sometimes we feel that if we could only get at the unconscious, resolve or bring to the surface all its hidden motives, pursuits and urges, then, perhaps, a vital change would be brought about. I feel there is quite a different way of approach to this problem, and I would like to talk it over hesitantly and rather tentatively with you.

To consider this problem fully we must go into the question of what is consciousness. I wonder if you have thought about it for yourself, or have merely quoted what authorities have said about consciousness? I do not know how you have understood, from your own experience, from your own study of yourself, what this consciousness implies—not only the consciousness of everyday activity and pursuits, but the consciousness that is hidden, deeper, richer, and much more difficult to get at. If we are to discuss this question of a fundamental change in ourselves, and therefore in the world and in this change to awaken a certain vision, an enthusiasm, a zeal, a faith, a hope, a certainty which will give us the necessary impetus for action—if we are to understand that, isn't it necessary to go into this question of consciousness?

We can see what we mean by consciousness at the superficial level of the mind. Obviously, it is the thinking process, thought. Thought is the result of memory, verbalization, it is the naming, recording and storing up of certain experiences, so as

to be able to communicate; and at this level there are also various inhibitions, controls, sanctions, disciplines. With all this we are quite familiar. And when we go a little deeper, there are all the accumulations of the race, the hidden motives, the collective and personal ambitions, prejudices, which are the result of perception, contact and desire. This total consciousness, the hidden as well as the open, is centered round the idea of the "me", the self.

When we discuss how to bring about a change, we generally mean a change at the superficial level, do we not? Through determinations, conclusions, beliefs, controls, inhibitions, we struggle to reach a superficial end which we want, which we crave for, and we hope to arrive at that with the help of the unconscious, of the deeper layers of the mind; therefore we think it is necessary to uncover the depths of oneself. But there is everlasting conflict between the superficial levels and the so-called deeper levels—all psychologists, all those who have pursued self-knowledge are fully aware of that.

Now, will this inner conflict bring about a change? And is that not the most fundamental and important question in our daily life; how to bring about a radical change in ourselves? Will mere alteration at the superficial level bring it about? Will understanding the different layers of consciousness, of the "me", uncovering the past, the various personal experiences from childhood up to now, examining in myself the collective experiences of my father, my mother, my ancestors, my race, the conditioning of the particular society in which I live—will the analysis of all that bring about a change which is not merely an adjustment?

I feel, and surely you also must feel, that a fundamental change in one's life is essential—a change which is not a mere reaction, which is not the outcome of the stress and strain

of environmental demands. And how is one to bring about such a change? My consciousness is the sum-total of human experience, plus my particular contact with the present; and can that bring about a change? Will the study of my own consciousness, of my activities, will the awareness of my thoughts and feelings and stilling the mind in order to observe without condemnation—will that process bring about a change? Can there be change through belief, through identification with a projected image called the ideal? Does not all this imply a certain conflict between what I am and what I should be? And will conflict bring about fundamental change? I am in constant battle within myself and with society, am I not? There is a ceaseless conflict going on between what I am and what I want to be; and will this conflict, this struggle bring about a change? I see a change is essential; and can I bring it about by examining the whole process of my consciousness, by struggling, by disciplining, by practising various forms of repression? I feel such a process cannot bring about a radical change. Of that one must be *completely* sure. And if that process cannot bring about a fundamental transformation, a deep inward revolution, then what will?

I hope I have made myself clear so far.

Do we see that the struggle to change what one is will not bring about a revolution, an inward transformation? If I see that, then what is the next step, what am I to do? Before I can find out the truth of this matter, must I not be very clear that such a process—the restrictions, moralities, compulsions and thoughts which are continually imprinted upon me by the society in which I have been brought up and conditioned—can never bring about a fundamental change? I must be very clear about that, must I not? And I doubt if we are.

So, I think it is important to see very clearly for oneself that the way we have been attempting to change ourselves is utterly false; for, if that process is seen to be false, then we shall be in a state of mind to discover what is the true way of changing. But if we do not see the content of the false in our minds, in our habits of thought and so on, then how can we ever find the other? So, should we not find out for ourselves, first of all, whether the pursuits with which we are familiar can ever bring about a radical change? Discipline, suppression, control, analysis, going through various forms of hypnosis to release the unconscious, adherence to a belief, conformity, the constant developing of a particular quality, the struggle to follow an ideal—is not this whole process utterly false? And if it is false, then should we not look at it, understand it, go into it and be completely free of it? Surely, it must be completely put away from us, and only then is there a possibility of discovering the new, which will bring about a transformation.

To convey verbally how to bring about a radical change is comparatively simple; but to actually experience that new element, that transforming quality, is entirely different. That is why I feel you should listen, not merely to hear what I am saying, but to find out for yourself whether the disciplines you have practised, the ambitions, the jealousies, the envies you have felt, the various ideals and beliefs you have followed, the analysis you have gone through, the introspection and struggle in which you have been caught—whether these things have any validity. And if they have not, then what is the state of the mind that has seen through and finished with them all?

Let us put the problem differently. However much I struggle to be different, to change, is not that struggle still part of the "me" that is desirous of a result, that is seeking a conti-

nity of happiness, the perpetuation of a particular state? I am greedy, or envious, or acquisitive, and I see the implications of it; so I discipline myself against it, I suppress it, try to inhibit certain reactions. This desire, this struggle to change greed into something else, is it not still an activity of the "me" that is attempting to become a better "me"? And the "me", the "I", this centre of the accumulating process, can it ever be "better"? And we know those moments, those rare occasions when the "me" is absent, completely absent, in which there is a timeless state, a sense of happiness that is not measured by the mind.

So, our problem is, how to bring about a change without effort? We are used to effort, are we not? We have been brought up in the habit of effort. Not liking this, we make effort to change it into that. Seeing myself to be ugly, selfish, or what you will, I make tremendous effort to change it. That is all we know. Now, realizing all this, being aware of the workings of the mind, is it possible not to make effort—and see what happens? Our effort is always towards success and conformity, is it not? We work towards a desired end, and to achieve it, we must conform. That is all we know in various degrees, negatively or positively. And is it possible to free the mind from this habit, that is, to make no effort, but merely be in a state in which the mind sees the fact and does not act upon the fact in order to transform it?

If we can look at ourselves without any desire to change, then there is a possibility of a radical change. But that is extremely difficult, is it not? It is not easy to observe oneself without the desire to do something about it. When we have a pleasant experience, we want to continue in that experience. If I had a pleasant experience yesterday, I want to continue it today; my mind lives on that experience of yesterday, and

so it is everlastingly making an effort to recapture the past, or to create the future from the memory of yesterday. Is it not possible for the mind to be aware of all this? And if you are not aware, you cannot be quiet, you cannot but make effort. You have to know the various activities of the mind, you have to be conscious of them, aware of what the mind is doing; and being aware, seeing how every kind of effort is still within the field of struggle, of trying to become something, and therefore of conformity—being aware of all that, is it not possible to observe without effort, to look without any desire to change what you are into something else?

It is extremely difficult to talk about this, to convey in words the thing that actually happens when you do not desire any particular change. After all, that is what we mean by integration, is it not? When you see the whole process of the mind, when you are aware of the various struggles, divisions, cleavages, and in the centre there is no movement to transform or to bring these cleavages together, then the observer is essentially quiet. He does not wish to transform anything, he is merely aware that these things are happening—which requires enormous patience, does it not? But most of us are so eager to change, to do something about ourselves; we are impatient for an end, for a result. When the mind is aware of its own activities, not only the conscious, but also the unconscious, then you do not have to examine the unconscious to bring the hidden things to the surface—they are there. But we do not know how to observe. And don't ask, "How am I to observe, what is the technique?" The moment you have a technique it is finished, you do not observe. The quietness of the centre comes only when you are aware of all this, and you see that you cannot do anything about it: it is so. As

long as the mind is active in its desire to transform itself, it can only be a model of its own projection; therefore there is no transformation. If you really see the truth of this, then there comes a state of mind which is not concerned with change at all—and therefore a change *does* take place.

As I said, this is a very difficult subject to talk about. It is more a question, not of verbal or so-called intellectual comprehension, but of feeling out for oneself how the activities of the mind do impede the radical change.

I will try to answer some of these questions.

Question: I think all mysticism is foolish, and your talks seem to have a mystical undertone. Is this your intention, or is my reaction to your talks a peculiar one based on my own prejudices exclusively?

KRISHNAMURTI: What do we mean by "mysticism"? Something hidden, mysterious? Something that comes out of India? Something you feel when your mind is irrational? Something vague, unclear, of which the prophets and teachers have spoken? Or, is it the experiencing of something real, something which is the summation of reason and yet is beyond reason, which is not verbal, an experience which is not a mere projection of the mind? Is it not important to find out the truth of the matter, without condemnation or acceptance?

We live in experience, do we not? We know life only as experience. And what do we mean by that word "experience"? Something which we can recognize, do we not? Something which we can name, which we can communicate to others. I have an experience only when I am capable of recognizing it. Otherwise, I have no experience. Once having

had a certain experience, I store it in memory, name it, give it a particular term; and when a similar experience comes, I recognize it, I give it the same term which I have used before. So, is not all experience that we are aware of based on recognition? And is truth, God, that something which is unnamable, a matter of recognition? That is, can reality be recognized? To recognize it, I must have had an experience of it before. Having had a previous experience of it, I say, "There it is again"; therefore, what I experience is never new.

Is it not important to inquire into this question of recognition and experience? If I am capable of recognizing an experience, does it not indicate that I have already experienced it? Therefore the experience which I now have is not new, it is already the old. As that which is re-experienced, recognized, is never new, but always the old, can it be reality, God? Must not this process of recognition come to an end before the new can be? And can that which is the new be verbalized, put into words? If it cannot, then is mysticism the experiencing of that which is beyond the verbal level, beyond the recognition of the mind? Surely, to be aware of that state, whatever it is, must we not go beyond all images, all knowledge? To find reality, God, or what you will, must we not go beyond the symbols of Christianity, of Hinduism, of Buddhism? Must we not free the mind from all habits, traditions, from all personal and collective ambitions? You may call this "mysticism" and say that it sounds foolish; but it is only when the mind is as nothing that it is capable of receiving the new. If we rely entirely on the mind for our guidance, if our action is based exclusively on reason, on logic, on conclusions, on materialistic reactions, then we will obviously create a brutal, ruthless world. Seeing all this, is it not possible for the mind

to go beyond and discover that which is new, the timeless?

Question: I find it extremely difficult to concentrate. Would you please go into this matter?

KRISHNAMURTI: Let us go into this matter together and see if we cannot understand what it is to concentrate without making an effort to be concentrated. Actually, what happens when you are attempting to concentrate? There is a conflict, is there not? You are trying to fix your mind on a particular thought, and your mind goes off; so there is a division, a cleavage in the mind between what it wants to concentrate upon, and what it is interested in. There is this constant battle going on. We try to discipline the mind, we practise focussing our thought on a particular idea, phrase, image, or symbol, and the mind is always wandering off. With that we are familiar, are we not?

Now, how is the mind to be concentrated? If it is interested, is there an effort to concentrate? And why is there this division between various thoughts, pursuits, desires? If that can be understood, then there will be natural concentration, will there not? Why is there this division of attention between the thing in which I am trying to be interested, and a thought which is apart from that? And what happens when we are aware of this division? We try to bridge the gap so that the mind can be concentrated on only one thing.

So, is not our problem that of the thinker and the thought? I want to think about one particular thought, and I put my mind on it, but another part of me wanders off. I pull it back and try to concentrate, and again it wanders off; so I keep this conflict going. I never try to find out why there is a thinker apart from the thought, why the thinker is al-

ways trying to control the thought, bring it back. Why is there this division? That is the problem, is it not? If there is no thinker apart from the thought, then every thought is concentration, is it not? Please observe your own thinking and you will see. There is the thinker trying to control his thought, trying to do something about his thought, trying to change it, dominate it. Now, why is there this division? And can the thinker ever dominate all his thoughts? He can do it only when he is completely absorbed in one particular thought, wholly identified with one belief, one symbol. Such a state obviously leads to insanity, does it not?

Now, can we understand why the thinker chooses between various thoughts and tries to dwell upon one particular thought? If we can understand that, which is to understand the process of choice, then we shall come naturally to a concentration in which there is no conflict. So, we have to understand the problem of choice, why the thinker chooses one thought and rejects another. When the thinker chooses a particular thought, various other thoughts are always impinging, and he is always pushing them aside. So, does choice lead to concentration? Is the mind concentrated when it is constantly choosing, excluding, rejecting? Is concentration a process of narrowing down the mind so that it can be completely identified with a particular thought? Yet that is what we generally mean by concentration, is it not? We mean a state in which the mind is so completely absorbed in a particular idea, a chosen thought, that no other thoughts disturb it, no other reactions come in; and yet there is a conflict of choice going on all the time.

So, in order to understand concentration, must we not first understand the problem of choice? As long as we choose one particular

thought and try to dwell on it, is not conflict with other thoughts inevitable? Must we not examine, be aware of *every* thought, rather than choose one and reject others? You will say, "I have no time to do that". But have you time to struggle against the army of impinging thoughts? And is that not a waste of time?

As every thought arises, look at it; do not choose, do not say, "This is good, that is bad; I am going to hold to the good and reject the bad". Without condemnation, be aware of each thought as it arises, and then you will see there comes a concentration which is not exclusive, which is not the result of choice, which is not the narrowing down of the mind. Such concentration is extensive, and only then is it possible for the mind to be quiet, for the mind to be still. Stillness is not the outcome of concentration, it is not the result of choice. Stillness comes about spontaneously when we understand the whole process of choice with its various activities, struggles; and in that stillness there is the unrecognizable, an experience which is not of the past.

August 16, 1952.

VI

We have become accustomed, I think, to the idea that struggle is inevitable, and that through struggle we shall come to understanding, we shall have peace, we shall realize something beyond the problems which evoke conflict. It seems to me important to understand this question of struggle, the conflict within and about us, and to find out whether it is necessary to creative understanding and to the release of human happiness. We accept struggle as an integral part of our daily existence, of our social contacts, of our inward, psychological being, and

we think that without struggle, conflict, we shall stagnate. There is the fear of stagnation, of being nothing, of destroying ourselves if we do not make an effort, if we do not struggle towards an object, a goal, an end. We think that without struggle, without inward stress and strain, the ultimate happiness is not attainable. So we accept struggle as part of life, and through struggle we think we can bring about a radical change in ourselves. This morning let us find out, if we can, whether struggle is necessary, whether conflict contributes to understanding, enlightenment and human happiness.

We see that struggle is necessary in certain directions, at certain levels: struggle with the earth, struggle in resolving objective problems. At certain levels of existence, struggle seems to be necessary; but we carry on that struggle into the psychological realm, where it becomes the acquisitive survival of the "me", and it is *there* that we have to find out whether struggle contributes to one's own happiness, to human welfare, and to the creation of a peaceful society. This conflict in relationship is a complex problem, is it not? For centuries we have accepted it as inevitable, and it is therefore very difficult to examine the whole question anew, to go into it deeply and discover its full significance. If we can, let us try this morning to see how far it is valid, and whether struggle must end if we are to understand the further reaches of the human heart.

Why do we struggle psychologically, inwardly? We struggle in order to conform to a pattern of action; we struggle to express certain feelings, or because we have a problem which through struggle we hope to resolve; we struggle in order to achieve a continuity, a survival of the "me" as an entity. Now, this struggle to conform, to survive, expresses itself in belief, in the ideal, does it not? We project the ideal and strive to conform, to adjust our-

selves to it, hoping through that struggle, through that adjustment to improve, to be happier, kinder, and so on. That is, we create a pattern of action through the desire to achieve a certain result, and thereby we establish the habit of constant inward or psychological struggle between the various layers of our consciousness. We struggle with problems, both personal and collective; having problems, we examine them, analyze, go into them as fully as possible, hoping in this way to resolve them. We struggle with the trivialities of our mind in order to banish them, to put them aside and go beyond. Our life is a series of never-ending struggles; we are always inquiring, always struggling to find out. We start to find out, but gradually establish the habit of a particular pattern of action; or, if we are more deeply concerned, we think that through struggle we shall be creative, that we must go through this process of conflict in order to achieve a certain peace of mind. All this is our life, the familiar pattern of our daily existence, and we need not go into it in more detail.

Now, I want to find out if struggle is necessary, if struggle can produce the radical inward change which is so essential. When we have a psychological problem, a problem of relationship, why do we struggle to solve it? Can such a problem be solved through struggle, through conflict? We struggle with a problem only when we want a particular result, a particular answer to that problem; but if our intention is to understand and go beyond the problem, surely this conflict with the problem will not help us, will it? We can understand the problem only when we are capable of looking at it without condemnation, justification, or any desire to find an answer outside of it. The moment we try to conform to a particular pattern which the mind has projected in the hope of solving the problem, there

is a state of struggle; and the more we struggle, the more complex the problem becomes. So we see that, to understand a problem profoundly, there must, first of all, be no effort to find a particular answer to it.

When I have a problem, am I not always seeking a particular answer to that problem? I am not concerned with understanding the problem, I want an answer to it; so a conflict is established. Whereas, if I would really understand the problem, I must be aware of the whole content of it, which is possible only when I am not identifying myself with a particular answer, when I am not judging, when I am not condemning. Being fully aware, the mind is quiet; and only then is the problem resolved, not when there is a struggle to find an answer. At one level we want an answer, and at another level we do not. We seek a particular solution to a problem, and yet we know, deeply, that the search for a particular solution involves conflict within oneself, and therefore only increases the problem in another direction. So, what is required is insight into the problem, which means understanding the whole of one's consciousness, the total process of oneself.

We see, then, that struggle to resolve a problem does not bring about freedom from that problem. On the contrary, it only makes the problem more complex. You can observe this for yourself.

Now, we think that survival is possible only through struggle, through contention, through conflict; and yet we see that where there is conflict between individuals, between groups, between nations, there is no possibility of survival at all; war and mass destruction are inevitable. As long as we are struggling for psychological security, there must be outward conflict, which results in war. We struggle to be psychologically secure, to survive acquisitively, to be the more; and as long as we are acqui-

sitively struggling to be the more, either in this world or in the psychological realm, there must be conflict, there must be incessant battle within and about us.

We struggle to be secure, to be certain, because the mind is afraid to be uncertain, to be in a state of constant inquiry, constant understanding, constant discovery. There can be discovery, understanding only when there is a state of deep uncertainty. But the mind dislikes to be uncertain, so it proceeds from memory to memory in order to be secure; it builds for itself various virtues, qualities, attributes, habits, patterns of action in which it can function. Unconsciously as well as consciously, most of us are seeking this psychological survival, which denies survival in the physical world. As long as the "me", the self, the "I" is cultivated, given nourishment, strength, there must be everlasting conflict.

So, that is our state, is it not? And if we want to change radically, then the walls which the mind has built around itself—the walls of virtue, belief, ideas, the desire for immortality and so on—must all be broken down so that the mind is completely free to discover what is real.

What is necessary, first of all, is to perceive for ourselves, without persuasion or argumentation, how we move from memory to memory, from knowledge to more knowledge; and this movement we consider a revolution. Tradition, environment, education, conditioning, can all be modified—and that is what every outward revolution tries to do, whether it be capitalist, communist, or fascist. They all try to change the environment, the conditioning, the tradition. It can be done, of course; but it does not release man from suffering, does it? And it is *that* we are considering: how to free the mind from sorrow, and whether sorrow can ever be solved through struggle. Does not the struggle itself strengthen the

cause of sorrow, which is the "me" with its self-centered activities? When I struggle to be virtuous, is that virtue? Though we have been brought up to believe that a virtuous state can be achieved through struggle, through conflict, through discipline, through influence, through education, does not that whole process strengthen the "me", which is the very cause of misery? When I try to discipline myself to be more generous, am I not strengthening the "me", which is the cause of greed? When I struggle to be humble, without pride, is that not a self-centered activity?

This is a very complex problem, and it cannot be dealt with casually, at only one level. Seeing this complex problem, and being aware that the root of suffering is the "me", the "I", the self, the ego—what name you give it is of no importance—, how can that foundation, how can that basis be broken, destroyed? How can this self, the "me", be put aside without struggle? That is the real problem, and it is *there* that the revolution, the change, the transformation must take place. Is this transformation brought about through conflict? Do I resolve the "me" by trying to impose upon it various regulations, compulsions? Or, does its resolution come about when the mind is aware of this whole complex problem and becomes non-active with regard to it? After all, it is the mind that is the centre of the "me", is it not? Perhaps most of us have not thought about this problem. As long as the self exists, there must be conflict, misery; as long as the self exists, there can be no creative being. But most of us accept the self and cultivate it in various ways. Now, if we realize the nature of the self, if we are extensively aware of its complex problems, is it not possible for the mind to be non-active with regard to them so that it does not contribute to the "me", give it nourishment?

I am concerned with the dissolution of the "me", of the "I", the negation of the self. How is it to be achieved without becoming an end? I see that suffering, frustration, conflict are inevitable as long as my mind is consciously or unconsciously occupied with the "me" and its activities. Now, how is all that to be resolved? Will the identification of myself with a nation, with an idea, with a belief, with what we call God, resolve it? Such identification is an activity of the "me", is it not? It is only an extension of the "me", an escape from the "me" of trivialities to what I call the immense, the universal—which is still part of my petty mind. So, identification does not resolve the "me", does not break down the walls of the "me"; nor does discipline, the practice of a particular pattern of action; nor does prayer, supplication, nor the constant demand to resolve it. All this only strengthens the "me", gives it continuity—the "me" being a bundle of memories, experiences, pleasures, struggles, pains, suffering. *Nothing* will resolve the "me" as long as the mind is active in its resolution, for the mind is incapable of breaking down the barriers, the walls that it has created. But when I am aware of this whole complex structure of the "me", which is the past moving through the present to the future, when I am aware of the inward as well as the outward, the hidden as well as the open—when I am fully aware of all that, then the mind, which has created the barriers in its desire to be secure, to be permanent, to have continuity, becomes extraordinarily quiet, it is no longer active; and only then is there a possibility of the dissolution of the "me".

Now, in listening to a statement of that kind, how you listen matters, does it not? Because, after all, what are we trying to do in these talks? We are not trying to superimpose one set of ideas on another, or substitute one belief for another, or follow one

teacher, renouncing another. What we are trying to do is to understand the problem, talk it over; and in talking it over, you are open to suggestions, you see the implications, and thereby you discover directly for yourself the falseness of this struggle. You do not make a conscious effort to change. The transformation comes when there is direct understanding, and therefore there is a certain spontaneity without any sense of compulsion. But that is possible only when you are capable of listening very quietly, inwardly, without any barriers. If you change because of argumentation, because logically it is so, because you are influenced, then you are only conditioned in a different direction, which brings again its sorrow. Whereas, if you understand this problem of sorrow as a whole, as a totality, and not as something to be escaped from superficially, then the mind becomes very quiet; and in that quietness there takes place a transformation which is not induced, which is not the result of any form of compulsion, of desire. It is *that* transformation which is essential; and that transformation is not possible through influence, through knowledge. Knowledge does not resolve our suffering—knowledge being explanations. Only when knowledge is suppressed *completely*, when we are no longer looking to knowledge as a means of guidance, only then is there a possibility for the mind to experience the unnamable, which is the only factor that brings about a radical transformation, a revolution.

Question: Great minds have never been able to agree on what is the ultimate reality. What do you say? Does it exist at all?

KRISHNAMURTI: What do *you* say? Is that not much more important: what *you* think? You want to know if there is an ultimate reality, and

you say that great minds have said there is or there is not. Of what value is that? You want to find out, don't you? You want to know if there is an absolute reality, something which is not changeable, which is permanent, which is beyond time. Now, how are you to find out? With what instrument are you going to find out? You have only the mind, have you not?—the mind being the result of time, the residue of memory, of experience. With that mind, you are going to find out if there is an ultimate reality. You have read about these matters, and what you have read has strengthened your own prejudices, opinions or objections; and with that mind you are going to find out. Can you? And is this not really a foolish question to ask? If I said there is or there is not an ultimate reality, what significance would it have? Actually, what significance would it have in your life? It would merely strengthen your particular conception, your particular experience, your particular knowledge. But the strengthening of your idea, the corroboration of your belief, is not the ultimate reality, is it? So, what is important, surely, is for you to find out; and to find out, your mind must be in a state of creative experience, must it not? Your mind must be capable of discovering—which means it must be completely free from all knowledge as to whether there is an ultimate reality, or only a series of ever more extensive and significant experiences. But your mind is crammed with knowledge, with information, with experience, with memories; and with *that* mind you try to find out. Surely, it is only when the mind is creatively empty that it is capable of finding out whether there is an ultimate reality or not. But the mind is never creatively empty. It is always acquiring, always gathering, living on the past or in the future, or trying to be focussed in the immediate present; it is never in that state of creativeness in which a new thing can

take place. As the mind is a result of time, it cannot possibly understand that which is timeless, eternal. So, our job is to inquire, not if there is an ultimate reality, but whether the mind can ever be free from time, which is memory, from this process of accumulation, the gathering of experiences, living on the past or in the future. That is, can the mind be still? Stillness is not the outcome of discipline, of control. There is stillness only when the mind is silently aware of this whole complex problem, and it is such a mind that can understand if there is an ultimate reality or not.

Question: With what should the mind be occupied?

KRISHNAMURTI: Here is a very good example of how conflict is brought into being: the conflict between what *should* be and what *is*. First we establish what *should* be, the ideal, and then try to live according to that pattern. We say the mind should be occupied with noble things, with unselfishness, with generosity, with kindness, with love; that is the pattern, the belief, the *should* be, the must, and we try to live accordingly. So there is a conflict set going between the projection of what *should* be, and the actuality, the what *is*, and through that conflict we hope to be transformed. As long as we are struggling with the *should* be, we feel virtuous, we feel good. But which is important: the *should* be, or what *is*? With what are our minds occupied—actually, not ideologically? With trivialities, are they not? With how one looks, with ambition, with greed, with envy, with gossip, with cruelty. The mind lives in a world of trivialities; and a trivial mind creating a noble pattern is still trivial, is it not? So, the question is not with what should the mind be occupied, but can the mind free itself from trivialities? If we are at all aware, if we are at all

inquiring, we know our own particular trivialities: incessant talk, the everlasting chattering of the mind, worry over this and that, curiosity as to what people are doing or not doing, trying to achieve a result, groping after one's own aggrandizement, and so on. With that we are occupied, and we know it very well. And can that be transformed? *That* is the problem, is it not? To ask with what the mind should be occupied is mere immaturity.

Now, being aware that my mind is trivial and occupied with trivialities, can it free itself from this condition? Is not the mind, by its very nature, trivial? What is the mind but the result of memory? Memory of what? Of how to survive, not only physically, but also psychologically through the development of certain qualities, virtues, the storing up of experiences, the establishing of itself in its own activities. Is that not trivial? The mind, being the result of memory, of time, is trivial in itself; and what can it do to free itself from its own triviality? Can it do anything? Please see the importance of this. Can the mind, which is self-centered activity, free itself from that activity? Obviously, it cannot; whatever it does, it is still trivial. It can speculate about God, it can devise political systems, it can invent beliefs; but it is still within the field of time, its change is still from memory to memory, it is still bound by its own limitation. And can the mind break down that limitation? Or, does that limitation break down when the mind is quiet, when it is not active, when it recognizes its own trivialities, however great it may have imagined them to be? When the mind, having seen its trivialities, is fully aware of them, and so becomes really quiet—only then is there a possibility of these trivialities dropping away. But as long as you are inquiring with what the mind should be occupied, it will be occupied with trivialities, whether it build a church, whether it go to prayer or to

a shrine. The mind itself is petty, small, and by merely saying it is petty you haven't dissolved its pettiness. You have to understand it, the mind has to recognize its own activities; and in the process of that recognition, in the awareness of the trivialities which it has consciously and unconsciously built, the mind becomes quiet. In that quietness there is a creative state, and *this* is the factor which brings about a transformation.

Question: I find I am a snob. I like the sensation, but I feel it is a wrong attitude. How am I to be free from this snobbishness?

KRISHNAMURTI: We all like to be superior, or to *feel* that we are superior, do we not? We want to have friends who are prominent, who are in the centre of things, we want to know the great. We all want to be identified with the great, or be seen with the great, or be ourselves the great, either through heredity, or through our own particular endeavour. From the clerk to the highest of the land, we all want to be somebody; so the snobbishness, the sense of importance begins. And though the questioner says the feeling of being somebody is pleasurable, he wants to know how to be free from that snobbishness. Surely, it is very simple to be free from that snobbishness, is it not? Be nobody. No, sirs, don't laugh and pass it off. It is very difficult to be nobody; because, our education, our social environment, our religious instruction, all encourage us to be somebody. Inwardly, don't you want to be somebody? Don't you want to be a good writer, or to know somebody who writes extraordinarily well and is popular, famous? Don't you want to be the first painter, the greatest musician, the most beautiful person, or the most virtuous saint? To know, to acquire, to possess—isn't that what

we are all striving after? If we are honest with ourselves, it is. All our struggle, our everlasting conflict is to achieve that: to be somebody. It gives great impetus, great energy, does it not? Ambition is a great spur, and we are caught in that habit of thought. Can you easily deny all that and be as nothing? And yet we must be as nothing—but not through discipline, not through compulsion. We are as nothing when we know what it is to love; but how can a man love when he is concerned with his own importance?

So, it is easy to say, "I must be as nothing"; but to bring it about requires enormous vitality, energy. To break down the habits, the customs, the traditions, the educational influences, the sense of competition—to break down all those encrustations requires a great deal of watchfulness, alertness, not only at the superficial level, but profoundly, deeply. But to be conscious that you are as nothing, is to be something. To be as nothing is a state which comes without invitation; and one knows that state only when there is love. But love is not a thing to be sought after; it comes when there is inward revolution, when the self is not important, when the self is not the centre of one's existence.

August 17, 1952.

VII

I think it is possible, in talking, to expose oneself and one's own inward thoughts, and if we can do that this evening, perhaps it will be worth while; for then this will not be a lecture, a talk to which you are listening, but an exposing of the problems and difficulties that one confronts in going into the question of transformation, this inward revolution which is so essential. We see around us the

disintegration of the world, and we are aware of our own extraordinary processes of deterioration as we grow older: lack of energy, the settling into grooves of well-established habit, the pursuit of various illusions and so on, all of which creates a barrier to the understanding of our own fundamental and radical change.

In considering this problem of change, which we have been doing for the last three weeks, it seems to me that the question of incentive is very important. For most of us, change implies an incentive. I need an incentive to change. Most of us require an incentive, an urge, a motive, a purpose, a vision, or identification with a particular belief, Utopia, or ideology, do we not? And does incentive bring about a radical change? Is not incentive merely a projection of one's own desires, idealized or personified, or put away in the future in the hope that by pursuing that self-projection we can somehow bring about a change? Is not this problem of change very profound, and can it be solved by the superficial incentives which societies offer, which religious organizations dangle before us? Can a fundamental transformation be brought about by the revolutionary ideologies which give logical reasons for change and offer the incentive of a better world, a heaven on earth, a society in which there are no class distinctions? We identify ourselves with these incentives and give our lives for the things which they promise; and does that bring about a radical change? That is the problem, is it not?

I do not know how much you have thought about all this, or how deeply you have gone into the question of changing oneself; but unless we understand from what point of view, from what centre the transformation must take place, it seems to me that mere superficial changes, however beneficial socially and economically, will not resolve our extraordinarily complex problems. The incentives,

the beliefs, the promises, the Utopias—to me, all these are very superficial. There can be a radical change only at the centre, only when there is complete self-abnegation, complete self-forgetfulness, the complete putting aside of the “me”, the self. Until that is done, I do not see how a fundamental transformation can take place. And is this radical change at the centre brought about through an incentive of any kind? Obviously not. And yet all our thinking is based on incentive, is it not? We are continually struggling to gain a reward, to do good, to live a noble life, to advance, to achieve. So, is it not important to find out what this self is that wants to grow, to improve?

What is the self, the “me”? If you were asked, what would be your response to that question? Some would say, perhaps, that is the expression of God, the higher self enclosed in material form, the immense manifested in the particular. And probably others would maintain that there is no spiritual entity, that man is nothing but a series of responses to environmental influences, the result of racial, climatic and social conditioning. Whatever the self may be, should we not go into it, understand it, and find out how it can be transformed at the centre?

What is the self? Is it not desire? Please, I would like to suggest these things for you to observe, not to contradict or accept; because, I feel the more one is capable of listening, not so much with the conscious mind, but unconsciously, effortlessly, the more there is a possibility of our meeting and proceeding together further and more deeply into the problem. If the conscious mind merely examines an idea, a teaching, a problem, then it does not go beyond its own level, which is very superficial; but if one can listen, not with the conscious mind, as it were, but with a mind that is relaxed, observing, and is therefore able to see what is beyond the words, the symbols, the images,

then there is a possibility, I think, of a quickening of direct experience and understanding, which is not a process of conscious analysis. I think we can do that at these talks if we do not meet idea by idea. What I am saying is not a set of ideas to be learnt, to be repeated, to be read over, or communicated to others; but if we can meet each other, not at the conscious, reasoning level, which we can do later, but at that level where the conscious mind is neither opposing nor struggling to understand, then there is a possibility, I think, of seeing something which is not merely verbal, not merely intellectual.

So, what is the self that needs fundamental transformation? Surely, it is *there* that a change must take place, not on the superficial level; and in order to bring about a radical change there, must we not find out what this self is, the “me”? And can we ever find out what the “me” is? Is there a permanent “me”? Or, is there a permanent desire for something, which identifies itself as the “me”?

Please don't take notes, do please listen. When you take notes you are not really listening; you are more concerned with putting down what you hear so that you can read it over tomorrow, or convey it to your friends, or print it somewhere. What we are trying to do is something quite different, is it not? We are trying to find out what this thing is which we call the self, the centre of the “me”, from which all activity seems to spring; for if there is no transformation there, mere change on the periphery, on the outside, on the surface, has very little meaning.

So, I want to find out what this centre is, and whether it is possible to really break it up, transform it, tear it away. What is the self with most of us? It is a centre of desire manifesting itself through various forms of continuity, is it not? It is the desire to have more, to perpetuate experience, to be enriched

through acquisition, through memories, through sensations, through symbols, through names, through words. If you look very closely, there is no such thing as a permanent "me" except as memory, the memory of what I have been, of what I am and what I should be; it is the desire for more, the desire for greater knowledge, greater experience, the desire for a continued identity, identity with the body, with the house, with the land, with ideas, with persons. This process goes on, not only at the conscious level, but also in the deeper, unconscious layers of the mind, and so the self, the centre of the "me" is sustained and nourished through time. But none of that is permanent, in the sense of a continuity, except through memory. In itself it is not a permanent state, but we try to make it permanent by clinging to a particular experience, a particular relationship or belief—not consciously, perhaps, but unconsciously we are driven to it through various desires, urges, compulsions, experiences.

So, all this is the "me", is it not? It is the self, the "I", which is ever wanting the more, which is never satisfied, everlastingly groping for further experience, further sensation, cultivating virtue in order to strengthen itself at the centre; therefore it is *never* virtue, but only the expansion of itself in the guise of virtue. So, that is the "me", the "I": it is the name, the form, and the feeling behind the symbol, beyond the word, which, in its struggle to acquire, to hold, to expand or to be less, creates an acquisitive society in which there is contention, competition, ruthlessness, war, and all the rest of it.

Unless there is a transformation at the centre, not substitution, but a radical uprooting of the "me", no fundamental change is possible. Realizing this, how is one to bring about a deep inner change? That is the problem, is it not?—for a serious person, not for the superficial who are seek-

ing some comforting illusion, *gurus*, teachers, and all the rest of the non-sense. So, how can that centre transform itself? Sirs, people who see that a change must take place, and do not know how it should come about, are easily caught by incentives, are they not? They are distracted by ideological Utopias, by the Masters, by worship, by churches, by organizations, by saviours and so on and on and on; but when I put aside all distractions because they will not transform the centre, and I am concerned only with the transformation of the centre—when I really see the urgency, the necessity of that, then all these superficial reformations have very little significance.

Now, when all incentives, pursuits and desires have been put aside, is one then capable of transforming the centre? You and I are considering this problem as two individuals, I am not addressing a group. You see the problem, do you not? There must obviously be a change, not at the superficial or abstract level, but at the very centre; there must be a new flow, a new state of being which is not of time, of memory; there must be a change which is not the result of any theory or belief, whether of the left or of the right, a change which is not the conditioning of a believer or a non-believer. I see this complex problem; and how is it possible for a spontaneous change to take place at the centre—a change which is not the result of compulsion, of discipline, which are mere substitutions? I do not know if you have put the question to yourself in this manner; and if you have, what do you find, how are you to bring about that change, that transformation? Is the understanding of these distractions, incentives, pursuits, desires, merely verbal, intellectual, superficial, or is it real—real in the sense that incentives no longer have any value, and therefore they have dropped away? Or,

knowing their immature promptings, are you still playing with them?

So, I have first to find out what is the state of my mind that sees the problem and tries to seek an answer, have I not? Am I making myself clear? There is the problem, which we all know, and of which we are fully aware at different moments of our existence; there are occasions when we see the significance, the depth of it. And as we discuss it together, what is the state of one's mind that is looking at the problem? Isn't that important? The state of the mind as it approaches the problem is very important, because that state of mind is going to find the answer. So, I first see the problem, and then I have to see what the state of my mind is that looks at the problem. Please, these are not first and second steps—the problem is a whole, a total process. It is only in putting it verbally that it has to be broken up in this way. If we approach the problem in stages, first seeing the problem, then inquiring what the state of the mind is, and so on and on, we shall get lost, we shall wander further and further away from the central issue. So, it is very important for me to be fully aware of the whole state of my mind as I approach the problem.

First of all, I do not know if I want to have a fundamental change, if I want to break all the traditions, values, hopes, beliefs that have been built up. Most of us do not, obviously. Very few want to go so deeply and fundamentally into the problem. They are quite satisfied with substitutes, with a change of belief, with better incentives. But, going beyond that, what is the state of my mind? And is the state of the mind different from the problem? Is not the problem the state of the mind? The problem is not apart from the mind. It is my mind that creates the problem, my mind being the result of time, of memory, the seat of the "me", which is everlastingly crav-

ing for the more, for immortality, for continuity, for permanency here and in the hereafter. So, can the mind detach itself from the problem and look at the problem? It can abstractly, logically, with reason—but actually, can it separate itself from the thing it has created and of which it is a part? This is not a conundrum, this is not a trick. It is a fact, is it not? My mind, seeing its own insufficiency, its own poverty, proceeds to acquire properties, degrees, titles, the everlasting God; so, it strengthens itself in the "me". The mind, being the centre of the "me", says, "I must change", and it proceeds to create incentives for itself, pursuing the good and rejecting the bad.

Now, can such a mind see the problem and act upon the problem? And when it does act, is it not still within the field of incentives, of desires, of time, of memory? So, is it not important for me to find out how my mind looks at the problem? Is the mind separate from the problem, as the observer apart from the observed, or is the mind itself the totality of the problem? With most of us, that is the point, is it not? I am observing the problem of how to dissolve radically and deeply that centre which is the "me"; so the mind says, "I am going to dissolve it". That is, the mind, the "I" separates itself as the observer and the observed, and then the observer acts upon the observed, the problem. But the observer is the creator of the problem, the observer is not separate from the problem. He himself is the problem. So, what is he to do? If we can really feel this out, just stay with the problem and not try to find an answer, a quick solution, or reach for a quotation from some teacher or book, or rely on our past experience; if we can simply be aware of this total problem without judgment, then I think we will find the answer—not an answer at the verbal level, but a solution which is not invented by the mind.

So, my problem is this, and I hope it is yours also: I see that a fundamental revolution must take place at the centre, not on the surface. Change on the surface has no meaning. Becoming better, nobler, acquiring more virtue, having much or little property—these are all superficial activities of a very superficial mind. I am not talking about those changes; I am concerned only with a change at the centre. I see that the “me” must be *completely* dissolved. So I inquire what the “me” is, I become aware of the “me”, not as a philosophical abstraction, but from day to day. From moment to moment I see what the “me” is—the “me” that is always watching, observing, gathering, acquiring, rejecting, judging, hating, breaking up, or coming together in order to be more secure. The change has to take place *there*; that centre has to be rooted out completely. And how is that to happen? Can the mind, which is the creator of the problem, abstract itself from the problem and then act upon it in the name of God, in the name of the higher self, for a Utopia, or for any other reason? And when it does that, has it dissolved the centre? Obviously it has not. Therefore, my problem is, can the mind bring about a fundamental revolution through dialectics, or through knowledge of historical processes? This is an important question, is it not? Because, if a radical change can take place at the centre, then my whole life has a different significance; then there is beauty, then there is happiness, then there is creation, then there is quite a different state of being; there is love, which is everlasting forgiveness.

So, can that state be brought about by the mind? If you say, “No”, you are not aware of the problem. That is a very quick, a very superficial answer. And if you say, “I must look to God, to some high spiritual state which will transform all this”, again you are relying on words, on sym-

bols, on a projection of the mind. So, what is one to do? Is this not a problem to you? Looking at this complex problem of the “me”, with all its darkness, its shadows and lights, its tensions and stresses, can I, the observer, affect this thing that is observed? Please listen to the problem, don’t look for an answer or try to solve it; just listen to it, let it soak into you, as the soft rains that enrich the earth. If you are really with the problem, if it is your daily concern from moment to moment to see how that change can be brought about, and if you are negatively putting aside those things which you have thought to be positive, then I think you will find the element that comes into being so darkly, without your knowing. This is not a promise. Don’t smile as though you had understood.

So, what we have to do, surely, is to be aware of the totality of this problem, not merely consciously, but especially unconsciously; we have to be aware of it inwardly, deeply. The superficial mind can give reasons, explanations, it can logically work out certain problems; but when we are concerned with a profound problem, the superficial approach has little value. And we are concerned with a very profound problem, which is how to bring about a change, a revolution at the centre. Without that fundamental transformation, mere changes on the surface have no meaning, and reforms need constant reform. If we can look at this problem as a whole, taste it, smell it, unconsciously absorb it, then we shall be familiar with all the activities and tricks of the “me”; we shall see how the observer is separating himself from the observed, rejecting this and accepting that. The more we know of this total process, the less the superficial mind will act. Thought is not the dissolver of the problem. On the contrary, thought must come to an end. It is the observer who judges, justifies,

accepts and rejects, all of which is the process of thinking. Thought has created our problem—the thought that seeks the more in property, in things, in relationship, in ideas, in knowledge; and with that thought we are trying to solve the problem. Thought is memory, and the calming of memory is the stilling of the mind; and the more the mind is still, the deeper it will understand this problem and resolve the centre.

Question: Does not this process of constant self-awareness lead to self-centeredness?

KRISHNAMURTI: It does, does it not? The more you are concerned about yourself, watching, improving, thinking about yourself, the more self-centered you are, are you not? That is an obvious fact. If I am concerned with changing myself, then I must observe, I must build a technique which will help me to break up that centre. There is self-centeredness as long as I am consciously or unconsciously concerned with a result, with success, as long as I am gaining and putting aside—which is what most of us are doing. The incentive is the goal I am pursuing; because I want to gain that end, I watch myself. I am unhappy, I am miserable, frustrated, and I feel there is a state in which I can be happy, fulfilled, complete; so I become aware in order to gain that state. I use awareness to get what I want; so I am self-centered. Through awareness, through self-analysis, through reading, studying, I hope to dissolve the “me”, and then I shall be happy, enlightened, liberated, I shall be one of the elite—and that is what I want. So, the more I am concerned with gaining an end, the greater is the self-centeredness of thought. But thought is ever self-enclosing anyhow, is it not?

So, what? To break down the self-centeredness, I must understand

why the mind seeks an end, a goal, a particular result. Why does my mind go after a reward? Why? Can it function in any other way? Is not the movement of the mind from memory to memory, from result to result? I have acquired this, I don't like it, and I am going to get something else. I don't like this thought, but that thought will be better, nobler, more comforting, more satisfying. As long as I am thinking, I can think in no other terms; for the mind moves from knowledge to knowledge, from memory to memory. Is not thinking self-centered in its very nature? I know there are exceptions, but we are not discussing the exceptions. In our everyday life, are we not consciously or unconsciously pursuing an end, gaining and avoiding, seeking to continue, putting aside anything that is disturbing, that is insecure, uncertain? In seeking its own certainty, the mind creates self-centeredness; and is not that self-centeredness the “me”, which then watches over and analyzes itself? So, as long as we seek a result, self-centeredness must exist, whether in an individual, in a group, in a nation or a race. But if we can understand why the mind seeks a result, a satisfying end, why it wants to be certain—if we understand that, then there is a possibility of breaking down the walls that enclose thought as the “me”. But that requires an astonishing awareness of the total process, not only of the conscious, but also of the unconscious levels, an awareness from moment to moment in which there is no gathering, no accumulation, no saying, “Yes, I have understood this, and I am going to use it for tomorrow”, a spontaneity which is not of the mind. Only then is there a possibility of going beyond the self-enclosing activities of thought.

August 23, 1952.

VIII

I would like to continue this morning with what we were discussing yesterday afternoon, the necessity of change and the problem involved in changing. I think most of us see at least superficially, and sometimes, perhaps, deeply, the importance of change in the outward world, where there is so much misery: war, starvation, class distinctions, snobbishness, the appalling difference between the rich and the poor, eighty or ninety percent of Asia going to bed without proper food, while here you are well fed. There must obviously be a complete transformation, a vital change, and many people have tried to bring it about in different ways: through bloody revolution, through economic adjustments, through various superficial reforms and so on. But it seems to me that the fundamental revolution cannot take place unless there is complete self-abnegation, a total dissolution of the "me", of the self; and yesterday I somewhat went into the problem and the processes involved in the dissolution of this "me" that is everlastingly struggling to assert itself, positively or negatively.

This morning I would like to discuss desire, and whether desire can ever be changed; for I think that desire is one of the major problems that confront each one of us in considering the question of fundamental transformation. Surely, until we understand the whole process of desire, the longing, the striving, the conscious or unconscious pursuit of a particular object, however noble — until we go into and understand that process, mere superficial reform or violent revolution will have very little significance. And again, as I said yesterday, please do not regard this as a talk to which you are listening, do not argue with me in your own mind, opposing one idea by another idea. What we are trying to do is to see the complex problem in-

involved in this process of desire. I am talking to you as an individual, not to a large and heterogeneous group of people who are not particularly interested in all this. We are discussing the problem as one individual to another, without opposition, to see how far we can go into it, how deeply we can bring about a radical transformation in ourselves. In talking it over with you, I am merely exposing the problem, and how I feel it may be approached; and I think it is much more important to listen, as it were, unconsciously, rather than with a conscious effort to understand.

For most of us, desire is quite a problem: the desire for property, for position, for power, for comfort, for immortality, for continuity, the desire to be loved, to have something permanent, satisfying, lasting, something which is beyond time. Now, what is desire? What is this thing that is urging, compelling us? — which doesn't mean that we should be satisfied with what we have or with what we are, which is merely the opposite of what we want. We are trying to see what desire is; and if we can go into it tentatively, hesitantly, I think we will bring about a transformation which is not a mere substitution of one object of desire for another object of desire. But this is generally what we mean by "change", is it not? Being dissatisfied with one particular object of desire, we find a substitute for it. We are everlastingly moving from one object of desire to another which we consider to be higher, nobler, more refined; but, however refined, desire is still desire, and in this movement of desire there is endless struggle, the conflict of the opposites.

So, is it not important to find out what is desire and whether it can be transformed? What is desire? Is it not the symbol and its sensation? Desire is sensation with the object of its attainment. Is there desire with-

out a symbol and its sensation? Obviously not. The symbol may be a picture, a person, a word, a name, an image, an idea which gives me a sensation, which makes me feel that I like or dislike it; if the sensation is pleasurable, I want to attain, to possess, to hold on to its symbol and continue in that pleasure. From time to time, according to my inclinations and intensities, I change the picture, the image, the object. With one form of pleasure I am fed up, tired, bored, so I seek a new sensation, a new idea, a new symbol. I reject the old sensation and take on a new one, with new words, new significances, new experiences. I resist the old and yield to the new which I consider to be higher, nobler, more satisfying. So, in desire there is a resistance and a yielding, which involves temptation; and of course, in yielding to a particular symbol of desire, there is always the fear of frustration.

If I observe the whole process of desire in myself, I see there is always an object towards which my mind is directed for further sensation, and that in this process there is involved resistance, temptation and discipline. There is perception, sensation, contact and desire, and the mind becomes the mechanical instrument of this process, in which symbols, words, objects are the centre round which all desire, all pursuits, all ambitions are built; and that centre is the "me". And can I dissolve that centre of desire — not one particular desire, one particular appetite or craving, but the whole structure of desire, of longing, hoping, in which there is always the fear of frustration? The more I am frustrated, the more strength I give to the "me". As long as there is hoping, longing, there is always the background of fear, which again strengthens that centre. And revolution is possible only at that centre, not on the surface, which is merely a process of distraction, a superficial change leading to mischievous action.

So, when I am aware of this whole structure of desire, I see how my mind has become a dead centre, a mechanical process of memory. Having tired of one desire, I automatically want to fulfill myself in another. My mind is always experiencing in terms of sensation, it is the instrument of sensation. Being bored with a particular sensation, I seek a new sensation, which may be what I call the realization of God; but it is still sensation. I have had enough of this world and its travail, and I want peace, the peace that is everlasting; so I meditate, control, I shape my mind in order to experience that peace. The experiencing of that peace is still sensation. So, my mind is the mechanical instrument of sensation, of memory, a dead centre from which I act, think. The objects I pursue are the projections of the mind as symbols from which it derives sensations. The word "God", the word "love", the word "communism", the word "democracy", the word "nationalism" — these are all symbols which give sensations to the mind, and therefore the mind clings to them. As you and I know, every sensation comes to an end, and so we proceed from one sensation to another; and every sensation strengthens the habit of seeking further sensation. So, the mind becomes merely an instrument of sensation and memory, and in that process we are caught. As long as the mind is seeking further experience, it can only think in terms of sensation; and any experience that may be spontaneous, creative, vital, strikingly new, it immediately reduces to sensation, and pursues that sensation, which then becomes a memory. Therefore the experience is dead and the mind becomes merely a stagnant pool of the past.

If we have gone into it at all deeply, we are familiar with this process; and we seem to be incapable of going beyond. And we *want* to go beyond, because we are tired of this endless routine, this mechani-

cal pursuit of sensation ; so the mind projects the idea of truth, of God ; it dreams of a vital change and of playing a principal part in that change, and so on and on and on. Hence there is never a creative state. In myself I see this process of desire going on, which is mechanical, repetitive, which holds the mind in a process of routine and makes of it a dead centre of the past in which there is no creative spontaneity. And also there are sudden moments of creation, of that which is not of the mind, which is not of memory, which is not of sensation, of desire. So, what am I to do ?

As I said yesterday, I think it is important to listen to what I am saying and merely be aware of what I am trying to imply. I am not trying to convince you, or to impress upon you a particular pattern of thought, which only leads to superficial thinking and so to mischievous action. To see how far what I am saying is true, as you listen be aware of the process of your own thinking without judgment ; and the moment you are aware of something that is true, it will act if you give it a chance. But if you listen to something that is true without letting it act upon you, it becomes a poison, it brings about a state of deterioration. Consciously or unconsciously, most of us avoid finding out what is true ; we do not want to listen to something which is not habitual, which is not the traditional pursuit of thought. So, if I may suggest, please listen, not with a view to being convinced, but listen to find out how your own mind operates. The moment I see how I am thinking, how I am acting, I do not want another to convince me of what I am. Self-knowledge brings wisdom ; and wisdom is not conviction, opinion, information, knowledge. It is something which is not measurable by the mind. All that I am trying to convey is the process of our own thinking, and how to be aware of it ; and in the process of

being aware of itself, the mind captures the significance that lies beyond the words, beyond the symbols and their sensations.

So, our problem is to understand desire — not how far it should go, or where it should come to an end, but to understand the whole process of desire, the cravings, the longings, the burning appetites. Most of us think that possessing very little indicates freedom from desire — and how we worship those who have but few things ! A loin cloth, a robe, symbolizes our desire to be free from desire ; but that again is a very superficial reaction. Why begin at the superficial level of giving up outward possessions when your mind is crippled with innumerable wants, innumerable desires, beliefs, struggles ? Surely, it is *there* that the revolution must take place, not in how much you possess, or what clothes you wear, or how many meals you eat. But we are impressed by these things because our minds are very superficial.

So, your problem and my problem is to see whether the mind can ever be free from desire, from sensation. Surely, creation has nothing to do with sensation ; reality, God, or what you will, is not a state which can be experienced as sensation. When you have an experience, what happens ? It has given you a certain sensation, a feeling of elation or depression. Naturally, you try to avoid, put aside the state of depression ; but if it is a joy, a feeling of elation, you pursue it. Your experience has produced a pleasurable sensation, and you want more of it ; and the more strengthens the dead centre of the mind, which is ever craving further experience. Hence the mind cannot experience anything new, it is *incapable* of experiencing anything new, because its approach is always through memory, through recognition ; and that which is recognized through memory is not truth, creation, reality. Such a mind cannot experience reality, it can only

experience sensation ; and creation is not sensation, it is something that is everlastingly new from moment to moment.

Now, I realize the state of my own mind ; I see that it is the instrument of sensation and desire, or rather, that it is sensation and desire, and that it is mechanically caught up in routine. Such a mind is incapable of ever receiving or feeling out the new ; for the new must obviously be something beyond sensation, which is always the old. So, this mechanical process with its sensations has to come to an end, has it not ? The wanting more, the pursuit of symbols, words, images with their sensations—all that has to come to an end. Only then is it possible for the mind to be in that state of creativeness in which the new can always come into being. If you will listen without being mesmerized by words, by habits, by ideas, and see how important it is to have the new constantly impinging on the mind, then, perhaps, you will understand the process of desire, the routine, the boredom, the constant craving for experience. Then I think you will begin to see that desire has very little significance in life for a man who is really seeking. Obviously, there are certain physical needs: food, clothing, shelter, and all the rest of it. But they never become psychological appetites, things on which the mind builds itself as a centre of desire. Beyond the physical needs, *any* form of desire—for greatness, for truth, for virtue—becomes a psychological process by which the mind builds the idea of the “me” and strengthens itself at the centre.

So, when you see this process, when you are really aware of it without opposition, without a sense of temptation, without resistance, without justifying or judging it, then you will discover that the mind is capable of receiving the new, and that the new is never a sensation ; therefore it can never be recognized, re-experi-

enced. It is a state of being in which creativeness comes without invitation, without memory ; and that is reality.

Question : I happen to be a successful business man of considerable means. I dropped by casually last Sunday to hear your talk, and I saw at once that what you are saying is perfectly true. It has created in me a serious conflict, for my whole background and occupation are diametrically opposed to the kind of life which I now realize is essential. I don't see how I can return to my business. What am I to do ?

KRISHNAMURTI: I wonder why some of you laughed ? Was it a nervous reaction to cover up your our conflict of a similar kind ? This man has asked a serious question, and you brush it off with a laugh. He is concerned, he wants to know what to do. What should he do ? If he is serious and not carried away by words, by the mere sensation of a pleasant morning, obviously he has to act drastically, has he not ? He may have to give up his business, because what he has realized is much more important than the business, than making money, than position, prestige, family, property. Can he go back to an occupation which is not what he wants, which he realizes is not his life ? But we generally cover up this struggle, this discontent, by words, by explanations, justifications, and slip back to the former state. We realize that the life we have been leading as a business man, or what you will, is unworthy, corrupting, destructive—we realize that, we feel it in our bones and blood. But instead of acting, thinking it out, pursuing what we think, we are afraid of the consequences ; and so there is an everlasting conflict going on between what we have realized and what we *should* do according to the dictates of society. So we invite

psychosomatic diseases, we invite the deterioration of the mind, the conflict under ground. You have felt the stirring of something real, of something which you know to be true, but you are caught in a machine of making money, or ritualism, or what you will. If you fully realize that, and not just verbally accept it, then there will be drastic action, a breaking away from the old habits. But you see, very few ever come to that realization. We are getting old, our habits are settled, we want comfort, we want people to appreciate us, to love us, to be kind in the pattern of action to which we are accustomed. So, instead of taking the drastic action, we cover up our conflict and get lost in words, in explanations. The more you are attached to possessions, to responsibilities, the vaster are the implications and the more difficult it is to act. But if you realize that it has to be done, there is the end of the matter, you will do it. When you perceive what is true, that very perception is action.

Question: After stripping away all the stimulations, sensations, hopes and beliefs, one is left with a sense of utter dullness. Since you say that the thinker can do nothing about this dullness, one feels frustrated. How is one to go beyond the dullness without doing something about it?

KRISHNAMURTI: I think most of us feel this way, do we not? We consciously strip ourselves of beliefs, of hopes, of sensations, because we want greater hopes, more stimulating sensations, more satisfying beliefs. We do not see the significance of hope, of belief, of sensation as a total process; we merely see that certain beliefs, sensations, hopes are futile, empty, without meaning, so we push them aside, we strip ourselves of them, or resign from certain societies. In stripping itself in order to gain more, naturally the mind be-

comes dull. It is still acting within the pattern of hope, of belief and sensation, so it feels frustrated; and then the problem arises, "How am I to be free of frustration?" Without understanding the total process of belief, which is the desire to be secure, to be certain, to take shelter in an idea, in a sensation—without understanding all that, going into it, being aware of all its implications, its nuances, we strip away one belief and pursue another. Whereas, if one is aware of how the mind creates a belief and clings to it, how it is everlastingly seeking sensation through experience—if one sees the full significance of that, then there is no problem of frustration. Then the mind is not dull—it is alert, it is constantly watching to find out, to discover where it lurks in its own security. It is fully aware of itself, ceaselessly observing its own processes; and how can such a mind be dull? How can such a mind ever feel frustrated? You feel frustrated because you want to fulfill yourself in certain sensations, in certain beliefs, certain hopes. Where there is the desire to fulfill, there is fear, which is frustration.

In its desire for sensation, happiness, security, certainty, the mind is creating at the same time the fear that they will not be. In pursuing its own projections, it gets caught in the fear of not fulfilling, of not being secure. It is this whole process that we have to understand; and understanding comes when we are aware of this process, when we observe it without judgment. The mind observes itself in action, there is no such entity as you observing the mind. The mind is aware of itself, of all its thoughts, of its hidden and open pursuits. Such a mind can never be dull, because there is never a moment of achievement, of success, of conformity. It is only when the mind conforms in its desire to succeed that it becomes dull, weary. A mind that is not seeking to extend

itself through sensation, through further experience, has no blockage, no hindrance in which it feels frustrated. If you and I can understand this process, if the mind can see itself in operation from moment to moment in our daily life, then I think the problem of dullness, of frustration, will disappear completely.

Question: I have had an experience of God, and I know for myself that God exists. Though it is a belief, it is not a mere escape, but is based on an actual experience. I listened to you for the first time last week, and I feel you are wrong when you say that all belief is a hindrance. Is not belief based on direct experience, a help to the realization of reality or God?

KRISHNAMURTI: What do we mean by a belief? A conviction? Please, I am not trying to define it according to the dictionary. You have beliefs. What are they based on? On experience, are they not? And your experience is the result of your tradition, of your background, of your education and the influence of your society. The influence of your environment conditions your belief. You have been brought up as a Christian, and you believe according to that tradition, according to that background. Another is brought up in a society where God is taboo, is regarded as absurd, illogical, unreal; and he also believes according to his background. So, you experience according to *your* background, as he will experience according to *his*. You experience that which you have unconsciously and deeply cultivated. You have been educated according to a certain pattern of thought which has been inculcated, built into you from childhood, and naturally you experience God according to that pattern; and your experience then becomes a reality to you, and you say it is no longer a matter of mere

belief, but is based on knowledge, on conviction, on truth. Will such a belief help you to experience further what you call God? Of course it will. But that which you experience according to your conditioning — is it God, is it truth? And will not that experience strengthen your belief, which is your conditioning? You may say that this is not an escape; but are you not reacting according to your conditioning, as another will react according to *his* conditioning?

So, what is important is, not whether you believe or disbelieve in God, but to free the mind from its conditioning — and *then* discover. If, without freeing itself from its own conditioning, the mind asserts that there is or that there is not God, what significance has it? So, the mind must free itself from its conditioning, that is, from its self-projections, its desires, its longing for certainty, for security, for its own continuity, whether in the State or in God. Only then is it possible to say whether there is an absolute reality, or a series of ever-expanding and more significant experiences. Surely, that is the important point, not whether your belief strengthens your conditioning, or whether your experience is of God. The moment the mind recognizes God, it is *not* God; the word is not the thing. Memory is not reality. That which is unnamable cannot be recognized, it is not a sensation; it is something *completely* different which comes into being from moment to moment; therefore, there is no continuity. As long as my mind seeks continuity, it is conditioned by its own desires; therefore it experiences that which gives it continuity, which it may call God, but which is *not* God. So, what is vital in this question is how the mind can free itself from its own background, conditioning; and is it ever possible to be free? That is the problem, not continued belief or disbelief, or whether belief will help you. We want God to help us in our

pettiness, in our ambitions, in our pursuits. Such a God is not a help but a hindrance.

So, our problem is, can the mind free itself from its conditioning, the background in which it has been brought up, educated, controlled, shaped? To be free, one has first to be aware that one is bound. The mind has to be aware of its own conditioning, of the conscious as well as of the hidden, underground conditioning—which is not a process of analysis. That is, if one part of the mind analyzes itself, goes deeply into the problem through analysis, it is not possible to free the mind from its conditioning. The mind can free itself only when it is aware of the total process of its conditioning, and of why it accepts this conditioning; and you *can* be aware of it, it is not very difficult. If the mind is constantly aware of its conditioning in its relationship with nature, with people, with ideas, with things, then the whole of existence is a mirror in which you can discover without analyzing. Analysis may temporarily open the door to a few difficulties; but to free the mind from its background, from conditioning, from tradition, so that it is made new—that is possible only when we are aware from moment to moment without struggle, when we see without effort what is happening within the corridors, the recesses of the mind. Only when the mind is new, free, is it capable of receiving that which is unnamable, the timeless.

August 24, 1952.

IX

Those who have attended these talks fairly regularly will know that we have been considering the very complex problem of change. This evening I would like to discuss, if possible, the power that brings about

change, and what it is; and whether there can be a direct experiencing of that power, that energy, or what you will. I think we realize that some kind of energy, force, or power is necessary for change. Politically we see it very clearly. There are the extreme forms of tyranny, and also the more persuasive methods of bringing about a reform through the power of organization. Most of us rely on some form of compulsion, on political, religious or social coercion, because we are caught in inertia, we are lazy, slothful. For most of us, change implies danger, and so we are unwilling to go through this psychological revolution which is so essential if we are to create a world in which human beings can act cleanly, decently.

We have been considering the various approaches to this problem of change; and it seems to me that we inevitably come to the central question as to what it is that brings about this change. What is that power, that energy, that force? Compulsion, self-discipline, any kind of coercion, creates resistance; and resistance does produce energy, power, which brings about a certain form of change. You must have noticed in your own life that the more you resist something, the more energy you have; the more you discipline, the more concentrated, focused you are, the greater the power. But does that bring about a fundamental change? Is *that* the power that is necessary for this inward, psychological revolution? Does the cultivation of the opposite bring about this essential transformation? If I hate, will the cultivation of love bring about a radical change? Is not the opposite of hate still within the field of hate? Is goodness the opposite of evil? Must I go through evil to find goodness? Is goodness the outcome of any form of compulsion, any form of discipline, coercion, suppression? Does not the cultivation of goodness, of compassion, of kind-

liness, merely emphasize the "me", the self? That is, suppose I hate, and, realizing its implications, I sedulously cultivate goodness, kindness; does not that process strengthen the "me", the self? The cultivation of goodness obviously brings about a certain change; there is power, there is energy. But surely, that change is still within the field of the "me", of the self, of the mind, is it not? And as I have pointed out, the more you cultivate goodness and become conscious that you are good, the more evil there is; for evil is the outcome of the self.

Let us say you realize all this, and you also see the necessity of a fundamental transformation. How are you to bring about that revolution? What is the power, the creative energy that brings about that revolution, and how is it to be released? You have tried disciplines, you have tried the pursuit of ideals and various speculative theories: that you are God, and that if you can realize that Godhood or experience the Atman, the highest, or what you will, then that very realization will bring about a fundamental change. Will it? First you postulate that there is a reality of which you are a part, and build up round it various theories, speculations, beliefs, doctrines, assumptions, according to which you live; and by thinking and acting according to that pattern, you hope to bring about a fundamental change. Will you?

Suppose you assume, as most so-called religious people do, that there is in you, fundamentally, deeply, the essence of reality; and that if, through cultivating virtue, through various forms of discipline, control, suppression, denial, sacrifice, you can get into touch with that reality, then the required transformation will be brought about. Is not this assumption still part of thought? Is it not the outcome of a conditioned mind, a mind that has been brought up to think in a particular way, according

to certain patterns? Having created the image, the idea, the theory, the belief, the hope, you then look to your creation to bring about this radical change.

So, one must first see the extraordinarily subtle activities of the "me", of the mind, one must become aware of the ideas, beliefs, speculations, and put them all aside; for they are really deceptions, are they not? Others may have experienced reality; but if *you* have not experienced it, what is the good of speculating about it, or imagining that you are in essence something real, immortal, godly? That is still within the field of thought, and anything that springs from thought is conditioned, is of time, of memory; therefore it is not real. If one actually realizes that—not speculatively, not imaginatively or foolishly, but actually sees the truth that any activity of the mind in its speculative search, in its philosophical groping, any assumption, any imagination or hope is only self-deception—, then what is the power, the creative energy that brings about this fundamental transformation? I do not know if you have come so far in your meditations, in your thoughts, in your daily awareness as to have rejected completely all assumptions, all imaginations, all speculative hopes, fears and demands. Surely, any person who is really seeking must come to that, must he not? And if you have come so far, what happens? What then is the force, the energy, the creative something that brings about a radical change?

You see, as long as I pursue an idea, however noble, however imaginatively godly, theoretically supreme, there is always the duality of the seeker and the thing which he seeks, is there not? There is the entity who hates, and the entity who is pursuing peace, love; the one who is good, and the other who is evil. That is our struggle, our conflict; and I

think *that* is the central problem—how to bridge the duality, how to go beyond. That is, suppose I hate, I have no affection in my heart. My heart is full of the things of the mind; it is cunning, devious, calculating, and I realize it. Also I feel that there can be a transformation in the world only when there is more love, a state of compassion, and therefore I pursue love. So there is in me the duality of love and hate, with its struggle: the private thought and the public life, that which I am, and that which I am trying to be. There is a constant inward battle, conflict—and if we can understand that, then perhaps we shall find out how to awaken the energy, that creative something which will bring about a transformation. To understand that the thinker and the thought are one—to *experience* it, not repeat it verbally, which has no meaning—, *that*, it seems to me, is the central problem. The self, the “me”, is made up of this struggle of duality, is it not? There is the “me” and the “not-me”, the bundle of memories, of conditionings, of hopes, and what it wants to be. The struggle between what *is* and what *should* be, the everlasting conflict between what I am and what I want to be, not only consciously, but deep down, unconsciously, in the obscure recesses of my mind and heart—is not that very struggle the process of the “me”? But if I can really experience that the thinker *is* the thought, the observer *is* the observed, then there is a release of that creative energy which brings about a fundamental transformation.

So, if you are at all aware of yourself, you will know that there is this constant struggle going on, which only emphasizes, gives nourishment, strength to the “me”, to the “I-ness”, to the ego, to the self—whether it be the higher or the lower self, it is all the same, because it is all within the field of thought. And is not the thinker created by thought? Is the thinker separate from thought? As long as the thinker is trying to con-

trol thought, shape it, give it a certain direction, which is the process of discipline, that very struggle gives strength to the thinker and so gives vitality to the “me”; and it is in this centre of the “me” that the revolution, the change must take place. And how is that to come about? I see clearly that no form of compulsion, no discipline, no incentive, no hope, no vision can bring it about, because in all these there is a duality, the what *is* and what *should* be, the observer and the observed; and as long as the observer exists, there must always be the struggle to achieve the thing which he has observed, which he has thought out. This struggle gives strength to the thinker, which is the “me”, the self. I see that very clearly, so what am I to do?

Perhaps, in coming to this point, we have used the conscious mind; we have followed the argument, we have opposed or accepted it, we have seen it clearly or dimly. That is, the conscious mind is active in pursuit of what the speaker is saying. But to go further and experience more deeply requires a mind that is quiet and alert to find out, does it not? It is no longer pursuing ideas; because, if you pursue an idea, there is the thinker following what is being said, and so you immediately create duality. If you want to go further into this matter of fundamental change, is it not necessary for the active mind to be quiet? Surely, it is only when the mind is quiet when it can understand the enormous difficulty, the complex implications of the thinker and the thought as two separate processes—the experiencer and the experienced, the observer and the observed. Revolution, this psychological, creative revolution in which the “me” is not, comes only when the thinker and the thought are one, when there is no duality as the thinker controlling thought; and I suggest it is this experience alone that releases the creative energy which in turn brings about a fundamental revolution, the break-

ing up of the psychological "me". But this is an extremely difficult thing to realize, because the mind is so conditioned to struggle, to be separate, to be secure, to be permanent, that it is afraid to think of the problem anew. We have probably never experienced this state in which the thinker is absent, in which the observer is not, because we are so conditioned by the idea, so accustomed to the feeling that the thinker is always separate from his thought; and you are not going to experience it by merely listening to me. But if you have earnestly followed these talks and have really experimented with yourself during the past weeks, you are bound to come to the point when you are fully aware that there is this extraordinary division between the thinker and the thought. Most of us are still unaware of this division. We are caught up in the conflict between the thinker and the thought, in the everlasting battle of the "me", the self, to acquire, to reject, to suppress, to become something. With that we are very familiar; but we are not aware of the division. If, becoming aware of the division, the thinker seeks to destroy it, to bridge it over, he increases the division, because then the thinker is again seeking to be something which he is not, thereby giving himself greater strength, greater security.

So, how is it possible for you and me, as individuals, to come to this experience, to this realization? We know the way of power—power through domination, power through discipline, power through compulsion. Through political power we hope to change fundamentally; but such power only breeds further darkness, disintegration, evil, the strengthening of the "me". We are familiar with the various forms of acquisition, both individually and as groups; but we have never tried the way of love, and we don't even know what it means. Love is not possible as long as there is the thinker, the centre of the "me". Realizing all this, what is one to do?

Surely, the only thing which can bring about a fundamental change, a creative, psychological release, is everyday watchfulness, being aware from moment to moment of our motives, the conscious as well as the unconscious. When we realize that disciplines, beliefs, ideals only strengthen the "me", and are therefore utterly futile—when we are aware of that from day to day, see the truth of it, do we not come to the central point when the thinker is constantly separating himself from his thought, from his observations, from his experiences? As long as the thinker exists apart from his thought, which he is trying to dominate, there can be no fundamental transformation. As long as the "me" is the observer, the one who gathers experience, strengthens himself through experience, there can be no radical change, no creative release. That creative release comes only when the thinker is the thought—but the gap cannot be bridged by any effort. When the mind realizes that any speculation, any verbalization, any form of thought only gives strength to the "me", when it sees that as long as the thinker exists apart from thought there must be limitation, the conflict of duality—when the mind realizes that, then it is watchful, everlastingly aware of how it is separating itself from experience, asserting itself, seeking power. In that awareness, if the mind pursues it ever more deeply and extensively without seeking an end, a goal, there comes a state in which the thinker and the thought are one. In that state there is no effort, there is no becoming, there is no desire to change; in that state the "me" is not, for there is a transformation which is not of the mind.

Question: One must obviously know the bad in order to know the good. Does this not imply the process of evolution?

KRISHNAMURTI: Must we know drunkenness to know sobriety? Must you go through hate in order to know what it is to be compassionate? Must you go through wars, destroying yourself and others, to know what peace is? Surely, this is an utterly false way of thinking, is it not? First you assume that there is evolution, growth, a moving from bad to good, and then you fit your thinking into that pattern. Obviously, there is physical growth, the little plant becoming the big tree; there is technological progress, the wheel evolving, through centuries, into the jet plane. But is there psychological progress, evolution? That is what we are discussing: whether there is a growth, an evolution of the "me", beginning with evil and ending up in good. Through a process of evolution, through time, can the "me", which is the centre of evil, ever become noble, good? Obviously not. That which is evil, the psychological "me", will always remain evil. But we do not want to face that. We think that through the process of time, through growth and change, the "I" will ultimately become reality. That is our hope, that is our longing: that the "I" will be made perfect through time. What is this "I", this "me"? It is a name, a form, a bundle of memories, hopes, frustrations, longings, pains, sorrows, passing joys. We want this "me" to continue and become perfect, and so we say that beyond the "me" there is a "super-me", a higher self, a spiritual entity which is timeless; but since we have thought of it, that "spiritual" entity is still within the field of time, is it not? If we can think about it, it is obviously within the field of time, is it not? If we can think about it, it is obviously within the field of our reasoning.

Please, if I can think about the spiritual state, if I know what it looks like, what it tastes like, what its sensations are, it is already within the field of my knowledge; and my knowledge is based on memory, on condi-

tioning. Surely, that which I can think about is not spiritual, timeless. Thought is the result of the past, of memory, of time; and thought has created this so-called spiritual entity because I am conditioned to accept that theory, I have been brought up from childhood to think in that way. Perhaps others are conditioned *not* to believe in a spiritual entity—which is actually happening in the world. They will deny that there is a spiritual entity, because they have been conditioned to think in those terms.

The mind, seeing its own impermanency, its own transiency, craves a permanent state; and the very craving creates the symbol, the sensation, the idea, the belief to which we cling. So, there is the "me" who is transient, and the "super-me", the higher self, which we consider to be permanent; and the mind is pursuing the permanent, thereby creating duality, the conflict of the opposites. In dividing thought into the superficial "me" which is impermanent, and the "me" which is concealed, far away, timeless, spiritual, with all the various degrees between the two, I have given birth to the conflict of duality; and to achieve the timeless, I say I must have time, there must be a psychological growth, a becoming. In this process there is always the "me", the observer, and the thing which he observes and is going to gain; and in giving himself to this struggle, he strengthens his longings, his desires. And to achieve what he is after, he must have time, the future; therefore he has reincarnation—if not now, tomorrow. But if we can cut across all that, then we will see that as long as there is the thinker apart from the thought, the observer separate from the observed, there must be conflict; and through conflict there can be no understanding, no peace.

Now, is it possible for the thinker and the thought, for the observer and the observed, to be one? You will never find out if you merely glance

at this problem and superficially ask me to explain what I mean by this or that. Surely, this is *your* problem, it is not my problem only; you are not here to find out how *I* look at this problem, or the problems of the world. This constant battle within, which is so destructive, so deteriorating—it is *your* problem, is it not? And it is also your problem how to bring about a radical change in yourself and not be satisfied with superficial revolutions in politics, in economics, in different bureaucracies. You are not trying to understand *me*, or the way *I* look at life. You are trying to understand yourself, and these are your problems which you have to face; and by considering them together, which is what we are doing in these talks, we can perhaps help each other to look at them more clearly, see them more distinctly. But to see clearly merely at the verbal level is not enough. That does not bring about a creative psychological change. We must go beyond the words, beyond all symbols and their sensations—the symbol of love, the symbol of God, the Hindu and the Christian symbols; for, though they create certain responses, they are all at the verbal level, at the level of images. We must put aside all these things and come to the central issue: how to dissolve the “me” which is time-binding, in which there is no love, no compassion. It is possible to go beyond only when the mind does not separate itself as the thinker and the thought. When the thinker and the thought are one, only then is there silence, the silence in which there is no image-making or waiting for further experience. In that silence there is no experiencer who is experiencing, and only then is there a psychological revolution which is creative.

Question: What are the essentials of right education?

KRISHNAMURTI: Surely, this is a very complex problem, is it not? And

do you think it can be answered in a few minutes? But perhaps we can see what is important in this question.

For what are we educating ourselves and our children? For war? For greater knowledge, so that we can destroy each other? For techniques, so that we can earn a livelihood? For information, culture, prestige? Actually, why are we educating our children? We really don't know, do we? How can we know when we ourselves are so utterly confused? Practically everything we do leads to war, to the destruction of our neighbours and ourselves. We are educating the child to compete, strengthening the “me”, conditioning him so that he can survive in this battle; and we throw in various forms of information, knowledge. That is what we call education. Or, we condition the child to think along certain lines and act according to established patterns; we want him to be a Catholic, a Christian Scientist, a communist, a Hindu, and so on and on. So, first of all, is it not important that the educator himself be educated? Surely, education is not the mere teaching of facts—anyone can pick those up in an encyclopaedia if he knows how to read. What is essential is to awaken intelligence so that the mind is able to question, to find out, and to meet life without getting caught in any form of conditioning, religious, social, or political; and for that, both the teacher and the parent have to be intelligent, have they not?

As this is a very complex problem which must be approached from different angles, we cannot merely lay down what are the essentials of right education; but we can see that what we are now doing throughout the world is false, destructive, uncreative. Creativeness is not the mere production of pictures, of inventions, it is not the writing of poems, of essays, books. That may or may not be creative. But what is important is this inward creativeness in which there

is no fear, no desire for self-extension, no aggressiveness, no psychological dependence, a state in which there is a freedom, a sense of aloneness which is not loneliness. This is the truly creative state, and it is only when we have awakened it in ourselves that we can help the student in his gifts, in his studies, in his relationships, without emphasizing the "me". But to break down the self-enclosing activities of the mind and come to that creativeness requires an enormous watchfulness, a constant alertness within oneself.

So, our problem is not easy; but we must begin with ourselves, must we not? Self-knowledge is the beginning of wisdom, and wisdom is not the mere repetition of someone else's experience or phrases. Wisdom has no authority; it comes into being as the mind begins to understand the depths and extensions of its own nature, which cannot be speculated upon. To discover that which is creative, we must come to it anew; the mind must be empty, free from all knowledge, from all memory. Only then is there a possibility of a new relationship and a new world.

August 30, 1952

X

As this is the last talk of the present series, perhaps it might be as well if I briefly went over what we have been discussing for the past several weeks; but in doing so, I am not making a résumé, which would imply recollection of what has been said and repeating it, and that is not my intention.

What we have been discussing is the problem of change. I think most of us realize the necessity of change, not only outwardly, in the economic and social world, but primarily at the psychological level of our existence. When we consider change, we generally think in terms of the superficial level. We mean the change that

must take place in the relationship of nations, of groups, of communities, of races. We talk of economic and social revolution, and how to bring it about—and there the majority of us stop. We are satisfied with intellectual concepts, verbal formulations, or with the vision of a new world to which we can give our faith and for which we can sacrifice ourselves. So, we see the necessity of change; but I feel a radical change can take place, not at the periphery, on the outside, the circumference, but only at the centre, that is, at the psychological level. In discussing this problem, we have considered it from different points of view; and perhaps this morning we can approach it from the point of view of authority, and how authority prevents a fundamental change. There is the authority of knowledge, the authority of one's own experience, the authority of memory, the authority of what others say, the authority of the interpreter; and wherever the mind clings to authority, is hedged about by it, obviously there can be no radical change.

I think authority is one of the greatest hindrances that prevent this inward transformation which is so essential if there is to be an outward change in which the problem of war and starvation can be resolved. Until there is a psychological revolution, a fundamental transformation in each one of us, mere outward reformation will not bring about the desired end; and this inward change is prevented when you and I as individuals cling to authority. Most of us are afraid of change. We want things to remain as they are, particularly at the physical level if we are well off. We have a house, a little bit of property, and we are afraid of change there. We are also afraid of change in belief, because we are uncertain of the future. However intelligent, clever, so-called intellectual the mind may be, it clings to some form of belief. Belief becomes the authority, the

ideal, the vision. In our relationships, in experience, there is the desire to be secure, to continue in a particular psychological state, and we are afraid to have a fundamental change along these lines. Being afraid, the mind creates authority: political authority, the authority of religion, of belief, of dogma, the authority of one's own experience, and so on.

Is it not important to find out how the mind is constantly creating its own barriers of authority, which prevent a radical transformation? Has not each one of us a subtle form of authority? There is the authority of the book, which is knowledge; and must not knowledge be *completely* set aside if the mind is to be free to see the new? And can the mind ever be free from this acquisition of knowledge? By knowledge we mean information concerning what has been said by the clever, the intellectual, the people who are capable of expressing ideas very clearly, subtly; and does not the mind, in its fear, make of this an authority to which it clings? And do we not make our own experience into authority, a pattern of action according to which we function? Do we not make belief into an authority? Because we ourselves are uncertain, fearful of change, of what might happen, there is always the belief, the ideal, the ultimate reality, the authority of a book, of another's experience, and of our own hope. Most of us are seeking something to which the mind can cling, round which the mind can build its own security, its own continuity, are we not? And can the mind ever be free from this pursuit, from the erection of these walls which hold it? Can the mind, being smothered by authority, ever change? Is this not one of our problems, yours and mine? Can the mind ever be free from authority, even at the superficial level?

You may not make an authority of me because, after all, I am not say-

ing anything which you cannot find out for yourself if you are eager, if you are alert, inquiring; but the desire for authority is always there. Being confused, you depend on interpreters to tell you what I am trying to say or not to say; you find interpreters of the truth. In yourself you are so uncertain, lost, confused, and you want someone to lead, to help you. The moment you rely on another, however great or absurd he may be, there is no freedom, hence there is no possibility of a radical change. In its own uncertainty, in its own confusion and desire to find security, the mind gradually sets up the authority of the church, of the political party, of the leader, the teacher, the book; and realizing this, the church, the State, the politicians, the cunning people, seize the authority and tell us what to think. Most of us are satisfied with authority because it gives us a continuity, a certainty, a sense of being protected. But a man who would understand the implications of this deep psychological revolution must be free of authority, must he not? He cannot look to any authority, whether of his own creation, or imposed upon him by another. And is this possible? Is it possible for me not to rely on the authority of my own experience? Even when I have rejected all the outward expressions of authority—books, teachers, priests, churches, beliefs—, I still have the feeling that at least I can rely on my own judgment, on my own experiences, on my own analysis. But can I rely on my experience, on my judgment, on my analysis? My experience is the result of my conditioning, just as yours is the result of *your* conditioning, is it not? I may have been brought up as a Mahommedan, or a Buddhist, or a Hindu, and my experience will depend on my cultural, economic, social and religious background, just as yours will. And can I rely on that? Can I rely for guidance, for hope, for the vision which will give

me faith, on my own judgment, which again is the result of accumulated memories, experiences, the conditioning of the past meeting the present? Can I analyze my own problems? And if I do, is the analyzer different from the thing that he has analyzed?

Now, when I have put all these questions to myself and I am aware of this problem, I see there can be only one state in which reality, newness, can come into being, which brings about a revolution. That state is when the mind is completely empty of the past; when there is no analyzer, no experiencer, no judgment, no authority of any kind. After all, is this not one of our deep problems? As long as the mind is crippled by the past, burdened with knowledge, with memories, with judgments, the new cannot be; as long as the mind is the centre of the self, the "me", which is the result of time, there is no possibility of the timeless. I do not know what the timeless, that ultimate reality is; but I see that I cannot possibly be aware of anything other than my own creations as long as the mind is merely in a state of experiencing, analyzing, judging, following.

So, if I am really anxious to find out whether there is anything new, the mind must see the nature of its own creations, its own illusions. And I think this is one of our greatest difficulties, because our whole education is to worship the intellect, the mind. So many books have been written about the mind, and everything that we have read is guiding, shaping, conditioning us. This is not a matter of agreement or disagreement with me; but are you not aware of these things in your own life? And a mind which is crippled by the past, by one's own experiences, by one's own motives, urges, demands, ambitions, beliefs, by the everlasting striving to be something—how can such a mind ever be capable of seeing the new? If you are at all aware of your own inner problems, and see

that the political, religious and economic crises of the whole world are inter-related with the psychological conflicts, you are bound to put these questions to yourself. Any change that takes place without freeing the mind of the past, is still within the field of time, therefore within the field of corruption; and surely, such a change is no change at all, it is merely a continuation of the old in a different form.

Being aware of all this, I ask myself, as you must also, whether the mind can possibly be free, completely empty of the past, and so capable of seeing something which is not of its own projection, of its own manufacture. To find out if it is possible, you have to experiment—which means that you must distrust *completely* any form of authority, self-imposed, or imposed by outward circumstances. And authority works very subtly. You are being influenced by me, you are bound to be. But if you are only being influenced, then there will be no radical change—it's merely a sensation which will react and throw off this influence, taking on another. Whereas, if you are deeply concerned with the problem of fundamental change, then you will see directly for yourself that this change *must* come about if there is to be peace in the world, if there is to be no starvation when many are well fed. If there is to be the universal well-being of man, there must be a change, not at the superficial level, but at the centre. The centre is the "me", the "I", which is everlastingly accumulating, positively or negatively; and one of its ways of acquisition is through authority. Through authority it has continuance. So, if you and I realize this, then the problem arises, can the mind empty itself of its whole content, can it be free of all the things that have been put upon it, imposed and self-imposed? It is only when the mind is empty that there is a possibility of creation; but I do not mean this super-

ficial emptiness which most of us have. Most of us are superficially empty, and it shows itself through the desire for distraction. We want to be amused, so we turn to books, to the radio, we run to lectures, to authorities; the mind is everlastingly filling itself. I am not talking of that emptiness, which is thoughtlessness. On the contrary, I am talking of the emptiness which comes through extraordinary thoughtfulness, when the mind sees its own power of creating illusion and goes beyond.

Creative emptiness is not possible as long as there is the thinker who is waiting, watching, observing in order to gather experience, in order to strengthen himself. And can the mind ever be empty of all symbols, of all words with their sensations so that there is no experiencer who is accumulating? Is it possible for the mind to put aside *completely* all the reasonings, the experiences, the impositions, authorities, so that it is in a state of emptiness? You will not be able to answer this question, naturally; it is an impossible question for you to answer, because you do not know, you have never tried. But, if I may suggest, listen to it, let the question be put to you, let the seed be sown; and it will bear fruit if you *really* listen to it, if you do not resist it, if you do not say, "How can the mind be empty? If it is empty, it cannot function, it cannot do its daily job". And what is its daily job? Routine, boredom, tiresome continuity. We all know that. So, it seems to me important to find out for yourself; and to find out, you must listen, inquire. When I am talking, I am helping you to inquire, I am not putting something across or over to you. I also am inquiring. That is the purpose of these talks.

After all these weeks of talking, of going into this problem of change, we must ultimately come to this question, whether the mind can ever be empty so that it can receive the new. It is only the new that can transform, not the old. If you pursue the pat-

tern of the old, any change is a modified continuity of the old; there is nothing new in that, there is nothing creative. The creative can come into being only when the mind itself is new; and the mind can renew itself only when it is capable of seeing all its own activities, not only at the superficial level, but deep down. When the mind sees its own activities, is aware of its own desires, demands, urges, pursuits, the creation of its own authorities, fears; when it sees in itself the resistance created by discipline, by control, and the hope which projects beliefs, ideals—when the mind sees through, is aware of this whole process, can it put aside all these things and be new, creatively empty? You will find out whether it can or cannot only if you experiment without having an opinion about it, without wanting to experience that creative state. If you *want* to experience it, you will; but what you experience is not creative emptiness, it is only a projection of desire. If you desire to experience the new, you are merely indulging in illusion. But if you begin to observe, to be aware of your own activities from day to day, from moment to moment, watching the whole process of yourself as in a mirror, then, as you go deeper and deeper, you will come to the ultimate question of this emptiness in which alone there can be the new. Truth, God, or what you will, is not something to be experienced; for the experiencer is the result of time, the result of memory, of the past; and as long as there is the experiencer, there cannot be reality. There is reality only when the mind is completely free from the analyzer, from the experiencer and the experienced.

Now can you not just listen to this as the soil receives the seed, and see if the mind is capable of being free, empty? It can be empty only by understanding all its own projections, its own activities, not off and on, but from day to day, from moment to moment. Then you will find the

answer, then you will see that the change comes without your asking, that the state of creative emptiness is not a thing to be cultivated—it is there, it comes darkly, without any invitation; and only in that state is there a possibility of renewal, newness, revolution.

Question: I read recently of a Hindu girl who could easily solve problems in higher mathematics which were difficult for even the greatest mathematicians. How can you explain this except by reincarnation?

KRISHNAMURTI: Isn't it very odd how we are satisfied by explanations? You have a particular theory of continuity, which is reincarnation. You have that belief, that conviction. I don't know why, but you have it—or rather, we do know why: because you want to continue. Having that belief, that explanation, you want to fit everything round it; and the authority of your belief cripples your discovery of the new. This girl's extraordinary faculty may or may not be the result of reincarnation; but surely, what is important is to find out your *own* state, not that of the girl, why your mind is caught and crippled by words, explanations. Good gracious me, there can be a dozen explanations for this; but why do you as an individual choose the particular explanation that satisfies you? That is important to find out, is it not? Because, if you go into it, you will discover how your mind is crippled by belief, by sensation, by the desire for your own continuity. Surely, that which continues cannot be the new. Only in dying is there the new. But we don't want to die, we want to continue. Our whole social structure, all our religious beliefs, are based on this continuity of the "me", of the "I", which means we are afraid of death, of coming to an end. Being afraid, we have innumerable explanations to cover up that fear; and the more we cover it, the more it festers. And

what is this fear? Please follow this: what is this fear of not being, of not continuing? What is the "you" that wants to continue? Is it not your property, the things that you have gathered in your house, the furniture, the radio, the washing machine, the qualities, the virtues you have struggled to gain, the name, the reputation, the memories and experiences? And if you really go into it, look at it earnestly, what are all these things? What are they but empty words, symbols that give you sensations; and these sensations we cling to. It is *that* we want to continue; and so there is never the new, there is never a death, but a postponement. It is only in dying that you see the new; it is only in putting an end to the old that there is a possibility of something creative. And is it possible to die from day to day? Is it possible not to hoard resentments, ideas, goals, to put an end to this process of achievement which gives birth to everlasting strife? Fear is a thing which we have never really looked at; death we have never faced. We watch other people die, but we don't know what death means because we are afraid of it; so we run away through explanations, through words, through ideas, beliefs. And can the mind face fear? Can the mind look at it? What is this fear? Is it a word, or an actuality? Please listen, find out. The thing which we are afraid of, is it the word "fear", or something which is actual? There is the fact of death; but we have ideas, opinions about death. The ideas about the fact create the fear. It is the word about the fact that creates the fear—not the fact itself. And can the mind be free of the word and look at the fact? Which means, really, looking at the fact without the activity of the mind. The mind is active only in words, in symbols, in opinions; so the mind creates the barrier and looks through the barrier at the fact, and therefore there is fear. Can the mind look at the fact without having an idea about it, without

an opinion, a judgment? If it can, then there is a *complete* revolution, is there not? Then there is a possibility of going beyond death.

Question: What is suffering?

KRISHNAMURTI: Let us inquire and find out. There is the physical pain which gradually becomes a mental suffering, and which the mind uses to create situations, problems, either to strengthen or to diminish itself. Then there is the suffering caused by not being loved sufficiently, by wanting love; there is suffering through death, when you love somebody and that somebody is gone; there is suffering through frustration, the suffering which comes when you are ambitious and cannot achieve your ambition; there is suffering through the loss of your property, through ill health. What does all this indicate? What is this thing that we call suffering? Is it not that through these activities of the mind the self-enclosing process of the "me" becomes more and more accentuated, strengthened? When you become aware that you are enclosed, held, is that not suffering? Does not suffering exist when you are conscious of yourself, of your battles, of your strivings, of your frustrated ambitions? The more you are caught in the conflicts of the self, the more there is of suffering. So, suffering is a reaction of the self; and to understand the implications of suffering is to go into the whole process of the "me", of the "I"—which is what we have been doing in these talks.

Suffering is an indication of the activities of the mind. Suffering is not to be denied; but most of us try to cover it up, we run away from it through explanations, through satisfying words. We do not go into the problem of suffering, which is to expose the "me" in its nakedness; and when it is suddenly exposed, we do not dwell with it, we do not watch it, we try to escape. In escape there is resistance, and that very resistance

creates further conflict, further struggle; so we are caught in this everlasting process of suffering. Whereas, if, when suffering comes, we are capable of looking at that nakedness, that loneliness, that emptiness which is the self, only then is there a possibility of going beyond it.

Question: What is meditation?

KRISHNAMURTI: Perhaps you and I can find out together what meditation is, so let us go into it. You are not waiting for an answer from me, so that you can be satisfied by words, by explanations. You and I are going to find out what meditation actually is.

What is meditation? Sitting quietly, cross-legged, or lying down, relaxed? Obviously, there must be relaxation of the body; but, though your body is relaxed, your mind is very active, chattering away endlessly. Being aware of this, you say, "I must control it, I must stop it, there must be a certain sense of quietness". So, you begin to control, to discipline your mind. Please follow all this, and you will see. You spend years in controlling, disciplining your chattering mind; your energy is spent in making the mind conform to a desired pattern, but you never succeed; and if you do succeed, your mind becomes so weary, lethargic, empty, dull. Obviously, that is not meditation. On the contrary, the mind must be supremely alert, not caught in a routine of habit, discipline.

So, I see that my mind, though it is chattering endlessly, cannot be disciplined, made to fit into a particular pattern of thought. Then how is it to be calmed? How is the chattering mind to be quiet? Just see the implications of the problem. If the observer, the analyzer, imposes a discipline on the chattering mind, then there is a conflict between the observer, the analyzer and the thing he has observed, analyzed. The thinker is struggling to make his thought conform to the pattern which he desires,

which is to calm the mind; so he disciplines it, he controls, dominates, suppresses it, in which is involved the conflict of duality. There is a division between the observer and the observed, and in that division there is conflict; and meditation is obviously not an endless process of conflict.

So, how is the mind, which is ceaselessly chattering, to be quiet? When I ask that question, what is the state of your mind? Please watch yourself. What is the state of your mind when I put that question? You are accustomed to discipline, control, but now you see its absurdity, its illusory nature; therefore, the state of your mind is that you do not know how to quiet the mind. You are finished with explanations, with knowledge, which is conditioning; the actual fact is that your mind is chattering, and you do not know how to quiet it. So, what is the state of your mind? You are really inquiring, are you not? You are watching, you have no answer. All that you know is that your mind is chattering, and you want to find out how the mind can be quiet—but not according to a method. Surely, the moment you put to yourself the question, "How is the mind to be quiet, cease from chattering"?, you have already entered the realm in which the mind is quiet, have you not? You know that your mind is active, ceaselessly battling, one layer against another layer, the observer fighting the observed, the experiencer wanting more; you are aware of the incessant vagaries of thought, and you actually do not know how to reduce it, how it is to be quiet. You reject all methods, because they have no meaning. To follow a method, to copy a pattern only cripples the mind through habit. Habit is not meditation. The routine of a discipline does not free the mind so that it can discover the new. So, you reject all that *completely*; but you still have the question, how is the mind to be quiet? The moment you put that question to yourself really, vitally, actually, what then is the state of your mind?

Is it not quiet? It is no longer chattering, analyzing, judging; it is watching, observing, because you don't know. The very state of not knowing is the beginning of quietness. You discover that as long as there is the struggle between the desired pattern and that which you are, there must be a battle; and this battle is a waste of energy, which creates inertia. So, the mind sees the falseness of all that and rejects it. As it observes, the mind becomes quiet; yet there is still the problem of the thinker apart from thought, so there is again a battle.

Meditation is all this process, not just a limited process with a particular end. It is this vast searching, groping, not being caught in any particular idea, belief, or experience, being aware that any projection of the mind is illusion, hypnosis. And if you go into it more and more deeply, not with a motive, not with any desire for a particular result, but simply watching the whole process of yourself, then you will see that, without any form of compulsion, suppression or discipline, the mind becomes creatively empty, still. That stillness will not give you any riches in this world—do not translate it so quickly into dollars. If you approach it with a begging bowl, it will offer you nothing. That stillness is free from all sense of continuity, in it there is no experiencer who is experiencing. When the experiencer is there, it is no longer stillness, it is merely a continuation of sensation. Meditation is all this process, which brings about a state in which the mind is still, no longer projecting, desiring, defending, judging, experiencing. In that state the new can be. The new is not to be verbalized; it has no words to explain it, therefore it is not communicable. It is something that comes into being when the mind itself is new; and this whole, complex process of self-knowledge is meditation.

August 31, 1952