

## **- Part 1, Conversation With David Shainberg And David Bohm -**

[1st Conversation - Transformation Of Man](#)

[2nd Conversation - Transformation Of Man](#)

[3rd Conversation - Transformation Of Man](#)

[4th Conversation - Transformation Of Man](#)

[5th Conversation - Transformation Of Man](#)

[6th Conversation - Transformation Of Man](#)

[7th Conversation - Transformation Of Man](#)

## **- Public Talks And Dialogue -**

[Chapter 1](#)

[Meditation Is The Emptying Of The Content Of  
Consciousness](#)

[Chapter 2](#)

[The Ending Of Conflict Is The Gathering Of Supreme  
Energy Which Is A Form Of Intelligence](#)

[Chapter 3](#)

[Out Of Negation Comes The Positive Called Love](#)

[Chapter 4](#)

[Death; A Great Act Of Purgation](#)

[Chapter 5](#)

[Action Which Is Skilful And Which Does Not  
Perpetuate The Self](#)

[Chapter 6](#)

[Reason And Logic Alone Will Not Discover Truth](#)

[Chapter 7](#)

[Intelligence, In Which There Is Complete Security](#)

[Chapter 8](#)

[In Negation The Positive Is Born](#)

[Chapter 9](#)

[Because There Is Space, There Is Emptiness And  
Total Silence](#)

[Chapter 10](#)

[The State Of The Mind That Has Insight Is Completely  
Empty](#)

[Chapter 11](#)

[Where There Is Suffering You Cannot Possibly Love](#)

[Chapter 12](#)  
[Sorrow Is The Outcome Of Time And Thought](#)

[Chapter 13](#)  
[What Is Death?](#)

[Chapter 14](#)  
[That Emptiness Is The Summation Of All Energy](#)

[Chapter 15](#)  
[When The Me Is Not, Then Compassion Comes Into Being](#)

[Chapter 16](#)  
[The Division Between The Observer And The Observed Is The Source Of Conflict](#)

[Chapter 17](#)  
[When There Is An Ending To Consciousness With Its Content There Is Something Entirely Different](#)

[Chapter 18](#)  
[Without Clarity, Skill Becomes A Most Dangerous Thing](#)

[Chapter 19](#)  
[How Is One To Know Oneself](#)

### **- Part 3, Ojai 1977-**

[Chapter 1 - Small Group Dialogue](#)

[Chapter 2 - Small Group Dialogue](#)

### **- Longer, Unedited Versions -**

[1st Conversation With Shainberg And Bohm](#)

[2nd Conversation With Shainberg And Bohm](#)

[3rd Conversation With Shainberg And Bohm](#)

[4th Conversation With Shainberg And Bohm](#)

[5th Conversation With Shainberg And Bohm](#)

[6th Conversation With Shainberg And Bohm](#)

[7th Conversation With Shainberg And Bohm](#)

[Part 2 - Chapter 2](#)

[Part 2 - Chapter 3](#)

[Part 2 - Chapter 5](#)

[Part 2 - Chapter 6](#)

[Part 2 - Chapter 8](#)

[Part 2 - Chapter 9](#)

[Part 2 - Chapter 10 & 11](#)

[Part 2 - Chapter 12 & 13](#)

[Part 2 - Chapter 14](#)

[Part 2 - Chapter 15](#)

[Part 2 - Chapter 17](#)

[Part 2 - Chapter 18](#)

[Part 2 - Chapter 19](#)

**THE WHOLENESS OF LIFE PART I DIALOGUE  
1 1ST CONVERSATION WITH DR. DAVID  
SHAINBERG AND PROF. DAVID BOHM  
BROCKWOOD PARK 17TH MAY, 1976**

KRISHNAMURTI: Can we talk about the wholeness of life? Can one be aware of that wholeness if the mind is fragmented? You can't be aware of the whole if you are only looking through a small hole.

Dr Shainberg: Right. But on the other hand in actuality you are the whole.

K: Ah! That is theory.

S: Is it?

Dr Bohm: A supposition, of course it is.

K: Of course, when you are fragmented how can you assume that you are the whole?

S: How am I to know I am fragmented?

K: When there is conflict.

S: That's right.

K: When opposing desires, opposing wishes, opposing thoughts bring conflict. Then you have pain, then you become conscious of your fragmentation.

S: Right. But at those moments it often happens that you don't want to let go of the conflict.

K: That is a different matter. What we are asking is: Can the fragment dissolve itself, for then only it is possible to see the whole.

S: All you really know is your fragmentation.

K: That is all we know.

B: That is right.

K: Therefore let's stick to that.

B: The supposition that there is a whole may be reasonable but as long as you are fragmented you could never see it. It would be just an assumption. K: Of course, right.

S: Right.

B: You may think you have experienced it once, but that is also an assumption.

K: Absolutely. Quite right.

S: You know, I wonder if there is not a tremendous pain or something that goes on when I am aware of my fragmentation - a loneliness somehow.

K: Look, sir: Can you be aware of your fragment? That you are an American, that I am a Hindu, Jew, Communist or whatever - you just live in that state. You don't say, "Well I know I am a Hindu" - it is only when you are challenged, it is only when it is said, "What are you?" that you say, "I am an Indian, or a Hindu, or an Arab".

B: When the country is challenged then you have got to worry.

K: Of course.

S: So you are saying that I am living totally reactively?

K: No, you are living totally in a kind of miasma, confusion.

S: From one piece to the next, from one reaction to the next reaction.

K: So can we be aware, actually, of the various fragments? That I am a Hindu, that I am a Jew, that I am an Arab, that I am a Communist, that I am a Catholic, that I am a businessman, that I

am married, that I have responsibilities; I am an artist, I am a scientist - you follow? All this sociological fragmentation.

S: Right.

K: As well as psychological fragmentation.

S. Right right. That is exactly what I started with. This feeling that I am a fragment.

K: Which you call the individual.

S: That I call important, not just the individual.

K: You call that important.

S: Right. That I have to work.

K: Quite.

S: It is significant. K: So can we now, in talking together, be aware that I am that? I am a fragment and therefore creating more fragments, more conflict, more misery, more confusion, more sorrow, because when there is conflict it affects everything.

S: Right.

K: Can you be aware of it as we are discussing?

S: I can be aware a little as we are discussing.

K: Not a little.

S: That's the trouble. Why can't I be aware of it?

K: Look, sir. You are only aware of it when there is conflict. It is not a conflict in you now.

B: But is it possible to be aware of it without conflict?

K: That is the next thing, yes. That requires quite a different approach.

B: But I was thinking of looking at one point - that the importance of these fragments is that when I identify myself and say "I am this", "I am that", I mean the whole of me. The whole of

me is rich or poor, or American, or whatever, and therefore it seems all-important. I think the trouble is that the fragment claims it is the whole, and makes itself very important.

S: Takes up the whole life.

B: Then comes a contradiction, and then comes another fragment saying it is the whole.

K: You know this whole world is broken up that way, outside and inside.

S: Me and you.

K: Yes, me and you, we and they...

B: But if we say "I am wholly this", then we also say "I am wholly that".

S; This movement into fragmentation almost seems to be caused by something. It seems to be...

K: Is this what you are asking? What is the cause of this fragmentation?

S: Yes. What is the cause of the fragmentation? What breeds it? What sucks us into it? K: We are asking something very important, which is: What is the cause of this fragmentation?

S: That is what I was getting into. There is some cause... I have got to hold on to something.

K: No. Just look at it, sir. Why are you fragmented?

S: Well, my immediate response is the need to hold on to something.

K: No, much deeper than that. Much deeper. Look at it. Look at it. Let's go slowly into it.

S: OK.

K: Not immediate responses. What brings this conflict which

indicates I am fragmented, and then I ask the question: What brings this fragmentation? What is the cause of it?

B: Right. That is important.

K: Yes. Why are you and I and the majority of the world fragmented? What is the cause of it?

B: It seems we won't find the cause by going back in time to a certain...

S: I am not looking for genetics, I am looking for right this second...

K: Sir, just look at it. Put it on the table and look at it objectively. What brings about this fragmentation?

S: Fear.

K: No, no, much more.

B: Maybe the fragmentation causes fear.

K: Yes, that's it. Why am I a Hindu? - if I am, I am not a Hindu, I am not an Indian, I have no nationality. But suppose I call myself a Hindu. What makes me a Hindu?

S: Well, conditioning makes you a Hindu.

K: What is the background, what is it that makes me say "I am a Hindu"? Which is a fragmentation, obviously.

S: Right, right.

K: What makes it? My father, my grandfather - generations and generations before me, 10,000 or 5,000 years, they have been saying you are a Brahmin. S: You don't say or write I am a Brahmin, you are a Brahmin. Right? That is quite different. You say I am a Brahmin because...

K: It is like you saying I am a Christian. Which is what?

S: Tradition, conditioning, sociology, history, culture, family,



everything.

K: But behind that, what is behind that?

S: Behind that is man's...

K: No, no. Don't theorize. Look at it in yourself.

S: Well, it gives me a place, an identity; I know who I am then, I have my little niche.

K: Who made that niche?

S: Well, I made it and they helped me make it. I am co-operating in this very...

K: You are not co-operating. You are it.

S: I am it. Right. That's right. The whole thing is moving towards... putting me in a hole.

K: So what made you? The great-great-grandparent created this environment, this culture, this whole structure of human existence, with all its misery, all its conflict - which is the fragmentation.

S: The same action that makes man right now.

K: Exactly. The Babylonians, the Egyptians, we are exactly the same now.

B: Yes.

S: This is all giving me my secondhand existence.

K: Yes. Proceed. Let's go into it. Let's find out why man has brought about this state. Which we accept - you follow? Gladly or unwillingly, we are of it. I am willing to kill somebody because he is a Communist or a Fascist, an Arab or a Jew, a Protestant or a Catholic or whatever it is.

S: Well, everywhere, the doctors, lawyers...

K: Of course, of course. The same problem. Is it the desire for security? Biological as well as psychological security?

S: You could say yes. K: If I belong to something to some organization, to some group, to some sect to some ideological community I am safe there.

B: That is not clear: you may feel safe.

K: I feel safe then. But it may not be safety.

B: Yes, But why don't I see that I am not really safe?

K: Go into it.

S: I don't see it.

K: Just look. I join a community...

S: Right. I am a doctor.

K: Yes, you are a doctor.

S: I get all these ideas....

K: Because you are a doctor you have a special position in society.

S: Right. I have a lot of ideas of how things work.

K: You are in a special position in society and therefore you are completely safe.

S: Right.

K: You can malpractice, but you are very protected by other doctors, other organizations - you follow?

S: Right.

K: You feel secure.

B: it is essential that I shouldn't enquire too far to feel secure, isn't it? In other words I must stop my enquiry at a certain point. If I start to ask too many questions...

K: ...then you are out! If I begin to ask questions about my community and my relation to that community, my relationship to the world, my relation to my neighbour, I am finished. I am out of

the community. I am lost.

S: That's right.

K: So to feel safe, secure, protected, I belong.

S: I depend.

K: I depend.

B: I depend wholly in one sense that if I don't have that, then I feel the whole thing is sunk. S: You see, not only do I depend but every problem I now have is with reference to this dependency. I don't know about the patient, I only know how the patient doesn't fit into my system.

K: Quite, quite.

S: Because that is my conflict.

K: He is your victim.

S: That's right, my victim.

B: You see, as long as I don't ask questions I can feel comfortable. But I feel uncomfortable when I do ask questions, very deeply uncomfortable. Because the whole of my situation is challenged. But then if I look at it more broadly I see the whole thing has no foundation - it is all dangerous. This community itself is in a mess, it may collapse. Even if the whole of it doesn't collapse, you can't count on the academic profession any more, they may not give money for universities. Everything is changing so fast that you don't know where you are. So why should I go on with not asking questions?

K: Why don't I ask questions? - Because of fear.

B: Yes, but that fear is from fragmentations.

K: Of course. So is that the beginning of this fragmentation? Does fragmentation take place when one is seeking security?

S: But why..?

K: Both biologically as well as psychologically. Primarily psychologically, then biologically.

S: Right.

K: Physically.

B: But isn't the tendency to seek physical security built into the organism?

K: Yes, that's right. It is. I must have food, clothes, shelter. It is absolutely necessary.

S: Right.

K: And when that is threatened - if I questioned the Communist system altogether, living in Russia, I am a non person.

S: But let's go a little bit slower here. You are suggesting that in my need for security, biologically, I must have some fragmentation. K: No, sir. Biologically, fragmentation takes place, the insecurity takes place, when psychologically I want security.

S: OK.

K: I don't know if I am making myself clear. Wait a minute. That is: if I don't psychologically belong to a group, then I am out of that group.

S: Then I am insecure.

K: I am insecure, and because the group gives me security, physical security, I accept everything they give me.

S: Right.

K: But the moment I object psychologically to the structure of the society and the community I am lost. This is an obvious fact.

S: Right.

B: Yes.

S: Were you suggesting then that the basic insecurity we live in is being conditioned, and the response to this - the answer to this - is a conditioned fragmentation?

K: Partly.

S: And that the movement of fragmentation is the conditioning?

K: Sir, look: if there were no fragmentation, historically, geographically, nationally, we would live perfectly safely. We would all be protected, we would all have food, all have houses. There would be no wars, we'd be all one. He is my brother, I am him. He is me.

But this fragmentation prevents that taking place.

S: Right. So you are suggesting even more there - you are suggesting that we would help each other?

K: I would help, obviously.

B: We are going round in a circle because...

K: Yes, sir, I want to get back to something, which is: if there were no nationalities, no ideological groups, and so on, we would have everything we want. That is prevented because I am a Hindu, you are an Arab, he is a Russian - you follow? We are asking : Why does this fragmentation take place? What is the source of it? Is it knowledge?

S: It is knowledge, you say. K: Is it knowledge? I am sure it is but I am putting it as a question.

S: It certainly seems to be.

K: No, no. Look into it. Let's find out.

S: What do you mean by knowledge, what are you talking about there?

K: The word to know. Do I know you? Or have I known you? I

can never say I know you, I mean actually; it would be an abomination to say "I know you". I have known you. But you in the meantime are changing - there is a great deal of movement going on in you.

S: Right.

K: To say I know you means I am acquainted or intimate with that movement which is going on in you. It would be impudence on my part to say I know you.

S: That's right.

K: So knowing - to know - is the past. Would you say that?

B: Yes, I mean what we know is the past.

K: Knowledge is the past.

B: The danger is that we call it the present. The danger is that we call knowledge the present.

K: That is just it.

B: In other words, if we said the past is the past, then wouldn't you say it needn't fragment?

K: What is that, sir?

B: If we said - if we recognized, acknowledged, that the past is the past, that it is gone, and therefore what we know is the past, then it would not introduce fragmentation.

K: No, it wouldn't, quite right.

B: But if we say what we know is what is present now, then we are introducing fragmentation.

K: Quite right.

B: Because we are imposing this partial knowledge on the whole.

K: Sir, would you say knowledge is one of the factors of

fragmentation? It is a large pill to swallow! B: And also there are plenty of other factors.

K: Yes. But that may be the only factor!

B: I think we should look at it this way, that people hope through knowledge to overcome fragmentation.

K: Of course.

B: To produce a system of knowledge that will put it all together.

K: Is that not one of the major factors, or perhaps the factor of fragmentation? My experience tells me I am a Hindu: my experience tells me that I know what god is.

B: Wouldn't we better say that confusion about the whole of knowledge is because of fragmentation?

K: That is what we were saying the other day - art is putting things in their right place. So I will put knowledge in its right place.

B: Yes, so that we are not confused about it.

K: Of course.

S: You know I was just going to read you this rather interesting example of a patient of mine who was teaching me something the other day. She said, "I have the feeling that the way you doctors operate is that you have certain kinds of patients, and if you do 'x' to them you will get a certain kind of effect. You are not talking to me, you are doing this to me hoping you will get this result."

K: Quite.

S: That is what you are saying.

K: No, a little more, sir, than that. We are saying, both Dr Bohm and I, we are saying that knowledge has its place.

S: Let's go into that.

K: Like driving a car, learning a language and so on.

B: If we drive a car using knowledge, that is not fragmentation.

K: No, but when knowledge is used psychologically...

B: One should see more clearly what the difference is. The car itself - as I see it - is a part, a limited part, that can be handled by knowledge.

S: It is a limited part of life. B: Of life, yes. When we say, I am so and so, I mean the whole of me. And therefore I am applying the part to the whole. I am trying to take in the whole by the part.

K: When knowledge assumes it understands the whole...

B: But it is often very tricky because I am not explicitly spelling out that I understand the whole, but it is implicit by saying I, or everything, is this way.

K: Quite, quite.

B: It implies that the whole is this way, you see. The whole of me, the whole of life, the whole of the world.

S: As Krishnaji was saying about never knowing a person - that is how we deal with ourselves. We say I know this and that about myself rather than being open to the new man. Or even being aware of the fragmentation.

B: If I am talking about you then I shouldn't say I know all because you are not a limited part like a machine. You see, the machine is fairly limited and you can know all that is relevant about it, or most of it anyway, Sometimes it breaks down.

K: Quite. Quite.

B: But when it comes to another person, that is immensely beyond what you could really know. The past experience doesn't



tell you the essence.

K: Are you saying, Dr Bohm, that when knowledge spills over into the psychological field..?

B: Well, also in another field which I call the whole in general. Sometimes it spills over into the philosophical field and then tries to make it metaphysical, the whole universe.

K: That is purely theoretical and has no meaning for me personally.

B: I mean that some people feel that when they are discussing metaphysics of the whole universe it is not psychological. It probably is, but some people may feel that they are making a theory of the universe, not discussing psychology. It is just a matter of language.

K: Language, quite.

S: Well you see what you are saying can be extended to what people are. They have a metaphysics about other people. I know all other people are not to be trusted.

K: Of course.

B: You have a metaphysics about yourself, saying I am such and such a person.

S: Right. I have a metaphysics that life is hopeless and I must depend on these things.

K: No, all that you can see is that we are fragmented. That is a fact. And I am aware of those fragmentations; there is an awareness of the fragmented mind because of conflict.

S: That's right.

B: You were saying before that we have got to have an approach where we are not aware of the fragmented mind just

because of conflict.

K: Yes. That's right.

B: Are we coming to that?

K: Coming, yes. I said: What is the source of this conflict? The source is fragmentation, obviously. What brings about fragmentation? What is the cause of it? What is behind it? We said perhaps knowledge.

S: Knowledge.

K: Knowledge. Psychologically I use knowledge; I think I know myself, when I really don't, because I am changing, moving. Or I use knowledge for my own satisfaction - for my position, for my success, for becoming a great man in the world. I am a great scholar, say. I have read a million books. This gives me position, prestige, a status. So is that it - that fragmentation takes place when there is a desire for security, psychological security, which prevents biological security?

S: Right.

K: You say right. Therefore security may be one of the factors. Security in knowledge, used wrongly.

B: Or could you say that some sort of mistake has been made, that man feels insecure biologically, and he thinks, what shall I do, and he makes a mistake in the sense that he tries to obtain a psychological sense of security - by knowledge? K: By knowledge, yes.

S: By knowing, yes. By repeating himself by depending on all these structures.

K: One feels secure by having an ideal.

S: Right. That is so true.

B: But somewhere one asks why the person makes this mistake. In other words if thought - if the mind had been absolutely clear, it would never have done that.

S: If the mind had been absolutely clear - but we have just said that there is biological insecurity. That is a fact.

B: But that doesn't imply that you have to delude yourself.

K: Quite right. Go on further.

S: There's that biological fact of my constant uncertainty. The biological fact of constant change.

K: That is created through psychological fragmentation.

S: My biological uncertainty?

K: Of course. I may lose my job, I may have no money tomorrow.

B: Now let's look at that. I may have no money tomorrow. You see, that may be an actual fact, but now the question is: What would a man say if his mind were clear, what would be his response?

K: He would never be put in that position.

S: He wouldn't ask that question.

B: But suppose he finds himself without money?

K: He would do something.

B: His mind won't just go to pieces.

S: He won't have to have all the money he thinks he has to have.

B: Besides that, he won't go into this well of confusion. K: No, absolutely.

S: The problem 99 per cent of the time, I certainly agree, is that we all think we need more than this ideal of what we should have.

K: No, sir. We are trying to stick to one point. What is the cause

of this fragmentation? S: Right.

K: We said knowledge spilling over into the field where it should not enter.

B: But why does it do so?

K: Why does it do so? That is fairly simple.

S: My sense of it from what we have been saying is that it does so in the illusion of security. Thought creates the illusion that there is security.

B: Yes, but why doesn't intelligence show that there is no security?

S: Why doesn't intelligence show it?

K: Can a fragmented mind be intelligent?

S: No.

B: Well, it resists intelligence.

K: It can pretend to be intelligent.

B: Yes. But are you saying that once the mind fragments then intelligence is gone?

K: Yes.

B: But now you are querying this problem. You are also saying that there can be an end to fragmentation.

K: That's right.

B: That would seem to be a contradiction.

K: It looks like that but it is not.

S: All I know is fragmentation.

K: Therefore...

S: That is what I have got.

K: Let's stick to it and prove it can end. Go through it.

B: But if you say intelligence cannot operate when the mind is

fragmented...

K: Is psychological security more important than biological security?

S: That is an interesting question.

K: Go on.

S: One thing we have condensed... K: No, I am asking. Don't move away from the question. I am asking: Is psychological security more important than biological security, physical security?

S: It isn't but it sounds like it is.

K: No, don't move away from it. I am asking. Stick to it. Is it to you?

S: I would say yes, psychological seems...

B: What is actually true?

S: Actually true, no. Biological security is more important.

K: Biological? Are you sure?

S: No. I think psychological security is what I actually worry about most.

K: Psychological security.

S: That is what I worry about most.

K: Which prevents biological security.

S: Right. I've figured that one out now.

K: No, no. Because I am seeking psychological security in ideas, in knowledge, in images, in confusions, this prevents me from having biological, physical security - for myself, for my children, for my brothers. I can't have it. Because psychological security says I am a Hindu, a blasted somebody in a little corner.

S: No question. I do feel that psychological...

K: So can we be free of the desire to be psychologically secure?

S: That's right. That is the question.

K: Of course it is.

S: That's the nub of it, right.

K: Last night I was listening to some people arguing on television - the chairman of this, the something of that, talking about

Ireland, and various other things. Each man was completely convinced of what he was saying.

S: That's right. I am sitting on meetings every week. Each man thinks his category is the most important. K: So man has given more importance to psychological security than to biological, physical security.

B: But it is not clear why he should delude himself in this way.

K: He has deluded himself because - why, why?

S: Images, power.

K: No, sir, it is much deeper than that. Why has he given importance to psychological security?

S: We seem to think that that is where security is.

K: No. Look more into it. The me is the most important thing.

S: Right. That is the same thing.

K: No, me. My position, my happiness, my money, my house, my wife - me.

B: Me. Yes. And isn't it that each person feels he is the essence of the whole? The me is the very essence of the whole. I would feel if the me were gone that the rest wouldn't mean anything.

K: That is the whole point. The me gives me complete security, psychologically.

B: It seems all-important. Of course.

S: All-important.

B: Yes, people say if I am sad then the whole world has no meaning - right?

S: It is not only that; I am sad if the me is all-important.

K: No. We are saying that in the me is the greatest security.

S: Right. That is what we think. K: No. Not we think. It is so.

B: What do you mean it is so?

K: In the world that is what is happening.

B: That is what is happening. But it is a delusion.

K: We will come to that later.

S: I think that is a good point. That it is so; that the me - I like that way of getting at it - the me is what is important. That is all it is. K: Psychologically.

S: Psychologically.

K. Me my country, my god, my house.

S: We have got your point.

**THE WHOLENESS OF LIFE PART I DIALOGUE  
2 2ND CONVERSATION WITH DR. DAVID  
SHAINBERG AND PROF. DAVID BOHM  
BROCKWOOD PARK 18TH MAY, 1976**

KRISHNAMURTI: May we go on where we left off yesterday? Or would you like to start something new?

Dr Bohm: I thought there was a point that wasn't entirely clear about what we were discussing yesterday. We rather accepted that security, psychological security, was wrong, was a delusion, but in general I don't think we made it very clear why we think it is a delusion. You see, most people feel that psychological security is a good thing and quite necessary, and that when it is disturbed, when a person is frightened, or sorrowful even - so disturbed that he might require treatment - he feels that psychological security is necessary before he can even begin to do anything.

K: Yes, right.

B: I don't think it's at all clear why one should say it is not really as important as physical security.

K: I think we have made it fairly clear but let's go into it. Is there really psychological security at all?

B: I don't think we discussed that fully yesterday.

K: Of course. Nobody accepts that. But we are enquiring into it, going into the problem of it.

B: I think that if you told somebody who was feeling very disturbed mentally that there is no psychological security he would just feel worse.

K: Collapse. Of course.



Dr Shainberg: Right.

K: We are talking of fairly sane, rational people.

S: OK.

K: We are questioning whether there is any psychological security at all. Permanency, stability, a sense of well-founded, deep-rooted existence, psychologically... I believe in something...

S: ...and that gives me...

K: It may be the most foolish belief...

S: Right.

K: ...a neurotic belief. I believe in it.

S: Right.

K: And that gives me a tremendous sense of vitality and stability.

B: I can think of two examples: one is that if I could really believe that after dying I would go to heaven, make quite sure of it, then I could be very secure anywhere, no matter what happens.

S: That would make you feel good.

B: Well, I wouldn't really have to worry; it would all be a temporary trouble; I would be pretty sure that in time it was all going to be very good. Do you see?

K: Right. That is the whole Asiatic attitude, more or less.

B: Or if I am a Communist, I think that in time Communism is going to solve everything; we are going through a lot of troubles now but it is all going to be worthwhile, and in the end everything will be all right. If I could be sure of that then I would feel very secure inside, even if conditions are hard now.

S: OK. All right.

K: So although one may have these strong beliefs which give

one a sense of security, of permanency, we are questioning whether there is such a thing in reality, in actuality...

S: Yes, yes. But I want to ask David something. Take a scientist, a guy who is going to his laboratory every day, or take a doctor - is he getting security from the very routinization of his life?

K: His knowledge.

S: Yes, from his knowledge.

B: Well, he makes believe he is learning the permanent laws of nature, really getting something that means something.

S: Yes.

B: And also getting a position in society - being well known and respected and financially secure. S: He believes that these things will give him security. The mother believes that a child will give her security.

K: Don't you have security psychologically?

S: Yes. I get a security out of my knowledge, out of my routine, out of my patients, out of seeing my patients, out of my position...

B: But there is conflict in that because if I think it over a little bit I doubt it, I question it. I say it doesn't look all that secure, anything may happen. There may be a war, there may be a depression, there may be a flood.

S: Right.

K: There may be sane people all of a sudden in the world!

B: So I say there is conflict and confusion in my security because I am not sure about it. But if I had an absolute belief in god and heaven...

K: This is so obvious!

S: It is obvious. I agree with you it is obvious but I think it has to be really felt.

K: But, sir, you, Dr Shainberg, you are the victim.

S: I'll be the victim.

K: For the moment. Don't you have strong belief

S: Right.

K: Don't you have a sense of permanency somewhere inside you?

S: I think I do.

K: Psychologically?

S: Yes, I do. I mean I have a sense of permanency about my intention.

K: Intention?

S: I mean my work.

K: Your knowledge?

S: ...my knowledge, my...

K: ...status...

S: ...my status, the continuity of my interest. You know what I mean?

K: Yes. S: There is a sense of security and the feeling that I can help someone.

K: Yes.

S: And that I can do my work.

K: That gives you security, psychological security.

S: There is something about it that is secure. What am I saying when I say "security"? I am saying that I won't be lonely.

K: No, no. Feeling secure. That you have something that is imperishable.

S: Which means - no I don't feel it that way. I feel it more in the sense of what is going to happen in time. What am I going to have to depend on? - what is my time going to be? - am I going to be lonely, is it going to be empty?

K: No, sir.

S: Isn't that security?

K: As Dr Bohm pointed out, if one has a strong belief in reincarnation, as the whole Asiatic world has, then it doesn't matter what happens. You may be miserable this life but next life you will be happier. So that gives you a great sense of "this is unimportant, but that is important".

S: Right, right.

K: And that gives me a sense of great comfort, for this is a transient world anyhow and eventually I will get to something permanent.

S: That is in the Asiatic world; but I think in the Western world you don't have that...

K: Oh, yes, you have it.

S: ...with a different focus.

K: Of course.

B: It is different but we have always had the search for security.

S: Right, right. But what do you think security is? I mean, for instance, you became a scientist, you have your own laboratory, you pick up books all the time - right? What the hell do you call security?

K: Having something... S: Knowledge?

K: Something which you can cling to and which is not perishable. it may perish eventually but for the time being, it is

there to hold on to.

B: You feel that it is permanent. Like people in the past who used to accumulate gold because gold is the symbol of the imperishable.

S: We still have people who accumulate gold... we have business men, they have got money.

B: You feel it is really there. It will never corrode, it will never vanish and you can count on it.

S: So it is something that I can count on.

K: Count on, hold on to, cling to, be attached to.

S: The me.

K: Exactly.

S: I know that I am a doctor. I can depend on that.

K: Experience. And on the other hand, tradition.

S: Tradition. I know that if I do this with a patient I will get a certain result - I may not get any good results but I'll get this result.

K: So I think that is fairly clear.

B: Yes, it is clear enough that this is part of our society.

K: Part of our conditioning.

B: Conditioning, that we want something secure and permanent. At least we think so.

S: I think there is a feeling in the West of wanting immortality.

K: That's the same thing.

B: Wouldn't you say that in so far as thought can project time, that it wants to be able to project everything as far as possible into the future? In other words the anticipation of what is coming is already the present feeling. If you anticipate that something bad may come you already feel bad.

K: That's right.

B: Therefore you would want to get rid of that.

S: So you anticipate that it won't happen. B: That it will all be good.

S: Right.

B: I would say that security would be the anticipation that everything will be good in the future...

K: Good.

S: It will continue.

B: It will become better; if it is not so good now it will certainly become better.

S: So then security is becoming?

K: Yes, becoming, perfecting, becoming.

S: I see patients all the time. Their projected belief is, I will become - I will find somebody to love me; I see patients who say, "I will become the chief of the department", "I will become the most famous doctor", "I will become the best tennis player". The best.

K: Of course, of course.

B: Well, it seems it is all focused on anticipating that life is going to be good, when you say that.

K: Yes, life is going to be good.

B: But it seems to me you wouldn't raise the question unless you had a lot of experience that life is not so good. In other words it is a reaction to having had so much experience of disappointment, of suffering...

K: Would you say that we are not conscious of the whole movement of thought?

B: It is only natural to feel I have had a lot of experience of suffering and disappointment and danger, and now I would like to be able to anticipate that everything is going to be good. At first sight it would seem that that is quite natural. But now you are saying it is not.

K: We are saying there is no such thing as psychological security. We have defined what we mean by security. We don't have to beat it over and over.

S: No, I think we have got that.

B: Yes, but is it clear now that these hopes are really vain hopes. That should be obvious, should it? K: Sir, there is death at the end of everything.

B: Yes.

K: You want to be secure for the next ten years, that is all, or fifty years. Afterwards it doesn't matter. Or if it does matter you believe in something that there is god, that you will sit on his right hand or whatever it is you believe. So I am trying to find out, not only that there is no permanency psychologically, but that there is no tomorrow psychologically.

B: That hasn't yet come out.

K: Of course, of course.

B: When we say empirically that we know these hopes for security are false because first of all you say there is death, secondly you can't count on anything; materially everything changes.

K: Everything is in flux.

B: Mentally everything in your head is changing all the time.

You

can't count on your own feelings, you can't count on enjoying a certain thing that you enjoy now, you can't count on being healthy, you can't count on money.

K: You can't rely on your wife, you can't rely - on anything.

S: Right.

B: So that is a fact. But I am saying that you are suggesting something deeper.

K: Yes, sir.

B: But we don't base ourselves only on that observation.

K: No, that is very superficial.

S: Yes, I am with you there.

K: So, if there is no real security, basic, deep, then is there a tomorrow, psychologically? Then you take away all hope. If there is no tomorrow you take away all hope.

B: What you mean by tomorrow is the tomorrow in which things will get better?

K: Better, more - greater success, greater understanding, greater...

B:.... more love.

K:.... more love, always that. S: I think that is a little quick. I think that there is a jump there because as I hear you, I hear you saying there is no security.

K: But it is so.

S: But for me to say - to really say, "I know there is no security" ...

K: Why don't you say that?

S: That is what I am getting at. Why don't I say that?

B: Well isn't it a fact - just an observed fact that there isn't



anything you can count on psychologically?

S: Right. But you see I think there is an action there. Krishnaji is asking, "Why don't you say there is no security?" Why don't I?

K: Do you, when you hear there is no security, see it as an abstracted idea or as an actual fact? Like that table, like your hand here, or those flowers?

S: I think it mostly becomes an idea.

K: That is just it.

B: Why should it become an idea?

S: That, I think, is the question. Why does it become an idea?

K: Is it part of your training?

Part - yes. Part of my conditioning.

S: Part of a real objection to seeing things as they are.

S: That's right.

B: If you try to see that there is no security, something seems to be there which is trying to protect itself - let us say that it seems to be a fact that the self is there. Do you see what I am driving at?

K: Of course.

B: And if the self is there it requires security, and this creates a resistance to accepting as a fact that there is no security, and puts it as an idea only. It seems that the factuality of the self being there has not been denied. The apparent factuality.

K: Is it that you refuse to see things as they are? Is it that one refuses to see that one is stupid? - not you - I mean one is stupid. To acknowledge that one is stupid is already... S: Yes. You say to me, "You refuse to acknowledge that you are stupid" - let us say it is me - that means then that I have got to do something...

K: No. Not yet. Action comes through perception, not through

ideation.

S: I am glad you are getting into this.

B: Doesn't it seem that as long as there is the sense of self, the self must say that it is perfect?

K: Of course, of course.

S: Now what makes it so hard for me to destroy this need for security? Why can't I do it?

K: No, no. It is not how you can do it. You see you are already entering into the realm of action.

S: That I think is the crucial point.

K: I say first see it. And from that perception action is inevitable.

S: All right. Now to see insecurity. Do you see insecurity? Do you actually see it?

K: No. No. No. Do you actually see that you are clinging to something, some belief which gives you security?

S: OK.

K: I cling to this house. I am safe. It gives me a sense of pride, a sense of possession; it gives me a sense of physical and therefore psychological security.

S: Right, and a place to go.

K: A place to go. But I may walk out and be killed and I have lost everything. There might be an earthquake and everything gone. Do you actually see it? The seeing, the perception, of that is total action with regard to security.

S: I can see that that is the total action.

K: No, that is an idea, still.

S: Yes, you're right. I begin to see that this whole structure is

the way I see everything in the world - right? I begin to see her, the wife, I begin to see these people - they fit into that structure.

K: You see them, and your wife, through the image you have about them. S: Right. And through the function they are seeing.

B: Their relation to you, yes.

K: Yes.

S: That is right. That's the function they serve.

K: The picture, the image, the conclusion is the security.

S: That's right.

B: Yes, but why does it present itself as so real? I see that there is a thought, a process which is driving on, continually...

K: Are you asking why has this image, this conclusion, become so fantastically real?

B: Yes. It seems to be standing there real, and everything is referred to it.

K: More real than the marbles, than the hills.

B: Than anything, yes.

S: More real than anything.

K: Why?

S: It is hard to say why. Because it would give me security.

K: No. We are much further than that.

B: Because, suppose abstractly and ideally you can see the whole thing as no security at all. I mean just looking at it professionally and abstractly.

S: That is putting the cart before the horse.

B: No, I am just saying that if it were some simple matter, with that much proof you would have already accepted it.

S: Right.

B: But when it comes to this, no proof seems to work.

S: Right. Nothing seems to work.

B: You say all that, but here I am presented with the solid reality of myself and my security and there is a sort of reaction which seems to say, well that may be possible but it is really only words. The real thing is me.

S: But there is more than that. Why has it such potency? I mean, it seems to take on such importance. B: Well, maybe. But I am saying that the real thing is me, which is all important.

S: There is no question about it. Me, me - me is important.

K: Which is an idea.

B: We can see abstractly that it is just an idea. The question is how do you break into this process?

K: I think we can break into it, or break through it, or get beyond it only through perception.

B: The trouble is that all that we have been talking about is in the form of ideas. They may be correct ideas but they won't break into this.

S: Right.

B: Because this dominates the whole of thought.

S: That is right. I mean you could even ask why are we here. We are here because we want to...

K: No, sir. Look: If I feel my security lies in some image I have, a picture, a symbol, a conclusion or an ideal, I would put it not as an abstraction but bring it down. You see it is so. I believe in something. Actually. Now I say, why do I believe?

B: Well have you actually done that?

K: No, I haven't because I have no beliefs. I have no picture, I

don't go in for all those kinds of games. I said `if'.

S: If, right.

K: Then I would bring the abstracted thing into a perceptive reality.

S: To see my belief, is that it?

K: See it.

S: To see my belief. Right. To see that `me' in operation.

K: Yes, if you like to put it that way. Sir, wait a minute. Take a simple thing. Have you a conclusion about something? A concept?

S: Yes.

K: Now wait a bit. How is that brought about? Take a simple thing - a concept that I am an Englishman.

B: The trouble is that we probably don't feel attached to such concepts. K: All right.

S: Let's take one that is real for me. Take the one about me being a doctor.

K: A concept.

S: That is a concept. That is a conclusion based on training, based on experience, based on the enjoyment of the work.

K: Which means what? A doctor means - the conclusion means he is capable of certain activities.

S: Right, OK. Let's take it. Concretely.

K: Work at it.

S: So now I have got this concrete fact that I have had this training, that I get this pleasure from the work, I get a kind of feedback...

K: Yes, sir. Move.

S: All right. Now that is my belief. That belief that I am a

doctor is based on all that, that concept.

K: Yes.

S: OK. Now I continually act to continue that.

K: Yes, sir, that is understood. Therefore you have a conclusion.

You have a concept that you are a doctor.

S: Right.

K: Based on knowledge, experience, everyday activity.

S: Right.

K: Pleasure and all the rest of it.

S: Right.

K: So what is real in that? What is true in that? Real, meaning actual.

S: Well that is a good question. What is actual?

K: Wait. What is actual in that? Your training.

S: Right.

K: Your knowledge.

S: Right.

K: Your daily operation. S: Right.

K: That's all. The rest is a conclusion.

B: But what is the rest?

K: The rest: I am very much better than somebody else.

B: Or else this thing is going to keep me occupied in a good way.

K: In a good way. I will never be lonely.

S: Right.

B: But isn't there also a certain fear that if I don't have this then things will be pretty bad?

K: Of course.

S: Right, OK.

B: And that fear seems to spur me on...

K: Of course. And if the patients don't turn up...

B: Then I have no money, fear.

K: Fear.

S: No activity.

K: So loneliness. So be occupied.

S: Be occupied doing this, completing this concept. OK. Do you realize how important that is to all people, to be occupied?

K: Of course, sir.

S: Do you get the meat of that?

K: Of course.

S: How important it is to people to be occupied. I can see them running around.

K: Sir, a housewife is occupied. Remove that occupation and she says: Please...

B: "What shall I do?"

S: We know that as a fact. Since we put electrical equipment into the houses the women are going crazy, they have nothing to do with their time.

K: The result of this is the effect on the children - don't talk to me about it.

S: Right, OK. Let's go on. Now we have got this fact. K: Now is this occupation an abstraction? Or actuality?

S: Now this is an actuality. I am actually occupied.

K: No.

B: What is it?

K: You are actually occupied - eh?

S: Yes.

K: Daily.

S: Daily.

B: Well what do you really mean by occupied?

S: What do you mean?

B: Well, I can say I am actually engaged in all these occupations - that is clear. I mean I am seeing patients as the doctor.

S: You are doing your thing.

B: I am doing my thing, getting my reward and so on. Being occupied seems to me to have a psychological meaning. There was something I once saw on television about a woman who was highly disturbed; it showed on the electro-encephalograph, but when she was occupied doing arithmetical sums the electro-encephalograph went beautifully smooth. She stopped doing the sums and it went all over the place. Therefore she had to keep on doing something to keep the brain working right.

K: Which means what?

B: Well what does it mean?

K: A mechanical process.

S: That's right.

B: It seems the brain starts jumping all over the place unless it has this thing.

K: A constant...

B: Content.

K: So you have reduced yourself to a machine.

S: Don't say it! No, it's not fair. But it is true. I have, I mean I feel there is a mechanical...



K: ...response.

S: Oh, yes - commitment. K: Of course.

B: But why does the brain begin to go so wild when it is not occupied? That seems to be a common experience.

K: Because in occupation there is security.

B: There is order.

K: Order.

S: In occupation there is a kind of mechanical order.

B: Right. So we feel our security really means we want order, is that right?

K: That's it.

B: We want order inside the brain. We want to be able to project order into the future, for ever.

S: That's right. But would you say that you can get it by mechanical order?

B: Then you get dissatisfied with it; you say, "I am getting sick of this mechanical life, I want something more interesting."

K: That is where the gurus come in!

B: Then the thing goes wild again. The mechanical order won't satisfy it. It works only for a little while.

S: I don't like the way something is slipping in there. We are going right from one thing to another. I am working for satisfaction.

B: I am looking for some regular order which is good, do you see? And I think that by my job as a doctor I am getting it.

S: Yes.

B: But after a while I begin to feel it is too repetitious. I am getting bored.

S: OK. But suppose that doesn't happen? Suppose some people remain satisfied with their jobs?

B: Well they don't really. I mean then they become dull.

K: Quite. Mechanical. And you stop that mechanism and the brain goes wild.

S: That's right.

B: Right. So they may feel they are a bit dull and they would like some entertainment, or something more interesting and exciting. And therefore there is a contradiction, there is conflict and confusion. K: Sir, Dr Shainberg is asking what is disturbing him. He feels he hasn't got his teeth into it.

S: You are right.

K: What is disturbing you?

S: Well, it is this feeling that people will say that...

K: No, you say, you.

S: Let's say I can get this order from occupying myself with something I like.

K: Go on. Proceed.

S: I do something I like and it gets boring, let's say, or it might get repetitious, but then I will find new parts of it. And then I'll do that some more because that gives me pleasure, you see. I mean I get a satisfaction out of it.

B: Right.

S: So I keep doing more of that.

K: You move from one mechanical process, get bored with it, and move to another mechanical process.

S: That's right.

K: Get bored with it and keep going.

S: That's right. That's it.

K: And you call that living.

S: That is what I call living.

B: I see that the trouble is that I now try to be sure that I can keep on doing this, because I can always anticipate a future when I won't be able to do it. I will be a bit too old for it, or else I'll fail. I'll lose the job or something. So I still have insecurity in that order.

K: Essentially it is mechanical disorder.

S: Masking itself as order.

K: Now, wait a minute. Do you see this? Or is it still an abstraction? Because you know, as Dr Bohm will tell you, idea means observation, the original meaning is observation. Do you observe this?

S: I see that, yes.

B: Then the point is, are you driven to this because you are frightened of the instability of the brain? If you are doing something because you are trying to run away from the instability of the brain, that is already disorder.

S: Yes, yes.

B: In other words that will be merely masking disorder.

S: Yes. Well then you are suggesting that this is the natural disorder of the brain?

B: No, I am saying that the brain without occupation tends to go into disorder.

K: In a mechanical process the brain feels secure, and when that mechanical process is disturbed it becomes insecure and disordered.

S: Then gets caught up again in the mechanical process.

K: Again and again and again and again.

S: It never stays with that insecurity.

K: No. When it perceives this process it is still mechanical. And therefore there is disorder.

B: The question is why does the brain get caught in mechanism?

K: Because it is the safest, the most secure way of living.

B: Well, it appears that way, but it is actually very...

K: Not appears, it is so for the time being.

B: For the time being, but in the long run it is not.

S: Are you saying we are time-bound, conditioned to be time-bound?

K: No. Conditioned by our tradition, by our education, by the culture we live in, to operate mechanically.

S: We take the easy way.

K: The easy way.

B: At the beginning the brain makes a mistake, let's say, and says "This is safer" - but somehow it fails to be able to see that it has made a mistake; it holds to this mistake. In the beginning you might call it an innocent mistake; it says, "This looks safer and I will follow it" and it continues in this mechanical process rather than seeing that it is wrong. K: You are asking: Why doesn't it see that this mechanical process is essentially disorder?

B: That it is essentially disorder and dangerous.

K: Dangerous.

B: It is totally delusory.

S: Why isn't there some sort of feedback? In other words I do something and it comes out wrong. At some point I ought to realize that. Why haven't I seen that my life is mechanical?

K: Now wait. You see it?

S: But I don't.

K: Wait. Why is it mechanical?

S: Well, it is mechanical because it is all action and reaction.

K: Why is it mechanical?

S: It is repetitious.

K: It is mechanical.

S: It is mechanical. I want it to be easy. I feel that it gives me the most security to keep it mechanical. I get a boundary. It is mechanical because it is repetitious...

K: You haven't answered my question.

S: I know I haven't! I am not sure what your question is.

K: Why has it become mechanical?

S: Why?

B: Why does it remain mechanical?

K: Why does it become and remain mechanical?

S: I think it remains mechanical... it is the thing we began with.

K: No. Pursue it. Why does it remain mechanical?

S: What has caused us to accept this mechanical way of living?

I am not sure I can answer that.

K: Look. Wouldn't you be frightened?

S: I would see the uncertainty.

K: No, no. If the mechanical life one lives suddenly stopped, wouldn't you be frightened?

S: Yes. B: Wouldn't there be some danger?

K: That, of course. There is a danger that things might...

S: ...go to pieces.

K: ...go to pieces.

S: It is deeper than that.

K: Wait. Find out. Come on.

S: It is not just that there is a genuine danger, that I would be frightened. It feels like things take on a terribly, moment-by-moment effect.

K: No, sir. Total order would give complete security, wouldn't it?

S: Yes.

K: The brain wants total order.

S: Right.

K: Otherwise it can't function properly. Therefore it accepts the mechanical, hoping it won't lead to disaster. Hoping it will find order in that.

B: Could you say that perhaps in the beginning the brain accepted this not knowing that this mechanicalism would bring disorder - that it just went into it in an innocent state?

K: Yes.

B: And now it is caught in a trap, and somehow it maintains this disorder, it doesn't want to get out of it.

K: Because it is frightened of greater disorder.

B: Yes. It says all that I've built up may go to pieces. In other words I am not in the same situation as when I first went into the trap because now I have built up a great structure. I'm afraid that structure will go to pieces.

K: Yes, but what I am trying to get at is that the brain needs this order, otherwise it can't function. It finds order in the mechanical process because it is trained from childhood - do as you are told, etc. There is a conditioning going on right from the start to live a

mechanical life.

B: And at the same time the fear of giving up this mechanism.

K: Of course, of course. B: In other words you are thinking all the time that without this mechanism everything will go to pieces, especially the brain.

K: Which means the brain must have order. And finds order in a mechanical way. Now do you see that actually the mechanical way of living leads to disorder? Which is tradition. If I live entirely in the past, which I think is very orderly, what takes place? I am already dead and I can't meet anything.

S: I am repeating myself always, right?

K: So I say, "Please don't disturb my tradition!" Every human being says, "I have found something which gives me order, a belief, a hope, this, or that, so leave me alone."

S: Right.

K: And life isn't going to leave him alone. So then he gets frightened and establishes another mechanical habit. Now do you see this whole thing? And therefore an instant action clearing it all away, and therefore order. The brain says at last I have an order, which is absolutely indestructible.

B: That doesn't follow logically.

K: It would follow logically if you go into it.

B: Go into it. Can we reach a point where it really follows necessarily?

K: I think we can only go into it if you perceive the mechanical structure which the brain has developed, attached and cultivated.

S: Can I share with you something I see as you are talking? I see it like this. Don't get impatient with me too quickly. I see it this

way. Flashing through my mind are various kinds of interchange between people. The way they talk, the way I talk to them at a party. It is all about what happened before. You find them telling you who they are, in terms of their past. I can see what they will be. Like one guy who said, "I have just published my thirteenth book." It is very important to him that I get that information, see. And I see this. And I see this elaborate structure. This guy has got it into his head that I am going to think this about him, and then he is going to go to his university and they will think that about him. He is always living like that and the whole structure is elaborate - right?

K: Are you doing that?

S: When did you stop beating your wife! Of course I am doing it. I am doing it right now. And seeing the structure right now in all of us.

K: But do you see that fragmentary action is mechanical action?

S: That's right. It is there, Krishnaji. That is the way we are.

K: And therefore political action can never solve any human problems. Nor can the scientist - he is another fragment.

S: But do you realize what you are saying? Let us really look at what you are saying. This is the way it is. This is the way life is.

K: That's right.

S: Right? This is the way it is. Years and years and years...

K: Therefore why don't you change it?

S: But this is the way it is. We live in terms of our structures. We live in terms of history. We live in terms of our mechanics. We live in terms of our form. This is the way we live.

K: It means that when the past meets the present and ends there,



a totally different thing takes place.

S: Yes. But the past doesn't meet the present so often. I mean...

K: I mean it is taking place now.

S: Now. Right now. Right. We are saying it now.

K: Therefore can you stop there?

S: We must see it totally.

K: No. The fact. The simple fact. The past meets the present.

That is a fact.

B: Let us say how does the past meet the present? Let us go into that.

S: How does the past meet the present?

B: Well, just briefly, I think that when the past meets the present the past stops acting. What it means is that thought stops acting so that order comes about.

S: Do you think the past meets the present, or the present meets the past?

K: How do you meet me?

S: I meet you in the present.

K: No. How do you meet me? With all the memories, all the images, the reputation, the words, the pictures, the symbols - with all that, which is the past, you meet me now.

S: That's right. That's right. I come to you with a...

K: The past is meeting the present.

S: And then?

K: Ends there. Does not move forward.

S: Can it stop? What is the past meeting present? What is that action?

K: I will show it to you. I meet you with the past, my memories,

but you might have changed in the meantime. So I never meet you.

I meet you with the past.

S: Right. That is a fact.

K: That is a fact. Now if I don't have that movement going on...

S: But I do.

K: Of course you do. But I say that that is disorder. I can't meet you then.

S: Right. How do you know that?

K: I don't know it. I only know the fact that when the past meets the present and continues, it is one of the factors of time, movement, bondage, fear, and so on. If, when the past meets the present, one sees this, one is fully aware of this, completely aware of this movement, then it stops. Then I meet you as though for the first time, then there is something fresh. It is like a new flower coming out.

S: Yes.

K: I think we will go on this afternoon. We haven't really tackled the root of all this. The root, the cause, of all this disturbance, this turmoil, travail and anxiety.

B: Why should the brain be in this wild disorder?

K: I know, wild. You, Dr Shainberg, who are a doctor, an analyst, you have to ask that fundamental question - Why? Why do human beings live this way?

**THE WHOLENESS OF LIFE PART I DIALOGUE**  
**3 3RD CONVERSATION WITH DR. DAVID**  
**SHAINBERG AND PROF. DAVID BOHM**  
**BROCKWOOD PARK 18TH MAY, 1976**

Krishnamurti: Shall we start where we left off? We were asking, weren't we, why do human beings live this way?

Dr Shainberg: What is the root?

K: The turmoil, the confusion, the sorrow behind it all, the conflict, the violence. And so many people offer different ways of solving the problems - the gurus, the priests all over the world, the thousands of books, everybody offering a new solution, a new method, a new way of solving the problems. And I am sure this has been going on for a million years. "Do this and you will be all right. Do that and you will be all right." But nothing seems to have succeeded in making man live in order, happily, intelligently, without this chaotic activity going on. Why do we human beings live this way - in this appalling misery? Why?

S: Well, I have often said they do it because the very sorrow, the very turmoil, the very problems themselves, give them a sense of security.

Dr Bohm: I don't really think so. I think people just get used to it, Whatever happens you get used to it and you come to miss it after a while just because you are used to it. But that doesn't explain why it is there.

K: I was reading the other day that in 5,000 years there have been 5,000 wars - and we are still going on.

S: That's right. A guy said to me once that he wanted to go to

Vietnam to fight because otherwise his life was every night at the bar.

K: I know, but that isn't the reason. Is it that we like it?

S: It is not that we like it; it is almost that we like not liking it.

K: Have we all become neurotic? S: Yes. The whole thing is neurotic.

K: Are you saying that?

S: Yes. The whole of society is neurotic.

K: Which means that entire humanity is neurotic?

S: I think so. This is the argument we have all the time: Is society sick? And then if you say society is sick, what is the value you are using for comparison?

K: Yourself, who is neurotic.

S: Right.

K: So when you are faced with this, that human beings live this way and have accepted it for millennia, you say, "Well they are all half crazy - demented, corrupt from top to bottom", and then I come along and ask why?

S: Why do we keep it up? Why are we crazy? I see it with my children. They spend 50 hours a week in front of the television box. That is their whole life. My children laugh at me, all their friends are doing it.

K: No, moving beyond that - why?

S: Why? Without it - what?

K: No: not without it, what.

S: That is what we run into.

B: No that is very secondary. You see, as we were saying this morning, I think we get to depend on it to occupy us, and war

would seem some release from the boredom of the pub, or whatever, but that is secondary.

K: And also when I go to fight a war, all responsibility is taken away from me. Somebody else becomes responsible - the general....

S: Right.

B: In the old days people used to think that war would be a glorious thing. When the first world war started in England everybody was in a state of high elation.

K: So looking at this panorama of horror - I feel this very strongly because I travel all over the place and I see this extraordinary phenomenon going on everywhere - I say why do people live this way, accept these things? We have become cynical.

B: Nobody believes anything can be done about it.

S: That's it.

K: Is it that we feel that we cannot do anything about it?

S: That's for sure.

B: That's been an old story. People say human nature...

K: ...can never be altered.

B: Yes. That is not new at all.

K: Not new.

S: But it's certainly true that people feel - let's not say people - we feel, like I said this morning, that this is the way it is, this is the way we live.

K: I know, but why don't you change it? You see your son looking at the television for 50 hours; you see your son going off to war, killed, maimed, blinded - for what?

B: Many people have said that they don't accept that human

nature is this way, that they will try to change it, and it hasn't worked. The Communists tried it; others tried it. There has been so much bad experience, which all adds up to the idea that human nature doesn't change.

S: You know when Freud came along, he made history: he never said psychoanalysis is to change people. He said we can only study people.

K: I am not interested in that. I know that. I don't have to read Freud, or Jung, or you, or anybody, it is there in front of me.

S: Right. So let's say we know this fact about people, they don't try to change.

K: So what is preventing them?

B: People have tried to change in many cases, but...

S: OK. But now let's say that they don't try to change.

K: They do. In a dozen ways they try to change.

S: Right.

K: But essentially they are the same.

B: You see, I think people cannot find out how to change human nature.

K: Is that it? B: Well, whatever methods have been tried are entirely...

S: is that it? Or is it the fact that the very nature of the way they want to change is part of the process itself

B: No.

K: That's what he is saying.

B: No, but I am saying both. I say the first part is that whatever people have tried has not been guided by a correct understanding of human nature.

S: So it is guided by this very process itself. Right? By the incorrectness?

B: Yes, let's take the Marxists who say that human nature can be improved, but only when the whole economical and political structure has been altered.

K: They have tried to alter it but human nature...

B: They can't alter it, you see, because human nature is such that they can't really alter it.

S: They make a mechanical change.

K: Look at it, sir: take yourself - sorry to be personal - but if you don't mind, you be the victim.

S: Pig in the middle.

K: Right. Why don't you change?

S: Well, the immediate feel of it is that there is still... I guess I shall have to say there is some sort of false security - the fragmentation, the immediate pleasures that are got from the fragmentation. In other words there is still that movement of fragmentation. That's how come there is not the change. It is not seeing the whole thing.

K: Are you saying that political action, religious action, social action, are all fighting each other? And we are that.

S: Right.

K: Is that what you are saying?

S: Yes, I am saying that. My immediate response is: Why don't I change? What is it that keeps me from seeing the total? I don't know. I keep coming up with a kind of feeling that I am getting something from not changing. K: Is it the entity that wishes to change - which sets the pattern or change, and therefore the pattern

is always the same under a different colour? I don't know if I am making myself clear?

S: Could you say it another way?

K: I want to change, and I plan what to change, how to bring about this change.

S: Right.

K: The planner is always the same.

S: That's right.

K: But the patterns change.

S: That's right. Yes. I have an image of what I want.

K: So the patterns change, but I, who want to change, create the patterns of change.

S: That's right.

K: So I am the old and the patterns are the new but the old is always conquering the new.

S: Right.

B: But when I do that I don't feel that I am the old...

K: ...of course.

B: I really don't feel I am involved in that old stuff I want to change.

K: It has been said a hundred million times. Do this and you will be transformed. You try to do it but the centre is always the same.

B: And each person who does it feels that it has never happened before.

K: Never before. Yes. My experience through reading some book is entirely different, but the experiencer is the same...

B: The same old thing, right.



K: I think that is one of the root causes of it.

S: Yes, yes.

B: It is a kind of sleight-of-hand trick whereby the thing which is causing the trouble is put into the position of the thing that is trying to make the change. It is a deception.

K: I am deceiving myself all the time by saying I am going to change that, become that. You read some book and say, "Yes how true that is, I am going to live according to that." But the me who is going to live according to that is the same old me.

S: Right, yes. That's right. We run into this with patients. For instance, the patient will say, the doctor is going to be the one who is going to help me. But when I see that that doctor is...

K: ...is like me.

S: ...is like me, he is not going to be able to help. Then the patient goes to someone else - most of them go to another therapy.

K: Another guru. After all they are all men too. A new guru, or an old guru - it is all the same old stuff.

S: You are really getting at the issue, that the root is this belief that something, someone, can help you.

K: No, the root remains the same - and we trim the branches.

B: I think the root is something we don't see because we put it in the position of the one who is supposed to be seeing.

K: Yes.

S: Say that another way.

B: It is a sort of a conjuring trick. We don't see the root because the root is put into the position of somebody who is looking for the root. I don't know if you see it.

K: Yes. The root says I am looking for the root.

S: Right.

B: It is like the man who says he is looking for his glasses, and he has got them on.

S: Or like that Sufi story - you know the story? - a guy is looking for a key he has lost. The Sufi comes along and sees the guy crawling around under the lamppost, and he says, "What are you doing?" "I am looking for my key." "Did you lose it here?" "No, I lost it over there but there's more light over here."

B: We throw the light on the other part.

K: Yes, sir. So if I want to change I don't follow anybody because they are all like the rest of the gang. I don't accept any authority in all this. Authority arises only when I am confused. When I am in disorder. S: That's right.

K: So I say, can I completely change at the very root?

B: Let's look at that: there seems confusion in the language because you say "I".

K: Confusion in the language, I know.

B: You say I am going to change and it is not clear what you mean by I.

K: The I is the root.

B: The I is the root, so how can I change?

K: That is the whole point.

B: You see the language is confusing because you say I have got to change at the root, but I am the root. So what is going to happen?

S: What is going to happen, yes?

K: No, no. How am I not to be I?

B: Well, what do you mean by that?

S: How am I not to be I? Let's roll it back a second. You state you are not going to accept any authority.

K: Who is my authority? Who? They have all told me, "Do this, do that, do the other. Read this book and you will change. Follow this system, you will change. Identify yourself with god, you will change." But I remain exactly as I was before - in sorrow, in misery, in confusion, looking for help, and I choose the help which suits me most. Umpteen different ways have been tried to change man. Rewarding him, punishing him, promising him. Nothing has brought about this miraculous change. And it is a miraculous change.

S: It would be, yes, yes.

K: It is so. So, seeing this, I reject all authority. It is a reasonable, sane rejection. Now how do I proceed? I have got 50 years to live. What is the correct action?

S: What is the correct action to live properly?

K: If everybody said, "I can't help you, you have to do it yourself, look at yourself", then the whole thing would begin to act. Here is a man who says, "I am neurotic and I won't go to any other kind of neurotic to make me sane". What does he do? He doesn't accept authority, because he has created the authority out of his disorder, B: Well, that is merely the hope that somebody knows what to do.

K: Yes.

B: Because I feel this chaos is too much for me and I just assume that somebody else can tell me what to do. But that comes out of this confusion.

S: Yes the disorder creates the authority.

K: In the school here I have been saying: If you behave properly there is no authority. The behaviour we have all agreed to - punctuality, cleanliness, this or that: if you really see it you have no authority.

S: Yes, I see that. That I think is a key point. That the disorder itself creates the need for authority.

B: It doesn't actually create a need for it. It creates among people the impression that they need authority to correct the disorder. That would be more exact.

K: So let's start from there. In the rejection of authority I am beginning to become sane. I say that now I know I am neurotic what shall I do? What is correct action in my life? Can I ever find it - being neurotic?

S: Right.

K: I can't. So I won't ask what is the right action - I will now say: Can I free my mind from being neurotic? Is it possible? I won't go to jerusalem, I won't go to Rome, I won't go to any doctors. Because I am very serious now. I am deadly serious because this is my life.

B: You have to be so serious because of the immense pressure to escape...

K: I won't.

B: ...you won't, but I am saying that one will feel at this juncture that there will probably be an intense pressure towards escape, saying this is too much.

K: No. No, sir. You see what happens...

S: What happens?

K: ...when I reject authority I have much more energy.

B: Yes, if you reject authority. K: Because I am now concentrated to find out for myself. I am not looking to anybody.

S: That's right. In other words, I then have to be really open to "what is", that is all I have got.

K: So what shall I do?

S: When I am really open to "what is"?

K: Not open. Here I am, here is a human being, caught in all this, what shall he do? - rejecting all authority, knowing that social discipline is immoral...

S: Then there is intense alertness...

K: No. Tell me. Tell me - you are a doctor, tell me what I am to do. I reject you.

S: Right.

K: Because you are not my doctor, you are not my authority.

S: Right.

K: You can't tell me what to do, because you are confused yourself

S: Right.

K: So you have no right to tell me what to do. So I come to you as a friend, and say let's find out. Because you are serious and I am serious. Let's see how...

S: ...we can work together.

K: No, no, be careful. I am not working together.

S: You are not going to work together?

K: No. We are investigating together. Working together means co-operation.

S: Right.

K: I am not co-operating. I say you are like me. What are we

going to co-operate with?

S: In order to co-operatively investigate.

K: No. Because you are like me, confused, miserable, unhappy, neurotic.

S: Right, right.

K: So I say, how can we co-operate? We can only co-operate in neuroticism. S: That's right. So what are we going to do?

K: So can we investigate together?

S: How can we investigate together if we are both neurotic?

K: I say look, I am going first to see in what ways I am neurotic.

S: OK. Let's look at it.

K: Yes, look at it. In what way am I neurotic - a human being, who comes from New York, or Tokyo, or Delhi, or Moscow, or wherever it is? He says, I know I am neurotic, the leaders of the world are neurotic and I am part of it - I am the world and the world is me - so I can't look to anybody. Do you see what that does?

S: It puts you straight up there in front.

K: It gives you a tremendous sense of integrity.

S: Right. You have to fall on your hands and run with it.

K: Now can I - I being a human being - can I look at my neuroticism? Is it possible to see my neuroticism? What is neuroticism? What makes me neurotic? All the things that have been put into me, which make the me. Can my consciousness empty all that?

S: Your consciousness is that thought.

K: Of course.

B: Is it only that?

K: For the moment I am limiting it to that.

B: That is my consciousness. That proliferation of my fragmentation, my thought, is my neuroticism. Isn't that right?

K: Of course. It is a tremendous question, you follow? Can I, can the consciousness of man, which began five, ten million years ago, with all the things that have been put into it, generation after generation, generation after generation, from the beginning until now - can you take the whole of it and look at it?

S: Can you take the whole of it - that's not clear. How can you take the whole of it and look at it?

B: It seems there's a language problem there: You say you are that, how can you look at it?

K: I'll show you in a minute. We'll go into it.

B: I mean there is a difficulty in stating it. K: I know, stating it. The words are wrong.

B: Yes, the words are wrong. So we shouldn't take these words too literally.

K: Not too literally, of course.

B: Could we say that the words can be used flexibly?

K: No, the word is not the thing.

B: But we are using words and the question is how are we to understand them? You see they are in some way an...

K: ...an impediment and...

B: ...in some way a clue to what we are talking about. It seems to me that one trouble with words is the way we take them. We take them to mean something very fixed.

K: Now, can you look at it without the word? Is that possible? The word is not the thing. The word is a thought. And as a human

being I realize I am neurotic - neurotic in the sense that I believe, I live in conclusions, in memories, which are neurotic processes.

S: In words.

K: In words. Words, pictures and reality. I believe in something. My belief is very real; it may be illusory - all beliefs are illusory but because I believe so strongly they are real to me.

B: Right.

K: So can I look at the nature of the belief, how it arose - look at it?

Can you look at that fact that you have a belief. Whatever it is, god, the State, or whatever.

S: But I believe it is true.

K: No, no. Can you look at that belief.

S: There is a belief and not a fact.

K: Ah, no. It is a reality to you when you believe in it.

S: Right, but how am I going to look at it if I really believe it? I say there is a god. Now you are telling me to look at my belief in the god.

K: Why do you believe? Who asked you to believe? What is the necessity of god? Not that I am an atheist, but I am asking you.

S: God is there for me, if I believe.

K: Then there is no investigation, it has stopped, you have blocked yourself; you have shut the door. S: That's right. But you see we have got such beliefs. How can we get at this? Because I think we have loads of these unconscious beliefs that we don't really shake. Like the belief in the me.

B: I think a deeper question is how the mind sets up reality. I mean, if I look at things I may think they are real. That may be an



illusion but when it comes it seems real. Even with objects, you can say a word and it becomes real when you describe it that way. And therefore in some way the word sets up in the brain a construction of reality. Then everything is referred to that construction of reality.

S: How are we to investigate that?

K: What created that reality? Would you say that everything thought has created is a reality - except nature?

B: Thought didn't create nature.

K: No, of course not.

B: Can't we put it that thought can describe nature.

K: Yes, thought can describe nature - in poetry...

B: And also in imagination.

K: Imagination. Can we say that whatever thought has put together is reality? The chair, the table, all these electric lights, nature - thought hasn't created nature but it can describe it.

B: And also make theories about it.

K: Make theories, yes. And also the illusion thought has created is the reality.

S: Right.

B: But doesn't this construction of reality have its place, because...

K: Of course, of course.

B: ...this table is real although the brain has constructed it. But at some stage we construct realities that are not there. We can see this sometimes in the shadows on a dark night constructing realities that are not there.

K: That there is a man there.

B: Yes. And also tricks and illusions are possible by conjurers. But then it goes further and we say that mentally we construct a logical reality, which seems intensely real, very strong. But it seems to me the question is: What is it that thought does to give that sense of reality, to construct reality? Can we watch that? K: What does thought do to bring about, to create, that reality?

S: You mean like if you talk to someone who believes in God, he says to you that is real. And if you talk to somebody who really believes in the self. I talk to many people, to many psychotherapists - they say the self is real, that it exists, it is a thing. You heard a psychotherapist once say to Krishnaji, "We know the ego exists."

B: Well, it is not only that. I think what happens is that the illusion builds up very fast once you construct the reality. It builds up a tremendous structure, a cloud of support around it.

K: So let's come to it. What are we doing now?

S: We are moving.

K: We are trying to find out what is the correct action in life. I can only find that out if there is order in me - right? Me is the disorder.

S: Right. That's right.

K: However real that me is, that is the source of disorder.

S: Right.

K: Because that separates, that divides - me and you, we and they, my nation, my god - me.

S: Right.

K: Me with its consciousness.

S: Right.

K: Can that consciousness be aware of itself? Aware, like thought thinking.

B: Thinking about itself?

K: Put it very simply: can thought be aware of its own movement?

B: Yes.

S: That's the question.

B: That's the question. It could be thought understanding its own structure.

S: And its own movement. But is it thought that is aware of itself? Or is it something else?

K: Try it. Try it. Do it now.

S: Right.

K: Do it now. Can your thought be aware of itself? Of its movement? B: It stops.

K: What does that mean?

S: It means what it says: it stops. The observation of thought, stops thought.

K: No, don't put it that way.

S: How would you put it?

K: It is undergoing a radical change.

B: So the word "thought" is not a fixed thing.

K: No.

B: The word "thought" does not mean a fixed thing. It can change - eh?

K: That's right.

B: In perception.

K: You have told me, and other scientists have told me, that in

the observation of an object through a microscope, the object undergoes a change.

B: In the quantum theory the object cannot be fixed apart from the fact of observation.

S: This is true with patients during psychoanalysis. They change automatically.

K: Forget the patient, you are the patient!

S: I am the patient, right.

K: What takes place when thought is aware of itself? You know, sir, this is an extraordinarily important thing.

B: Yes.

K: That is, can the doer be aware of his doing? I can move this vase from here to there and be aware of that moving. That is very simple. I stretch out my arm... But can thought be aware of itself, its movement, its activity, its structure, its nature, what it has created, what it has done in the world?

S: I want to save that question for tomorrow.

**THE WHOLENESS OF LIFE PART I DIALOGUE  
4 4TH CONVERSATION WITH DR. DAVID  
SHAINBERG AND PROF. DAVID BOHM  
BROCKWOOD PARK 19TH MAY, 1976**

KRISHNAMURTI: I don't think that yesterday we answered the question: Why do human beings live the way they are living? I don't think we went into it sufficiently deeply. Did we answer it?

Dr Shainberg: We got the point - but we never answered that question.

K: I was thinking about it this morning and it struck me that we hadn't answered it fully. We went into the question: Can thought observe itself?

S: Right.

Dr Bohm: Right. Yes.

K: But I think we ought to answer that other question.

B: But I think that what we said was on the way to answering it. I mean it was relevant to the answer.

K: Yes, relevant. But it is not complete.

S: No, it's not complete, it doesn't really get hold of that issue: Why do people live the way they do, and why don't they change?

K: Yes. Could we go into that a little bit before we go on?

S: Well, you know my immediate answer to that question was that they like it. We came up against that and then pulled away.

K: I think it is much deeper than that, don't you? Because if one actually transformed one's conditioning, the way one lives, one might find oneself economically in a very difficult position.

S: Right.

K: It would be going against the current, completely against the current.

B: Are you saying that it might lead to a certain objective insecurity?

K: Objective insecurity. B: It is not merely a matter of the imagination.

K: No, no, actual insecurity.

B: Yes, because a lot of the things we are discussing are to do with some illusion of security or insecurity. In addition there is some genuine...

K: ...genuine insecurity. And also doesn't it imply that you have to stand alone?

S: Definitely you would be in a totally different position.

K: Because it is being completely out of the stream. And that means you have to be alone, psychologically alone. And we ask whether human beings can stand that.

S: Well, certainly this other is to be completely together.

K: It is the herd instinct. Be together, with people, don't be alone.

S: Be like them, be with them - it is all based on competition in some way. I am better than you...

K: Of course, of course. It is all that.

B: Well, it is unclear because in some sense we should be together, but society, it seems to me, is giving us some false sense of togetherness which is really fragmentation.

K: Quite right. So would you say that one of the main reasons why human beings don't want to transform themselves radically, is that they are frightened of not belonging to a group, to a herd, to

something definite - of standing completely alone? I think you can only co-operate from that aloneness, not the other way round.

S: People don't like to be different, that we know.

K: I once talked to an FBI man - he came to see me and he said, "Why is it that you walk alone all the time? Why are you so much alone? I see you among the hills walking alone. Why?" He thought it was very disturbing.

B: Well, I think anthropologists find that in primitive peoples the sense of belonging to the tribe is even stronger; their entire psychological structure depends on being in a tribe.

K: You would rather cling to the misery you already know than come into another kind of misery you don't know.

S: That's right. Being with others...

K: ...you are safe. B: You will be taken care of, as your mother may have taken care of you; you are gently supported. You feel that fundamentally everything will be all right because the group is large, it is wise, it knows what to do. I think there is a feeling like that, rather deep. The Church may give that feeling.

K: Yes. You have seen those animal pictures? They are always in herds.

B: Aren't people seeking from the group a sense that they have some support from the whole?

K: Of course.

B: Now isn't it possible that you are discussing an aloneness in which you have a certain security? People are seeking in the group a kind of security; well, it seems to me, that that can arise actually in aloneness.

K: Yes, that is right. In aloneness you can be completely secure.

B: I wonder if we could discuss that because it seems there is an illusion there: people feel they should have a sense of security.

K: Quite right.

B: And they are looking for it in a group, the group being representative of something universal.

K: The group is not the universal.

B: It isn't, but it is the way we think of it.

K: Of course.

B: The little child thinks the tribe is the whole world.

K: A human being, if he transforms himself, becomes alone, but that aloneness is not isolation - it is a form of supreme intelligence.

B: Yes, but could you go into that a little further about it not being isolation, because at first when you say alone - the feeling that I am entirely apart...

K: It is not apart.

S: All people seem to gravitate together; they have to be like other people. What would change that? Why should anybody change from that? What would such people experience when they are alone? They experience isolation.

K: I thought we had already dealt with that fairly thoroughly. When one realizes the appalling state of the world, and of oneself, the disorder, the confusion and the misery, and when one says there must be a total change, a total transformation, one has already begun to move away from all that.

S: Right. But here one is, being together...

K: Being together, what does it really mean?

S: I mean being in this group...

K: Yes, what does it really mean? Identifying oneself with the



group, remaining with the group - what does it mean? What is involved in it? The group is me. I am the group.

S: Right.

K: Therefore it is like co-operating with myself.

B: Perhaps you could say as Descartes said, "I think, therefore I am" - meaning that I think implies that I am there. One says, "I am in the group, therefore I am". You see, if I am not in a group where am I? In other words I have no being at all. That is really the condition of the primitive tribe, for most of the members anyway.

And there is something deep there because I feel that my very existence, my being, psychologically, is implied in being in the group. The group has made me, everything about me has come from the group. I am nothing without the group.

K: Yes, quite right. I am the group in fact.

B: And therefore if I am out of the group I feel everything is collapsing. I don't know where I am. I have no orientation, to life or to anything.

S: Right.

B: And therefore, you see, that might be the greatest punishment the group could inflict, to banish me.

K: Yes, look what is happening in Russia: when there is a dissenter he is banished.

B: Such banishment sort of robs him of his being. It is almost like killing him.

K: Quite. I think that is what it is, the fear of being alone. Alone is translated as being isolated from all this.

B: Could we say from the universal?

K: Yes, from the universal. B: It seems to me you are implying

that if you are really alone, genuinely alone, then you are not isolated from the universe.

K: Absolutely. On the contrary.

B: Therefore we first have to be free of this false universal.

S: This false identification with the group.

B: Identification with the group as the universal. Treating the group as if it were the universal support of my being.

S: Right, right. Now there is something more to that. What is being said is that when that localized identification with the group, that false security, is dropped, one is opened up to the participation in...

K: No, there is no question of participation - you are the universe.

S: You are that.

B: As a child I felt that the town I was in was the whole universe; then I found another town further away which felt almost beyond the universe, which must be the ultimate limits of all reality. So the idea of going beyond that would not have occurred to me. And I think that is how the group is treated. We know abstractly that it is not so, but the feeling you have is like that of a little child.

K: Is it then that human beings love, or hold on to, their own misery and confusion because they don't know anything else?

B: Yes.

K: The known is so far, then the unknown.

S: Right. Yes.

K: Now to be alone implies, doesn't it, to step out of the stream?

S: Of the known.

K: Step out of the stream of this utter confusion, disorder, sorrow, despair, hope and travail - to step out of all that.

S: Right.

K: And if you want to go much deeper into this, to be alone implies, doesn't it, not to carry the burden of tradition with you at all?

B: Tradition being the group, then.

K: The group. Tradition also being knowledge.

B: Knowledge, but it comes basically from the group.

Knowledge is basically collective. It is collected by everybody.

K: So to be alone implies total freedom. And when there is that great freedom it is the universe. B: Could we go into that further because to a person who hasn't seen this, it doesn't look obvious?

S: I think David is right there. To a person, to most people, I think - and I have tested this out recently - the idea, or even the deep feeling, that you are the universe, seems to be so...

K: Ah, sir, that is a most dangerous thing to say. How can you say you are the universe when you are in total confusion? When you are unhappy, miserable, anxious, jealous, envious how can you say you are the universe? Universe implies total order.

B: Yes, the cosmos in Greek meant order.

K: Order, of course.

B: And chaos was the opposite.

K: Yes.

S: But I...

K: No, listen. Universe, cosmos, means order.

S: Right.

K: And chaos is what we live with.

S: That's right.

K: How can I think I have universal order in me? That is the good old trick of the mind which says disorder is there, but inside you there is perfect order. That is an illusion. It is a concept which thought has put there and it gives me a certain hope, but it is an illusion, it has no reality. What has actual reality is the confusion.

S: Right.

K: My chaos. And I can imagine, I can project a cosmos but that. is equally illusory. So I must start with the fact of what I am, which is that I am in chaos.

S: I belong to a group.

K: Chaos, chaos is the group. So to move away from that into cosmos, which is total order, means that I am alone. There is a total order which is not associated with disorder, chaos. That is alone.

B: Yes, can we go into that? Suppose several people are in that state, moving into cosmos, into order out of the chaos of society - are they all alone?

K: No, they don't feel alone there. There is only order.

B: Are they different people? K: Sir, would you say - suppose - no, I can't suppose - we three are in cosmos, there is only cosmos, not you, Dr Bohm, Dr Shainberg and me.

B: Therefore we are still alone.

K: That is, order is alone.

B: I looked up the word "alone" in the dictionary; basically it is all one.

K: All one. Yes.

B: In other words there is no fragmentation.

K: Therefore there is no three - we three. And that is

marvellous, sir.

S: But you jumped away there. We have got chaos and confusion. That is what we have got.

K: So as we said, to move away from that, which is to have total order, most people are afraid. Alone, as he pointed out, is all one. Therefore there is no fragmentation, then there is cosmos.

S: Right. But most people are in confusion and chaos. That is all they know.

K: So how do you move away from that? That is the whole question.

S: That is the question. Here we are in chaos and confusion, we are not over there.

K: No, because you may be frightened of that. Frightened of an idea of being alone.

S: How can you be frightened of an idea?

B: That is easy.

K: Aren't you frightened of tomorrow? Which is an idea.

S: OK. That is an idea.

K: So they are frightened of an idea which they have projected, which says, "My God, I am alone", which means I have nobody to rely on.

S: Right, but that is an idea.

B: Well, let's go slowly. We have said that to a certain extent it is genuinely so. You are not being supported by society. You do have a certain genuine danger because you have withdrawn from the hub of society. S: I think we are confused here. I really do because I think if we have got confusion, if we have got chaos...

K: Not if - it is so.

S: It is so, OK I go with you. We have got chaos and confusion, that is what we have got. Now if you have an idea about being alone while in chaos and confusion, that is just another idea, another thought, another part of the chaos. Is that right?

K: That's right.

S: OK. Now that is all we have got, chaos and confusion.

K: And in moving away from that we have the feeling we will be alone.

B: In the sense of isolated.

K: Isolated.

S: Right. That's what I am getting at.

K: We will be lonely.

S: That's right.

K: Of that we are frightened.

S: Not frightened, in terror.

K: Yes. Therefore we say, "I would rather stay where I am in my little pond than face isolation." And that may be one of the reasons why human beings don't radically change.

S: That's right.

B: That's like this primitive tribe - the worst punishment is to be banished.

S: You don't have to go to a primitive tribe. I see people and talk to people all the time; patients come to me and say, "Look, Saturday came, I couldn't stand being alone, I called up 50 people looking for somebody to be with."

B: Yes, that is much the same.

K: So that may be one of the reasons why human beings don't change.

S: Right. K: The other is that we are so heavily conditioned to accept things as they are. We don't say to ourselves, "Why should I live this way?" S: That is certainly true. We don't.

B: We have to get away from this conviction, that the way things are is all that can be.

K: Yes, that's right. You see, the religions have pointed this out by saying there is another world, aspire to that. This is a transient world, it doesn't matter, live as best as you can in your sorrow, and then you will be perfectly happy in the next world.

S: Right.

K: And the Communists say there is no next-world, so make the best of this world.

B: I think they would say that there is happiness in the future in this world.

K: Yes, yes. Sacrifice your children for the future, which is exactly the same thing.

B: But it seems it is a sort of transformation of the same thing: we say we want to give up this society as it is, but we invent something similar.

K: Yes, quite.

S: It has to be similar if we are inventing it.

B: Yes, but it seems it is an important point, that there is a subtle way of not being alone.

K: Quite right.

S: You mean we go ahead and make it out of the old ideas?

B: Yes. To make heaven for the future.

K: So what will make human beings change? Radically.

S: I don't know. Even the idea you are suggesting here is that it

can't be different, or that it is all the same: that is part of the system itself.

K: Agreed. Now wait a minute. May I ask you a question? Why don't you change? What is preventing you?

S: I would say that it is - oh, it's a tough question. I suppose the answer would be that - I don't have any answer.

K: Because you have never asked yourself that question. Right?

S: Not radically.

K: We are asking basic questions. S: Right. I don't really know the answer to the question.

K: Now, sir, move away from that, sir. Is it that our structure, our whole society, all religions, all culture is based on thought, and thought says, "I can't do this. Therefore an outside agency is necessary to change me."

S: Right.

K: Whether the outside agency is the environment, the leader, or God. God is your own projection of yourself, obviously. And you believe in God, you believe in some leader; you believe, but you are still the same.

S: That's right.

K: You may identify with the State and so on, but the good old me is still operating. So is it that thought doesn't see its own limit? Doesn't know, realize, that it cannot change itself?

B: Well, I think thought loses track of something; it doesn't see that it itself is behind all this.

K: Of course. We said that. Thought has produced all this chaos.

B: But thought doesn't really see this exactly.



S: What thought does in fact is to communicate through gradual change.

K: That is all the invention of thought.

S: Yes, but that is where I think the hook is.

K: No, sir, please, sir, just listen.

S: Sure.

K: Thought has put this world together. Technologically as well as psychologically. The technological world is all right, leave it all alone, we won't even discuss that. It would be too absurd. But psychologically, thought has built all this world in me and outside me. And does thought realize that it has made this mess, this chaos?

B: I would say that it doesn't. It tends to look on this chaos as independently existent.

K: But it is its baby!

B: It is, but it is very hard for thought to see that. That is really what we were discussing yesterday.

K: Yes, we are coming back to that. B: To this question of how thought gives a sense of reality. We were saying that technology deals with something that thought made, but it is actually an independent reality once it is made.

K: Like the table, like those cameras.

B: But you could say that thought also creates a reality which it calls independent, but isn't.

K: Yes, yes. So, does thought realize, is it aware, that it has created this chaos?

S: No.

K: Why not? But you, sir. Do you realize it?

S: I realize that...

K: Not you - does thought - you see! I have asked you a different question: Does thought, which is you, your thinking - does your thinking realize the chaos it has created?

B: Thought tends to attribute that chaos to something else, either to something outside, or to me who is inside.

K: Thought has created me.

B: But also thought has said that me is not thought, although in reality it is. Thought is treating me as a different reality.

K: Of course, of course.

B: And thought is saying that it is coming from me and therefore it doesn't take credit for what it does.

K: To me thought has created the me.

S: That's right.

K: And so "me" is not separate from thought. It is the structure of thought, the nature of thought that has made me.

S; Right.

K: Now: Does your thinking, or does your thought realize this?

S: In flashes it does.

K: No, not in flashes. You don't see that table in flashes; it is always there. We asked a question yesterday, and we stopped there: Does thought see itself in movement?

S: Right.

K: The movement has created the me, created the chaos, created the division, created the conflict, jealousy, anxiety, fear... S: Right. Now what I am asking is another question. Yesterday we came to a moment where we said thought stops.

K: No. That is much later. Please just stick to one thing.

S: OK. What I am trying to get at is what is the actuality of thought seeing itself?

K: You want me to describe it?

S: No, no, I don't want you to describe it - what I am trying to get at is what is the actuality that thought sees? We get into the problem of language here - but it seems that thought sees and forgets.

K: No, no, please. I am asking a very simple question. Don't complicate it. Does thought see the chaos it has created? That's all. Which means: Is thought aware of itself as a movement? Not I am aware of thought as a movement - the I has been created by thought.

S: Right.

B: I think a question that is relevant is: Why does thought keep on going? How does it sustain itself? Because as long as it sustains itself it produces something like an independent reality, an illusion of reality.

S: What is my relationship to thought?

K: You are thought. There is no you related to thought.

S: Right. But look, look. The question is: I say to you, "What is my relationship to thought" - and you say to me " You are thought". in some way what you say is clear, but that is still the way thought is moving for me, to say it is my relationship to thought.

B: Well, that's the point. Can this very thought stop right now?

K: Yes.

B: What is sustaining this whole thing? - at this very moment? - was the question I was trying to get at.

S: Yes, that's the question.

B: In other words, say we have a certain insight but nevertheless something happens to sustain the old process right now.

K: That's right.

S: Right now thought keeps moving. K: No, Dr Bohm asked a very good question which we haven't answered. He said, Why does thought move?

B: When it is irrelevant to move.

K: Why is it always moving? What is movement? Movement is time - right?

S: That's too quick. Movement is time.

K: Obviously, of course. Physically, from here to London, from here to New York. And also psychologically from here to there.

S: Right.

K: I am this, I must be that.

S: Right. But if a thought is not necessarily all that...

K: Thought is the new movement. We are examining movement, which is thought. Look: if thought stopped there is no movement.

S: Yes, I know. I am trying - this has to be made very clear.

B: I think there is a step that might help: to ask myself what it is that makes me go on thinking or talking. I can often watch people and see they are in a hole just because they keep on talking. If they would stop talking the whole problem would vanish. I mean it is just this flow of words that comes out as if it were reality, and then they say that is my problem, it is real and I have got to think some more. There is a kind of a feedback saying, "I have got a problem, I am suffering."

S: You have got an `I' thought.

B: Yes, I think that; therefore I have a sense that I am real. I am thinking of my suffering, and in that it is implicit that it is I who am there, that the suffering is real because I am real.

S: Right.

B: And then comes the next thought, which is: Since that is real I must think some more.

S: It feeds on itself.

B: Yes. And one of the things I must think is that I am suffering. And I am compelled to keep on thinking that thought all the time. Maintaining myself in existence. Do you see what I am driving at? That there is a feedback.

K: Which means that if thought is movement, which is time, and there is no movement I am dead! I am dead. B: Yes, if that movement stops, then the sense that I am there being real must go, because the sense that I am real is the result of thinking.

K: Do you see this is extraordinary?

S: Of course it is.

K: No, no, actually. In actuality, not in theory. One realizes thought is movement - right?

S: Right.

B: And in this movement it creates an image of...

K: ...of me...

B: ...that is supposed to be moving.

K: Yes, yes. Now, when that movement stops there is no me. The me is time, put together by time, which is thought.

S: Right.

K: So do you, listening to this, realize the truth of it? Not the

verbal, logical statement, but the truth of such an amazing thing? Therefore there is an entirely different action. The action of thought as movement brings about a fragmentary action, a contradictory action. When the movement as thought comes to an end there is total action.

B: Can you say then that whatever technical thought brings about has an order?

K: Of course.

B: In other words it doesn't mean that thought is permanently gone.

K: No, no.

S: It can still be a movement in its proper place, in its fitting order?

K: Of course. So is a human being afraid of all this? Unconsciously, deeply, he must realize the ending of me. Do you understand? And that is really a most frightening thing. My knowledge, my books, my wife - the whole thing which thought has put together. And you are asking me to end all that.

B: Can't you say it is the ending of everything? Because everything that I know is there.

K: Absolutely. So you see, really I am frightened; a human being is frightened of death. Not the biological death... S: To die now.

K: This coming to an end. And therefore he believes in God, reincarnation, and a dozen other comforting things, but in actuality, when thought realizes itself as movement and sees that movement has created the me, the divisions, the quarrels, the whole structure of this chaotic world - when thought realizes this, sees the truth of

it, it ends. Then there is cosmos. You listen to this: how do you receive it?

S: Do you want me to answer?

K: I offer you something. How do you receive it? This is very important.

S: Yes. Thought sees its movement...

K: No, no. How do you receive it? How does the public, who listens to all this, receive it? They ask, "What is he trying to tell me?"

S: What?

K: He says I am not telling you anything. He says listen to what I am saying and find out for yourself whether thought as movement has created all this, both the technological world which is useful, which is necessary, and this chaotic world.

S: Right.

K: How do you receive it, listen to it? What takes place in you when you listen to it?

S: Panic.

K: No. Is it?

S: Yes. There is a panic about the death. There is a sense of seeing, and then there is a fear of that death.

K: Which means you have listened to the words; the words have awakened the fear.

S: Right.

K: But not the actuality of the fact.

S: I wouldn't say that. I think that is a little unfair. They awaken the...

K: I am asking you.

S: ...they awaken the actuality of the fact and then there seems to be a silence, a moment of great clarity that gives way to a kind of feeling in the pit of the stomach where things are dropping out, and then there is a kind of...

K: Withholding.

S: ...withholding, right. I think there is a whole movement there.

K: So you are describing humanity?

S: No I am describing me.

K: You are humanity.

B: You are the same.

S: Right.

K: You are the viewer, the people who are listening.

S: That's right. So there is a sense of what will happen tomorrow?

K: No, no. That is not the point. No. When thought realizes itself as a movement, and realizes that that movement has created all this chaos, total chaos, complete disorder - when it realizes that, what takes place? Actually? You are not frightened, there is no fear. Listen to it carefully. There is no fear. Fear is the idea brought about by an abstraction. You understand? You have made a picture of ending and are frightened of that ending.

S: You are right. You are right.

K: There is no fear.

S: No fear and then there is...

K: There is no fear when the actuality takes place.

S: That's right. When the actuality takes place there is silence.

K: With the fact there is no fear.

B: But as soon as thought comes in...



K: That's right.

S: That's right. Now wait a minute; no, don't go away. When thought comes in...

K: Then it is no longer a fact. You haven't remained with the fact.

B: Well, that is the same as saying you keep on thinking.

K: Keep on moving.

B: Yes. Well, as soon as you bring thought in, it is not a fact; it is an imagination or a fantasy which is thought to be real, but it is not so. Therefore you are not with the fact any longer. K: We have discovered something extraordinary, that with fact there is no fear.

S: Right.

B: So all fear is thought, is that it?

K: That's right.

S: We have got a big mouthful here.

K: No. All thought is fear, all thought is sorrow.

B: That goes both ways, that all fear is thought, and all thought is fear.

K: Of course.

B: Except the kind of thought that arises with the fact alone.

S: I want to interject something right here: it seems to me we have discovered something quite important right here, which is that at the actual seeing, the instant of attention is at its peak.

K: No. Something new takes place, sir. Something totally new that you have never looked at. It has never been understood or experienced, whatever it is. A totally different thing happens.

B: But isn't it important that we acknowledge this in our thought, I mean in our language?

K: Yes.

B: As we are doing now. In other words, if it happened and we didn't acknowledge it, then we are liable to fall back.

K: Of course, of course.

S: I don't get you.

B: Well, we have to see it not only when it happens but we have to say that it happens.

S: Then are we creating a place to localize this, or not?

K: No, no. What he is saying is very simple. He is saying, does this fact, this actuality take place? And can you remain with it, can thought not move but remain only with that fact? Sir, it is like saying: Remain totally with sorrow. Do not move away, do not say it should be or shouldn't be, or how am I to get over it - just totally remain with that thing. With the fact. Then you have an energy which is extraordinary.

**THE WHOLENESS OF LIFE PART I DIALOGUE**  
**5 5TH CONVERSATION WITH DR. DAVID**  
**SHAINBERG AND PROF. DAVID BOHM**  
**BROCKWOOD PARK 19TH MAY, 1976**

KRISHNAMURTI: We have talked about the necessity for human beings to change, and about why they don't change, why they accept this intolerable condition of the human psyche. I think we ought to approach the same thing from a different angle. Who has invented the unconscious?

Dr Shainberg: Who has invented it? I think there is a difference between what we call the unconscious and what is the unconscious. The word is not the thing.

K: Yes, the word is not the thing. Who has thought it up?

S: Well, I think the history of thinking about the unconscious is a long and involved process.

K: May we ask: Have you an unconscious? Are you aware of your unconscious? Do you know if you have an unconscious that is operating differently, trying to give you hints - are you aware of all that?

S: Yes. I am aware of an aspect of myself that is incompletely aware. That is what I call the unconscious. It is aware of my experience, aware of events in an incomplete way. That's what I call the unconscious. It uses symbols and different modes of telling, of understanding a dream, say, in which I discover jealousy that I wasn't aware of.

K: Do you also give importance, Dr Bohm, to a feeling that there is such a thing?

Dr Bohm: Well, I don't know what you mean by that. I think there are some things we do that we are not aware of. We react, we use words in an habitual way...

S: We have dreams.

B: We have dreams, yes... K: I am going to question all that because I am not sure...

S: You are not questioning that we have dreams?

K: No. But I want to question, I want to ask the experts if there is such a thing as the unconscious, because I don't think it has played any important part in my life at all.

S: Well, it depends on what you mean.

K: I will tell you what I mean. Something hidden, something incomplete, something that I have to go after consciously or unconsciously - discover, unearth, explore and expose. See the motives, see the hidden intentions.

B: Well, could we make it clear that there are some things people do which you can see they are not aware of doing?

K: I don't quite follow.

B: Well, for example, this Freudian slip of the tongue - somebody makes a slip of the tongue which expresses his will.

K: Yes, yes, I didn't mean that quite.

S: That is what most people think of as the unconscious. You see, I think there are two problems here, if I can just put in a technical statement. There has arisen in the history of thinking about the unconscious, a belief that there are things in it which must be lifted out. Then there are a large group of people now who think of the unconscious as areas of behaviour, areas of response, areas of experience that they are not fully aware of, so that in the

daytime they might have, let's say, an experience of stress which they didn't finish with, and at night they go through re-working it in a new way.

K: I understand all that.

S: So that would be the unconscious in operation. You get it also from the past or from previous programmes of action.

K: I mean - the collective unconscious, the racial unconscious.

B: Let's say somebody has been deeply hurt in the past; you can see that his whole behaviour is governed by that. But he doesn't know it; he may not know it.

K: Yes, that I understand.

S: But his response is always from the past. K: Yes, quite. What I am trying to find out is why we have divided the conscious and the unconscious. Or is it one unitary total process - one movement? Not hidden, not concealed, but moving as a whole current. These clever brainy birds come along and split it up and say there is the conscious and the unconscious, the hidden, the incomplete, the storehouse of racial memories, family memories....

S: The reason that that has happened, I think, is partially explained by the fact that Freud and Jung and others were seeing patients who had fragmented off this movement which you are talking about. So much knowledge of the unconscious grew out of that.

K: That's what I want to get at.

S: There's the whole history of hysteria, where patients couldn't move their arms, you know?

K: I know.

S: Then you open up their memories and eventually they can

move their arms. Or there were people who had dual personalities...

K: Is it an insanity - not insanity - is it a state of mind that divides everything, that says there is the unconscious and the conscious? Is it also a process of fragmentation?

B: Well, wouldn't you say, as Freud has said, that certain material is made unconscious by the brain because it is too disturbing?

K: That is what I want to get at.

B: It is fragmented. That is well known in all schools of psychology.

S: That's right. That is what I am saying. It is fragmented off and is then called the unconscious. What is fragmented is the unconscious.

K: I understand that.

B: But would you say that the brain itself is in some sense holding it separate on purpose in order to avoid it?

K: Yes, avoiding facing the fact.

S; That's right. B: Yes. So that it is not really separate from consciousness.

K: That is what I want to get at.

S: It isn't separate from consciousness but the brain has organized it in a fragmented way.

B: Yes, but then it is a wrong terminology to call it that. The word unconscious already implies a separation.

K: That's right, separation.

B: To say there are two layers, the unconscious and the surface consciousness, a structure is implied. But this other notion is to say

that that structure is not implied, but that certain material wherever it may be is simply avoided.

K: I don't want to think about somebody because he has hurt me. That is not the unconscious, it's just that I don't want to think about him.

S: That's right.

K: I am conscious he has hurt me and I don't want to think about it.

B: But a kind of paradoxical situation arises there because eventually you would become so good at it that you wouldn't realize you were doing it. That seems to happen, you see.

K: Yes, yes.

B: People become so proficient at avoiding these things that they cease to realize they are doing it.

K: Yes.

B: It becomes habitual.

S: That is right. I think this is what happens. These hurts....

K: The wound remains.

S: The wound remains and we forget that we have forgotten-

K: The wound remains.

B: We remember to forget, you see!

K: Yes.

S: We remember to forget and then the process of therapy is to help the remembering and the recall - to remember you have forgotten, and then to understand the connections of why you forgot; then the thing can move in a more holistic way, rather than being fragmented.

K: Do you consider, or feel that you have been hurt?

S: Yes.

K: And want to avoid it? Resist, withdraw, isolate - the whole picture being the image of yourself being hurt and withdrawing - do you feel that when you are hurt?

S: Yes. I feel - how to put it?

K: Let's go into this.

S: Yes, I feel there is definitely a move not to be hurt, not to have that image, not to have that whole thing changed because if it is changed it seems to catapult into the same experience that was the hurt. This has a resonance with that unconscious which reminds me... you see I am reminded of being hurt deeply by this more superficial hurt.

K: I understand that.

S: So I avoid hurt - period.

K: If the brain has a shock - a biological, physical shock - must the psychological brain, if we can call it that, be hurt also? Is that inevitable?

S: No, I don't think so. It is only hurt with reference to something.

K: No. I am asking you: Can such a psychological brain, if I can use those two words, never be hurt? - in any circumstances, given family life, husband, wife, bad friends, so-called enemies, all that is going on around you - never get hurt? Because apparently this is one of the major wounds of human existence. The more sensitive you are, the more aware, the more hurt you get, the more withdrawn. Is this inevitable?

S: I don't think it is inevitable but I think it happens frequently, more often than not. And it seems to happen when an attachment is



formed and then the loss of that attachment. You become important to me, I like you, or I am involved with you, then it becomes important to me that you don't do anything that disturbs that image.

K: That is, the relationship between two people, the picture we have of each other, the image - that is the cause of hurt. B: Well, it also goes the other way: we hold those images because of hurt.

K: Of course, of course.

B: Where does it start?

K: That is what I want to get at.

S: That is what I want to get at too.

K: He pointed out something.

S: I know he did, yes.

B: Because the past hurt gives tremendous strength to the image, the image which helps us to forget it.

S: That's right.

K: Now is this wound in the "unconscious" - we use the word unconscious in quotes for the time being - is it hidden?

S: Well, I think you are being a little simplistic about that because what is hidden is the fact that I have had this happen many times - it happened with my mother, it happened with my friend, it happened in school, when I cared about somebody... You form the attachment and then comes the hurt.

K: I am not at all sure that it comes through attachment.

S: Maybe it is not attachment, that is the wrong word. What happens is that I form a relationship with you where an image becomes important - what you do to me becomes important.

K: You have an image about yourself.

S: That's right. And you are saying that I like you because you

are conforming with the image.

K: No, apart from like and dislike, you have an image about yourself. Then I come along and put a pin in that image.

S: No, first you come along and confirm it.

B: The hurt will be greater if you first come along and are very friendly to me and confirm the image, and then suddenly put a pin in me.

K: Of course, of course.

B: But even somebody who didn't confirm it can hurt if he puts a pin in properly. S: That's right. That's not unconscious. But why did I have the image to begin with? That is unconscious.

K: Is it unconscious? That is what I want to get at. Or it is so obvious that we don't look. You follow what I am saying?

S: I follow, yes.

K: We put it away. We say it is hidden. I question whether it is hidden at all, it is so blatantly obvious.

S: I don't feel all parts of it are obvious.

B: I think we hide it in one sense. Shall we say that this hurt means that everything is wrong with the image, but we hide it by saying everything is all right? In other words the thing that is obvious may be hidden by saying it is unimportant, that we don't notice it.

S: Yes we don't notice it but I ask myself what is it that generates this image, what is that hurt?

K: Ah, we will come to that. We are enquiring, aren't we, into the whole structure of consciousness?

S: Right.

K: Into the nature of consciousness. We have broken it up into

the hidden and the open. It may be the fragmented mind that is doing this. And therefore strengthening both.

S: Right.

The division grows greater and greater and greater...

S: The fragmented mind is...

K: ...doing this. Now most people have an image about themselves, practically everybody. It is that image that gets hurt. And that image is you, and you say, "I am hurt".

B: It is the same as what we were discussing this morning.

K: Yes.

B: You see, if I have a pleasant self-image, I attribute the pleasure to me and say that it is real. When somebody hurts me then the pain is attributed to me and I say that's real too. It seems that if you have an image that can give you pleasure, then it must also be able to give you pain. There is no way out of that.

K: Absolutely. S: Well, the image seems to be self-perpetuating, as you were saying.

B: I think people hope that the image will give them pleasure.

K: Pleasure only.

B: Only pleasure, but the very mechanism that makes pleasure possible makes pain possible, because the pleasure comes if I say "I think I am good", and this is sensed to be real, which makes that goodness real, but if somebody comes along and says, " You are no good, you are stupid", that too is real and therefore very significant.

K: The image brings both pleasure and pain.

B: I think people would hope for an image that would bring only pleasure.

S: People do hope that, there is no question. But people not only

hope for the image, they invest all their interest in their image.

B: The value of everything depends on this self-image being right. So if somebody shows it's wrong, everything is wrong.

S: That's right.

K: But we are always giving new shape to the image.

B: But I think this image means everything, and that gives it tremendous power.

S: The entire personality is directed to the achievement of this image. Everything else takes second place.

K: Are you aware of this?

S: Yes. I am aware of it.

K: What is the beginning of this?

S: Well...

K: Please, just let me summarize first. Every human being practically has an image of himself, of which he is unconscious or not aware.

S: That's right. Usually it's sort of idealized.

K: Idealized, or not idealized, it is an image.

S: That's right. They must have it. K: That have it.

B: They have it.

S: But they must direct all their actions towards getting it.

B: I think one feels one's whole life depends on the image.

K: Yes, that's right.

S: Depression is when I don't have it.

K: We will come to that. The next question is: How does it come into being?

S: Well, I think it comes into being in the family in some way. You are my father and I understand through watching you that if I

am smart you will like me, right?

K: Quite. We agree.

S: I learn that very quickly. So I am going to make sure I get that love...

K: It is all very simple. But I am asking: What is the origin of making images about oneself?

B: If I had no image at all I would never get into that, would I?

S: If I never made images..?

B: Yes. Never made any image at all no matter what my father did.

K: I think this is very important.

S: That is the question.

B: Maybe the child can't do it, but suppose he can... K: I am not at all sure...

B: Perhaps he can, but I am saying under ordinary conditions he doesn't manage to do it.

S: You are suggesting that the child already has an image that he has been hurt.

K: Ah, no, no. I don't know. We are asking.

B: But suppose there was a child who made no image of himself.

S: OK. Let's assume he has no image.

B: Then he cannot get hurt.

K: He can't be hurt. S: There I think you are in very hot water psychologically because a child...

K: No, we said "suppose".

B: Not the actual child - but suppose there was a child who didn't make an image of himself so he didn't depend on that image

for everything. The child you talked about depended on the image that his father loved him.

S: That's right.

B: And therefore when his father doesn't love him, everything has gone, right?

S: Right.

B: Therefore he is hurt. But if he has no image that he must have his father love him, then he will just watch his father.

S: But let's look at it a little more pragmatically. Here is the child and he is actually hurt.

B: He can't be hurt without the image. Who is going to get hurt?

K: It is like putting a pin into the air.

S: Now wait a minute, I am not going to let you guys get away with this! Here you have got this child vulnerable in the sense that needs psychological support. He has enormous tensions.

K: Sir, agreed to all that. Such a child has an image.

S: No, no image. He is simply not being biologically supported.

K: No. No.

B: Well, he may make an image of the fact that he is not biologically supported. You have to get the difference between the actual fact of what happens biologically and what he thinks of it. Right? Now I have seen a child sometimes drop suddenly, he really goes to pieces, not because he was dropped very far but because that sense of...

K: Loss, insecurity.

B: ...insecurity, because his mother was gone. It seemed as if everything had gone, right? And he was totally disorganized and screaming, but he dropped only about this far, you see. But the

point is he had an image of the kind of security he was going to get from his mother. Right? S: That is the way the nervous system works.

B: Well, that is the question - Is it necessary to work that way? Or is this the result of conditioning?

K: This is an important question.

S: Oh, terribly important.

K: Because whether in America or in this country, children are running away from their parents. The parents seem to have no control over them. They don't obey, they don't listen. They are wild. And the parents feel terribly hurt. I saw on TV what is happening in America. One woman was in tears. She said, "I am his mother he doesn't treat me as a mother, he just orders me about." He had run away half a dozen times. And this separation between parents and children is growing all over the world. They have no relationship between themselves, between each other. So what is the cause of all this, apart from sociological, economic pressures which made the mother go out to work and leave the child alone - we take that for granted - but much deeper than that? Is it that the parents have an image about themselves and insist on creating an image in the children?

S: I see what you are saying.

K: And the child refuses to have that image - he has his own image. So the battle is on.

S: That is very much what I was saying when I said that initially the hurt of the child...

K: We haven't come to the hurt yet.

S: Well, what is in that initial relationship between child...

K: I doubt if they have any relationship. That is what I am trying to get at.

S: I agree with you. There is something wrong with the relationship.

K: Have they a relationship at all? Look, young people get married, or they don't get married. They have a child by mistake, or intentionally, but young people are children themselves; they haven't understood the universe, cosmos or chaos - they just have this child.

S: That's right. That is what happens. K: And they play with it for a year or two and then say, "For God's sake, I am fed up with this child", and look elsewhere. And the child feels left, lost.

S: That's right.

K: And he needs security, from the beginning he needs security.

S: Right.

K: Which the parents do not give, or are incapable of giving - psychological security, the sense of "You are my child, I love you, I'll look after you, I'll see that throughout life you will behave properly". They haven't got that feeling. They are bored with it after a couple of years.

S: That's right. K: Is it that they have no relationship right from the beginning neither the husband, nor the wife, boy or girl? Is it only a sexual relationship, the pleasure relationship? Is it that they won't accept the pain principle involved with the pleasure principle?

S: That's right.

K: What I am trying to see is if there is actually any relationship at all, except a biological, sexual, sensual relationship.



S: Well...

K: I am questioning it, I am not saying it is so, I am questioning it.

S: I don't think it is so. I think they have a relationship but it is a wrong relationship.

K: There is no wrong relationship. It is a relationship or no relationship.

S: Well, then we will have to say they have a relationship. I think most parents have a relationship with their children.

B: Suppose the parent and child have images of each other, and the relationship is governed by those images - the question is whether that is actually a relationship or not, or whether it is some sort of fantasy of relationship.

K: A fanciful relationship. Sir, you have children - forgive me if I come back to you - you have children. Have you any relationship with them? In the real sense of that word.

S: Yes. In the real sense, yes. K: That means you have no image about yourself.

S: Right.

K: And you are not imposing an image on them?

S: That's right.

K: And the society is not imposing an image on them?

S: There are moments like that...

K: Ah, no. That is not good enough. It is like a rotten egg.

S: This is an important point.

B: If it is moments it is not so. It is like saying a person who is hurt has moments when he is not hurt, but he is sitting there waiting to explode when something happens. So he can't go very

far. It is like somebody who is tied to a rope, and as soon as he reaches the limits of that rope he is stuck.

S: That is right.

B: So you could say I am related as long as certain things are all right, but beyond that point it just sort of blows up. You see what I am driving at? That mechanism is inside there, buried, so it dominates me potentially. It is like the man who is tied to a rope and says there are moments when I can move wherever I like, but I can't really because if I keep on moving I am bound to come to the end.

S: That does seem to be what happens, in fact. There is a reverberation in which there is a yank-back.

B: Either I come to the end of the cord, or else something yanks the cord. The person who is on the end of a cord is really not free ever.

S: Well, that's true, I mean I think that is true.

B: You see in the same sense the person who has the image is not really related ever.

K: Yes, that is just the whole point. You can play with it verbally, but the actuality is that you have no relationship.

S: You have no relationship as long as it is the image.

K: As long as you have an image about yourself you have no relationship with another. This is a tremendous revelation - you follow? It is not just an intellectual statement. S: I have the memory of times when I do have what I think is a relationship, yet one must be honest with you, and say that after such relationship there inevitably seems to be this yank-back.

B: The end of the cord.

S: Yes, a yank-back. You have a relationship with somebody but you will go just so far.

K: Of course. That is understood.

B: But then really the image controls it all the time because the image is the dominant factor. If you once pass that point, no matter what happens, the image takes over.

K: So the image gets hurt, and the child, because you impose the image on the child. You are bound to because you have an image. Because you have an image about yourself you are bound to create an image in the child.

S: That is right.

K: You follow, you have discovered? And society is doing this to all of us.

B: So you say the child is picking up an image just naturally, as it were, quietly, and then suddenly it is hurt?

K: Hurt. That's right.

B: So the hurt has been prepared and preceded by this steady process of building an image?

S: That's right. There is evidence, for instance, that we treat boys differently from girls...

K: No. Look at it: don't verbalize it too quickly.

B: You see, if the steady process of building an image didn't occur there would be no basis, no structure, to get hurt. In other words the pain is due entirely to some psychological fact. Whereas I was previously enjoying the pleasure of saying, "My father loves me, I am doing what he wants" - now comes the pain - "I am not doing what he wants, he doesn't love me".

S: I don't think we touched on the biological situation of the

child feeling neglected.

B: Well, if the child is neglected, he must pick up an image in that very process. K: Of course. If you admit, see it as a reality, that as long as the parents have an image about themselves they are bound to give that image to the child...

S: Right. There is no question, as long as the parent is the image-maker and has an image, he can't see the child.

K: And therefore gives an image to the child.

S: Right. He will condition the child to be something.

K: You see, society is doing this to every human being. Religions, every culture around us is creating this image. And that image gets hurt. Now the next question is: Is one aware of all this? Which is part of our consciousness.

S: Right, right.

K: The content of consciousness makes up consciousness. That is clear.

S: Right.

K: So one of the contents is the image-making, or maybe the major machinery that is operating, the major dynamo, the major movement. Being hurt, which every human being is - can that hurt be healed and never be hurt again? That is, can a human mind which has created the image, which has accepted the image, can that mind put away the image completely and never be hurt? - which means that a great part of consciousness is empty - it has no content. I wonder.

S: Can it? I really don't know the answer to that.

K: Why? Who is the image-maker? What is the machinery or the process that is making images? I may get rid of one image and

take on another. I am a Catholic, I am a Protestant, I am a Hindu, I am a Zen monk, I am this, I am that - you follow? - they are all images.

S: Who is the image-maker?

K: You see, after all, if there is an image of that kind how can you have love in all this?

S: We don't have an abundance of it.

K: We don't have it. S: That's right. We have got a lot of images. That is why I say I don't know. K: It is terrible, sir, to have these images - you follow?

S: Right. I know about image-making, I see it. I see it even when you are talking about it. I can see that if I don't make one image I will make another.

K: Of course, sir. We are saying, Is it possible to stop the machinery that is producing images? And what is the machinery? Is it wanting to be somebody?

S: Yes. It is wanting to be somebody, it is wanting to know - wanting to have. Somehow or other it seems to be wanting to handle the feeling that if I don't have it I don't know where I am.

K: Being at a loss?

S: Yes. The feeling that you are at a loss. Not to be able to rely on anything, not to have any support, breeds more disorder - you follow? B: That is one of the images...

K: The image is the product of thought - right?

S: It is organized.

K: Yes, a product of thought. It may go through various forms of pressure, a great deal of conveyor belt, and at the end it produces an image.

S: Right. No question. I agree with you there, yes.

K: Can the machinery stop? Can thought which produces these images, which destroys all relationship so that there is no love - not verbally but actually no love - can it stop? When a man who has got an image about himself says, "I love my wife, or my children", it is just sentiment, romantic, fanciful emotionalism.

S: Right.

K: As it is now, there is no love in the world. There is no sense of real caring for somebody.

S: That is true. K: The more affluent the worse it becomes. Not that the poor have this. I don't mean that. Poor people haven't got this either - they are concerned with filling their stomachs, and work, work, work.

B: But still they have got lots of images.

K: Of course. All these are the people who are correcting the world - right? Who are ordering the universe. So I ask myself, can this image-making stop? Stop, not occasionally, but stop. Because unless it does I don't know what love means. I don't know how to care for somebody. And I think that is what is happening in the world because children are really lost souls, lost human beings. I have met so many, hundreds of them now, all over the world. They are really a lost generation. As the older people are a lost generation. So what is a human being to do? What is the right action in relationship? Can there be right action in relationship as long as you have an image?

S: No.

K: Ah! Sir, this is something tremendous. S: That is why I was wondering. It seemed to me you made a jump there. You said all

we know is images, and image-making. That is all we know.

K: But we never said can it stop?

S: We have never said can it stop - that is right.

K: We have never said, for God's sake if it doesn't stop we are going to destroy each other.

B: You could say that the notion we might stop is something more we know that we didn't know before...

K: It becomes another piece of knowledge.

B: I was trying to say that when you say "all we know", a block comes in.

S: Right.

B: You see, it is not much use to say "all we know". If you say it is all we know then it can never stop.

K: He is objecting to your use of "all".

S: I am grateful to you.

B: That is one of the factors blocking it.

S: Well, if we come down to it, what do we do with that question: Can it stop?

K: I put that question to you. Do you listen to it?

S; I listen to it - right.

K: Ah, do you? S: It stops.

K: No, no. I am not interested in whether it stops. Do you listen to the question. Can it stop? We now examine, analyse, this whole process of image-making - the result of it, the misery, the confusion, the appalling things that are going on. The Arab has his image, the Jew, the Hindu, the Muslim, the Christian, the Communist. There is this tremendous division of images, of symbols. If that doesn't stop, you are going to have such a chaotic

world - you follow? - I see this, not as an abstraction, but as an actuality, as I see that flower.

S: Right.

K: And as a human being, what am I to do? Because I personally have no image about this. I really mean I have no image about myself, no conclusion, no concept, no ideal - none of these images. I have none. And I say to myself what can I do? - when everybody around me is building images and so destroying this lovely earth where we are meant to live happily in human relationship and look at the heavens and be happy about it. So what is the right action for a man who has an image? Or is there no right action?

S: Let me turn it back. What happens with you when I say to you Can it stop?

K: I say, of course. It is very simple to me. Of course it can stop. You don't ask me the next question: How do you do it? How does it come about?

S: No, I just want to listen for a minute to when you say, "Yes, of course". OK. Now how do you think it can stop? Let me put it to you straight - I have absolutely no evidence that it can, no experience that it can.

K: I don't want evidence.

S: You don't want any evidence?

K: I don't want somebody's explanation.

S: Or experience?

K: Because they are based on images. Future image, or past image or living image. So I say: Can it stop? I say it can. Definitely. It is not just a verbal statement to amuse you. To me



this is tremendously important. S: Well, I think we agree that it is tremendously important, but how?

K: Not how. Then you enter into the question of systems, mechanical processes, which are part of our image-making. If I tell you how, you will say tell me the system, the method and I'll do it every day and I'll get the new image.

S: Yes.

K: Now I see the fact of what is going on in the world.

S: I am with you, yes.

K: Fact. Not my reaction to it. Not romantic, fanciful theories of what it should not be. It is a fact that as long as there are images there is not going to be peace in the world, or love in the world - whether it be the Christ image, or the Buddha image or the Muslim image - you follow? There won't be peace in the world. Right. I see it as a fact. Right? I remain with that fact. Finished. This morning we said that if one remains with the fact there is a transformation. That is, not let thought interfere with the fact.

B: For then more images come in.

K: More images come in. So our consciousness is filled with these images.

S: Yes, that is true.

K: I am a Hindu, a Brahmin, I am by tradition better than anybody else, I am the chosen people, I am the Aryan - you follow? I am an Englishman - all that is crowding my consciousness.

B: When you say remain with the fact, one of the images that may come in is that it is impossible, that it can never be done.

K: Yes, that is another image.

B In other words, if the mind could stay with that fact with no comment whatsoever...

S: The thing that comes through to me when you say remain with the fact is that you are really calling for an action right there.

K: Sir, it is up to you. You are involved in it.

S: But that is different from remaining with it.

K: Remain with that. S: To really see it. You know how that feels? It feels like we are always running away.

K: So our consciousness, sir, is these images - conclusions, ideas...

S: We are always running away.

K: Filling, filling, and that is the essence of the image. If there is no image-making what is consciousness? That is quite a different thing.

B: Do you think we could discuss that next time?

K: Yes. Tomorrow.

**THE WHOLENESS OF LIFE PART I DIALOGUE  
6 6TH CONVERSATION WITH DR. DAVID  
SHAINBERG AND PROF. DAVID BOHM  
BROCKWOOD PARK 20TH MAY, 1976**

KRISHNAMURTI: Dr Bohm, as you are a well-known physicist, I would like to ask you, after these five dialogues we have had, what will change man? What will bring about a radical transformation in the total consciousness of human beings?

Dr Bohm: Well, I don't know that the scientific background is very relevant to that question.

K: No, probably not, but after having talked together at length, not only now but in previous years, what is the energy - I am using energy not in any scientific sense but in the just ordinary sense - the vitality, the energy, the drive - which seems to be lacking? If I were listening to the three of us, if I were a viewer, I would say, "Yes, it is all very well for these philosophers, these scientists, these experts, but it is outside my field. It is too far away. Bring it nearer. Bring it much closer so that I can deal with my life."

B: Well, I think at the end of the last discussion we were touching on one point of that nature, because we were discussing images.

K: Images, yes.

B: And the self-image. And questioning whether we have to have images at all.

K: Of course, we went into that. But, you see, as a viewer, totally outside, listening to you for the first time, the three of you, I would say, "How does it touch my life? It is all so vague and

uncertain and it needs a great deal of thinking, which I am unwilling to do. So please tell me in a few words, or at length, what am I to do with my life. Where am I to touch it? Where am I to break it down? From where am I to look at it? I have hardly any time. I go to the office. I go to the factory. I have got so many things to do - children, a nagging wife, poverty - the whole structure of misery, and you sit there, you three, and talk about something which doesn't touch me in the least. So could we bring it down to brass tacks, as it were, where I can grapple with it as an ordinary being?

B: Well, could we consider problems arising in daily relationship as the starting point?

K: That is the essence, isn't it? I was going to begin with that. You see, my relationship with human beings is in the office, in the factory, on a golf-course.

B: Or at home.

K: Or at home. And at home there is routine, sex, children (if I have children, if I want children), and the constant battle, battle, battle all my life. Insulted, wounded, hurt - everything is going on in me and around me.

B: Yes, there is continual disappointment.

K: Continual disappointment, continual hope, desire to be more successful, to have more money - more, more, more of everything. Now how am I to change my relationship? What is the *raison d'etre*, the source of my relationship? If we could tackle that a little bit this morning, and then go on to what we were discussing, which was really much more - which is really very important - which is not to have an image at all.

B: Yes. But it seems, as we were discussing yesterday, that we tend to be related almost always through the image.

K: Through the image. That's right.

B: You see I have an image of myself and of you as you should be in relation to me.

K: Yes.

B: And then that gets disappointed and hurt and so on.

K: But how am I to change that image? How am I to break it down? I see very well that I have got an image and that it has been put together, constructed, through generations. I am fairly intelligent, I am fairly aware of myself, and I see I have got it. But how am I to break it down?

B: Well, as I see it, I have got to be aware of that image, watch it as it moves.

K: So I am to watch it? Am I to watch it in the office?

B: Yes. K: In the factory, at home, on the golf-course? - because my relationships are in all these areas.

B: Yes, I would say I have to watch it in all those places.

K: I have to watch it all the time in fact.

B: Yes.

K: Now am I capable of it? Have I got the energy? I go through all kinds of miseries, and at the end of the day I crawl into bed. And you say I must have energy. So I must realize that relationship is of the greatest importance.

B: Yes.

K: Therefore I am willing to give up certain wastages of energy.

B: What kind of wastage?

K: Drinking, smoking, useless chatter. Endless crawling from

pub to pub.

B: That would be the beginning, anyway.

K: That would be the beginning. But you see I want all those, plus more - you follow?

B: But if I can see that everything depends on this...

K: Of course.

B: ...then I won't go to the pub, if I see it interferes.

K: So I must, as an ordinary human being, realize that the greatest importance is to have right relationship.

B: Yes. It would be good if we could say what happens when we don't have it.

K: Oh, when I don't have it, of course...

B: Everything goes to pieces.

K: Not only everything goes to pieces but I create such havoc around me. So can I, by putting aside smoke, drink, and endless chatter about this or that - can I gather that energy? Will I gather that energy which will help me to face the picture which I have, the image which I have?

B: That means going into ambition also and many other things.

K: Of course. You see I begin by obvious things, like smoking, drinking, the pub... Dr Shainberg: Let me just stop you here. Suppose my real image is that you are going to do it for me, that I can't do it for myself.

K: That is one of our favourite conditionings - that I can't do it myself, therefore I must go to somebody to help me.

S: Or I go to the pub because I am in despair because I can't do it for myself and want to obliterate myself through drink, so that I no longer feel the pain of it.

B: At least for the moment.

S: That's right. And also I am proving to myself that my image that I can't do it for myself is right. By treating myself in such a way

I am going to prove to you that I can't do it for myself, so maybe you will do it for me.

K: No, no. I think we don't realize, any of us, the utter and absolute importance of right relationship. I don't think we realize it.

S: I agree with you. We don't.

K: With my wife, with my neighbour, with the office, wherever I am - and also with nature - I don't think we realize a relationship which is easy, quiet, full, rich, happy - the beauty of it, the harmony of it. Now can we tell the ordinary viewer, the listener, the great importance of that?

S: Let's try. How can we communicate to somebody the value of a right relationship? You are my wife. You are whining, nagging me - right? You think I should be doing something for you when I am tired and don't feel like doing anything for you.

K: I know. Go to a party.

S: That's right. "Let's go to a party. You never take me out. You never take me anywhere."

K: So how are you, who realize the importance of relationship, to deal with me? How? We have got this problem in life.

B: I think it should be very clear that nobody can do it for me. Whatever somebody else does won't affect my relationship.

S: How are you going to make that clear?

B: But isn't it clear?

S: It is not obvious. I, as the viewer, feel very strongly that you

ought to be doing it for me. My mother never did it for me, somebody has got to do it for me. B: But isn't it obvious that it can't be done? It is just a delusion because whatever you do I will be in the same relationship as before. Suppose you live a perfect life. I can't imitate it, so I'll just go on as before, won't I? So I have to do something for myself. Isn't that clear?

S: But I don't feel able to do anything for myself.

B: But can't you see that if you don't do anything for yourself it is inevitable that it must go on? Any idea that it will ever get better is a delusion.

S: Can we say then that right relationship begins with the realization that I have to do something for myself?

K: And the utter importance of it.

S: Right. The utter importance. The responsibility I have for myself.

K: Because you are the world. And the world is you. You can't shirk that.

B: Perhaps we could discuss that a bit because it may seem strange to the viewer to hear someone say "You are the world".

K: After all, you are the result of the culture, the climate, the food, the environment, the economic conditions, your grandparents - you are the result of all that - all your thinking is the result of that.

S: I think you can see that. B: That's right. That's what you mean by saying you are the world.

K: Of course, of course.

S: Well I think you can see that in what I have been saying about the person who feels he is entitled to be taken care of by the world - the world is in fact moving in that direction...



K: No, sir. This is a fact. You go to India, you see the same suffering, the same anxiety - and you come to Europe, to America, and in essence it is the same.

B: Each person has the same basic structure of suffering and confusion and deception. Therefore if I say I am the world, I mean that there is a universal structure and it is part of me and I am part of that. K: Part of that, quite. So now let's proceed from there. The first thing you have to tell me as an ordinary human being, living in this mad rat race, is, "Look, realize that the greatest, most important thing in life is relationship. You cannot have relationship if you have an image about yourself. Any form of image you have about another, or about yourself, prevents the beauty of relationship.

S: Right.

B: Yes. The image that I am secure in such and such a relation, for example, and not secure in a different situation, prevents relationship.

K: That's right.

B: Because I will demand of the other person that he put me in the situation that I think is secure, you see?

S: Right.

B: But he may not want to.

S: Right. So that if I have the image of a pleasurable relationship, I have what I call claims on the other person; in other words I expect him to act in such a way that he acknowledges that image.

B: Yes. Or I may say that I have the image of what is just and right. S: In order to complete my image?

B: Yes. For example, the wife says, "Husbands should take their wives out to parties frequently" - that is part of the image. Husbands have corresponding images and then those images get hurt.

S: I think we have to be very specific about this. Each little piece of this is with fury.

B: With energy.

S: Energy and fury and the necessity to complete this image in relationship; therefore relationship gets forced into a mould.

K: Sir, I understand all that. But you see most of us are not serious. We want an easy life. You come along and tell me: relationship is the greatest thing. I say, of course, quite right. And I carry on in the old way. What I am trying to get at is this: What will make a human being listen to this seriously even for two minutes? He won't listen to it. If you went to one of the great experts on psychology, or whatever it is, he wouldn't take time to listen to it. The experts have all got their own plans, their pictures, their images - they are surrounded by all this. So to whom are we talking?

B: To whoever can listen.

S: We are talking to ourselves.

K: No. Not only that. To whom are we talking?

B: Well, whoever is able to listen.

K: That means somebody who is somewhat serious.

B: Yes. And I think we may even form an image of ourselves as not capable of being serious.

K: That's right.

B: In other words that it is too hard.

K: Too hard, yes.

B: There is an image to say I want it easy, which comes from the image that this is beyond my capacity.

K: Quite. So let's move from there. We say that as long as you have an image, pleasant or unpleasant, created, put together by thought, there is no right relationship. That is an obvious fact. Right?

S: Right.

B: Yes, and life ceases to have any value without right relationship.

K: Yes, life ceases to have any value without right relationship. Now my consciousness is filled with these images. Right? And the images make my consciousness.

S: That is right.

K: Now you are asking me to have no images at all. That means no consciousness, as I know it now. Right, sir?

B: Yes, well could we say that the major part of consciousness is the self-image? There may be some other parts but...

K: We will come to that.

B: We come to that later. But for now, we are mostly occupied with the self-image.

K: Yes. That is right. S: What about the self-image? And the whole way it generates itself?

B: We discussed that before. It gets caught on thinking of the self as real. That is always implicit. Say, for example, the image may be that I am suffering in a certain way, and I must get rid of this suffering. There is always the implicit meaning in that, that I am real, and therefore I must keep on thinking about this reality.

And it gets caught in that feedback we were talking about - the thought feeds back and builds up.

S: Builds up more images.

B: More images, yes.

S: So that is the consciousness...

K: Wait. The content of my consciousness is a vast series of images, inter-related - not separated, but interrelated.

B: But they are all centred on the self.

K: On the self, of course. The self is the centre.

B: The self is regarded as all important.

K: Yes.

B: That gives it tremendous energy.

K: Now what I am getting at is this: you are asking me, who am fairly serious, fairly intelligent, asking me as an ordinary human being to empty that consciousness.

S: Right. I am asking you to stop this image-making.

K: Not only the image-making. You are asking me to be free of the self, which is the maker of images.

S: Right.

K: And I say please tell me how to do it. And you tell me that the moment you ask me how to do it, you are already building an image, a system, a method.

B: Yes, when you ask how am I to do it - you have already put 'I' in the middle. The same image as before with a slightly different content.

K: So you tell me, never to ask how to do it because the "how" involves the me doing it. Therefore I am creating another picture.

B: That shows the way you slip into it. When you ask how to do

it, the word "me" is not there but it is there implicitly. K:

Implicitly, yes.

B: And therefore you slip in.

K: So now you stop me and say proceed from there. What is the action that will free consciousness, even a corner of it, a limited part of it? I want to discuss it with you. Don't tell me how to do it. I have understood that and I will never again ask how to do it. The how, as Dr Bohm explained, conveys implicitly the me wanting to do it, and the me is the factor of the image-maker.

S: Right.

K: I have understood that very clearly. So then I say to you, I realize this - what am I to do?

S: Do you realize it?

K: Yes, sir. I know it. I know I am making images all the time. I am very well aware of it. Because I have discussed with you. I have gone into it. I have realized right from the beginning during these talks that relationship is the most important thing in life. Without that life is chaos.

S: Got it.

K: That has been driven into me. I see that every flattery and every insult is registered in the brain, and that thought then takes it over as memory and creates an image, and the image gets hurt.

B: So the image is the hurt...

K: ...is the hurt.

S: That's right.

K: So, Dr Bohm, what is one to do? What am I to do? There are two things involved in it - one is to prevent further hurts and the other is to be free of all the hurts that I have had.

B: But they are both the same principle.

K: I think there are two principles involved.

B: Are there?

K: One to prevent it, the other to wipe away the hurts I have.

S: It is not just that I want to prevent the further hurt. It seems to me that you must first say how I am to be aware of how in fact I take flattery. I want you to see that if I flatter you, you get a big inner gush; then you get a fantasy about yourself. So now you have  
107 got an image of yourself as this wonderful person who fits the flattery.

K: No, you have told me very clearly that it is two sides of the same coin. Pleasure and pain are the same.

S: The same, exactly the same.

K: You have told me that.

S: That's right. I am telling you that.

K: I have understood it.

B: They are both images.

K: Both images, right. So please - you are not answering my question. How am I, realizing all this, I am a fairly intelligent man, I have read a great deal, an ordinary man - I personally don't read so it is an ordinary man I am talking about - I have discussed this and I see how extraordinarily important all this is - and I ask, how am I to end it? Not the method. Don't tell me what to do. I won't accept it because it means nothing to me - right, sirs?

B: Well, we were discussing whether there is a difference between the stored-up hurts and the ones which are to come.

K: That's right. It is the first thing I have to understand. Tell me.

B: Well, it seems to me that fundamentally they work on the

same principle.

K: How?

B: Well, if you take the hurt that is to come my brain is already disposed to respond with an image.

K: I don't understand it. Make it much simpler.

B: Well, there is no distinction really between the past hurts and the present one because they all come from the past, I mean come from the reaction of the past.

K: So you are telling me, don't divide the past hurt from the future hurt because the image is the same. B: Yes. The process is the same. I may just be reminded of the past hurt, and that is the same as somebody else insulting me.

K: Yes, yes. So you are saying to me, don't divide the past from the future hurt. There is only hurt. Therefore look at the image, not in terms of past hurts or future hurts but just look at that image which is both the past and the future.

B: Yes.

K: Right?

B: But we are saying look at the image, not at its particular content but its general structure.

K: Yes, yes, that's right. Now then my next question is: How am I to look at it? Because I have already an image with which I am going to look. You promise me by your words, not promise exactly, but give me hope that if I have right relationship I will live a life that will be extraordinarily beautiful, I will know what love is - therefore I am already excited by this idea.

B: Then I have to be aware of an image of that kind too.

K: Yes, yes. Therefore, how am I - that is my point - how am I

to look at this image? I know I have an image, not only one image but several images, but the centre of that image is me, the I - I know all that. Now how am I to look at it? May we proceed now? Right. Is the observer different from that which he is observing? That is the real question.

B: That is the question, yes. You could say that that is the root of the power of the image.

K: Yes, yes. You see, sir, what happens? If there is a difference between the observer and the observed there is that interval of time in which other activities go on.

B: Well, yes, in which the brain eases itself into something more pleasant.

K: Yes. And where there is a division there is conflict. So you are telling me to learn the art of observing, which is: that the observer is the observed.

B: Yes, but I think we could look first at our whole conditioning, which tells us that the observer is different from the observed.

K: Different. Of course.

B: We should perhaps look at that, because that is what everybody feels.

K: That the observer is different. B: Ordinarily, when I am thinking of myself, that self is a reality, which is independent of thought, do you see?

K: Yes, we think that it is independent of thought.

B: And that the self is the observer who is a reality.

K: Quite right.

B: Who is independent of thought and who is thinking, who is



producing thought.

K: But it is the product of thought.

B: Yes. That is the confusion.

K: Are you telling me, sir, that the observer is the result of the past?

B: Yes. One can see that.

K: My memories, my experiences - it is all the past.

B: Yes, but I think the viewer may find it a little hard to follow that, if he hasn't gone into it.

S: Very hard, I think.

K: Be fairly simple.

S: What do you mean?

K: Don't you live in the past? Your life is the past.

S: Right.

K: You are living in the past. Right?

S: That's right, yes.

K: Past memories, past experiences.

S: Yes, past memories, past becomings.

K: And from the past you project the future.

S: Right.

K: You hope that you will be good, that you will be different in future. It's always from the past to the future.

S: That's right. That's how it is lived.

K: Now that past is the me, of course.

B: But it does look as if it is something independent...

K: Is it independent?

B: It isn't, but... K: I know, that is what we are asking. Is the me independent of the past?

B: It looks as if the me is here looking at the past.

K: The me is the product of the past.

S: Right. I can see that.

K: How do you see it?

B: Intellectually.

S: I see it intellectually.

K: Then you don't see it.

S: Right. That is what I am coming to.

K: You are playing tricks.

S: I see it as an intellectual - that's right, that's right. I see it intellectually.

K: Do you see this table intellectually?

S: No.

K: Why?

S: There is an immediacy of perception there.

K: Why isn't there an immediacy of perception of a truth, which is that you are the past?

S: Because time comes in. I imagine that I have gone through time.

K: What do you mean imagine?

S: I have an image of myself at three, I have an image of myself at ten and I have an image of myself at seventeen, and I say that they followed in sequence in time. I see myself having developed over that time. I am different now from what I was five years ago.

K: Are you?

S: I am telling you that that is how I have got that image. That image of a developmental sequence.

K: I understand all that, sir.

S: And I exist as a storehouse of memories, of accumulated incidents.

K: That is, time has produced that.

S: Right. I see that, right. K: What is time?

S: I have just described it to you. Time is a movement... I have moved from the time I was three.

K: From the past, it is a movement.

S: That's right. From three to ten, to seventeen.

K: Yes, I understand. Now, is that movement an actuality?

S: What do you mean by actuality?

B: Or is it an image? Is it an image, or is it an actuality? I mean, if I have an image of myself as saying "I need this", it may not be an actual fact - right? It is just...

K: An image is not a fact.

S: Right. But I feel...

K: No, what you feel is like saying "my experience".

S: No, I am describing an actual...

B: But that is the whole point about the image, that it imitates an actual fact, you get the feeling that it is real. In other words I feel that I am really there - an actual fact looking at the past, at how I have developed.

S: Right.

B: But is it a fact that I am doing that?

S: What do you mean? It is an actual fact that I get the feeling that I am looking.

B: Yes, but is it an actual fact that that is the way it all is and was?

S: No, it is not. I can see the incorrectness of my memory which

constructs me in time. I mean, obviously I was much more at three than I can remember; I was more at ten than I can remember, and obviously there was much more going on at seventeen than I have in my memory.

B: Yes, but the me who is here now is looking at all that.

S: That's right.

B: But is he really there and is he looking? That is the question.

S: Is the me that is looking..?

K: ...an actuality. As this table is.

S: Well, let's... K: Stick to it, stick to it.

S: That is what I am going to do. What is an actuality is this development, this image of a developmental sequence.

B: And the me who is looking at it?

S: And the me who is looking at it, that's right.

B: But it may be, in fact it is, that the me who is looking at it is also an image as is the developmental sequence.

S: You are saying then that this image of me is...

K: ...is not reality.

B: It is not a reality independent of thinking.

K: So we must go back to find out what is reality.

S: Right.

K: Reality, we said, is everything that thought has put together. The table, the illusion, the churches, the nations - everything that thought has contrived is reality. But nature is not this sort of reality. It is not put together by thought, though it is nevertheless a reality.

B: It is a reality independent of thought. But is the me who is looking, a reality independent of thought, like nature?

K: That is the whole point. Have you understood?

S: Yes. I am beginning to see.

K: Sir, just let's be simple. We said we have images; I know I have images and you tell me to look at them, to be aware of them, to perceive the image. Is the perceiver different from the perceived? That is all my question is.

S: I know. I know.

K: Because if he is different then the whole process will go on indefinitely - right? But if there is no division, if the observer is the observed, then the whole problem changes. S: Right.

K: Right? So is the observer different from the observed? Obviously not. So can I look at that image without the observer? And is there an image when there is no observer? Because the observer makes the image, the observer is the movement of thought. B: We shouldn't call it the observer then because it is not looking. I think the language is confusing.

K: The language is, yes.

B: Because if you say it is an observer that implies that something is looking.

K: Yes, quite.

B: What you really mean is that thought is moving and creating an image as if it were looking, but nothing is being seen.

K: Yes.

B: Therefore there is no observer.

K: That is right. But put it round the other way: Is there a thinker without thought?

B: No.

K: Exactly. There you are. If there is no experiencer is there an

experience? So you have asked me to look at my images, which is a very serious and very penetrating demand. You say look at them without the observer, because the observer is the image-maker, and if there is no observer, if there is no thinker, there is no thought - right? So there is no image. You have shown me something enormously significant.

S: As you said the question changes completely.

K: Completely. I have no image.

S: It feels completely different. It's as if there is a silence.

K: So I am saying, my consciousness is the consciousness of the world, because, in essence, it is filled with the things of thought - sorrow, fear, pleasure, despair, anxiety, attachment, hope;-it is a turmoil of confusion; a sense of deep agony is involved in it all. And in that state I cannot have any relationship with any human being.

S: Right.

K: So you say to me: To have the greatest and most responsible relationship is to have no image. You have pointed out to me that to be free of images, the maker of the image must be absent. The maker of the image is the past, is the observer who says "I like this", "I don't like this", who says "my wife, my husband, my house" - the me who is in essence the image. I have understood this. Now the next question is: Are the images hidden so that I can't grapple with them, can't get hold of them? All you experts have told me that there are dozens of underground images - and I say, "By Jove, they must know, they know much more than I do, so I must accept what they say." But how am I to unearth them, expose them? You see, you have put me, the ordinary man, into a terrible

position.

S: You don't have to unearth them once it is clear to you that the observer is the observed.

K: Therefore you are saying there is no unconscious.

S: Right.

K: You, the expert! You, who talk endlessly about the unconscious with your patients.

S: I don't.

K: You say there is no unconscious.

S: Right.

K: I agree with you. I say it is so. The moment you see that the observer is the observed, that the observer is the maker of images, it is finished.

S: Finished. Right.

K: Right through.

S: If you really see that.

K: That's it. So the consciousness which I know, in which I have lived, has undergone a tremendous transformation. Has it? Has it for you? And if I may ask Dr Bohm also - both of you, all of us - realizing that the observer is the observed, and that therefore the image-maker is no longer in existence, and so the content of consciousness, which makes up consciousness, is not as we know it - what then?

S: I don't know how you say it...

K: I am asking this question because it involves meditation. I am asking this question because all religious people, the really serious ones who have gone into this question, see that as long as we live our daily lives within the area of this consciousness - with

all its images, and the image-maker - whatever we do will still be in that area. Right? One year I may become a Zen-Buddhist, and another year I may follow some guru, and so on and so on, but it is always within that area.

S: Right.

K: So what happens when there is no movement of thought, which is the image-making - what then takes place? You understand my question? When time, which is the movement of thought, ends, what is there? Because you have led me up to this point. I understand it very well. I have tried Zen meditation, I have tried Hindu meditation, I have tried all the kinds of other miserable practices and then I hear you, and I say, "By Jove, this is something extraordinary these people are saying. They say that the moment there is no image-maker, the content of consciousness undergoes a radical transformation and thought comes to an end, except in its right place." Thought comes to an end, time has a stop. What then? Is that death?

S: It is the death of the self.

K: No, no.

S: It is self-destruction.

K: No, no, sir. It is much more than that.

S: It is the end of something.

K: No, no. Just listen to it. When thought stops, when there is no image-maker, there is a complete transformation in consciousness because there is no anxiety, there is no fear, there is no pursuit of pleasure, there are none of the things that create turmoil and division. Then what comes into being, what happens? Not as an experience because that is out. What takes place? I have



to find out, for you may be leading me up the wrong path!

**THE WHOLENESS OF LIFE PART I DIALOGUE  
7 7TH CONVERSATION WITH DR. DAVID  
SHAINBERG AND PROF. DAVID BOHM  
BROCKWOOD PARK 20TH MAY, 1976**

KRISHNAMURTI: After this morning, as an outsider, you have left me completely empty, without any future, without any past, without any image.

Dr Shainberg: That's right. Somebody who was watching us this morning said, "How am I going to get out of bed in the morning?"

K: I think that question of getting out of bed in the morning is fairly simple, because life demands that I act, not just stay in bed for the rest of my life. You see, I have been left, as an outsider who is viewing all this, who is listening to all this, with a sense of a blank wall. I understand what you have said very clearly. I have, at one glance, rejected all the systems, all the gurus, this meditation and that meditation. I have discarded all that because I have understood the meditator is the meditation. But have I solved my problem of sorrow, do I know what it means to love, do I understand what compassion is? - not just understand intellectually. At the end of these dialogues, after discussing with you all, listening to you all, have I this sense of astonishing energy which is compassion? Have I ended my sorrow? Do I know what it means to love somebody, to love human beings..?

S: Actually.

K: Actually.

S: ...not just talk about it.

K: No, no, I have gone beyond all that. And you haven't shown

me what death is.

Dr Bohm: No.

K: I haven't understood a thing about death. You haven't talked to me about death. So we will cover these things before we finish this evening. B: Could we begin with the question of death?

K: Yes. Let's begin with death.

B: One point occurred to me about what we discussed this morning: We had come to the point of saying that when we see that the observer is the observed, that is death. Essentially that is what you said. Now this raises a question: If the self is nothing but an image what is it that dies? If the image dies that is nothing, it is not death - right?

K: That's right.

B: So is there something real that dies?

K: There is biological death.

B: We are not discussing that at the moment. You were discussing some other kind of death.

K: We were saying this morning, that if there are no images at all in my consciousness, there is death.

B: That is the point. It is not clear. What is it that has died?

K: The images have died. `Me' is dead.

B: But is that a genuine death?

K: Ah, that is what I want to find out. Is it a verbal comprehension?

B: Or, more deeply, is there something that has to die? Something real. In other words if an organism dies something real has died. But when the self dies...

K: Ah, but I have accepted so far that the self has been an

astonishingly real thing.

B: Yes.

K: Then you three come along and tell me that that image is fictitious. I understand that, and I am a little frightened that when that dies, when there is no image, there is an ending to something.

B: Yes, well what is it that ends?

K: Ah, quite. What is it that ends?

B: Is it something real that ends? You could say that an ending of an image is no ending at all - right?

K: At all... B: If it is only an image that ends it is only an image of ending. What I am trying to say is that nothing much ends if it is only an image.

K: Yes. That is what I want to get at.

B: Is it? You know what I mean?

K: If it is merely an ending of an image...

S: ...then that is nothing much. B: It is like turning off the television. Is that what death is? Or is there something deeper that dies?

K: Oh, very much deeper.

B: Something deeper dies?

K: Yes.

S: How about the image-making process?

K: No, no. I would say it is not the end of the image which is death, but something much deeper.

B: But it is still not the death of the organism.

K: Still not the death of the organism, of course. The organism will more or less...

B: ...go on, up to a point.

K: Up to a point, yes. There is disease, accident, old age. But death. The ending of the image is fairly simple, and fairly acceptable. But that is a very shallow pool.

B: Yes.

K: You have taken away the little water there is in the pool and there is nothing but mud left behind. That is nothing. So is there something much more?

S: That dies?

K: No. Not that dies, but to the meaning of death.

S: Is there something more than the image that dies, or does death have a meaning beyond the death of the image?

K: That is what we are asking.

S: Is there something about death that is bigger than the death of the image?

K: Obviously, it must be. B: Will this include the death of the organism, this meaning?

K: The organism might go on, but eventually it comes to an end.

B: Yes, but if we were to see what death means as a whole, universally, then we would also see what the death of the organism means. But is there some meaning also in the death of the self-image? The same meaning?

K: That is only, I should say, a very small part.

B: That is very small.

K: That is a very, very small part.

B: But there might be a process or a structure beyond the self-image that might die, that creates the self-image.

K: Yes, that is thought.

B: That is thought. Now are you discussing the death of thought?

K: That again is only superficial.

B: That is very small.

K: Very small.

B: Is there something beyond thought in this that..?

K: That is what I want to get at.

S: We are trying to get at the meaning of death...

B: We are not quite there.

S: ...which is beyond the death of the self, thought or the image.

K: No, just look: the image dies, that is fairly simple.

S: Right.

K: It is a very shallow affair. Then there is the ending of thought, which is dying to thought.

B: You said thought is deeper than the image but still not very deep.

K: Not very deep. Now is there something more?

B: In what sense "more"? Something more that exists? Or something more that has to die?

S: Is it something creative that happens?

K: No, no. We are going to find out. B: But I mean your question is not clear when you say, "Is there something more?"

K: Death must have something enormously significant.

B: But are you saying that death has a meaning, a significance, for everything? For the whole of life?

K: For the whole of life.

B: It is not generally accepted, if we are thinking of the viewer, that death has that significance. As we live now death is...

K: ...is at the end.

B: ...is at the end and we try to forget about it.

K: Yes.

B: Try to make it unobtrusive.

K: But as you three have pointed out, my life has been in a turmoil, my life has been a constant conflict...

B: Right.

K: That has been my life. I have clung to the known and therefore death is the unknown, so I am afraid of it. And you come along and say, "Look, death is partly the ending of the image and the maker of the image, but death has much greater significance than merely this empty saucer."

B: Well, if you could make it more clear why it must have.

S: Why must it?

K: Is life just a shallow, empty pool? Empty mud at the end of it?

S: Why would you assume it is anything else?

K: I want to know.

B: But even if it is something else we have to ask why is it that death is the key to understanding.

K: Because it is the ending of everything. The end of reality and all my concepts, my images - the end of all the memories.

B: But that is in the ending of thought, right?

K: The ending of thought. It also means the ending of time.

B: Ending of time.

K: Time coming to a stop totally. There is no future in the sense of the past meeting the present and carrying on. B: Psychologically speaking.

K: Yes, psychologically speaking, of course; we are speaking psychologically. Psychological ending to everything.

S: Right.

K: That's what death is.

B: And when your organism dies then everything ends for that organism.

K: Of course. When the organism dies it is finished. But wait a minute. If I don't end the image, the stream of image-making goes on.

B: It is not too clear where it goes on. In other people?

K: It manifests itself in other people. That is, I die; the organism dies and at the last minute I am still with the image that I have.

B: Yes, well then what happens to that?

K: That image has its continuity with the rest of the images, your image, my image.

S: Right.

K: Your image is not different from mine.

S: Right. We share that.

K: No, no. Not share it. It is not different. It may be a little more frail, or have a little more colour, but essentially my image is your image.

S: Right.

K: So there is this constant flow of image-making.

B: Well, where does it take place? In people?

K: It is there. It manifests itself in people.

B: You feel it is in some ways more general, more universal?

K: Yes, much more universal.

B: That is rather strange.



K: Eh?

B: I say it is rather strange to think of that.

K: Yes.

S: It is there. Like a river, it is there. K: Yes, it is there.

S: And it manifests itself in streams.

B: In people.

S: Which we call people.

K: No, that stream is the maker of images and imagery.

B: In other words you are saying that the image does not originate only in one brain, but is in some sense universal?

K: Universal. Quite right.

B: You are not only saying that it is just the sum of all the brains; you are implying something more?

K: It is the effect of all the brains and it manifests itself in people as they are born.

B: Yes.

K: Now is that all? Let's say, yes. Does death bring about this sense of enormous, endless energy which has no beginning and no end? Life must have infinite depth.

B: Yes, and it is death which opens that out.

K: Death opens that up.

B: But we say it is more than the death of the image-making. You see, this is not clear. Is it something real which is blocking that from realizing itself?

K: Yes. It is blocking itself through images and the thoughtmaker.

S: The image-making and thought-making are blocking this greater...

K: Wait a minute. There are still other blocks, deeper blocks.

B: That is what I was trying to get at. That there are deeper blocks that are real.

K: That are real.

B: And they really have to die.

K: That is just it.

S: Would that be like this stream that you were talking about.. ?

K. There is a stream of sorrow, isn't there? B: Is sorrow deeper than the image? K: Yes.

B: That is important.

K: It is.

S: You think so?

K: Don't you?

S: I do.

K: Be careful, sir, this is very serious.

S: That's right.

B: Would you say sorrow and suffering are the same, just different words?

K: Different words.

S: Deeper than this image-making is sorrow.

K: Isn't it? Man has lived with sorrow a million years. B: Well, could we say a little more about sorrow. It is more than pain.

K: Much more than pain. Much more than loss. Much more than losing someone.

S: It is deeper than that.

K: Much deeper than that.

B: It goes beyond the image, beyond thought.

K: Of course. It goes beyond thought.

B: Beyond thought, and what we ordinarily call feeling.

K: Of course. Feeling, thought. Now can that end?

S: Before you go on - are you saying that the stream of sorrow is a different stream from the stream of image-making?

K: No, it is part of the stream.

S: Part of the same stream? K: The same stream but much deeper.

B: Then are you saying that there is a very deep stream, and that image-making is on the surface of this stream?

K: That's all. B: Right. The waves on the surface, right? Could you say we have understood the waves on the surface of this stream, which we call image-making?

K: Yes, that's right. Image-making.

B: And the disturbances in sorrow come out on the surface as image-making.

K: That's right.

S: So now we have got to go deep-sea diving!

K: You know, sir, there is universal sorrow.

B: Yes, but let's try to make it clear. It is not merely that there is the sum of all the sorrow of different people...

K: No, no. Could we put it this way? The waves on the river don't bring compassion or love - compassion, love, we have said, are synonymous, so we will keep to the word "compassion". The waves don't bring this. What will? Without compassion human beings are destroying themselves. So does compassion come with the ending of sorrow, which is not the sorrow created by thought?

B: In thought you have sorrow for the self - right?

K: Yes. Sorrow for the self.

B: Which is self-pity.

K: Self-pity.

B: And now you say there is another sorrow, a deeper sorrow.

K: There is a deeper sorrow.

B: Which is not merely the total sum but something universal.

K: That's right.

S: Can we spell that out? Go into it?

K: Don't you know it? I am just asking. Don't you know, aren't you aware of a much deeper sorrow than the sorrow of thought, of self-pity, the sorrow of the image?

S: Yes.

B: Is it sorrow for the fact that man is in this state which he can't get out of?

K: That is partly it. That means partly the sorrow of ignorance.

B: Yes. Man is ignorant and cannot get out of it. K: Cannot get out of it. And the perception of that sorrow is compassion.

B: All right. Then the non-perception is sorrow?

K: Yes, yes, yes. Are we seeing the same thing?

S: No, I don't think so.

K: Say, for instance, you see me in ignorance.

B: Or I see the whole of mankind in ignorance.

K: Mankind in ignorance. Ignorant in the sense we are talking about - that is, the maker of the image...

B: Let's say that if my mind is really right, good, clear, that should have a deep effect on me.

S: What would have a deep effect on me?

B: To see this tremendous ignorance, this tremendous destruction.

K: We are getting at it. We are getting at it.

S: Right, right.

K: We are getting at it. B: But then if I don't fully perceive, if I start to escape the perception of it, I am in it too.

K: Yes, in it too.

B: The feeling is that universal sorrow is still something I can feel, is that what you mean to say?

K: Yes.

B: Although I am not very perceptive as to what it means.

K: No, no. You can feel the sorrow of thought.

B: The sorrow of thought. But I can sense, or somehow be aware of the universal sorrow.

K: Yes.

B: Right.

S: You say universal sorrow is there whether you feel it...

K: You can feel it. B: Feel it or sense it.

K: Sorrow of man living like this. B: Is that the essence of it?

K: I am just moving into it. Let's go.

B: Is there more to it than that?

K: Much more to it.

B: Then perhaps we should try to bring that out.

K: I am trying to. You see me: I live the ordinary life, image, sorrow, fear, anxiety; I have the sorrow of self-pity. And you, who are "enlightened" (in quotes), look at me, and I say, "Aren't you full of sorrow for me?" - which is compassion.

B: I would say that is a kind of energy which is tremendously aroused because of this situation.

K: Yes.

B: But would you call it sorrow? Or compassion?

K: Compassion, which is the outcome of sorrow.

B: But have you felt sorrow first? I mean, does the enlightened person feel sorrow and then compassion?

K: No.

S: The other way?

K: No, no. Go very carefully. You see, sir, you are saying that one must have sorrow first to have compassion.

B: I am not. I am just exploring.

K: Yes, you are exploring. Through sorrow you come to compassion.

B: That is what you seem to be saying.

K: Which implies that I must go through all the horrors of mankind...

S: Right.

B: Well, let's say that the enlightened man sees this sorrow, sees this destruction, and he feels some tremendous energy - we will call it compassion.

K: Yes.

B: Now does he understand that the people are in sorrow..?

K: Of course. B: ...but he himself is not in sorrow.

K: That's right. That's right.

B: But he feels a tremendous energy to do something.

K: Yes. Tremendous energy of compassion.

S: Would you say then that the enlightened man perceives, or is aware of the conflict, the awkwardness, the blundering, the loss of life, but that he is not aware of sorrow?

K: No, sir. Dr Shainberg just listen. Suppose you have been

through all this - image, thought, the sorrow of thought, fears, anxieties, and you say, "I have understood all that". But you have very little left. You have energy, but it is a very shallow business. And is life as shallow as all that? Or has it an immense depth? Depth is the wrong word.

B: Well, yes, inwardness?

K: Inwardness, yes. And to find that out don't you have to die to everything known?

B: But how does this relate to sorrow at the same time?

K: I am coming to that. You might feel that I am ignorant, that I have my anxieties and fears. You are beyond it, you are on the other side of the stream as it were. Don't you have compassion for me?

S: Yes. B: Yes.

K: Compassion. Is that the result of the ending of sorrow, universal sorrow?

B: Universal sorrow? You say the ending of sorrow. Now you are talking about the person who is in sorrow to begin with.

K: Yes.

B: And in him this universal sorrow ends? Is that what you are saying?

K: No. More than that.

B: More than that? Well, we have to go slowly because if you say the ending of universal sorrow, the thing that is puzzling is to say that it still exists, do you see?

K: Eh? B: You say if the universal sorrow ends then it has all gone.

K: Ah, it is still there.

B: Still there. There is a certain puzzle in language.

K: Yes, yes.

B: So in some sense the universal sorrow ends, but in another sense it persists.

K: Yes, that is right.

B: Could we say that if you have an insight into the essence of sorrow, universal sorrow, then sorrow ends in that insight? Is that what you mean?

K: Yes, that's right.

B: Although...

K: Although it still goes on.

S: I have got a deeper question. The question is...

K: I don't think you have understood.

S: Oh, I think I have understood that one, but my question comes before, which is that the image-making has died - right? That is, the waves. Now I come into the sorrow.

K: You have lost the sorrow of thought.

S: Right. The sorrow of thought has gone but there is a deeper sorrow.

K: Is there? Or are you assuming there is a deeper sorrow?

S: I am trying to see what you are saying.

K: No, no. I am saying: Is there compassion which is not related to thought? Or is that compassion born of sorrow?

S: Born of sorrow?

K: Born in the sense that when the sorrow ends there is compassion.

S: OK. That makes it a little clearer. When the sorrow of thought...



K: Not personal sorrow.

S: No. When the sorrow...

K: Not the sorrow of thought. B: Not the sorrow of thought, something deeper.

S: Something deeper. When that sorrow ends then there is a birth of compassion.

B: Of compassion, of energy.

K: Now is there not a deeper sorrow than the sorrow of thought?

S: There is. As you were saying, there is sorrow for ignorance which is deeper than thought - the sorrow for the universal calamity of mankind trapped in this sorrow, the sorrow for a continual repetition of wars and poverty and people mistreating each other, that's a deeper sorrow. K: I understand all that.

S: That is deeper than the sorrow of thought.

K: Can we ask this question: What is compassion? Which is love. We are using that one word to cover a wide field. What is compassion? Can a man who is in sorrow, in thought, in the image - can he have that? He cannot. Actually he cannot - right?

B: Yes.

K: Now when does that compassion come into being? Without that life has no meaning. You have left me without that. All you have taken away from me is superficial sorrow, thought and image-making. And I feel there is something much more.

B: Just doing that leaves something empty.

K: Yes.

B: Meaningless.

K: There is something much greater than this shallow little

business. B: When we have thought which produces sorrow, self-pity, and when we also have the realization of the sorrow of mankind, could you say that the energy which is deeper is in some ways being..?

K: ...moved.

B: ...moved. Well, first of all in this sorrow this energy is...

K: ...caught.

B: ...is caught up in whirlpools or something. It is deeper than thought but there is some sort of very deep disturbance of the energy. K: Quite right.

B: Which we call deep sorrow.

K: Deep sorrow.

B: Ultimately its origin is the blockage in thought, isn't it?

K: Yes, that is deep sorrow of mankind. For centuries upon centuries it has been like that - you know, like a vast reservoir of sorrow.

B: It is sort of moving around in some way that is disorderly.

K: Yes.

B: And preventing clarity. I mean perpetuating ignorance.

K: Yes, perpetuating ignorance, right.

B: Because if it were not for that then man's natural capacity to learn would solve all these problems.

K: That's right.

S: Right, right.

K: Unless you three give me, or help me, or show me, an insight into something much greater, I say, "Yes, this is very nice", and off I go - you follow? What we are trying to do, as far as I can see, is to penetrate into something beyond death.

B: Beyond death?

K: Death we say is not only the ending of the organism, but the ending of the content of the consciousness - consciousness as we know it now.

B: Is it also the ending of sorrow?

K: The ending of sorrow of the superficial kind. That is clear.

B: Yes.

K: And a man who has gone through all that says, "That isn't good enough. You haven't given me the flower, the perfume. You have just given me the ashes of it." And now we three are trying to find out that which is beyond the ashes.

S: Right.

B: There is that which is beyond death?

K: Ah, absolutely.

B: Would you say that is eternal, or... K: I don't want to use that word.

B: I mean is it in some sense beyond time?

K: Beyond time.

B: Therefore eternal is not the best word.

K: There is something beyond the superficial death, a movement that has no beginning and no ending.

B: But it is a movement?

K: It is a movement. Movement, not in time.

S: What is the difference between a movement in time, and a movement out of time?

K: Sir, that which is constantly renewing, constantly - new isn't the word - constantly fresh, endlessly flowering, that is timeless. But this word flowering implies time. B: I think we can see the

point.

S: I think we get that, the feel of renewal in creation, and coming and going without transition, without duration, without linearity.

K: Let me come back to it in a different way. Being a fairly intelligent man, having read various books, tried various meditations, at one glance I have an insight into all that, at one glance - which is the end of image-making. It is finished. I won't touch it. Then a meditation must take place to delve, to have an insight, into something which the mind has never touched before.

B: But even if you do touch, it doesn't mean that the next time it will be known.

K: Ah, it can never be known in a sense.

B: It can never be known. It's always new in some sense.

K: Yes, it is always new. It is not a memory stored up, altered, changed, and called new. It has never been old. I don't know if I can put it that way.

B: Yes. I think I understand that. But could you say it is like a mind that has never known sorrow?

K: Yes.

B: It might seem puzzling at first. You move out of this state which has known sorrow into a state which has not known sorrow.

K: Quite right, sir.

B: In other words there is no you.

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

S: Can we say it in this way too - that it is an action which is moving where there is no you?

K: You see when you use the word "action", it means not in the

future, nor in the past; action is doing.

S: Yes.

K: And most of our actions are the result of the past, or according to a future ideal. That's not action, that is just conformity.

S: Right. I am talking about a different kind of action.

K: To penetrate into this, the mind must be completely silent. Otherwise you are projecting something into it.

S: Right. It is not projecting into anything.

K: Absolute silence. And that silence is not the product of control - wished for, premeditated, predetermined.

S: Right.

K: Therefore that silence is not brought about through will.

S: Right.

K: Now in that silence there is this sense of something beyond all time, all death, all thought - you follow? Nothing. Not a thing, you understand, nothing. And therefore empty and therefore tremendous energy.

B: Is this also the source of compassion? K: That's it.

S: What do you mean by source?

B: Well, in this energy is compassion...

K: Yes, that is right.

S: In this energy is...

K: This energy is.

B: Compassion.

S: That's different.

K. Of course. S: This energy is compassion. You see that is different from saying the source.

K: You see, beyond that there is something more. S: Beyond that?

K: Of course.

B: Why do you say of course? What could it be that is more?

K: Sir, let us put it, approach it, differently. Everything thought has created is not sacred, is not holy.

B: Because it is fragmented.

K: It is fragmented. We know that putting up an image and worshipping it is a creation of thought.

S: That's right.

K: Made by the hand, or by the mind, it is still an image. So in that there is nothing sacred. Because, as Dr Bohm pointed out, thought is fragmented, limited, finite; it is the product of memory and so on.

B: Is the sacred, therefore, that which is without limit?

K: That's it. There is something beyond compassion.

B: Beyond compassion.

K: Which is sacred.

B: Is it beyond movement?

K: Sacred. You can't say movement, or non-movement. A living thing - you can only examine a dead thing.

S: Right.

K: A living thing you can't examine. What we are trying to do is to examine that living thing which we call sacred, which is beyond compassion.

B: What is our relation to the sacred then?

K: To the man who is ignorant there is no relationship - right? Which is true. To the man who is free of the image and the image-

maker, it has no meaning yet - right? It has meaning only when he goes beyond everything, dies to everything. Dying means never for a single second accumulating anything psychologically.

S: But he asked the question: What is the relationship to the sacred? Is there ever a relationship to the sacred? K: No, no. He is asking what is the relationship between that which is sacred, holy, and reality.

B: Well, that is implicit anyway. I mean that is implied.

K: Of course. We have talked about this question some time ago. Reality, which is the product of thought, has no relationship to that because thought is an empty little affair.

S: Right.

K: Relationship comes through insight, intelligence and compassion.

S: What is intelligence, I suppose we are asking. I mean, how does intelligence act?

K: Wait, wait. You have had an insight into the image. You have had an insight into the movement of thought - the movement of thought which is self-pity, which creates sorrow. You have had a real insight into that. Haven't you? It is not a verbal agreement or disagreement or a logical conclusion. You have had a real insight into that, into the waves of the river.

S: Right.

K: Now isn't that insight intelligence?

S: Right.

K: Which is not the intelligence of a clever man, we are not talking about that. Now work with that intelligence, which is not yours or mine, not Dr Shainberg's or Dr Bohm's, or somebody's.

That insight is universal intelligence, global or cosmic intelligence. Now move further into it. Have an insight into sorrow, which is not the sorrow of thought. Then out of that insight compassion. Now have insight into compassion. Is compassion the end of all life? End of all death? It seems so because the mind throws out all the burdens which man has imposed upon himself - right? So you have that tremendous feeling, that tremendous thing inside. Now that compassion, delve into it. And there is something sacred, untouched by man - in the sense of being untouched by his mind, by his cravings, by his demands, by his prayers, by his everlasting chicanery. And that may be the origin of everything, which man has misused - you follow?

B: If you say it is the origin of all matter, all nature... K: Everything, all matter, all nature.

B: All of mankind.

K: Yes. That's right, sir. So at the end of these dialogues, what have you, what has the viewer got, what has he captured?

S: What would we hope he has got? Would you say what we hope he has captured, or what he has actually captured?

K: What he has actually, not hope. What has he actually captured? Has his bowl filled?

S: Filled with the sacred.

K: Or does he say, "Well I have got a lot of ashes left, very kind of you, but I can get that anywhere". Any logical, rational, human being would say, "They are discussing my part in all this and I am left with nothing".

S: What has he got?

K: He has come to you - I have come to you three wanting to



find out, wanting to transform my life, because I feel that is absolutely necessary, not just to get rid of my ambitions and all the silly stuff mankind has collected - I have emptied myself of all that - the I has died to all that. Now have I got anything out of all this? Have you given me the perfume of that thing?

S: Can I give you the perfume?

K: Or share it with me.

S: Has the viewer shared with us the experience we have had being together?

K: Have you two shared this thing with this man?

S: Have we shared this with this man?

K: If not, then what? A clever discussion - oh, we are fed up with that. You can only share when you are really hungry - burning with hunger. Otherwise you share words. So I have come to the point, we have come to the point, when we see that life has an extraordinary meaning.

B: Yes, it has a meaning far beyond what we usually think.

K: Yes, that is so shallow and empty.

B: So would you say this sacred is also life?

K: Yes, that's what I was getting at. Life is sacred. B: And the sacred is life.

S: Have we shared that?

K: Have you shared that? So we mustn't misuse life. We mustn't waste it because our life is so short.

B: You feel that each of our lives has a part to play in this sacred which you talked about? It is a part of the whole, and to use it rightly has a tremendous significance?

K: Yes, quite right. But to accept it as a theory is as good as any

other theory.

S: Right. But somehow I feel troubled. Have we shared it? That burns, that question burns. Have we shared the sacred?

K: Which really means that all these discussions, dialogues, have been a process of meditation. Not a clever argument, but a real penetrating meditation which brings insight into everything that is being said.

B: Well, I should say we have been doing that.

K: I think we have been doing that.

S: And have we shared that?

B: With whom?

S: With the viewer?

K: Ah, are you considering the viewer? Or is there no viewer at all? Are you speaking to the viewer, or only to that thing in which the viewer, you and I, and everything is? You understand what I am saying?

S: You said we have been in a meditation, and I say we have been in a meditation - but how far have we shared our meditation?

K: No. I mean has it been a meditation?

S: Yes.

K: Meditation is not just argument.

S: No, we have shared in that.

K: Seeing the truth of every statement.

S: Right.

K: Or the falseness of every statement. Or seeing in the false the truth. S: Right. Then being aware of the false in each of us as it comes out and is clarified.

K: Seeing it all, and therefore we are in a state of meditation.

And whatever we say must then lead to that ultimate thing. Then you are not sharing.

S: Where are you?

K: There is no sharing. It is only that.

S: The act of meditation is that.

K: There is only that.

# **THE WHOLENESS OF LIFE PART II CHAPTER 1 6TH PUBLIC TALK OJAI CALIFORNIA 17TH APRIL 1977 'MEDITATION IS THE EMPTYING OF THE CONTENT OF CONSCIOUSNESS'**

Meditation is one of the most important things in life; not how to meditate; not meditation according to a system; not the practice of meditation; but rather that which meditation is. If one can find out, very deeply, the significance, the necessity and the importance of it for oneself, then one puts aside all systems, methods, gurus, together with all the peculiar things that are involved in the Eastern type of meditation.

It is very important to uncover for oneself what one actually is; not according to the theories and the assertions and experiences of psychologists, philosophers and the gurus, but rather by investigating the whole nature and movement of oneself; by seeing what one actually is.

One does not seem to be able to understand how extraordinarily important it is to see what one is, actually, as though one is looking at oneself in a mirror, psychologically; thereby bringing about a transformation in the very structure of oneself. When one fundamentally, deeply, brings about such a transformation, or mutation, then that mutation affects the whole consciousness of man. This is an absolute fact, a reality. To bring about a fundamental transformation becomes very important, if one is at all serious, if one is concerned with the world as it is, with all its appalling misery, confusion and uncertainty, with all the divisions of religions and nationalities, with their wars, with their

accumulation of armaments, spending enormous sums to prepare for war, to kill people, in the name of nationality and so on and so on.

To see what one actually is, it is vital that there be freedom, freedom from the whole content of one's consciousness; the content of consciousness being all the things put together by thought. Freedom from the content of one's consciousness, from one's angers and brutalities, from one's vanities and arrogance, from all the things that one is caught up in, is meditation. The very seeing of what one is, is the beginning of the transformation. Meditation implies the ending of all strife, of all conflict, inwardly and therefore outwardly. Actually, there is no inward or outward, it is like the sea, there is the ebb and flow.

In uncovering what one actually is, one asks: Is the observer, oneself, different from that which one observes - psychologically that is. I am angry, I am greedy, I am violent; is that I different from the thing observed, which is anger, greed, violence? Is one different? Obviously not. When I am angry there is no I that is angry, there is only anger. So anger is me; the observer is the observed. The division is eliminated altogether. The observer is the observed and therefore conflict ends.

Part of meditation is to eliminate totally all conflict, inwardly and therefore outwardly. To eliminate conflict one has to understand this basic principle; the observer is not different from the observed, psychologically. When there is anger, there is no I, but a second later thought creates the I and says: "I have been angry" and brings in the idea that I should not be angry. So there is anger and then the I who should not be angry; the division brings

conflict. When there is no division between the observer and the observed, and therefore only the thing that is, which is anger, then what takes place? Does anger go on? Or is there a total ending of anger? When anger occurs and there is no observer, no division, it blossoms and then ends - like a flower, it blooms, withers and dies away. But as long as one is fighting it, as long as one is resisting it, or rationalizing it, one is giving life to it. When the observer is the observed, then anger blossoms, grows and naturally dies - therefore there is no psychological conflict in it.

One lives by action; action according to a motive, according to an ideal, according to a pattern, or habitual and traditional action, all without any investigation. A mind that is in meditation must find out what action is. One of the major problems in one's life is conflict and from conflict all kinds of neurotic activities arise. To end conflict and therefore to end neurotic action, is very important, so that one has a sane mind, a mind that is healthy, a mind that is not neurotically caught in beliefs and fears and so on.

How does one act, according to what principle, according to what quality or state of mind does one act? Generally one acts from memory, the memory which is set in a pattern, which has become habit, routine. One acts according to that which is remembered as pleasant; or one acts according to an ideal one has determined to carry out in daily life; or one has an ambition which one tries to fulfil. There are various types of action and each of them is incomplete, fragmented; none is holistic - "I'm a business man and I come home and I love my children, but when I'm at business, there, I do not love anybody, I want profit, etc. etc; I may be a scholar, a painter, but my life - though I am an excellent painter - is

shoddy, I'm vicious, greedy, wanting money, position, recognition, fame."

One's actions are divided, fragmentary and when there is fragmentary action it must inevitably bring conflict, psychologically. Is there an action which is without conflict in which there are no regrets, no failures, no sense of frustration; is there an action which is whole, harmonious, complete, an action not in a particular field contrary to another field? One has to see what one is actually doing, how one is actually living a contradictory life, acting contradictorily and therefore in conflict. One must become aware of it. And if one is completely aware, then what takes place?

Suppose I live in contradictory actions and you tell me, "Be ware of it". What do you mean by being aware of it? - I ask. Awareness is not possible when you choose, when you say: "I like that particular action, I would like to keep that; please help me to avoid all other action." That is not awareness; that is choosing a particular action which appears most satisfactory, most comforting most gratifying, rewarding and so on. Where there is choice there is no complete awareness. If one is completely aware, there is no problem. There is then an action which is continuous, without any break and therefore holistic. It is to have a mind that is sane, which implies not being committed to any particular form of belief, dogma, or ideal, nothing. It is to have a mind able to think clearly, directly, objectively. In the process of meditation one comes to find that action.

To find out what meditation is, all previous knowledge of what meditation is thought to be blocks the exploration. Freedom from

psychological authority is absolutely necessary. What is necessary in the investigation? Is it concentration; is it attention or is it awareness? When one concentrates, one's whole energy is focused on something particular, one resists and puts aside all interfering thoughts. In concentration one is resisting. But to be aware of one's thought there is no concentration; one does not choose in awareness which thought one would like; one is just aware. From that awareness comes attention. In attention there is no centre from which one is attending. This is really important to understand, it is the essence of meditation. In concentration there is a centre from which one is concentrating, on a picture or on an idea or on some image, etc; one is exercising energy in concentration, in resisting building a wall, so that no other thought comes in and there must be conflict. To totally eliminate that conflict become choicelessly aware of thought; then there is no contradiction, no resistance about any thought. From that arises awareness; awareness of all the movement of one's thought. Out of that awareness comes attention. When one is attending to something, really deeply, there is no centre; there is no me.

In attention - if one has gone that far - one is free from all the travails of thought, its fears, agonies and despairs; that is the foundation. The content of one's consciousness is being emptied; it is being freed. Meditation is the emptying of the content of consciousness. That is the meaning and the depth of meditation, the emptying of all the content - thought coming to an end.

Meditation is the attention in which there is no registration. Normally the brain is registering almost everything, the noise, the words which are being used - it is registering like a tape. Now is it



possible for the brain not to register except that which is absolutely necessary? Why should I register an insult? Why? Why should I register flattery? It is unnecessary. Why should I register any hurts? Unnecessary. Therefore, register only that which is necessary in order to operate in daily life - as a technician, a writer and so on - but psychologically, do not register anything. In meditation there is no registration psychologically, no registration except the practical facts of living, going to the office, working in a factory and so on - nothing else. Out of that comes complete silence, because thought has come to an end - except to function only where it is absolutely necessary. Time has come to an end and there is a totally different kind of movement, in silence.

Religion then has a totally different meaning, whereas before it was a matter of thought. Thought made the various religions and therefore each religion is fragmented and in each fragment there are multiple subdivisions. All that is called religion, including the beliefs, the hopes, the fears and the desire to be secure in another world and so on, is the result of thought. It is not religion, it is merely the movement of thought, in fear, in hope, in trying to find security - a material process.

Then what is religion? It is the investigation, with all one's attention, with the summation of all one's energy, to find that which is sacred, to come upon that which is holy. That can only take place when there is freedom from the noise of thought - the ending of thought and time, psychologically, inwardly - but not the ending of knowledge in the world where you have to function with knowledge. That which is holy, that which is sacred, which is truth, can only be when there is complete silence, when the brain itself

has put thought in its right place. Out of that immense silence there is that which is sacred.

Silence demands space, space in the whole structure of consciousness. There is no space in the structure of one's consciousness as it is, because it is crowded with fears - crowded, chattering, chattering. When there is silence, there is immense, timeless space; then only is there a possibility of coming upon that which is the eternal, sacred.

**THE WHOLENESS OF LIFE PART II CHAPTER  
2 2ND PUBLIC TALK SAANEN 12TH JULY 1977  
'THE ENDING OF CONFLICT IS THE  
GATHERING OF SUPREME ENERGY WHICH IS  
A FORM OF INTELLIGENCE'**

There is the theory of old, that god, divinity, descends on man and helps him to grow, to evolve and to live nobly. That is the old tradition of the countries in the East and also in a different way, in the West. In belief in such theories there is great comfort; a feeling that one is at least secure in something; that there is somebody that is looking after you and the world. That is a very old theory and it has no meaning whatsoever. That theory and teaching gives some kind of hope in a Utopia in the future as made by the present; a hope arising from the limits of what one is now. Unless there is a radical transformation, such a future is the modified continuity of "what is".

One realizes that there is no security whatsoever in the things that thought has put together if one has gone into it sufficiently intelligently, rationally and sanely to find out; one sees that there is really no structure, either in the future, or in the past, or in the present, philosophical, religious, or ideological, which can give any kind of security whatsoever.

One accepts very easily the path that is the most satisfying, the most convenient, the most pleasurable. It is very easy to move into that groove. And authority dictates, lays down, in a religious or a psychological system, a method by which, or through which, you are told you will find security. But if one sees that there is no

security in any such authority, then one can find out whether it is possible to live without any guidance, without any control, without any effort psychologically. So, one is going to investigate, to see, whether the mind can be free to find the truth of this matter, so that one will never, under any circumstance, conform to any pattern of authority, psychologically. When one is conforming to a pattern, religious, psychological, or the pattern which one has set for oneself, there is always a contradiction between what one actually is and the pattern. There is always a conflict and this conflict is endless. If one has finished with one pattern one goes to another. One is educated to live in this field of conflict because of these ideals, patterns, conclusions, beliefs and so on. Conforming to a pattern one is never free; one does not know what compassion is and one is always battling and therefore giving importance to oneself; the self becomes extraordinarily important with the idea of self-improvement.

So, is it possible to live without a pattern? Now, how is one, as a human being, the total representative of all mankind, how is one going to find out the truth of this matter? Because if one's consciousness is changed radically, profoundly - no, revolutionized rather than changed - then one affects the consciousness of the whole of mankind.

How is one going to go into this problem; with what capacity does one investigate? To investigate there must be freedom from motive. If one wants to investigate the question of authority, one's background says: I must obey, I must follow; and in the process one's background is always projecting, is always distorting one's investigation. Can one be free of one's background so that it does

not interfere in any way with one's investigation? One's urgency to find the truth, one's immediacy, one's demand, puts the background in abeyance; one's intensity to find out is so strong that the background ceases to interfere. Although the background, one's education, one's conditioning, is so strong - it has accumulated for centuries; consciously one cannot fight it, one cannot push it aside; one cannot battle with it and one sees that to fight the background only intensifies the background - yet one's very intensity to find out the truth of authority puts that background much further away; it is no longer impinging on one's mind.

One needs to have tremendous energy to find out the truth of this matter. Mostly, this energy is dissipated in the conflict between "what is" and "what should be". One sees that "what should be" is an escape from, or an avoidance of, the fact of "what is". Or thought, incapable of meeting "what is", projects "what should be" and uses that as a lever to try to remove "what is". So is it possible to look at, to observe, "what is", without any motive to change or to transform it, or to make it conform to a particular pattern that you or another has established - whatever may happen at the end of it? If one does, the background fades away. If one is very intense to understand, one forgets oneself, forgets one is a Hindu, a Christian, a Buddhist, one forgets all one's background; therefore the whole thing disappears, the background, the motive, everything, because there is the present necessity and the urgency to find out.

The intensity that is necessary can only come into being when there is no cause and no effect and therefore no reaction. It implies that one must be completely alone in one's investigation. Aloneness does not mean isolation, it does not mean one is withdrawn and has

built a wall around oneself. Alone means that one is all one. Then one is a total human being representing all humanity, one's consciousness has undergone a change through perception, which is the awakening of intelligence. That intelligence finishes forever with psychological authority; it profoundly affects one's consciousness.

Is it possible to live a life without any pattern, without any goal, without any idea of the future, a life without conflict? It is only possible when one lives completely with "what is". With "what is" means with that which is actually taking place. Live with it; do not try to transform it, do not try to go beyond it, do not try to control it, do not try to escape from it, just look at it, live with it. If you are envious, or greedy, jealous, or you have problems, sex, fear, whatever they are, live with them without any movement of thought that wants to move away from them. Which means what? One is not wasting one's energy in control, in suppression, in conflict, in resistance, in escape. All that energy was being wasted; now one has gathered it up. Because one sees the absurdity of it, the falseness of it, the unreality of it, one has now the energy to live with "what is; one has that energy to observe without any movement of thought. It is the thought that has created jealousy and thought that says: "I must run away from it, I must escape from it, I must suppress it." If one sees that falseness of escape, resistance, suppression, then that energy which has gone into escape, resistance and suppression is gathered to observe. Then what takes place?

One is not escaping, not resisting and then one is envious, the envy being the result of the movement of thought. The envy arises

from comparison, measurement - I have not, you have. And thought, because it has been educated to run away, runs away from this thing. Now because one sees the falseness of it one stops and one has the energy to observe this envy. That very word "envy" is its own condemnation. When one says "I am envious", there is already a sense of pushing it away. So, one must be free of the influence of the word to observe. And this demands tremendous alertness, tremendous watchfulness, awareness, so as not to escape and so as to see that the word envy has created the feeling; for without the word, is there the feeling? If there is no word and therefore no movement of thought, then is there envy?

The word has created the feeling because the word is associated with the feeling, it is dictating the feeling. Can one observe without the word? Now, words are the movement of thought used to communicate - communicate with oneself, or with another - when there are no words there is no communication between the fact and the observer. Therefore the movement of thought as envy has come to an end; come to an end completely, not temporarily - one can look at a beautiful car and observe the beauty of its lines and that is the end of it.

To live with "what is" completely, implies no conflict whatsoever. Therefore there is no future as transforming it into something else. The very ending of it is the gathering of supreme energy which is a form of intelligence.

## **THE WHOLENESS OF LIFE PART II CHAPTER 3 5TH PUBLIC TALK OJAI CALIFORNIA 16TH APRIL 1977 'OUT OF NEGATION COMES THE POSITIVE CALLED LOVE'**

Throughout the world human beings are always seeking security, both physiological and psychological. Physical security is denied when psychological security - which does not really exist - is sought in various forms of illusion and in divisive beliefs, dogmas, religious sanctions and so on. Where there are these psychological divisions, there must inevitably be physiological division with all its conflicts, wars and the suffering and the tragedy and the inhumanity of man to man. Wherever one goes in the world, it does not matter whether it is in India, Europe, Russia, China or America, human beings, psychologically, are more or less the same; they suffer, they are anxious, uncertain, confused, often in great pain, ambitious, fighting each other everlastingly.

Basically, psychologically, as all human beings are the same one can with reason say that the world is oneself and one is the world. That is an absolute fact, as one can see when one goes into it very deeply. And the content of human consciousness is the whole movement of thought and the desire for power, position, security and the pursuit of pleasure in which there is fear. Fear and pleasure are the two sides of the same coin. Without understanding the whole structure and nature of pleasure, based on desire, one will never understand and live a life in which there is love.

Fear and the pursuit of pleasure are part of consciousness. But is love also a part of consciousness? When there is fear, is there love?



When there is the mere pursuit of pleasure, is there love? Is love pleasure and desire, or has it nothing whatsoever to do with pleasure and desire?

One's brain, through the constant habit of seeking security has become mechanical; mechanical in the sense of following certain definite patterns, repeating these patterns over and over again in the routine of daily life. There is the repetition of pleasure and the burden of fear and the inability to resolve it. So, gradually, the brain, or part of the brain, has become mechanical, repetitive, biologically as well as psychologically; one is caught in certain patterns of belief, dogma, ideology - the American ideology, the Russian ideology, the ideology of India and so on. There is the direction, the pursuit, and the mind and the brain deteriorate.

However pleasant, the life one lives is a life that is repetitive; however desirable, however complex, it is a repetitive life - the same belief from childhood to death, the same rituals, whether it is church or temple, there is the tradition of it, over and over again. There is the repetition of pleasure, sexual pleasure or the pleasure of achievement, the pleasure of possession, the pleasure of attachment, all these cause the brain to deteriorate because they are repetitive. So long as there is the pursuit of pleasure as a repetitive process and the burden of fear which it brings and which man has not resolved - he has run away from it, escaped from it, rationalized it, but still it remains - the brain deteriorates.

What is love? Is it pleasure - pleasure in the repetitive sexual act, which is generally called love? The love of one's neighbour, the love of one's wife, in which there is great pleasure, possession and comfort, based on desire - is that love? Where there is

possessive attachment to another, there must be jealousy, there must be fear and antagonism. These are obvious facts - nothing extraordinary or ideological - they are facts, "what is". So is attachment love? And what is the basis of attachment? Why is one attached to something, to property, to an idea, to an ideology, to a person, to a symbol, to a concept which is called God? If one does not fully understand the significance of attachment, then one will never be able to find the truth of love. Is not the basis of attachment the fear of being alone, the fear of being isolated, the emptiness, the sense of insufficiency in oneself?

We are attached to people, to ideas, to symbols, or to concepts, because in them we think there is security. Is there security in any relationship? Is there security - which is really the essence of attachment - in one's wife, or husband? And if one seeks security in the wife or the husband and so on, then what takes place? One possesses, legally or not legally. And where there is possession there must be fear of losing - therefore jealousy, hatred, divorce and all the rest of it. Is love attachment? Can there be love when there is attachment; with all the implications of that word which include fear, jealousy, guilt, irritation leading to hatred - all that is implied when one uses the word "attachment"? Where there is attachment can there be love? These are factual, not theoretical, questions. One is dealing with daily life, not with some extraordinary life. One can only go very deeply and very far if one begins very near, which is oneself. If one does not understand oneself one cannot move far. One is delving into problems which are tremendously important in one's daily life.

Although one has to go into this question logically, rationally,

sanelly, one has to go beyond it; because logic is not love, reason is not love. The desire to be loved and to love is not love. Out of the negation of what is not love, every moment of one's life, out of the putting aside of what is not love, comes the positive thing called love.

Thought is fragmentary, limited; thought cannot solve the problem of what love is and thought cannot cultivate love. When one makes an abstraction in thought, one moves away from "what is". That movement of abstraction becomes a condition according to which one lives, therefore one no longer lives according to facts. This is what one has done all one's life; but one will never know what love is through abstraction, will not know the enormous beauty, depth and significance of love.

Why does man put up with this suffering? Why worship suffering, which the Christians do, apparently? What is the meaning of suffering? What is it that suffers? When one says "I suffer," who is it that suffers? What is the centre that says "I am in an agony of jealousy, of fear, of loss"? What is that centre, that "essence", of a human being who says "I suffer"? Is it the movement of thought, as time, which creates the centre? How does that I come into being, which, having come into being says, "I suffer, I am anxious, I am frightened, I am jealous, I am lonely". That I is never stationary, it is always moving: "I desire this, I desire that and then I desire something else", it is in constant movement. That movement is time, that movement is thought.

There is a concept in the Asiatic world that the I is something which is beyond time; and further, the concept that there is a higher I still. In the Western world the I has never been thoroughly

examined. Qualities have been attributed to it, Freud and Jung and other psychologists have given attributes to it but have never gone into this question of the nature and the structure of the I which says "I suffer".

The I, as one observes, says "I must have that", a few days later it wants something else. There is the constant movement of desire; the constant movement of pleasure; the constant movement of what one wants to be and so on. This movement is thought as psychological time. The I who says "I suffer" is put together by thought. Thought says, "I am John, I am this, I am that". Thought identifies itself with the name and with the form and is the I in all the content of consciousness; it is the essence of fear, hurt, despair, anxiety, guilt, the pursuit of pleasure, the sense of loneliness, all the content of consciousness. When one says "I suffer", it is the image that thought has built about itself, the form, the name, that is in sorrow.

The more intense the challenge is, the greater is the energy demanded to meet it. Sorrow is this challenge. To that challenge one has to respond. But if one responds to it by escaping from it, by seeking comfort from it, then one is dissipating the energy that one needs to meet this thing.

There is no escape - there is no escape because if one tries to escape, sorrow is always there, like one's shadow, like one's face, it is always with one - so remain with it, without any movement of thought. If one runs away from it, one has not solved it; but if one remains with it, not identifying oneself with it - because one is that suffering - then all your energy is present to meet this extraordinary thing that happens. Out of that suffering comes

passion.

There is a solution, there is an ending to sorrow - as there is an ending to fear - completely. Then only is there a possibility to know what love is. One thinks that one will learn something from suffering, that there is a lesson to be learnt from suffering. But when one observes suffering in oneself, not escaping from it, but remaining with it totally, completely, without any movement of thought, without any alleviation, comfort, but just completely holding to it, then one will see a strange psychological transformation take place.

Love is passion, which is compassion. Without that passion and compassion, with its intelligence, one acts in a very limited sense; all one's actions are limited. Where there is compassion that action is total, complete, irrevocable.

# **THE WHOLENESS OF LIFE PART II CHAPTER 4 5TH PUBLIC TALK OJAI CALIFORNIA 16TH APRIL 1977 'DEATH--A GREAT ACT OF PURGATION'**

Death is something not only mysterious but a great act of purgation. That which continues in a repetitive pattern is degeneration. The pattern may vary according to country, according to climate, according to circumstance, but it is a pattern. Moving in any pattern brings about a continuity and that continuity is part of the degenerating process of man. When there is an ending of continuity, something new can take place. One can understand it instantly if one has understood the whole movement of thought, of fear, hate, love - then one can grasp the significance, instantly, of what death is.

What is death? When one asks that question, thought has many answers. Thought says: "I do not want to go into all the miserable explanations of death." Every human being has an answer to it, according to his conditioning, according to his desire, his hope. Thought always has an answer. The answer will invariably be intellectual, verbally put together by thought. But one is examining, without having an answer, something totally unknown, totally mysterious - death is a tremendous thing.

One realizes that the organism, the body, dies and the brain - having in life been misused in various forms of self-indulgence, contradiction, effort, constant struggle, wearing itself out mechanically, for it is a mechanism - also dies. The brain is the repository of memory; memory as experience, as knowledge. From

that experience and knowledge, stored up in the cells of the brain, as memory, thought arises. When the organism comes to an end, the brain also comes to an end, and so thought comes to an end. Thought is a material process - thought is nothing spiritual - it is a material process based on memory held in the cells of the brain; when the organism dies, thought dies. Thought creates the whole structure of the me - the me that wants this, the me that does not want that, the me that is fearful, anxious, despairing, longing, lonely - fearful of dying. And thought says: "What is the value, what is the significance of life for a human being who has struggled, experienced, acquired, lived in such an ugly, stupid, miserable way and then for it to end?" So, thought then says: "No, this is not the end, there is another world." But that other world is still merely the movement of thought.

One asks what happens after death. Now ask quite a different question: What is before death? - not what is after death. What is before death, which is one's life. What is one's life? Go to school, to college, university, get a job, man and woman live together, he goes off to the office for 50 years, she goes off earning more money, they have children, pain, anxiety, each fighting. Living such a miserable life one wants to know what is after death - about which volumes have been written, all produced by thought, all saying, "Believe". So, if one puts all that aside, literally, actually, puts it all aside, then what is one faced with? - the actual fact that oneself who is put together by thought, comes to an end - all one's anxieties, all one's longings come to an end. When one is living, as one is living now, with vigour, with energy, with all the travail of life, can one live meeting death now? I am living in all vigour,

energy and capacity, and death means an ending to that living. Now, can I live with death all the time? That is: I am attached to you; end that attachment, which is death - is it not? One is greedy and when one dies, one cannot carry greed with one; so end the greed, not in a week's time, or ten days' time - end it, now. So one is living a life full of vigour, energy, capacity, observation, seeing the beauty of the earth and also the ending of that instantly, which is death. So to live before death is to live with death; which means that one is living in a timeless world. One is living a life in which everything that one acquires is constantly ending, so that there is always a tremendous movement, one is not fixed in a certain place. This is not a concept. When one invites death, which means the ending of everything that one holds, dying to it, each day, each minute, then one will find - not "one" there is then no oneself finding it, because one has gone - then there is that state of a timeless dimension in which the movement we know as time, is not. It means the emptying of the content of one's consciousness so that there is no time; time comes to an end, which is death.



## **THE WHOLENESS OF LIFE PART II CHAPTER 5 1ST PUBLIC TALK BROCKWOOD PARK 27TH AUGUST 1977 'ACTION WHICH IS SKILFUL AND WHICH DOES NOT PERPETUATE THE SELF.'**

We have become very skilful in dealing with our daily life; skilful, in the sense of being clever in applying a great deal of knowledge which we have acquired through education and through experience. We act skilfully, either in a factory, or in a business and so. That skill becomes, through repetitive action, routine. Skill, when it is highly developed - as it should be - leads to self importance and self aggrandizement. Skill has brought us to our present state, not only technologically but in our relationships, in the way we deal with each other - not clearly, not with compassion, but with skill. Is there an action, in our daily life, which is skilful yet which does not perpetuate the self, the me, which does not give importance to oneself and to one's self-centred existence? Is it possible to act skilfully without strengthening the self? To answer that one has to enquire into what clarity is; when there is clarity there is action which is skilful and which does not perpetuate the self.

Clarity exists only when there is freedom to observe. One is only capable of observing, looking, watching, when there is complete and total freedom; otherwise there is always distortion in the observation. Is it possible to be free of all the distorting factors in one's outlook? When one observes oneself, or another, or society, the environment, the whole cultural, political and religious

movements that are going on in the world - the so-called religious movements - can one do so without any prejudice, without taking any side, without projecting one's own personal conclusions, one's beliefs and dogmas, one's experience and knowledge and be totally free to observe clearly?

One may describe what compassion is in the most eloquent and poetic manner but in whatever words it is expressed, those words are not the thing. Without compassion there is no clarity; without clarity there is no selfless skill - they are interrelated. Can one have this extraordinary sense of compassion in one's daily life, not as a theory, not as an ideal, not something to be achieved, to be practised and so on, but to have it totally, completely, at the very root of one's being?

Can there be clarity? One can be very clear in one's thinking, in its objectivity, rationality, sanity; but such thinking, however logical, however objective, is very limited. And one sees that such logical, objective thinking has not solved our problems; the philosophers, the scientists, the so-called religious people, have thought very clearly about certain things, but in daily life, clear thinking has not resolved our most important issues. One may think very clearly about one's envy or violence, but that does not bring about the ending of envy or violence. Clear thinking is limited because it is thought and thought itself is limited, conditioned. Thought itself has its own boundary; it may try to go beyond that boundary by inventing a logos, a deity or a Utopian State and so on, but these inventions are still limited because thought is the product of memory, experience and knowledge and it is always from the past and therefore time-bound. Is it possible to

see the limitations of thought and give it its right place? Giving the right place to thought brings clarity.

To understand the whole meaning and the depth of compassion one has to investigate the movement of one's consciousness. Wherever one goes in the world, east or west, north or south, human beings have great anxiety and live in uncertainty, always seeking security in some form or another - physiologically or psychologically. And they are full of violence, right through the world; this is an extraordinary phenomenon - violence, greed, envy, hatred. In consciousness there is the good and the bad; the bad is increasing; it is increasing because the good has become static, the good is not flowering. One has accepted certain patterns of what is thought to be good and one lives according to those patterns. So, the good, instead of flowering, is withering and thereby giving strength to the bad. There is more violence, more hatred, there are more national and religious divisions, there is every form of antagonism, right through the world. It is on the increase because the good is not flowering. Now, be aware of this fact without any effort; the moment one makes effort one gives importance to the self, which is the bad. Just observe the actual fact of the bad without any effort, observe it without any choice - because choice is a distorting factor. When one observes so openly, so freely, then the good begins to flower. It is not that one pursues the good and thereby gives it strength to flower but when the bad, the evil, the ugly, is understood, completely, the other naturally flowers.

We have strengthened in our consciousness, through great development of skill, the structure and the nature of the self. The

self is violence, the self is greed, envy and so on. They are of the very essence of the self. As long as there is the centre as the me, every action must be distorted. Acting from a centre you are giving a direction, and that direction is distortion. You may develop a great skill in this way but it is always unbalanced, inharmonious. Now, can consciousness with its movement undergo a radical transformation, a transformation not brought about by will? Will is desire, desire for something and when there is desire there is a motive, which is again a distorting factor in observation. In our consciousness there is this duality, the good and the bad. We are always looking with the eyes of the good and also with the eyes of the bad, so there is a conflict. Now to eliminate conflict altogether is only possible when you observe without any choice. Just observe yourself. In that way you eliminate the conflict between the good and the bad.

**THE WHOLENESS OF LIFE PART II CHAPTER  
6 1ST PUBLIC TALK SAANEN 10TH JULY 1977  
'REASON AND LOGIC ALONE WILL NOT  
DISCOVER TRUTH.'**

Reason and logic have not solved our human problems, and we are going to find out if there is quite a different approach to all the problems and travails of life. We shall come upon something that is beyond reason; for reason has not solved any of our political, economic or social problems; nor has it solved the intimate human problems between two people. It becomes more and more obvious that we live in a world that is going to pieces, that has become quite insane, quite disorderly and a dangerous place to live in. Up to a point we must reason together, logically, sanely, holistically; then, perhaps, beyond that point, we shall be able to find a different state, a different quality of mind, not bound by any dogma, by any belief, by any experience and therefore a mind that is free to observe and through that observation see exactly "what is" and also find that there is energy to transform it.

One must not start from any conclusion, from any belief, from any dogma which conditions the mind, but from a mind that is free to observe, to learn, to move and act. Such a mind is a compassionate mind for compassion has no cause; it is not a result. Compassion comes when the mind is free and it brings about a fundamental psychological revolution. That psychological revolution is what we are concerned with from the beginning to the end.

So we will begin by asking ourselves: What is it that we are

seeking? Physical comfort? Physical security? Deep down, is there the demand or desire to be totally secure in all our activities; in all our relationships to be stable, certain, permanent? We cling to experience that gives us a certain quality of stability, or to a certain identification which gives us a sense of permanency, well-being. In a belief there is security; in identification with a particular dogma, political or religious, there is security. If we are aged, we find security or happiness in the remembrance of things past, in the experiences that we have known, in the love that we have had, and we cling to the past. And if we are young and cheerful we are satisfied for the moment, not thinking about the future or the past. But gradually youth slips into old age with the desire to be secure, with the anxiety of uncertainty, of not being able to depend on anything or anybody, yet desiring deeply to have something secure to cling to.

We have to examine closely whether there is psychological security at all. And if there is no psychological security will a human being go insane; will he become totally neurotic, because he has no security? Probably the majority of human beings are somewhat neurotic. A Communist, a Catholic, Protestant or Hindu, each is secure in his belief; he has no fear because he clings to it. And when you begin to investigate, or question, or reason with him he stops at a certain point and will not examine further, it is too dangerous, he feels his security is being threatened; then communication ceases. He may reason, think logically up to a certain point but is incapable of breaking through to a different dimension altogether; he is stuck in a groove and will not investigate anything else. Does that really give security? Does

thought, which has created all these beliefs, dogmas, experiences, divisions, give security? We function with thought; all our activity is based on thought, horizontal or vertical; whether you are aspiring to great heights it is the movement of thought vertically; or whether you are merely satisfied to bring about a social revolution and so on it is the horizontal movement of thought. So does thought fundamentally, basically, give security, psychologically? Thought has its place; but when thought assumes that it can bring about psychological security then it is living in illusion. Thought wanting ultimate security has created a thing called god; and humanity clings to that idea. Thought can create every kind of romantic illusion. And when the mind, psychologically, seeks security in the dogma of the Church, or some other dogmatic assertion, or whatever it is, it is seeking security in the structure of thought.

Thought is the response of experience and knowledge, stored up in the brain as memory; that response is therefore always moving from the past. Now, is there security in the past? Please use your reason, logic, all your energy to find out. Can any activity of thought, which is essentially of the past, give security? Follow the sequence of it; in that which it has created it seeks security and that security is of the past. Thought, though it may project the future, says: "I am going to attain godhood", yet that movement of thought is essentially from the past. Or, recognizing there is no security in the past, thought then projects an idea, an idealistic state of mind and finds security in the hope of that in the future.

A human being, throughout life, depends on thought and the things that thought has put together as being most essential,

holiness, unholiness, morality, immorality and so on. Someone comes along and says: "Now look, all that is the movement of the past." Having reasoned with him, logically, the other says: "Why not, what is wrong with holding on to thought even though it is of the past"? He acknowledges it, and says: "I'll hold to it, what is wrong?" Yet when the human mind lives in the past and when it holds to the past, then it is incapable of living, or perceiving truth.

We come to a certain point and we say: "Yes, I see and I recognize logically, that in those things there is no security and when they are questioned there is fear." And when we say we see that, what do we mean by that word "see"? Is it merely a logical understanding, a verbal understanding, a linear understanding, or is it an understanding which is so profound that that very understanding breaks down, without any effort, the whole movement of thought? When you say: "I understand what you are saying", what do you mean by that word "understand"? Do you mean you understand the English words? Is it an understanding of the words, the meaning of the words, the explanation of the words and therefore an understanding only at a very superficial level? Or, is it that, when you say "I understand", you mean you actually "see", or observe the truth as to what thought is; you actually feel, taste, observe in your blood as it were, that thought, whatever it creates, has no security? You "see" the truth of it and therefore you are free of it. Seeing the truth of it is intelligence. Such intelligence is not reason, logic, or the very careful dialectical explanation; the latter is merely the exposition of thought in various forms; and thought is never intelligent. The perception of the truth is intelligence; and in that intelligence there is complete security.



That intelligence is not yours or mine; that intelligence is not conditioned - we have finished with all that. We have seen that thought in its very movement creates conditioning and when you understand that movement, that very understanding is intelligence. In that intelligence there is security, from that there is action.

We may talk about this question in different ways, in different fields, such as fear, pleasure, sorrow, death, meditation, but the essence of it is this: thought is the movement from the past, therefore of time and therefore measurable. That which is measurable can never find the immeasurable, which is truth. That can only take place when the mind actually sees the truth that whatever thought has created, in that there is no security; the very observation of that is intelligence. When there is that intelligence then it is all finished. Then you are out of this world, though you are living in it; though trying to do something in it, you are completely an outsider.

## **THE WHOLENESS OF LIFE PART II CHAPTER 7 1ST PUBLIC TALK OJAI CALIFORNIA 2ND APRIL 1977 'INTELLIGENCE, IN WHICH THERE IS COMPLETE SECURITY.'**

Wherever one goes in the world, India, Europe and America, one sees great sorrow, violence, wars, terrorism, killing, drugs - every kind of stupidity. One accepts these as though inevitable and easily puts up with them, or one revolts against them; but revolt is a reaction, as Communism is a reaction to Capitalism or Fascism.

So, without revolting, without going against everything and forming one's own little group, or without following a guru from India or from elsewhere, without accepting any kind of authority - because in spiritual matters there is no authority - can we investigate these problems that human beings have had, centuries upon centuries, generation after generation, these conflicts, uncertainties, travails, all the things that human beings go through during life only to end in death, without understanding what it is all about?

Psychologically, inwardly, every human being, whoever he is, is the world. The world is represented in oneself and oneself is the world. That is a psychological, absolute fact; though one may have a white skin and another a brown or black skin, be affluent or very poor, yet inwardly, deep down, we are all the same; we suffer loneliness, sorrow, conflict, misery, confusion; we depend on someone to tell us what to do, how to think, what to think; we are slaves to propaganda from the various political parties and religions, and so on. That is what is happening all over the world

inwardly; deep down, we are slaves to the propaganda of the experts, of the governments and so on, we are conditioned human beings, whether we live in India, Europe or America.

So, one is actually, psychologically, the world and the world is oneself. Once one realizes this fact, not verbally, not ideologically or as an escape from fact, but actually, deeply feel the fact, realize the fact, that one is not different from the other - however far away he is - inwardly he suffers greatly and is terribly frightened, uncertain, insecure, then one is not concerned with one's little self, one is concerned with the total human being. One is concerned with the total human being - not with Mr X or Y or somebody else - but with the total psychological entity as a human being, wherever he lives. He is conditioned in a particular way; he may be a Catholic, a Protestant, or he may be conditioned by thousands of years of certain kinds of beliefs, superstitions, ideas and gods, as in India, but below that conditioning, in the depth of his mind, when alone, he is facing the same life of sorrow, pain, grief and anxiety. When one sees this as an actual, irrevocable fact, then one begins to think entirely differently and one begins to observe, not as an individual person having troubles and anxieties, but whole, entire. It gives one an extraordinary strength and vitality; one is not alone, one is the entire history of mankind - if one knows how to read that history which is enshrined in one. This is not rhetoric but a serious factor one is deeply concerned with, a fact which one denies, because one thinks one is so individualistic. One is so concerned with oneself, with one's petty problems, with one's little guru, with one's little beliefs; but when one realizes this extraordinary fact, then it gives one tremendous strength and a great urgency to

investigate and transform oneself, because one is mankind. When there is such transformation, one affects the whole consciousness of man because one is the entire humanity; when one changes fundamentally, deeply, when there is this psychological revolution in one, then naturally, as one is part of the total consciousness of the human being, which is the rest of humanity, its consciousness is affected. So, one is concerned to penetrate the layers of one's consciousness and to investigate whether it is possible to transform the content of that consciousness so that out of that transformation a different dimension of energy and clarity may come into being.

A human being, who is representative of the world, who is the world, psychologically, what is his innermost demand? In one part of his consciousness it is to find both biological and psychological security; he must have food, clothes and shelter - that is an absolute necessity. But also he demands, craves, and searches for psychological security - to have psychological certainty about everything. The whole struggle in the world, both physiologically and psychologically, is to find security. Security means physical permanency, physically to be well, to continue, advance, grow, and also it means psychological permanency. Everything, psychologically, if one observes very carefully, is very impermanent; one's relationships, psychologically, are most uncertain. One may be temporarily secure in one's relationship with another, man or woman, but it is only temporary. That very temporary security is the ground of complete insecurity.

So one asks: is there any security, psychologically, at all? One seeks psychological security in the family - the family being the wife, the children. There one tries to find a relationship that will be

secure, lasting, permanent - all relative, because there is always death. And, not always finding it - there are divorces, quarrels and all the misery, jealousies, anger, hatred that goes on - one tries to find security in a community, with a group of people, large or small. One tries to find security in the nation - I'm an American, I'm a Hindu - that gives a tremendous sense of apparent security. But when one tries to find security, psychologically, in a nation, that nation is divided from another nation. Where there is division between nations - in one of which one has invested psychologically one's security - there are wars, there are economic pressures. That is what is actually going on in the world.

If one seeks security in an ideology - the Communist ideology, the Capitalist ideology, the religious ideologies, with their dogmas, images - there is division; one believes in one set of ideals which one likes, which give one comfort, in which one seeks security with a group of people who believe the same thing, yet another group believes another thing and from them one is divided. Religions have divided people. The Christians, the Buddhists, the Hindus, the Muslims, divide; they are at each other, each believing something extraordinary, romantic, unrealistic, unreal, not factual.

Seeing all this - not as something to be avoided or to become supercilious or intellectual about - seeing all this very clearly, one asks, is there psychological security at all? And, if there is no psychological security, then does it become chaos? One loses one's identity - one has been identified with a nation, America, or with Jesus, with Buddha and so on - when reason, logic, makes it clear how absurd all this is. Does one despair because one has observed the fallacy of these divisive processes, the unreality of these

fictions, myths, fantasies which have no basis? The very perception of all this is intelligence - not the intelligence of a clever, cunning mind, not the intelligence of book knowledge, but the intelligence which comes out of clear observation. In that intelligence, brought about this clear observation, there is security; that very intelligence is secure.

But one will not let go, one is too afraid to let go lest one does not find security. One can let go of being a Catholic, Protestant, Communist, and so on, fairly easily. But when one does let go, when one cleanses oneself of all this, either one does it as a reaction, or one does it because one has observed intelligently, holistically, with great clarity, the absurdity of the fantasies and the make-belief. Because one observes without any distortion, because one is not out to get something from it, because one is not thinking in terms of punishment and reward, because one observes very clearly, then that very clarity of perception is intelligence. In that there is extraordinary security - not that you become secure, but intelligence is secure.

One has come to the absolute fact - not relative fact - the absolute fact that there is no psychological security in anything that man has invented; one sees that all our religions are inventions, put together by thought. When one sees that all our divisive endeavours, which come about when there are beliefs, dogmas, rituals, which are the whole substance of religion, when one sees all that very clearly, not as an idea, but as a fact, then that very fact reveals the extraordinary quality of intelligence in which there is complete, whole security.

**THE WHOLENESS OF LIFE PART II CHAPTER  
8 4TH PUBLIC TALK SAANEN 17TH JULY 1977  
'IN NEGATION THE POSITIVE IS BORN.'**

We are dealing with the facts of daily life, our way of living. Most of us abstract from those facts ideas and conclusions which become our prisons. We may ventilate those prisons but still we live there and go on making further abstractions of facts there. We are not dealing with ideas, exotic philosophies, or with abstract conclusions. We are going into problems that require a great deal of care and about which we must be very serious - because the house is burning. The Communist world is pressing in all the time, constraining us to believe in certain ideologies and if we do not we can be sent either to a concentration camp or a mental hospital. That is gradually closing in. If you are aware of the world situation, of what is happening in the world economically, socially, politically, of the preparation for wars, you become extremely serious; it is not a thing to play around with, you have to act.

Most of us are mediocre - we just go half way up the hill. Excellence means going to the very top of it and we are asking for excellence. Otherwise we shall be smothered, destroyed, as human beings, by the politicians, by the ideologists, whether they are Communists, Socialists and so on. We are demanding of ourselves the highest form of excellence. That excellence can only come into being when there is clarity and compassion without which the human mind will destroy human beings, destroy the world.

We are exercising reason, clear objective thinking, and logic, but they themselves do not bring about compassion. We must

exercise the qualities that we have, which are reason, careful observation and from those the excellency of clear sight to examine the various contents of consciousness, in which compassion does not exist; there may be pity in them, sympathy and tolerance, there may be the desire to help, there may be a form of love, but all these are not compassion.

Is compassion or love, pleasure? What is the significance and the meaning of pleasure, which every human being is seeking and pursuing at any cost? What is pleasure? There is the pleasure derived from possessions; the pleasure derived from a capacity or talent; the pleasure when you dominate another; the pleasure of having tremendous power, politically, religiously or economically; the pleasure of sex; the pleasure of the great sense of freedom that money gives. There are multiple forms of pleasure. In pleasure there is enjoyment, and further on there is ecstasy, the taking delight in something and the sense of ecstasy. "Ecstasy" is to be beyond yourself. There is no self to enjoy. The self - that is the me, the ego, the personality - has all totally disappeared, there is only that sense of being outside. That is ecstasy. But that ecstasy has nothing whatsoever to do with pleasure.

You take a delight in something; the delight that comes naturally when you look at something very beautiful. At that moment, at that second, there is neither pleasure, nor joy, there is only that sense of observation. In that observation the self is not. When you look at a mountain with its snow cap, with its valleys, its grandeur and magnificence, all thought is driven away. There it is, that greatness in front of you and there is delight. Then thought comes along registering as memory what a marvellous and lovely



experience it was. Then that registration, that memory, is cultivated and that cultivation becomes pleasure. Whenever thought interferes with the sense of beauty, the sense of the greatness of anything, a piece of poetry, a sheet of water, or a lonely tree in a field, it is registration. But, to see it and not register it - that is important. The moment you register it, the beauty of it, then that very registration sets thought into action; then the desire to pursue that beauty, which becomes the pursuit of pleasure. One sees a beautiful woman, or man; instantly it is registered in the brain; then that very registration sets thought into motion and you want to be in her or his company and all that follows. Pleasure is the continuation and the cultivation in thought of a perception. You have had sexual experience last night, or two weeks ago, you remember it and desire the repetition of it, which is the demand for pleasure.

It is the function of the brain to register; in registration it is secure, it knows what to do and from that there is the development of skill. That skill in its turn becomes a great pleasure as a talent, a gift; it is the movement, the continuation of thought through desire and pleasure. Is it possible to register only that which is absolutely necessary and not register anything else? Take a very simple thing: most of us have had physical pain of some sort or another; that pain is registered and the brain says, tomorrow, or a week later, I must be very careful not to have that pain again. Physical pain is distorting; you cannot think clearly when there is great pain. It is the function of the brain to register that pain so as to safeguard itself from doing things that will bring about pain. It must register and then there is the fear of that pain happening again later - that registration has caused fear. Is it possible, having had that pain, to

end it, not carry it on, not carry it over? If so, then the brain has the security of being free and intelligent; but the moment the pain is carried over it is never free.

Is it possible to register only the things that are absolutely necessary? The necessary things are the knowledge of how to drive a car, how to speak a language, technological knowledge, the knowledge of reading, writing and so on. But in our human relationships, those between man and woman for example, every incident in that relationship is registered. What takes place? The woman is irritated, nags, or is friendly, kindly, or says something just before the man goes off to the office, which is ugly; so from this there is built up, through registration, an image about her and she builds an image about him - this is factual. In human relationships, between man and woman, or between neighbours and so on, there is registration and the process of image making. But when the husband says something ugly listen to it carefully, end it, do not carry it on; then you will find that there is no image-making at all. If there is no image-making between a man and a woman the relationship is entirely different; there is no longer the relationship of one thought opposed to another thought - which is called relationship, which actually it is not; it is just ideas.

Pleasure follows registration of an incident in the continuation given by thought. Thought is the root of pleasure. If you had no thought and you saw a beautiful thing it would rest at that. But thought says: "No I must have that; from this flows the whole movement of thought.

What is the relationship of pleasure to joy? Joy comes to you uninvited, it happens. You are walking along in a street, or sitting

in a bus, or wandering in the woods, seeing the flowers, the hills, and the clouds and the blue sky and suddenly there is the extraordinary feeling of great joy; then comes the registration, thought says: "What a marvellous thing that was, I must have more of it." So, again, joy is made into pleasure by thought. This is seeing things as they are, not as you want them to be; it is seeing them exactly, without any distortion, seeing what is taking place.

What is love? Is it pleasure; which is the continuation of an incident through the movement of thought? Is the movement of thought love? Is love remembrance? A thing has happened and living in its remembrance, feeling that remembrance of something which is over, resuscitating it and saying, "What a marvellous thing that was when we were together under that tree; that was love" - all that is the remembrance of a thing that is gone. Is that love? Is love the pleasure of sex? - in which there is tenderness, kindness and so on - is that love? That is not to say that it is, or that it is not.

We are questioning everything that man has put together of which he says: "This is love." If love is pleasure then it gives emphasis to the remembrance of past things and therefore brings about the importance of the me - my pleasure, my excitement, my remembrances. Is that love? And is love desire? What is desire? One desires a car; one desires a house; one desires prominence, power, position. There are infinite things one desires; to be as beautiful as you are; to be as intelligent, as clever, as smart as you are. Does desire bring clarity?

The thing that is called love is based on desire - desire to sleep with a woman, or sleep with a man, desire to possess her, dominate her, control her, "she is mine, not yours." Is love in the pleasure

derived in that possession, in that dominance? Man dominates the world and now there is woman fighting the domination.

What is desire? Does desire bring about clarity? In its field does compassion flower? If it does not bring clarity and if desire is not the field in which the beauty and the greatness of compassion flower, then what place has desire? How does desire arise? One sees a beautiful woman, or a beautiful man - one sees. There is the perception, the seeing, then the contact, then the sensation, then that sensation is taken over by thought, which becomes the image with its desire. You see a beautiful vase, a beautiful sculpture - ancient Egyptian, or Greek - and you look at it and you touch it; you see the depth of sculpture of the figure sitting cross-legged. From that there is a sensation. What a marvellous thing and from that sensation desire; "I wish I had that in my room; to look at it every day, touch it every day" - the pride of possession, to have such a marvellous thing as that. That is desire: seeing, contact, sensation, then thought using that sensation to cultivate the desire to possess - or not to possess.

Now comes the difficulty: realizing this the religious people have said: "Take vows of celibacy; do not look at a woman; if you do look treat her as your sister, mother, whatever you like; because you are in the service of God you need all your energy to serve Him; in the service of God you are going to have great tribulations, therefore be prepared, but do not waste your energy." But the thing is boiling and we are trying to understand that desire which is constantly boiling, wanting to fulfil, wanting to complete itself.

Desire arises from the movement - seeing - contact - sensation - thought with its image - desire. Now we are saying: seeing -

touching - sensation, that is normal, healthy - end it there, do not let thought take it over and make it into a desire. Understand this and then you will also understand that there will be no suppression of desire. You see a beautiful house, well proportioned with lovely windows, a roof that melts into the sky, walls that are thick and part of the earth, a beautiful garden, well kept. You look at it, there is sensation; you touch it - you may not actually touch it but you touch it with your eyes - you smell the air, the herbs, the newly-cut grass. Can you not end it there? End it there, say: "It is a beautiful house; but there is no registration and no thought which says: "I wish I had that house" - which is desire and the continuation of desire. You can do this so easily; and I mean easily, if you understand the nature of thought and desire.

Is thought love? Does thought cultivate love? It is not pleasure, it is not desire, it is not remembrance, although they have their places. Then what is love? Is love jealousy? Is love a sense of possession, my wife, my husband, my girl - possession? Has love within it fear? It is none of these things, entirely wipe them all away, end them, putting them all in their right place - then love is.

Through negation the positive is - through negation; that is: is pleasure love? - you examine pleasure and see it is not that - though pleasure has its place it is not that - so you negate that. You see it is not remembrance though remembrance is necessary; so put remembrance in its right place, therefore you have negated remembrance as not being love. You have negated desire, though desire has a certain place. Therefore through negation the positive is. But we, on the contrary, posit the positive and then get caught in the negative. One must begin with doubt - completely doubting -

then you end up with certainty. But if you start with certainty, then you end up in uncertainty and chaos.

So in negation the positive is born.

**THE WHOLENESS OF LIFE PART II CHAPTER  
9 7TH PUBLIC TALK SAANEN 24TH JULY 1977  
'BECAUSE THERE IS SPACE, THERE IS  
EMPTINESS AND TOTAL SILENCE.'**

Time, for us, is very important, both chronologically and psychologically. We depend so much on psychological time. Time is related to movement - from here to there takes time. A distance to be covered, to arrive at a goal, to fulfil a purpose, requires time.

To learn a language requires time. That has been carried over into the psychological field: "We need time to be perfect; we need time to get over something; we need time to be free of our anxieties; to be free of our sorrow; to be free of our fears and so on." Time is needed in practical matters, in the field of technology and so on and that need for time has been introduced into our psychological life and we have accepted it. To wipe away our nationalities, to become brotherly we think we need time.

Psychological time implies hope; the world is mad, let us hope in the future there will be a sane world. We are questioning whether there is such a thing as psychological time at all. We ask: Is there an action in which time is not involved at all? Action arising from a cause, a motive, needs time. Action based on a pattern of memory needs time to put into action. If you have an ideal, however noble, however beautiful and romantic, however nonsensical even, you need time to arrive at that idealistic state. And to arrive at that you destroy the present. It does not matter what happens to you now; what is important is the future. For the sake of the future sacrifice yourself now - some marvellous future

established by the ideologists, the religious teachers and so on throughout the world. We question that and ask whether there is any psychological time at all and therefore no hope. "What shall I do if I have no hope?" Hope is so important because it gives you satisfaction, energy, drive to achieve something.

When one looks closely, non-sentimentally, logically, is there psychological time at all? There is psychological time only when one moves away from "what is". There is psychological time when one realizes that one is violent and then proceeds to enquire how to be free of it; that movement away from "what is" is time. But if one is totally and completely aware of "what is", then there is no such time.

Most of us are violent. Violence is not only hitting somebody physically, but anger, jealousy, acceptance of authority, conformity, imitation, accepting the edicts of another. Human beings are violent; that is the fact - violence. The very word "violence" condemns it. By the very usage of the word "violence" you have already condemned violence. See the intricacies of this. Being violent and being negligent, or lazy, we move away from it and invent ideological non-violence. That is time - the movement from "what is" to "what should be". That time comes to an end, completely, when there is only "what is" - which is non-verbal identification with "what is". Anger is a form of violence, or hatred, jealousy. The words "anger", "hatred" or "jealousy" in themselves are condemnatory; they are verbalizations which strengthen by reaction. When I say "I am angry," I have recognized from past angers the present anger, so I am using the word "anger" which is of the past and identifying that word with the present. The



word has become extraordinarily important; yet if there is no usage of the word so that there is only the fact, the reaction, then there is no strengthening of that feeling.

Is it possible to live, psychologically, without tomorrow? To say: "I love you, I will meet you tomorrow", that affection is in memory projected towards tomorrow. Is there an activity without time at all? Love is not time; it is not a remembrance. If it is, it is not love, obviously. "I love you because you gave me sex; or you gave me food, or flattered me; or you said you needed a companion; I am lonely therefore I need you" - all that is not love, surely? When there is jealousy, when there is anxiety or hatred, that is not love. So then what is love? Love is obviously a state of mind in which there is no verbalization, no remembrance, but something immediate.

There is a way of living, in daily life, where time as movement from this state to that, has gone. What happens when you do that? You have an extraordinary vitality, an extraordinary sense of clarity. You are then only dealing with facts, not with ideas. But as most of us are imprisoned in ideas and have accepted that way of life, it is very difficult to break away. But, have an insight into it, then it is finished.

Our minds are so cluttered up, with knowledge, with worries, with problems, with money, with position and prestige; they are so burdened that there is no space at all; yet without space there is no order.

When I look at this valley from a height and there is a direction because I want to see where I live, then I lose the vastness of space. Where there is direction space is limited. Where there is a purpose,

a goal, something to be achieved, there is no space. If you have a purpose in life for which you are living, concentrating, where is there space? Whereas if there is no concentration there is vast space.

When there is a centre from which we look, then space is very limited. When there is no centre, that is to say, no structure of the me which has been put together by thought, there is vast space. Without space there is no order, there is no clarity, there is no compassion.

Living where there is no effort, where there is no action of will, where there is tremendous space, is part of meditation.

So far we have only dealt with the waves on the surface of the ocean. You have only dealt with the superficiality of it. Now, if you have gone so far you can go into the depth of the ocean - of course you must understand how to dive deeply; not you dive, it comes about.

There is concentration, choiceless awareness and attention. Concentration implies resistance. Concentration on a particular thing, on the page you are reading, or on the phrase you are trying to understand: to concentrate is to put all your energy in a particular direction. In concentration there is resistance and therefore effort and division. You want to concentrate, thought goes off on something else, you bring it back - the fight. If you are interested in something you concentrate very easily. Implied in the word concentrate is putting your mind on a particular object, a particular picture, a particular action.

Choiceless awareness is to be aware both externally and inwardly, without any choice. Just to be aware of the trees, the

mountains, nature, just to be aware. Not choose, saying, "I like this", "I don't like that", or "I want this", "I don't want that". It is to observe without the observer. The observer is the past, which is conditioned, always looking from that conditioned point of view, therefore there is like and dislike and so on. To be choicelessly aware implies observing the whole environment around you, the mountains, the trees, also the ugly world and the towns; just to be aware, observe and in that observation there is no decision, no will, no choice.

In attention there is no centre, there is no me attending. When there is no me which limits attention then attention is limitless; attention has limitless space.

After understanding all the waves on the surface - fear, authority, all the petty affairs compared to that which we are going into - the mind has then emptied consciousness of the whole of its content. It is empty; not through action of will, not through desire, not through choice. Consciousness, then, is totally different, is of a totally different dimension.

Because there is space there is emptiness and total silence - not induced silence, not practised silence; which are all just the movement of thought and therefore absolutely worthless. When you have gone through all this - and there is great delight in going through all this, it is like playing a tremendous game - then in that total silence there is a movement which is timeless, which is not measured by thought - thought has no place in it whatsoever - then there is something totally sacred, timeless.

**THE WHOLENESS OF LIFE PART II CHAPTER  
10 5TH PUBLIC TALK SAANEN 19TH JULY 1977  
'THE STATE OF THE MIND THAT HAS  
INSIGHT IS COMPLETELY EMPTY.'**

An awakened intelligence has a deep, true, insight into all our psychological problems, crises, blockages and so on; not intellectual comprehension, not the resolving of problems through conflict. Having an insight into a human issue is to awaken this intelligence; or, having this intelligence, there is the insight - both ways. In such insight there is no conflict; when you see something very clearly, when you see the truth of the matter, there is the end of it, you do not fight against it, you do not try to control, you do not make all manner of calculated, motivated, efforts. From that insight, which is intelligence, there is action - not postponed action but immediate action.

We are educated from childhood to exercise, as deeply as possible, every form of effort. If you observe yourself you will see what tremendous efforts we make to control ourselves, to suppress, adjust and modify ourselves to certain patterns or objectives that you or another have established; so there is constant struggle. We live with it and we die with it. And we ask: Is it possible to live our daily life without a single conflict?

Most of us are awakened to all the problems, political, religious, economic, social, ideological and so on, in which we live. Being somewhat aware of all that most of us are discontent. When you are young, this dissatisfaction becomes like a flame and you have a passion to do something. So you join some political party, the

extreme Left, the extreme revolutionary, the extreme forms of "Jesus freaks" and so on and so on. By joining these things, by adopting certain attitudes, certain ideologies, that flame of discontent fades away and you then appear to be satisfied. You say: "This is what I want to do" and you pour your heart into it. But gradually you find, if you are at all awake to the problems involved, that you are not satisfied. It is too late; you have already given half your life to something which you thought would be completely worthwhile and you have found later on that it is not so; then your energy, capacity and drive has withered away. Gradually the real flame of discontent has withered away. You must have noticed the pattern that has been followed all the time, generation after generation, in yourself, in your children, in the young and the old.

But if you are alive to all these things and are discontented and if you do not allow this discontent to be squashed by the desire to be satisfied, by the desire to adjust oneself to the environment, to the "establishment", or to an ideal, to a Utopia, if you allow this flame to keep on burning, not being satisfied with anything, then the superficial satisfactions have no place; then this very dissatisfaction is demanding something much greater and the ideals, the gurus, the religions, the "establishment", become totally superficial. This flame of discontent, because it has no outlet, because it has no object in which it can fulfil itself, that flame becomes a great passion. That passion is intelligence. If you are not caught in these superficial, essentially reactionary things, then that extraordinary flame is intensified. That intensity brings about a quality of mind having a deep insight instantly into things, and

from that there is action.

Such dissatisfaction does not make you neurotic or bring about imbalance. There is imbalance only when this dissatisfaction is translated, or caught in a trap of some kind or another; then there is distortion, then there are all kinds of fights, inwardly.

If you have been caught in these various traps, can you put them aside, wipe them out, destroy them? - do what you like, but have this tremendous flame of discontent now. It does not mean that you throw bombs at people, destroy, indulge in physical revolution and riots. When you put aside all the traps that man has created around you and that you have created for yourself, then this flame becomes a supreme intelligence. And that intelligence gives you insight. And when you have insight, from that there is immediate action.

Action is not tomorrow. There is an action without cause; it has been a problem for many great thinkers; action without cause, action without motive, action not dependent on some ideology. One of the demands of serious people is to find out if there is an action which is per se, for itself; which is without cause and motive. See what is implied in it: no regrets, no retention of those regrets and all the sequence that follows from those regrets, such action does not depend on some past or future ideology; it is an action which is always free. It is an action that is only possible when there is insight born of intelligence.

Most people would say that there must be conflict otherwise there is no growth; that conflict is part of life. A tree in a forest struggles to reach the sun; that is a form of conflict. Every animal is in conflict. And we human beings, supposed to be intelligent, are

yet constantly in conflict. Now discontent says: "Why should I be in conflict?" Conflict implies comparison, imitation, conformity, adjustment to a pattern, the modified continuity of what has been, through the present, to the future - all a process of conflict. The deeper the conflict the more neurotic you become. And so, in order to have respite from conflict you believe most deeply in God, saying: "His will be done" - and we create this monstrous world.

Conflict implies comparison. Can one live without comparison? which means no ideal, no authority of a pattern, no conformity to a particular ideology. It implies freedom from the prison of ideas so that there is no comparison, no imitation, no conformity; therefore you are stuck with "what is" - actually what is. Comparison comes only when you compare "what is" with "what should be", or "what might be", or try to transform "what is" into something which it is not and all this implies conflict.

To live without comparison is to remove a tremendous burden. If you remove the burden of comparison, imitation, conformity, adjustment, modification, then you are left with "what is". Conflict arises only when you try to do something with "what is", try to transform it, to modify it, to change it, or to suppress it, run away from it. But if you have an insight into "what is" then conflict ceases; you are left with "what is". And what happens to "what is"? What is the state of your mind when you are looking at "what is"? What is the state of your mind when you are not escaping, not trying to transform, or deform "what is"? What is the state of that mind that is looking and has insight? The state of the mind that has insight is completely empty. It is free from escapes, free from suppression, analysis and so on. When all these burdens are taken

away - because you see the absurdity of them, it is like taking away a heavy burden - there is freedom. Freedom implies an emptiness to observe. That emptiness gives you insight into violence - not the various forms of violence, but the whole nature of violence and the structure of violence; therefore there is immediate action about violence, which is to be free, completely, from all violence.



# **THE WHOLENESS OF LIFE PART II CHAPTER 11 5TH PUBLIC TALK SAANEN 19TH JULY 1977 'WHERE THERE IS SUFFERING YOU CANNOT POSSIBLY LOVE'**

We say that love is part of suffering. When you love somebody it brings about suffering. We are going to question whether it is possible to be free of all suffering. When there is freedom from suffering in the consciousness of the human being then that freedom brings about a transformation in consciousness and that transformation affects the whole of mankind's suffering. That is part of compassion.

Where there is suffering you cannot possibly love. That is a truth, a law. When you love somebody and he or she does something of which you totally disapprove and you suffer, it shows that you do not love. See the truth of it. How can you suffer when your wife throws you away and goes after somebody else? Yet we suffer from that. We get angry, jealous, envious, hateful; at the same time we say, "I love my wife"! Such love is not love. So, is it possible not to suffer and yet have the flowering of immense love?

What is the nature and the essence of suffering - the essence of it, not the various forms of it? What is the essence of suffering? Is it not the total expression, at that moment, of complete self-centred existence? It is the essence of the me - the essence of the ego, the person, the limited, enclosed, resisting existence, which is called the "me". When there is an incident that demands understanding and insight, that is denied by the awakening of the me, the essence which is the cause of suffering. If there were no me, would there be

suffering? One would help, one would do all kinds of things, but one would not suffer.

Suffering is the expression of the me; it includes self-pity, loneliness, trying to escape, trying to be with the other who is gone - and all else that is implied. Suffering is the very me, which is the image, the knowledge, the remembrance of the past. So, what relationship has suffering, the essence of the me, to love? Is there any relationship between love and suffering? The me is put together by thought: but is love put together by thought?

Is love put together by thought? - the memories of the pains, the delights, and the pursuit of pleasure, sexual or otherwise, of the pleasure of possessing somebody and somebody liking to be possessed; all that is the structure of thought. The me with its name, with its form, its memory, is put together by thought - obviously. But if love is not put together by thought, then suffering has no relationship to love. Therefore action from love is different from action from suffering.

What place has thought in relation to love and in relation to suffering? To have an insight into it means you are neither escaping, wanting comfort, frightened to be lonely, isolated; it means therefore your mind is free and that which is free is empty. If you have that emptiness you have an insight into suffering. Then suffering as the me disappears. There is immediate action because that is so; action then is from love, not from suffering.

One discovers that action from suffering is the action of the me and that therefore there is constant conflict. One can see the logic of it all, the reason for it. Only so is it possible to love without a shadow of suffering. Thought is not love; thought is not

compassion. Compassion is intelligence - which is not the outcome of thought. What is the action of intelligence? If one has intelligence it is operating, it is functioning, it is acting. But if one asks: What is the action of intelligence? - one merely wants thought to be satisfied. When one asks: What is the action of compassion? - is it not thought that is asking? Is it not the me that is saying: If I could have this compassion I would act differently? Therefore when one puts such questions one is still caught in terms of thought, But with an insight into thought then thought has its right place and intelligence then acts.

# **THE WHOLENESS OF LIFE PART II CHAPTER 12 3RD PUBLIC TALK BROCKWOOD PARK 3RD SEPTEMBER 1977 'SORROW IS THE OUTCOME OF TIME AND THOUGHT'**

We are concerned with the whole existence of man and whether a human being can ever be free from his travail, his efforts, his anxieties, violence and brutality, and whether there is an end to sorrow.

Why have human beings, throughout the ages, sustained and put up with suffering? Can there be an ending to it all?

One must be free of all ideologies. Ideologies are dangerous illusions, whether they are political, social, religious, or personal. Every form of ideology either ends up in totalitarianism, or in religious conditioning - as the Catholic, the Protestant, the Hindu, the Buddhist and so on; and ideologies become such great burdens. So, to go into the enormous question of suffering, one must be free from all ideologies. One may have experienced a great deal of suffering which may have brought about certain definite conclusions. But to enquire into this question one must be utterly free of all conclusions.

Obviously there is biological, physical, suffering, and that suffering may distort the mind if one is not very careful. But we are concerned with the psychological suffering of man. In investigating suffering we are investigating the suffering of all mankind, because each one of us is of the essence of all humanity; each one of us is, psychologically, inwardly, deeply, like the rest of mankind.

They suffer, they go through great anxiety, uncertainty, confusion, violence, through great sense of grief, loss, loneliness, as each one of us does. There is no division, psychologically, between us all. We are the world, psychologically, and the world is us. That is not a conviction, that is not a conclusion, that is not an intellectual theory, but an actuality, to be felt, to be realized and to be lived. Investigating this question of sorrow one is investigating not only one's own personal limited sorrow but also the sorrow of mankind. Do not reduce it to a personal thing, because when one sees the enormous suffering of mankind, in the understanding of the enormity of it, the wholeness of it, then one's own part has a role in it. It is not a selfish enquiry concerned with how I am to be free of sorrow. If one makes it personal, limited, then one will not understand the full significance of the enormity of sorrow.

In opposition to sorrow there is happiness, as in one's consciousness there is the bad and the good. In one's consciousness there is sorrow and a sense of happiness. In enquiring one is not concerned with sorrow as an opposite to happiness, gladness, enjoyment but with sorrow itself. The opposites contain each other. If the good is the outcome of the bad, then the good contains the bad. And if sorrow is the opposite of happiness, then the enquiry into sorrow has its root in happiness. We are enquiring into sorrow per se, not as an opposite to something else.

It is important to understand how one observes the nature and the movement of sorrow. How does one look at one's sorrow? If one looks at it as though it was different from oneself then there is a division between oneself and that which one calls sorrow. But is that sorrow different from oneself? Is the observer of sorrow

different from sorrow itself? Or is it that the observer is sorrow? It is not that he is free from sorrow and then looks at sorrow, or identifies with sorrow. Sorrow is not just in the field of the observer; he is sorrow. The observer is the observed. The experiencer is the experienced; just as the thinker is the thought. There is no division as when the observer says "I am in sorrow", and who then divides himself off and tries to do something about sorrow - run away from it; seek comfort; suppress it; and all the various means of attempting to transcend sorrow. Whereas, if one sees that the observer is the observed, which is a fact, then one eliminates altogether the division that brings about conflict. One has been brought up, educated, to think that the observer is something totally different from the observed; as for example: one is the analyser therefore one can analyse - but the analyser is the analysed. So in this perception there is no division between the observer and the observed, between the thinker and the thought - there is no thought without the thinker - if there is no thinker there is no thought - they are one.

So if one sees that the observer is the observed, then one is not dictating what sorrow is, one is not telling sorrow what it should be, or not be, one is just observing without any choice, without any movement of thought.

There are various kinds of sorrow; the man who has no work; the man who will always remain poor, the man who will never enjoy clean clothes or a fresh bath - as happens among the poor. There is the sorrow of ignorance, the sorrow when children are maltreated, the sorrow when animals are killed - vivisection and so on. There is the sorrow of war, which affects the whole of

mankind. There is the sorrow when someone whom you love, dies. There is the sorrow of the desire to fulfil and the ensuing failure and frustration. So, there are multiple kinds of sorrow. Does one deal with all the multiple expressions of sorrow piecemeal? Or does one deal with the root of sorrow as a whole? Does one take each expression of the hundreds of varieties of sorrow? Or go to the very root of sorrow? If one takes all the multiple expressions of sorrow there will be no end. One may trim them individually, diminish them, but more will always remain. Can one look at the multiple branches of sorrow and through that observation go into the very root of sorrow, from the outside go inside and examine what is at the root, the cause? If one does not end sorrow there is no love in one's heart - although one may pity others and be troubled by the slaughter that is going on.

What is sorrow? Why does one suffer? Is it that one has lost something that one had? Or is there suffering because one has been promised a reward and that reward has not been given? - because we are educated through reward and punishment. Does one suffer because of self-pity? Because one has not the things that another has? Does one suffer through comparison, measurement? Does one suffer because, through limitation, one has not been able to achieve that which one is trying to imitate - trying to conform to a pattern and never reaching that pattern fully, completely? So one asks very deeply: What is suffering and why does one suffer?

One must be very careful in examination to see whether the word "sorrow" itself weighs down on man. Sorrow has been praised, romanticized. It has been made into something that is essential in order to find reality - one must go through suffering to

find love, pity, compassion. We seek through suffering a reward. Does not the word "sorrow" bring about the feeling of sorrow? Or, independent of that word and the stimulation of that word, the reaction of that word, is there sorrow by itself? If this examination is a matter of tremendous crisis in one's life, as it must be, then, when there is sorrow, it is a challenge and all one's energy is brought into being - otherwise one dissipates that energy by running away, seeking comfort, inventing explanations such as karma and so on. It is a challenge: What is sorrow? Is there an ending to sorrow? One can only respond completely to it when one has no fear, when one is not caught up in the machinery of pleasure, when one is not escaping from it, seeking comfort, but responding to it with all one's energy - a response that is the expression of the totality of one's energy.

In the understanding of the cause of sorrow does sorrow disappear? I may say to myself: "I am full of self-pity, if I can end self-pity there will be no sorrow." So I work at getting rid of it because I see how silly it is; I try to suppress it; I worry about it like a dog with a bone. And I may, intellectually, think I am free from sorrow. But the uncovering of the cause of sorrow is not the ending of sorrow. The searching for the cause of sorrow is a wastage of energy; sorrow is there, demanding one's tremendous attention. It is a challenge asking one to act. But instead of that one says: "Let me look to the cause; let me find out; is it this, that, or the other? I may be mistaken; let me talk it over with others; or is there some book that will tell me what the real cause is?" But all this is moving away from the actual fact, the actual, response to that challenge.



If one's mind, the movement of its thought, is looking through its memory and responding according to that memory, according to previous knowledge, then one is acting not directly to the challenge, but merely responding from memory, from the past. I am in sorrow, my son, my wife, or the social conditions - the poverty, the brutality of man - bring about a great sorrow in me. It wants a response, a complete response, from me as a human being who represents the totality of humanity. If thought responds to the challenge saying: "I must find out how to respond to it; I have had sorrow before and I know all the meaning of the suffering and the pain, the anxiety and the loneliness of sorrow," then it is responding according to remembrance, therefore it is not an actual response; it is not actually seeing the fact that any response to that challenge from memory is no response at all, it is mere reaction. It is not action, it is reaction. Once see that, then the question is: What is the root of it all - not the cause? When there is a cause there is an effect and the effect in turn becomes a cause and the action from that becomes the cause for the next action. There is a chain effect. When the mind is caught in this limited chain, and it is always limited, then any response to the challenge will be very limited and time bound. But can one act to that challenge without a time interval? One may not actually have had any immediate sorrow, but one sees the enormity of the sorrow of mankind - the global sorrow of mankind. If one responds to that according to one's conditioning, according to one's past memory, then one is caught in action that is always time binding. The challenge and its response demand no time interval. Therefore there is instant action.

Fear is the movement of thought - thought as measure. Fear is

time. Thought is the response of memory, knowledge, experience; it is limited; it is a movement in time. If there is no time there is no fear. I am living now but I am afraid I might die - I might in the future. There is a time interval produced by thought. But if there is no time interval at all, there is no fear. So, in the same way: is the root of sorrow time? - time being the movement of thought. And if there is no thought at all, when one responds to that challenge, is there suffering?

Can one put away, for the time being, all one's habitual ideas about time, sorrow and fear? Put away all one's conclusions, all that one has read about sorrow and begin again as though one knew nothing about sorrow. Though one suffers one has no answer to it. But one has been so conditioned: put the burden of sorrow on to somebody else, as Christianity has done so beautifully; go to church and one sees all the suffering in that figure. The Christians have given all that suffering over to somebody and think by that they have understood the whole vast field of sorrow. In India, in the Asiatic countries, they have also another form of evasion - karma. But face the actual movement at the moment of sorrow and be completely choicelessly aware of that thing and one asks: Is time, which is thought, the fundamental issue that makes sorrow flower? Is thought responsible for suffering? - not only the suffering of others, the brutality of others, but for the total ignorance of this whole earth.

There is no new thought; there is no free thought. There is only thought and that is the response of knowledge and experience, stored up in the brain as memory. Now if that is fact, if one sees that it is true that sorrow is the outcome of time and thought - if

that is not a supposition - then one is responding to sorrow without the me for the me is put together by thought. My name, my form, how I look, my qualities, my reactions, all the things that are acquired, are all put together by thought. Thought is `me'. Time is `me', the self, the ego, the personality, all that is the movement of time as me. When there is no time, when one responds to this challenge of suffering and there is no me, then, is there suffering?

Is not all sorrow based on me, the individual, the personality, the ego? It is the self that says, "I suffer", "I am lonely", "I am anxious", this whole movement, this whole structure, is me in thought. And thought posits not only me but also that I am a superior me - something far superior to thought; yet it is still the movement of thought. So, there is an ending to sorrow when there is no me.

## **THE WHOLENESS OF LIFE PART II CHAPTER 13 3RD PUBLIC TALK BROCKWOOD PARK 3RD SEPTEMBER 1977 'WHAT IS DEATH?'**

One has known of thousands of deaths - the death of someone very close or the death of masses through the atomic bomb - Hiroshima and all the horrors that man has perpetrated on other human beings in the name of peace and in the pursuit of ideologies. So, without any ideology, without any conclusion, one asks: What is death? What is the thing that dies - that terminates? One sees that if there is something that is continuous it becomes mechanical. If there is an ending to everything there is a new beginning. If one is afraid then one cannot possibly find out what this immense thing called death is. It must be the most extraordinary thing. To find out what death is one must also enquire into what life is before death. One never does that. One never enquires what living is. Death is inevitable; but what is living? Is this living, this enormous suffering, fear, anxiety, sorrow, and all the rest of it - is this living? Clinging to that one is afraid of death. If one does not know what living is one cannot know what death is - they go together. If one can find out what the full meaning of living is, the totality of living, the wholeness of living, then one is capable of understanding the wholeness of death. But one usually enquires into the meaning of death without enquiring into the meaning of life.

When one asks: What is the meaning of life? - one immediately has conclusions. One says it is this; one gives it a significance according to one's conditioning. If one is an idealist, one gives life

an ideological significance; again, according to one's conditioning, according to what one has read and so on. But if one is not giving a particular significance to life, if one is not saying life is this or something else, then one is free, free of ideologies, of systems, political, religious or social. So, before one enquires into the meaning of death one is asking what living is. Is the life one is living, living? The constant struggle with each other? Trying to understand each other? Is living according to a book, according to some psychologists, according to some orthodoxy living?

If one banishes all that, totally, then one will begin with "what is". "What is" is that our living has become a tremendous torture, a tremendous battle between human beings, man, woman, neighbour - whether close or far. It is a conflict in which there is occasional freedom to look at the blue sky, to see something lovely and enjoy it and be happy for a while; but the cloud of struggle soon returns. All this we call living; going to church with all the traditional repetition, or the new English repetition, accepting certain ideologies. This is what one calls living and one is so committed to it one accepts it. But discontentment has its significance - real discontent. Discontent is a flame and one suppresses it by childish acts, by momentary satisfactions; but discontent when you let it flower, arise, it burns away everything that is not true.

Can one live a life that is whole, not fragmented? - a life in which thought does not divide as the family, the office, the church, this and that and death so divided off that when it comes one is appalled by it, one is shocked by it so that one's mind is incapable of meeting it because one has not lived a total life.

Death comes and with that one cannot argue; one cannot say:

"Wait a few minutes more" - it is there. When it comes, can the mind meet the end of everything while one is living, while one has vitality and energy, while one is full of life? When one's life is not wasted in conflicts and worries one is full of energy, clarity. Death means the ending of all that one knows, of all one's attachments, of one's bank accounts, of all one's attainments - there is a complete ending. Can the mind, while living, meet such a state? Then one will understand the full meaning of what death is. If one clings to the idea of 'me', that me which one believes must continue, the me that is put together by thought, including the me in which one believes there is the higher consciousness, the supreme consciousness, then one will not understand what death is in life.

Thought lives in the known; it is the outcome of the known; if there is not freedom from the known one cannot possibly find out what death is, which is the ending of everything, the physical organism with all its ingrained habits, the identification with the body, with the name, with all the memories it has acquired. One cannot carry it all over when one goes to death. One cannot carry there all one's money; so, in the same way one has to end in life everything that one knows. That means there is absolute aloneness; not loneliness but aloneness, in the sense there is nothing else but that state of mind that is completely whole. Aloneness means all one.

# **THE WHOLENESS OF LIFE PART II CHAPTER 14 4TH PUBLIC TALK BROCKWOOD PARK 4TH SEPTEMBER 1977 'THAT EMPTINESS IS THE SUMMATION OF ALL ENERGY'**

One's consciousness, which is oneself, is filled with one's own concepts and conclusions and with other people's ideas; it is filled with one's fears, anxieties and pleasures and with occasional flashes of joy and with one's sorrow. That is one's consciousness. That is the pattern of one's existence.

Is it at all possible to bring about a radical change in one's consciousness? For if it is not possible then one is everlastingly living in a prison of one's own ideas, one's own concepts - living in a field where there is every kind of confusion, uncertainty, instability. And one seems to think that if one moves from one corner of that field to another one has greatly changed, but still one is in the same field. As long as one lives within the field that one calls one's consciousness, however little or however great it may change, yet in that field there is no fundamental human transformation.

Ideologies, however clever, however carefully thought out, ultimately bring about dangerous illusions - whether they are the ideologies of the Right, Centre, or the extreme Left, they all end up either in great bureaucracies controlling man, or in concentration camps, or the destructive moulding of man according to a particular concept. This is what is happening throughout the world; the intellectuals have led us to this point.

We have been prisoners of religious ideologies and dogmas -

the Catholic, the Hindu, the Buddhist and so on, and the gurus, with their modern modifications of the ancient traditions and ideologies, are also the prisoners of those ideologies.

If one observes all this, carefully, impersonally, objectively, one realizes that one must put away all ideologies and ask oneself whether consciousness with its content - which is what one is, with all one's conflicts, struggles, confusions, misery and occasional happiness - can become aware of itself and empty itself? That is one problem in meditation.

Meditation is not seeking an end; it is not groping purposefully after a goal. Out of meditation comes immense silence; not cultivated silence, not the silence between two thoughts, between two noises, but a silence that is unimaginable. The brain becomes extraordinarily quiet when in this process of enquiry; when there is silence there is great perception. In this silence there is emptiness, an emptiness that is the summation of all energy.

In examining the question of consciousness and its content it is very important to find out whether one, oneself, is observing it, or if in observing, consciousness becomes aware of itself. There is a difference. Either, one observes the movement of one's consciousness - one's desires, hurts, ambitions, greeds and all the rest of the content of our consciousness - as if from the outside; or consciousness becomes aware of itself. This is only possible when thought realizes that it is only observing what it has created, which is the content of its consciousness; then thought realizes that it is only observing itself, not 'me' which thought has put together observing consciousness. There is only observation; then consciousness begins to reveal its content, not only the superficial



consciousness but the deeper layers of consciousness, the whole content of consciousness. If one sees the importance of sheer absolute motionless observation, then the thing flowers; consciousness opens up its doors.

One learns the art of observing without any distortion, without any motive, without any purpose just to observe. In that there is tremendous beauty because then there is no distortion. One sees things clearly as they are. But if one makes an abstraction of them into ideas and then through the ideas observes, then it is a distortion.

One freely, without any distorting factor, enters into the observation of consciousness. There is nothing hidden and consciousness begins to reveal its own totality, its content, one's hurts, greed, envy, happiness, beliefs, ideologies, past traditions, the present scientific or factual traditions and so on and so on - all that is our consciousness. One observes it without any movement of thought; because it is thought that has put together all the content of our consciousness - thought has built it. When thought comes and says: "This is right, this is wrong, this shouldn't be, that should", one is still within the field of consciousness; one is not going beyond it. One has to understand very clearly the place of thought; it has its own place, in the field of knowledge, technology and so on. But thought has no place whatsoever in the psychological structure of man. So, can one observe one's consciousness and does it reveal its content? - not bit by bit, but the totality of its movement. Then only is it possible to go beyond it.

In enquiring, can one observe without any movement of the eye? Because the eye has an effect on the brain. When one keeps

the eyeballs completely still observation becomes very clear because the brain is quietened. So, can one observe without any movement of thought interfering with one's observation? It is only possible when the observer realizes that he and that which he is observing are one - the observer is the observed. Anger is not different from me - I am anger, I am jealousy. There is no division between the observer and the observed; that is the basic reality one must capture. Then the whole of consciousness begins to reveal itself without the making of any effort. In that total observation there is the emptying of, or the going beyond, all the things that thought has put together - which is one's consciousness.

Then there is the problem of time - time psychologically, as a movement towards the fulfilment of an idea, an ideology. One is greedy, or violent: one says to oneself: "I will take time to get over it, or to modify it, or change it, or to get rid of it, or to go beyond it." That time is psychological time, not chronological time, by the watch or by the sun. There is this whole conditioning of one's mind which says: "I will take time to achieve that which I consider to be essential, to be beautiful, to be good." One questions that time, and asks: Is there psychological time at all? Is it not that thought has invented that time?

This is a very important thing to understand because it shatters altogether the idea of tomorrow - psychologically. It is a tremendous fact. If one understands that, psychologically, there is no tomorrow, then what will one do with that "which is"? If there is no time, then how is violence to end? One is conditioned to use time as a means of getting rid, slowly or quickly, of - say - violence. But if there is no time at all then what takes place when

there is violence? Will there be violence? If it is one's whole outlook that, psychologically, there is no time at all, then is there a me who is violent? The me is put together through time. The me as violence, is time. But if there is no time at all as me, then there is nothing, there is no violence.

If there is no time at all, there is no past or future, but only something else, totally different. One is so conditioned to time and one says psychologically, that there must be time for me to evolve, for me to become something other than that which I am. When one sees the truth of the fact that thought itself is the cause of this time, then there is an ending of the past and the future; there is only the sense of timeless movement now. It is really extraordinary if one understands this. And, after all, love is that. Love is at the same level, at the same time, at the same intensity; at that moment that is love - not the remembrance of it, or the future hope for it. That state of mind, which is love, is really completely without time. Then see what happens in one's relationship with another. One perhaps has that extraordinary sense of love which is not of time, which is not of thought, which is not a remembrance of pleasure or pain; then what is the relationship between one who has that and another who has not? One has no image about another because the image is the movement of time, thought has built images step by step about another and that is no longer happening; but the other has made images about oneself step by step; for the other is in a movement of time and oneself has no time at all. One has this extraordinary sense of love which is not of time. What then is one's relationship with another? When one has that extraordinary quality of love then in that quality there is supreme intelligence. That

intelligence is going to act in that relationship, it is not oneself who will act in that relationship. It is really a marvellous thing to go into because it totally alters all relationship; and if there is no such fundamental alteration in relationship there is no alteration in this monstrous society which we have built.

What is space? Can there be space without order? Just take an outward physical example: is there space when there is disorder in a room? When one throws one's clothes all over the place and everything is in disorder, is there space? There is only space when everything is in its right place. So, outwardly. Now inwardly: our minds are so confused, our whole life is self-contradiction, disorder, caught in various habits, drugs, smoke, drink, sex and so on. Obviously habits are mechanical and where there are habits there is disorder. What is order inwardly? Is order something dictated by thought? Thought itself is a movement of disorder. One thinks one can bring about social order by very careful thought, by ideological thought. Society, whether in the West or the East, is in disorder, is confused, is contradictory and the world is so totally mad. Wherever there is the movement of thought, time-binding, fragmentary and limited in itself, there must be total disorder.

Is there an action which is not the result of the movement of thought; an action not conditioned by ideologies which have been put together by thought? Is there an action totally free from thought? Such action, then, would be complete, whole, total - not fragmentary, not contradictory. Such action would be whole action in which there is no regret, no sense of "I wish I hadn't done that", or "I will try to do that". Disorder comes about when there is the movement of thought and thought itself is fragmentary and when it

acts everything must be fragmentary. If one sees that very clearly, then one asks: "What is action without thought?" Action means the doing now, not doing tomorrow, or having done in the past. It is as love, it is not of time. Love and compassion are beyond intellect, beyond memory; they are a state of mind that acts because love and compassion are supremely intelligent - intelligence acts. Where there is space, there is order, which is the action of intelligence; it is neither yours nor mine, it is intelligence born out of love and compassion. Space implies a mind that is not occupied; yet our minds are occupied all day long about something or other and so there is no space, not even an interval between two thoughts, every thought is associated with another thought so that there is no gap - the whole mind is crowded, chattering, with opinions and judgements.

True order brings enormous space; space means silence; out of silence comes this extraordinary sense of emptiness. Do not be frightened by that word "empty; when there is emptiness then things can happen.

What is beauty? Does it lie in a picture, in a museum, in a poem? Does it lie in the line of the mountains against the sky; or in a sheet of water reflecting the beauty of the clouds, or in the line an architect gives a building; or in a home that has a certain beauty? What is beauty? - not the imagination that creates beauty; not the word that creates beauty; not a beautiful idea. When one sees something extraordinarily alive and beautiful, a mountain, a clear sky, a view, at that moment when seeing it totally one is absent, is one not? Because of the immensity of the mountain, its extraordinary stability, its sense of firmness and the line of it, its

magnificence drives away the me - for the moment. The outer glory has driven away the petty little me - like a boy given a toy, he is absorbed by it, he will play with it for an hour and break it up and when you take the toy away he is back to himself, naughty, crying and mischievous. The same thing has happened; the great mountain has driven away the petty little me, and one sees it for the moment. When the me is absent, totally, there is beauty. Then one's relationship to nature changes completely; the earth becomes precious, every tree, every leaf, everything is part of that beauty - but man is destroying everything.

Is there anything sacred, holy? Obviously the things that thought has put together in the religious sense - investing sacredness in images, in ideas - are not sacred at all. That which is sacred has no division, not one a Christian, another a Hindu, Buddhist, Muslim and all the rest of the divisions. That which thought has put together is of time, is fragmentary, is not whole, therefore it is not holy, though you worship the image on a cross that is not holy, that is invested with sacredness by thought; the same with the images that the Hindus have put together, or the Buddhists and so on. What then is sacred? One can only find out when thought has discovered itself, its right place, without effort, without will and there is this immense sense of silence; the silence of the mind without any movement of thought. It is only when the mind is absolutely free and silent that one discovers that which is beyond all words, which is timeless. Then out of that comes the vastness of true meditation.

## **THE WHOLENESS OF LIFE PART II CHAPTER 15 2ND PUBLIC TALK BROCKWOOD PARK 28TH AUGUST 1977 'WHEN THE ME IS NOT, THEN COMPASSION COMES INTO BEING'**

No guru and no system can help one to understand oneself.

Without understanding oneself there is no *raison d'etre* to find out that which is right action, that which is truth. In investigating one's consciousness one is investigating the whole human consciousness - not only one's own - because one is the world and when one observes one's own consciousness one is observing the consciousness of mankind - it is not something personal and self-centred.

One of the factors in consciousness is desire. From perception, contact and sensation, thought creates the image and the pursuit of that image is the desire to fulfil, with all the frustration and the bitterness following from that. Now, can there be an observation of sensation not ending in desire? Just to observe. Which means one has to understand the nature of thought, because it is thought that gives continuity to desire; it is thought that creates the image out of sensation followed by the pursuit of that image.

Thought is the response of memory, experience and knowledge, stored up in the brain. Thought is never new, it is always from the past. Thought, therefore, is limited. Although it has created innumerable problems yet it has also created the extraordinary world of technology - marvellous things it has done. But thought is limited because it is the outcome of the past, therefore it is time-binding. Thought pretends to conceive the immeasurable, the

timeless, something beyond itself; it projects all kinds of illusory images. Can one observe the whole movement of desire without images and the pursuit of those images; without thereby becoming involved in frustration, in the hope of fulfilment and so on? Just to observe the whole movement of desire; to become aware of it.

Can one psychologically be free yet not be caught up in the illusion that one is free? That illusion comes about when one says to oneself. "I must be free from fear" - which is the movement of desire. Having understood the nature of desire and its movement, its images, its conflicts, then one can look at fear in oneself and not deceive oneself that one is psychologically free from fear. Then one can go into the whole question of fear; not a particular form of fear, but go to the very root of fear, which is much simpler and quicker than taking the various branches of fear and trimming them. By observing the totality of fear then come to the root of it. One can only go to the root of it when one observes the totality of the various forms of fears - observe, become aware of them, but not try to do something about them. By observing the whole tree of fear, with all the branches, with all its various qualities, all its divisions, go to the very root of it.

What is the root of fear, psychologically? Is not the root of fear, time? - what might happen tomorrow, or in the future; what might happen if one does not do certain things. Time as the past, time as what might happen now or in the future; is not the root of fear and time the movement of thought?

The root of fear is the movement of time; which is thought as measure. Can one observe, can one be aware of this movement, not controlling it, suppressing it, or escaping from it, but just observing



aware of its total movement? One is aware of this total movement of thought as time and measure - I have been, I shall be, I hope to be - one is choicelessly aware of this fact and remaining with it, not moving away from what actually is. What actually is, is the movement of thought, which says: "I have been hurt in the past and I hope I shall not be hurt in the future." That very process of thinking is fear - taking that as an example. Where there is fear, obviously there is no affection, there is no love.

A great part of consciousness is the enormous desire for and the pursuit of pleasure. All religions have said do not pursue pleasure, sexual or any kind of pleasure because you have given your life over to Jesus, or Krishna; they advocate suppressing desire, suppressing fear, suppressing any form of pleasure. Every religion has talked about it endlessly. We are saying: on the contrary do not suppress anything, do not avoid anything. Do not analyse one's fear - just observe. All human beings are caught in this pursuit of pleasure and when that pleasure is not given there is hatred, violence, anger and bitterness. So one must understand this pursuit, this enormous urge for pleasure which human beings have throughout the world.

The function of the brain is to register, as a computer registers. It registers pleasure, and thought gives the energy and the drive to pursue pleasure. One has had pleasure of various kinds yesterday: they are registered. Then thought says there must be more and thought then pursues the more. The more then becomes pleasure; the desire for continuity of pleasure is given vitality and driven by thought - thinking about it, today or tomorrow, later on. That is the movement of pleasure. Now: is it possible to register only that

which is absolutely necessary and nothing else? We are continually registering so many things unnecessarily and so building up the self, the me - "I am hurt; I am not what I should be; I must achieve what I think should be", and so on. The whole of this registration is an action of giving importance to the self. Now we are asking: Is it possible to register only that which is absolutely necessary? What is absolutely necessary? - not all the things the psyche builds up, which are memories.

What is necessary to register and what is not necessary to register? The brain is occupied all the time with registering, therefore there is no tranquillity, no quietness, whereas if there is a clarity as to what is to be registered and what is not to be registered then the brain is quieter - and that is part of meditation.

Are the things that one registers psychologically necessary at all? Anything that you hold psychologically is unnecessary. By holding those things, registering those things, by the brain holding on to them, it attains a certain security; but that security is merely the me that has gathered all the psychological hurts and imprints. So we are saying: to register anything psychologically and hold it is absolutely unnecessary - one's beliefs, one's dogmas, one's experiences, one's wishes and desires, they are all totally unnecessary. So, what is it that is necessary? Food, clothes and shelter - nothing else. This is a tremendous thing to understand in oneself; it means that the brain is no longer the accumulating factor of the me. The brain is rested, tranquil and it needs considerable tranquillity; but it has always sought that tranquillity, that security, in the me which is the accumulation of all the past registrations, which are just memories, therefore worthless - like collecting a lot

of dead ash and giving tremendous importance to it.

To register only that which is absolutely necessary; it is a marvellous thing if one can go into it and do it because then there is real freedom - freedom from all the accumulated knowledge, tradition, superstition and experience, which have all built up this enormous structure to which thought clings as the me. When the me is not, then compassion comes into being and that compassion brings clarity. With that clarity there is skill.

Where there is unnecessary registration there is no love. If one wants to understand the nature of compassion one has to go into this question of what love is and whether there is such a thing as love without any form of attachment with all its complications, with all its pleasures and fears.

## **THE WHOLENESS OF LIFE PART II CHAPTER 16 2ND PUBLIC TALK OJAI CALIFORNIA 3RD APRIL 1977 'THE DIVISION BETWEEN THE OBSERVER AND THE OBSERVED IS THE SOURCE OF CONFLICT'**

There are two types of learning: one, memorizing what is being taught and then observing through memory - which is what most of us call learning - the other, learning through observation and not storing it as memory. Put another way: one is to learn something by heart, so that it is stored up in the brain as knowledge and subsequently acting according to that knowledge, skilfully or unskilfully; when one goes to school and university, one stores up a great deal of information as knowledge and according to that knowledge one acts, beneficially for oneself or for society; but incapable of acting simply, directly. The other kind of learning - to which one is not quite so accustomed because one is such a slave to habits, to tradition, to every form of conformity - is to observe without the accompaniment of previous knowledge, to look at something as though for the first time, afresh. If one observes things afresh, then there is not the cultivation of memory; it is not as when one observes and through that observation stores up memory so that the next time one observes it is through that pattern of memory, therefore not anymore observing afresh.

It is important to have a mind that is not constantly occupied, constantly chattering. To an unoccupied mind a new seed of learning can germinate - something entirely different from the cultivation of knowledge and acting from that knowledge.

Observe the skies, the beauty of the mountains, the trees, the light among the leaves. That observation, if stored up as memory, will prevent the next observation being fresh. When one observes one's wife or friend, can one observe without the interference of the recording of previous incidents in that particular relationship? If one can observe or watch the other without the interference of previous knowledge, one learns much more.

The most important thing is to observe; to observe and not to have a division between the observer and the observed. Mostly there is a division as between the observer who is the total summation of past experience as memory and the observed, that which is - so the past observes. The division between the observer and the observed is the source of conflict.

Is it possible for there to be no conflict at all, right through one's life? Traditionally, one accepts that there must be this conflict, this struggle, this everlasting fight, not only physiologically in order to survive, but psychologically in desire and fear, like and dislike, and so on. To live without conflict is to live a life without any effort, a life in which there is peace. Man has lived, centuries upon centuries, a life of battle, conflict, both outwardly and inwardly; a constant struggle to achieve and fear of losing, dropping back. One may talk endlessly about peace, but there will be no peace as long as one is conditioned to the acceptance of conflict. If one says it is possible to live in peace, then it is just an idea and therefore valueless. And if one says it is not possible, then one blocks any investigation.

Go into it psychologically first; it is more important than physiologically. If one understands very deeply the nature and the

structure of conflict psychologically and perhaps ends it there, then one may be able to deal with the physiological factor. But if one is only concerned with the physiological, biological factor, to survive, then one probably will not be able to do it at all.

Why is there this conflict, psychologically? From ancient times, both socially and religiously, there has been a division between the good and the bad. Is there really this division at all - or is there only "what is", without its opposite? Suppose there is anger; that is the fact, that is "what is", but "I will not be angry" is an idea, not a fact.

One never questions this division, one accepts it because one is traditional by habit, not wanting anything new. But there is a further factor; there is a division between the observer and the observed. When one looks at a mountain, one looks at it as an observer and one calls it a mountain. The word is not the thing. The word "mountain" is not the mountain, but to oneself the word is very important; when one looks, instantly there is the response, "that is a mountain". Now, can one look at the thing called "mountain", without the word, because the word is a factor of division? When one says "My wife," the word "my" creates division. The word, the name, is part of thought. When one looks at a man or a woman, a mountain or a tree, whatever it is, division takes place when thought, the name, the memory, comes into being.

Can one observe without the observer, who is the essence of all the memories, experiences, reactions and so on, which are from the past? If one looks at something without the word and the past memories, then one looks without the observer. When one does

that, there is only the observed and there is no division and no conflict, psychologically. Can one look at one's wife or one's nearest intimate friend without the name, the word and all the experiences that one has gathered in that relationship? When one so looks one is looking at her or him for the first time.

Is it possible to live a life that is completely free from all psychological conflict? One has observed the fact, it will do everything if one lets the fact alone. As long as there is division between the image-making observer, and the fact - which is no image but only fact - there must be everlasting conflict. That is a law. That conflict can be ended.

When there is an ending of psychological conflict - which is part of suffering - then how does that apply to one's livelihood, how does that apply in one's relationship with others? How does that ending of psychological struggle, with all its conflicts, pain, anxiety, fear, how does that apply to one's daily living - one's daily going to the office etc. etc? If it is a fact that one has ended psychological conflict, then how will one live a life without conflict outwardly? When there is no conflict inside, there is no conflict outside, because there is no division between the inner and the outer. It is like the ebb and flow of the sea. It is an absolute, irrevocable fact, which nobody can touch, it is inviolate. So, if that is so, then what shall one do to earn a livelihood? Because there is no conflict, therefore there is no ambition. Because there is no conflict, there is no desire to be something. Because inwardly there is something absolute which is inviolate, which cannot be touched, which cannot be damaged, then one does not depend psychologically on another; therefore there is no conformity, no

imitation. So, not having all that, one is no longer heavily conditioned to success and failure in the world of money, position, prestige, which implies the denial of "what is" and the acceptance of "what should be".

Because one denies "what is" and creates the ideal of "what should be" there is conflict. But to observe what actually is, means one has no opposite, only "what is". If you observe violence and use the word "violence" there is already conflict, the very word is already warped: there are people who approve of violence and people who do not. The whole philosophy of non-violence is warped, both politically and religiously. There is violence and its opposite, non-violence. The opposite exists because you know violence. The opposite has its root in violence. One thinks that by having an opposite, by some extraordinary method or means, one will get rid of "what is".

Now, can one put away the opposite and just look at violence, the fact? The non-violence is not a fact. Non-violence is an idea, a concept, a conclusion. The fact is violence - that one is angry; that one hates somebody; that one wants to hurt people; that one is jealous; all that is the implication of violence, that is the fact. Now, can one observe that fact without introducing its opposite? For then one has the energy - which was being wasted in trying to achieve the opposite - to observe "what is". In that observation there is no conflict.

So, what will a man do who has understood this extraordinary complex existence based on violence, conflict, struggle, a man who is actually free of it, not theoretically, but actually free? Which means, no conflict. What shall he do in the world? Will one ask



this question if one is inwardly, psychologically, completely free from conflict? Obviously not. It is only the man in conflict who says: "If there is no conflict, I will be at an end, I will be destroyed by society because society is based on conflict."

If one is aware of one's consciousness, what is one? If one is aware, one will see that one's consciousness is - in its absolute sense - in total disorder. It is contradictory, saying one thing, doing something else, always wanting something. The total movement is within an area which is confined and without space and in that little space there is disorder.

Is one different from one's consciousness? Or is one that consciousness? One is that consciousness. Then is one aware that one is in total disorder? Ultimately that disorder leads to neurosis, obviously - and all the specialists in modern society such as psychoanalysts, psychotherapists and so on. But inwardly, is one in order? Or is there disorder? Can one observe this fact? And what takes place when one observes choicelessly - which means without any distortion? Where there is disorder, there must be conflict. Where there is absolute order there is no conflict. And there is an absolute order, not relative order. That can only come about naturally, easily, without any conflict, when one is aware of oneself as a consciousness, aware of the confusion, the turmoil, the contradiction, outwardly and inwardly observing without any distortion. Then out of that comes naturally, sweetly, easily, an order which is irrevocable.

**THE WHOLENESS OF LIFE PART II CHAPTER  
17 6TH PUBLIC TALK SAANEN 21ST JULY 1977  
'WHEN THERE IS AN ENDING TO  
CONSCIOUSNESS WITH ITS CONTENT THERE  
IS SOMETHING ENTIRELY DIFFERENT'**

To observe holistically is to observe - or to listen to - the whole content of something. Normally, we look at things partially, according to our pleasure, or according to our conditioning, or according to some idealistic point of view; we always look at things fragmentarily. The politician is mostly concerned with politics; the economist, the scientist, the business man, each has his own concern, generally throughout life. It seems that we never take, or observe the whole movement of life - like a full river with a great volume of water behind it; water right from beginning to end. It may become polluted but, given sufficient extent, it can cleanse itself. So, in the same way, we can treat life holistically moving totally from the beginning to the end without any fragmentation, without any deviation, without any illusion. It is important to understand how the mind creates illusions of self-importance and all the various types of illusions which are comforting and safe - at least for the time being. We look at something with a preconceived idea or belief, so that we never really actually see it.

Illusions are created by seeking satisfaction in desire. Satisfaction is entirely different from ecstasy. Ecstasy is a state of being, or not being, which is outside of oneself. That is ecstasy in which there is no experiencing. The moment there is experiencing,

then it is the self with its past memories, its recollections, which is translating, creating illusions. Ecstasy never creates illusions. You cannot hold on to ecstasy because it is outside of oneself; there is no question of remembering it; there is no question of wanting it; wanting it is the desire to satisfy and that creates illusion.

Most of us are caught in some kind of illusion - the illusion of being, or not being, the illusion of power, position and so on: whole categories projected from the centre, which is the me. Illusion means to see sensuously through a definite conclusion, prejudice, or idea.

A mind that is caught in illusions has no order. Order can only come about holistically. We need order; even in a very small room one puts things in their right place otherwise it becomes disorderly, ugly, and lacking repose. We think order, psychologically, is in the following of a certain pattern or a certain routine which we have already established in the past. Order is, psychologically, something entirely different; it can only come about when there is clarity. Clarity brings order, not the other way round; try to seek order then that becomes mechanistic, a conformity to a pattern in which there can be no clarity.

Order implies harmony in daily life. Harmony is not an idea. We are caught in the prison of ideas and there is no harmony in that. Harmony and clarity imply seeing things holistically, observing life as a total unitary movement - not, I am a business man at the office and a different person at home; not, I am an artist and can do the most absurd and eccentric things; not this breaking up, or fragmenting, of life into various categories, the elite and the non-elite, the worker and the non-worker, the intellectual and the

romantic, which is the way we normally live. See how important it is to treat life as a total movement in which everything is included, in which there is no breaking down, as the good and the bad and heaven and hell. See holistically so that when you observe your friend, or your wife or your husband, you see holistically in that relationship.

We think of freedom as freedom from something - freedom from sorrow, from anxiety, from work - which is really reaction and therefore not freedom at all. When someone says "I am free from smoking", that is a response from what has been, a moving away from what has been. But we are talking of freedom which is not from something, which implies observing holistically.

In observing holistically there is no fragmentation, or direction in that observation; for when there is direction there is distortion. Only when there is complete freedom can you observe holistically and in that observation there is no satisfaction and therefore there is no illusion.

So, observe life as a total movement, non-fragmented, holistic, flowing continuously - "continuously" but not in the sense of time. Usually the word "continuous" implies time; but there is a continuity which is not of time. We think of the relationship between the past and the future as a continuity, without breaking up. That is what we generally understand by the word "continuity", which is of time. Time is movement, a time-span to be covered through days, months, or years, with an ideal to be achieved at the end of it. Time implies thought; thought is a movement of measure; the movement of time. But, is there a continuity - if we can use that word, which is not perhaps quite right - is there a continuity which

is not a series of incidents related to the past as cause becoming effect now and the effect in turn becoming future cause? Is there a state of being in which there is an ending, a coming to an end, of everything?

We think of life as a measured movement in time; a movement which ends in death. Up to that point that is what we call continuity. Yet one observes a movement which is not of time, which is not a remembrance of something of the past going through the present and modifying the future and so continuing. There is a state of mind which is dying to everything that is happening; all that happens is coming in and flowing out - there is no retaining but always a flowing out. That state of mind has its own sense of beauty and "continuity" which is not of time.

Every religion, from ancient times, has tried to find out if there is something beyond death. The Ancient Egyptians thought that, in a way, living is part of death, so you carried over your slaves, your cattle, as you died. To go over to the other side was to live as you have lived this side, in the past. That was a continuity. The ancient people of India said life must have a continuity; for otherwise what is the point of achieving moral character, having so much experience in life, having suffered so much, if it merely ends in death - what is the point of it? Therefore, they said, there must be a future and in that future the content of consciousness is modified life after life; its content went on. The Christians have a different kind of fulfilment, such as the resurrection and so on. But, we want to find the truth of it; not what you think, not what the professionals, the priests and the psychologists think. There have appeared certain articles in the press in America and Europe

affirming that people have "died" and come back to daily life remembering having experienced extraordinary "after death" states, light, beauty - whatever. One questions whether they really died, because if one is really dead it means that oxygen is not going to the brain and after several minutes the brain deteriorates; when there is real death there is no coming back and therefore no recollection of something after you die. Death may be a most extraordinary experience, much greater than so-called love, much greater than any desire, any idea, any conclusion; or it may be the end of everything, of every form of relationship, every form of recollection, remembrance, accumulation. It may be total annihilation; the complete ending of everything. One must find out what is the truth of the matter.

To come upon the truth, every form of identification must end, every form of fear, every desire for comfort. One must not be caught in that illusion which says: "Yes, there is a marvellous state after death." The mind must have no identification with the name, with the form, or with any person, idea, conclusion. Is that possible? That does not deny love; on the contrary, when one is attached to a person there is no love; there is dependence; there is the fear of being left alone in a world where everything is so insecure, both psychologically and outwardly. To find out what is the truth of death, what is the meaning, the real depth, of that extraordinary thing that must happen, there must be freedom. And there is no freedom when there is attachment, when there is fear, when there is a desire for comfort. Can one put all that aside? To find the truth of this extraordinary thing called death one must also find the truth of what is before death; not the truth after death, but

also the truth before death. What is the truth before death? If that is not clear the other cannot be clear. One must look very closely, carefully and freely, at what is before death, which we call living. What is the truth of one's living? - which means what is one, or who is one - which one calls living? A heavily conditioned mind brought about through education, environment, culture, through religious sanctions, beliefs and dogmas, rituals, "my country", "your country", the constant battle, wanting to be happy and being unhappy, depressed and elated, going through anxiety, uncertainty, hate, envy and the pursuit of pleasure; afraid to be alone, fear of loneliness, old age, disease - this is the truth of our life, our daily life. Can such a mind, which has not put order in this life - order in the sense of that which comes through clarity and compassion - can such a mind which is so utterly fragmented, disorderly, frightened, find out the truth about something outside of all that?

So what is the truth of death - that is, complete ending? There may be annihilation, or there may be something; but that is a hope creating distortion and illusion; so one is cutting that out.

One can only find out the truth of it when there is an ending - an ending to everything that you have; the ending to attachment, not giving it a day, ending it completely, now. That is what death means - ending, complete ending; and when there is complete ending something new is born.

Fear is a burden, a terrible burden and when one removes that burden completely there is something new that takes place. But one is afraid of ending - either ending at the end of one's life, or ending now. End your vanity, because without ending there is no beginning. We are caught in this continuity of never ending. When

there is total, complete, holistic, ending there is something totally new beginning, which you cannot possibly imagine; it is a totally different dimension.

To find out the truth of death, there must be the ending of the content of one's consciousness. Then one will never ask "Who am I?" or "What am I?" One is one's consciousness with its content.

When there is an ending to that consciousness with its content there is something entirely different, which is not imagined.

Human beings have sought immortality in their actions; one writes a book and in that book there is one's immortality as a writer; a great painter makes a painting and that painting becomes the immortality of that human being. All that must end - which no artist is willing to do.

Each human being is a representative of the whole of humanity and when there is that change in consciousness one brings about a change in the human consciousness. Death is the ending of this consciousness as one knows it.



**THE WHOLENESS OF LIFE PART II CHAPTER  
18 3RD PUBLIC TALK SAANEN 14TH JULY 1977  
'WITHOUT CLARITY, SKILL BECOMES A  
MOST DANGEROUS THING'**

When one has developed a skill it gives a certain sense of well-being, security. And that skill, born of knowledge, must invariably, in its action, become mechanical. Skill in action is what one has sought because it gives a certain position in society, a certain prestige. Living in that field all the time, as one does in modern society, with all its economic demands, that knowledge and skill become, not only additive but also invariably a repetitive mechanical process that gradually gathers its own stimulation, its own arrogance, and power. In that power one has security.

Society, at the present time, is demanding more and more skill - whether one is an engineer, a technological expert, a scientist, a psychotherapist, etc. etc - but there is great danger - is there not? - is seeking all this skill resulting from accumulated knowledge, for in this increase there is no clarity. When skill becomes all important in life, not only because it is the means of livelihood, but because one is totally educated for that purpose - all our schools, colleges and universities are directed for that purpose - then that skill invariably brings about a certain sense of power, of arrogance and self-importance.

The art of learning is not only in the accumulation of the knowledge necessary for skilful action, but also in that learning which is without accumulation. There are two types of learning: acquiring and accumulating a great deal of knowledge through

experience, through books, through education which may be used in skilful action; and another form in which one never accumulates and in which one never registers anything other than that which is absolutely necessary. In the first form, the brain is registering and accumulating knowledge, storing it up and acting from that store skilfully, or unskilfully. In the second form, one becomes so totally aware that one only registers that which is absolutely necessary and nothing else; then the mind is not cluttered and influenced with the movement of accumulated knowledge.

In this art of learning, accumulating knowledge, by registering only the things that are necessary for skilful action, there is the non-registering of any psychological reactions; the brain is employing knowledge where function and skill are necessary and yet the brain is free not to register in the psychological area. It is very arduous this, to be so totally aware that one only registers that which is necessary and not, absolutely does not, register anything which is unnecessary. Someone insults you, someone flatters you, someone calls you this or that - no registration. This gives tremendous clarity. To register and yet not to register so that there is no psychological building up of the me, the structure of the self. The structure of the self arises only when there is the registration of everything that is not necessary; that is: giving importance to one's name, one's experience, one's opinions and conclusions, all that is the intensifying of the energy in the self - which is always distorting.

The art of learning gives this extraordinary clarity and if there is great skill in action without that clarity then it breeds self-importance, whether the self-importance is identified with oneself

or with a group, or with a nation. Self-importance denies clarity. There cannot be compassion without clarity and because there is no compassion skill has become so important. If there is no clarity there is no awakening of intelligence, that intelligence which is neither yours nor mine, it is intelligence. That intelligence has its own action, which is non-mechanistic and therefore without cause.

As in the art of seeing and of listening, in the art of learning there is no movement of thought. Thought is necessary to accumulate knowledge to function skilfully, otherwise thought has no place whatsoever. This brings tremendous clarity. In such clarity there is no centre from which one is functioning; no centre which has been put together by thought, as the me, mine; for where there is that centre there must be a circumference, where there is a circumference there is resistance, there is the division which is one of the fundamental causes of fear. Without clarity skill becomes a most destructive thing in life - which is what is happening in the world; men can go to the moon and put the flag of their country there, but that is not from clarity; they can kill each other through wars as a result of the extraordinary development of technology, all from the movement of thought, which is not clarity. Thought can never understand that which is whole, that which is immeasurable, which is timeless.

# **THE WHOLENESS OF LIFE PART II CHAPTER 19 2ND PUBLIC DIALOGUE BROCKWOOD PARK 1ST SEPTEMBER 1977 'HOW IS ONE TO KNOW ONESELF?'**

What is the nature of thought that it ceases when there is complete attention and when there is no attention it arises? One has to understand what it is to be aware otherwise one will not be able to understand completely the full significance of attention.

Is there an idea of awareness or is one aware? There is a difference. The idea of being aware, or being aware. "Aware" means to be sensitive, to be alive, to the things about one, to nature, to people, to colour, to the trees, to the environment, to the social structure, the whole thing, to be aware outwardly of all that is happening and to be aware to what is happening inside. To be aware is to be sensitive, to know, to observe, what is happening inside psychologically and also what is happening outside, environmentally, economically, socially and so on. If one is not aware of what is happening outwardly and one begins to be aware inwardly then one becomes rather neurotic. But if one begins to be aware of what is exactly happening in the world, as much as possible, and then from there moves inwardly, then one has a balance. Then there is a possibility of not deceiving oneself. One begins by being aware of what is happening outwardly and then one moves inward - like the ebb and flow of the tide, there is constant movement - so that there is no deception. If one knows what is happening outside and from there moves inward one then has criteria.

How is one to know oneself? Oneself is a very complex structure, a very complex movement; how is one to know oneself so that one does not deceive oneself? One can only know oneself in one's relationship to others. In one's relationship to others one may withdraw from them because one does not want to be hurt and in relationship one may discover that one is very jealous, dependent, attached and really quite callous. So relationship acts as a mirror in which one knows oneself. It is the same thing outwardly; the outer is a reflection of oneself, because society, governments, all these things, are created by human beings fundamentally the same as oneself.

To find out what awareness is one must go into the question of order and disorder. One sees outwardly that there is a great deal of disorder, confusion and uncertainty. What has brought about this uncertainty, this disorder; who is responsible? Are we? Be quite clear as to whether we are responsible for the disorder outwardly; or is it some divine disorder out of which divine order will come? So, if one feels responsible for the outward disorder then is not that disorder an expression of one's own disorder?

One observes that disorder outwardly is created by our disorder inwardly. As long as human beings have no order in themselves there will be disorder, always. Governments may try to control that disorder, outwardly; the extreme form is the totalitarianism of Marxism - saying it knows what order is, you do not, it is going to tell you what it is and suppress you, or confine you in concentration camps and psychiatric hospitals and all that follows.

The world is in disorder because we are in disorder, each one of us. Is one aware of one's disorder or has one but a concept of

disorder? Is one aware that one is in disorder or is it merely an idea which has been suggested that one accepts? The acceptance of an idea is an abstraction, an abstraction from "what is". The abstraction is to move away from "what is" - and one mostly lives in ideas and moves away from facts. Is one accepting a concept of disorder or is one aware that one is oneself in disorder? Does one understand the difference between the two? Does one become aware, per se, for itself?

What does one mean by disorder? There is contradiction; one thinks one thing, and does another. There is the contradiction of opposing desires, opposing demands, opposing movements in oneself - duality. How does this duality arise? Is it not that one is incapable of looking at "what is"? One would rather run away from "what is" into "what should be", hoping somehow, by some miracle, by some effort of will, to change "what is" into "what should be". That is: one is angry and one "should not" be angry. If one knew what to do with anger, how to deal with anger and go beyond it, there would be no need for "what should be", which is "do not be angry". If one can understand what to do with "what is", then one will not escape to "what should be". Because one does not know what to do with "what is", one hopes that by inventing an ideal that one can somehow through the ideal change "what is". Or, because one is incapable and does not know what to do, one's brain becomes conditioned to living always in the future - the "what one hopes to be". One is essentially living in the past but one hopes by living for an ideal in the future to alter the present. If one were to see what to do with "what is" then the future does not matter. It is not a question of accepting "what is", but remaining with "what is".

One can only understand something if one looks at "what is" and does not run away from it - not try to change it into something else. Can one remain with, observe, see, "what is" - nothing else? I want to look at "what is". I realize that I am greedy but it does not do anything. Greed is a feeling and I have looked at that feeling named greed. The word is not the thing; but I may be mistaking the word for the thing. I may be caught in words but not with the fact - the fact that I am greedy. It is very complex; the word may incite that feeling. Can the mind be free of the word and look? The word has become so important to me in my life. Am I a slave to words? - knowing that the word is not the thing. Has the word become so important that the fact is not real, actual, to me? I would rather look at a picture of a mountain than go and look at a mountain; to look at a mountain I have to go a great distance, climb, look, feel. Looking at a picture of a mountain is looking at a symbol, it is not reality. Am I caught in words, which are symbols, thereby moving away from reality? Does the word create the feeling of greed? - or is there greed without the word? This requires tremendous discipline, not suppression. The very pursuit of the enquiry has its own discipline. So I have to find out, very carefully, whether the word has created the feeling, or if the feeling exists without the word. The word is greed, I named it when I had that feeling before therefore I am registering the present feeling by a past incident of the same kind. So the present has been absorbed into the past.

So I realize what I am doing. I am aware that the word has become extraordinarily important to me. So then, is there a freedom from the word greed, envy or nationality, Communist, Socialist and so on - is there a freedom from the word? The word is

of the past. The feeling is the present recognized by the word from the past, so I am living all the time in the past. The past is me. The past is time; so time is me. The me says: "I must not be angry because my conditioning has said: do not be greedy, do not be angry." The past is telling the present what it should do. So there is a contradiction because fundamentally, very deeply, the past is dictating the present, what it should do. The me, which is the past with all its memories, experiences, knowledge, a thing put together by thought, the me, is dictating what should happen.

Now, can I observe the fact of greed without the past? Can there be observation of greed without naming, without getting caught in the word, having understood that the word can create the feeling and that if the word creates the feeling then the word is 'me', which is of the past, telling me "do not be greedy"? Is it possible to look at "what is" without the me - which is the observer? Can I observe greed, the feeling, its fulfilment and action, without the observer which is the past?

The "what is" can only be observed when there is no me. Can one observe the colours and forms around one? How does one observe them? One observes through the eye. Observe without moving the eye; because if one moves the eye the whole operation of the thinking brain comes into being. The moment the brain is in operation there is distortion. Look at something without moving one's eyes; how still the brain becomes. Observe not only with one's eyes but with all one's care, with affection. There is then an observation of the fact, not the idea, but the fact, with care and with affection. One approaches "what is" with care, with affection; therefore there is no judgement, no condemnation; therefore one is



free of the opposite.

# **THE WHOLENESS OF LIFE PART III CHAPTER 1 SMALL GROUP DIALOGUE OJAI CALIFORNIA 22ND MARCH 1977**

Questioner(1): Can we discuss the relation between Krishnamurti's teaching and truth?

Questioner (2): Is there such a thing as a teaching at all, or is there only truth?

KRISHNAMURTI: Is it the expression of truth? There are two things involved. The speaker is either talking out of the silence of truth, or he is talking out of the noise of an illusion which he considers to be the truth.

Q: That is what most people do.

K: So which is it that he is doing?

Q: There could be a confusion between the word and truth.

K: No, the word is not the truth. That's why we said: either he is talking out of the silence of truth or out of the noise of illusion.

Q: But because one feels that he is speaking out of the silence of truth there is a greater possibility for the word to be taken as truth.

K: No, let's go slowly for this is interesting. Who is going to judge, who is going to see the truth of the matter? The listener, the reader? You who know Indian scriptures, Buddhism, The Upanishads, etc - you are familiar with them and know most of the contents of all that. Are you capable of judging? How shall we find out? You hear him talking about these things and you wonder if he is really speaking out of this extraordinary silence of truth, or as a reaction and from a conditioned childhood and so on. That is to say, either he is talking out of his conditioning or out of the other.

How will you find out? How will you approach this problem?

Q: Is it possible for me to find out if what is meeting that teaching is the noise within myself?

K: That's why I am asking you. What is the criterion, the measure that you apply so you can say: "Yes, that is it." Or do you say: "I don't know"? I am asking what you do. Or don't you know but are examining, investigating; not whether he is speaking out of silence or conditioning, but you are watching the truth of what he is saying. I would want to know whether he was speaking out of this, or out of that. But as I don't know, I am going to listen to what he is saying and see if it is true.

Q: But what sees it as true?

K: Say one is fairly alive to things. One listens to this man and one wants to find out whether what he says is mere words or the truth.

Q: When I have come to the conclusion that it is the truth, then I am already not listening.

K: No, I don't know. My life is concerned with this problem - not just for a few years or a few days. I want to know the truth of this matter. Is he speaking out of experience or from knowledge, or not out of any of these things? Most people speak out of knowledge, so we are asking that question.

I don't know how you would find out. I'll tell you what I would do. I would put his personality, his influence, all that, completely aside. Because I don't want to be influenced, I am sceptical, doubtful, so I am very careful. I listen to him and I don't say "I know" or "I don't know", but I am sceptical. I want to find out.

Q: Sceptical means you are inclined to doubt it, which is

already a bias...

K: Oh, no! I am sceptical in the sense that I don't accept everything that is being said.

P: But you lean towards doubting. It's negation.

K: Oh, no. I would rather use the word doubt, in the sense of questioning. Let's put it that way. I say to myself. Am I questioning out of my prejudice? This question has never been put to me before, I am exploring it. I would put everything aside - all the personal reputation, charm, looks, this and that - I am not going to accept or reject, I am going to listen to find out. Am I prejudiced? Am I listening to him with all the knowledge I have gathered about religion, of what the books have said, what other people have said, or what my own experience tells me?

Q: No. I may be listening to him precisely because I have rejected all that.

K: Have I rejected it? Or am I listening to him with all that? If I have rejected that then I am listening. Then I am listening very carefully to what he has to say. Q: Or I am listening with everything that I already know of him? K: I have said: I have put away his reputation. Am I listening to him with the knowledge that I have acquired through books, through experience, and therefore I am comparing, judging evaluating? Then I can't find out whether what he is saying is the truth. But is it possible for me to put aside all that? I am passionately interested to find out. So for the time being - while I am listening at least - I will put aside everything I have known. Then I proceed. I want to know, but I am not going to be easily persuaded, pulled into something by argument, cleverness, logic. Now am I capable of listening to what he is

saying with complete abandonment of the past? It comes to that. Are you? Then my relationship to him is entirely different. Then I am listening out of silence.

This is really a very interesting question. I have answered for myself. There are a dozen of us here, how would you answer it? How do you know that what he is talking about is the truth?

Q: I wouldn't be concerned with that word truth. When you use the word truth you indicate you have the ability to judge what is true, or you already have a definition of truth, or you know what truth is. Which means you will not be listening to what somebody is saying.

K: Don't you want to know whether he is speaking falsehood, out of a conditioned mind, from a rejection and therefore out of a reaction?

Q: (1): I realize that in order to listen to this man I can't listen with a conditioned mind - not to anybody.

Q (1): Another question which arises is: I reject all this knowledge and listen in silence. Is truth in that silence?

K: I don't know. That is one of the things I have got to find out.

Q (1): If there is no rejection there is no silence.

Q (2): As this well is an endless source, is the teaching the same as truth?

K: How would you answer this question?

Q: I think first of all you can be sensitive to what is false. In other words, to see if there is something false, something incoherent.

K: Logic can be very false. Q(1): Yes, I don't mean just logic, but you can be sensitive to the whole communication to see if there

is some deception. I think one of the questions implied here is: Are you deceiving yourself?

Q(2): But doesn't that sensitivity imply the absence of one's own projections - the silence after having moved through all your own colouring of it. Only then can you be that sensitive.

Q(3): You have to be free of deceiving yourself to see that.

K: Again, forgive me for asking: How do you know he is speaking the truth? Or is he deceiving himself and is caught in an illusion which gives him a feeling that he is telling the truth? What do you answer?

Q: One goes into it oneself. One cannot accept it without going deeply into it.

K: But one can deceive oneself so appallingly.

Q: You go through the layers of all those deceptions and beyond them.

K: If I were a stranger I might say: You have listened to this man for a long time, how do you know he is telling the truth? How do you know anything about it?

Q: I could say that I have looked at what you have said, and each time I was able to test it to see if it was right. I have not found anything which was contradictory.

K: No. The question was: How do you find out the truth? - Not about contradiction, logic, all that. One's own sensitivity, one's own investigation, one's own delving - is that enough?

Q(1): If one goes all the way, if one goes through all the possible self-deceptions.

Q(1): And then goes so far as to say that in the moments when one is listening - I do not know how deeply, but listening at all -

one feels there is a change in oneself. It may not be a total revolution, but there is a change.

K: That can happen when you go for a walk and look at the mountains and are quiet, and when you come back to your home certain things have taken place. You follow what I am saying?

Q(1): Yes.

Q(2): We listen to people who speak from knowledge, and we listen to you, and there is something totally different. The non-verbal...

K: Have you answered the question?

Q(1): To myself I have. I have listened to scores of people and I listen to K. I don't know what it is, but it is totally different.

Q(2): That means there is a ring of truth in it.

Q(3): There are people who imply that in some way you are deceiving yourself. They do not see it that way.

Q(4): There was a man who wrote to me and asked if I agreed with everything Krishnamurti said. "Didn't he tell you that you should doubt everything he said?" The only way I could answer was to say: "Look, to me it is self evident."

K: It may be self evident to you and yet an illusion. It is such a dangerous, delicate thing.

Q(1): It can be that there is a scale on which we weigh it.

Q(2): I think that for thought it is not at all possible to be sure about this matter. It is typical of thought that it wants to be sure that it is not deceiving itself, that it is listening to truth. Thought will never give up that question, and it is right for thought never to give up questioning, but thought cannot touch it, cannot know about it.

K: Dr Bohm and I had a discussion of this kind in a different way. If I remember rightly we said: Is there such a silence which is not the word, which is not imagined or induced? Is there such a silence, and is it possible to speak out of that silence?

Q: The question was whether the words are coming from perception, from the silence, or from the memory.

K: Yes.

Q: The question is whether the words that are used are communicating directly and are coming out of the emptiness, out of the silence, or not.

K: That is the real question.

Q: As we used to say: like the drum which vibrates to the emptiness within.

K: Yes. Are you satisfied by this answer? - by what the others have said? Q: No, Krishnaji.

K: Then how do you find out?

Q: The very words you are using deny the possibility of being satisfied and to work at it intellectually. It is something that has nothing to do with those things.

K: Look, suppose I love you and trust you. Because I trust you and you trust me whatever you say won't be a lie and I know you won't deceive me under any circumstances, you won't tell me something which is not actual to you.

Q: I might do something out of ignorance.

K: But say you trust me and I trust you. There is a relationship of trust, confidence, affection, love; like a man and a woman when they are married, they trust each other. Now is that possible here? Because - as she points out - I can deceive myself with logic, with



reason, with all these things: millions of people have done it. I can also see the danger of, "I love the priest; and he can play havoc with me.

Q(1): If one has affection for someone, one projects all kinds of illusions on to him.

Q(2): I think the trust, the investigation, logic and all that goes together with love.

K: That is a very dangerous thing too.

Q(1): Of course it is.

Q(2): Isn't there any way to avoid danger?

K: I don't want to be caught in an illusion.

Q: So can we say that truth is in the silence out of which the teaching comes?

K: But I want to know how the silence comes! I might invent it. I might have worked to have a silent mind for years, conditioned it, kept it in a cage, and then say, "Marvellous, I am silent". There is that danger. Logic is a danger. Thought is a danger. So I see all the dangers around me. I am caught in all these dangers and I want to find out if what that man is saying is the truth.

Q(1): I think there is no way or procedure to find that out. There is no prescription. I cannot tell anybody how to find out. I can say that I feel it with all my being, that something is true and maybe I can convey it through my life, but I cannot convince anybody through words or reason or by any method. And in the same way I cannot convince myself.

Q(2): Are we saying that perception has to be pure and in the realm of silence - the real realm of silence, not a fantasy - in order to be able to even come close to this question?

K: Dr Bohm is a scientist, a physicist, he is clear-thinking, logical; suppose someone goes to him and asks, "Is what Krishnamurti says the truth?" How is he going to answer?

Q: Doesn't Dr Bohm, or anybody, have to go beyond the limitations of logic?

K: Somebody comes to him and asks: "Tell me, I really want to know from you, please tell me if that man is speaking the truth."

Q: But you are then saying, use the instrument of logic to find out?

K: No. I am very interested because I have heard so many people who are illogical and careless say he is speaking the truth. But I go to a serious thinker, careful with the use of words, and ask: "Please tell me if he is telling the truth, not some crooked thing covered up," How is he going to answer me?

Q: The other day when that man said you may be caught in a groove,\* and you looked at it first, what happened then?

K: I looked at it in several different ways and I don't think I am caught in a groove, but yet I might be. So after examining it very carefully, I left it. Something takes place when you leave it alone after an examination, something new comes into it.

Now I am asking you: Please tell me if that man is speaking the truth.

Q: For me it is a reality. I can't communicate it to you. This is what I have found out and you have to find it out for yourself. You have to test it in your own mind.

K: But you may be leading me up the garden path.

Q: That is all I can say. I can't really communicate it.

K: You may be up the garden path yourself.

Q(1): But then why should I go to Dr Bohm, much as I respect him?

\*See Dialogue II, pages 234-5 and 236-7. Q(2): One thing I can say is that I have questioned it and I have said it may be so, it may not be so, and I have looked carefully into the question of self-deception.

Q(3): It seems to me I would want to know what he is bringing to bear on the answer to this question. Is it science? Is it logic? Is it his own intelligence? I would want to know out of what he was going to answer me.

K: How do you in your heart of hearts, as a human being, know that he is speaking the truth? I want to feel it. I object to logic and all that. I have been through that before. Therefore if all that is not the way, then what is?

Q: There are people who are very clever, who speak of things which are very similar, who have grasped this intellectually very well and say they are speaking from truth.

K: Yes, they are repeating in India now: "You are the world, That is the latest catch-word!"

Q: In order to communicate that, I have to speak out of the silence you were referring to.

K: No, please be simple with me. I want to know if Krishnamurti is speaking the truth. Dr Bohm has known Krishnamurti for several years. He has a good, trained mind so I go to him and ask him.

Q: All he can say is, "I know this man, this is how he affects me He has changed my life." And suddenly a note may be struck in the other one.

K: No. I want it straight from the horse's mouth!

Q(1): Dr Bohm is here. Let him tell us.

Q(2): But you said you wanted proof.

K: I don't. It is a very serious question, it isn't just a dramatic or intellectual question. This is a tremendous question.

Q: Can one ever get an answer? Or is that person asking a false question to begin with?

K: Is he?

Q(2): Of course. How can a person know?

Q(2): I think I could say to him that when we did discuss these things it was from the emptiness, and that I felt it was a direct perception K: Yes. Is direct perception unrelated to logic?

Q: It doesn't come from logic.

K: But you are logical all the same.

Q: That may come later, not at that moment.

K: So you are telling me: I have found out that man is telling the truth because I had a direct perception, an insight into what he is saying.

Q: Yes.

K: Now be careful, because I have heard a disciple of some guru saying exactly the same thing.

Q: I have also heard a guru say this but a little later by looking at it logically I saw the thing was nonsense. When I was looking at the fact and the logic I saw that it did not fit. So I would say that in addition to direct perception I have constantly examined this logically.

K: So you are saying that perception has not blinded you and with that perception goes logic also.

Q: Yes, logic and fact.

K: So perception first, then logic. Not first logic, then perception.

Q: Yes. That is what it always has to be.

K: So through perception and then with logic, you see that it is the truth. Hasn't this been done by the devout Christians?

Q: Logic is not enough, because we have to see how people actually behave as well. I see that Christians say certain things, but when we look at the whole of what they do it doesn't fit.

K: Isn't there a terrible danger in this?

Q: I am sure there is a danger.

K: So you are now saying that one has to walk in danger.

Q: Yes.

K: Now I begin to understand what you are saying. One has to move in a field which is full of danger, full of snakes and pitfalls.

Q: Which means one has to be tremendously awake.

K: So I have learned from talking to him that this is a very dangerous thing. He has said you can only understand whether Krishnamurti is speaking the truth if you are really prepared to walk in a field which is full of pitfalls. Is that right?

Q: Yes.

K: It is a field which is full of mines, the razor's edge path. Are you prepared to do that? One's whole being says "Be secure".

Q: That is the only way to do anything.

K: I have learnt to be aware of the dangers around me and also to face danger all the time and therefore to have no security. The enquirer might say, "This is too much" and go away!

So this is what I want to get at. Can the mind - which has been

conditioned for centuries to be secure - abandon that, and say, "I will walk into danger"? That is what we are saying. It is logical, but in a sense it is illogical.

Q: In principle that is the way all science works.

K: Yes, that is right. So it also means I don't trust anybody - any guru, any prophet. I trust my wife because she loves me and I love her, but that is irrelevant.

Q: The word danger has to be explained too. From one point it is dangerous, and from another it isn't. I have to investigate. My conditioning is very dangerous.

K: So we're saying: "I have walked in danger and I have found the logic of this danger. Through the perception of the danger I have found the truth of what Krishnamurti is saying. And there is no security, no safety in this. Whereas all the others give me safety."

Q: Security becomes the ultimate danger.

K: Of course.

Q: What you have described is actually the scientific approach. They say every statement must be in danger of being false; it has been put that way.

K: That is perfectly right. I have learnt a lot - have you? A man comes from Seattle or Sheffield or Birmingham and is told: "I have found that what he says is the truth because I have had a perception and that perception stands logically". It is not outside of reason. And in that perception I see that where I walk is full of pitfalls, of danger. Therefore I have to be tremendously aware. Danger exists when there is no security. And the gurus, the priests; all offer security. Seeing the illogic of it I accept this illogic too Q: I am not

sure that you should call it illogical; it is not illogical but it is the way logic has to work.

K: Of course. Are we saying that direct perception, insight and the working out of it demand great logic, a great capacity to think clearly? But the capacity to think clearly will not bring about insight.

Q: But if the logic does not bring about perception, what does it do exactly?

K: It trains, it sharpens the mind. But that certainly won't bring about an insight.

Q: It is not through the mind that the perception comes.

K: That all depends on what you mean by the mind. Logic makes the mind sharp, clear, objective and sane. But that won't give you the other. Your question is: How does the other come about?

Q(1): No. That was not my question. Logic clears the mind, but is the mind the instrument of perception?

Q(2): You see, you must have the perception. If you have a perception, for example, about the ending of sorrow, or fear, it may be that the whole thing is a deception. Logic is something which provides the clarity in what you are doing from there on.

Q(3): Yes, that is what we said, that it clears the mind of confusion, of the debris.

Q(4): The debris may come if you don't have logic.

K: You might remain in the debris if you don't have logic.

Q: If the perception is a real perception and so the truth, why does it then need the discipline of logic to examine it?

K: We said perception works out logically. It does not need

logic. Whatever it does is reasonable, logical, sane, objective.

Q: It is logical without an intent to make it so.

K: That's it.

Q: It is like saying that if you see what is in this room correctly, you will not find anything illogical in what you see.

K: All right. Will the perception keep the confusion, the debris away all the time so that the mind never accumulates it and doesn't have to keep clearing it away? That was your question, wasn't it?

Q: I think perception can reach the stage at which it is continually keeping the field clear. I say that it can reach that stage for a certain moment.

K: At a certain moment I have perception. But during the interval between the perceptions there is a lot of debris being gathered. Our question is: Is perception continuous so that there is no collection of the debris? Put it round the other way: Does one perception keep the field clear?

Q: Can one make a difference between insight and perception?

K: Don't break it up yet. Take those two words as synonymous. We are asking: Is perception from time to time, with intervals. During those intervals a lot of debris collects and therefore the field has to be swept again. Or does perception in itself bring about tremendous clarity in which there is no debris?

Q: Are you saying that once it happens it will be there for ever?

K: That is what I am trying to get at. Don't use the words "continuous," "never again". Keep to the question; Once perception has taken place can the mind collect further debris, confusion? It is only when that perception becomes darkened by the debris, that the process of getting rid of it begins. But if there is perception why



should there be a collecting, gathering?

Q: There are a lot of difficult points in this.

# **THE WHOLENESS OF LIFE PART III CHAPTER 2 SMALL GROUP DIALOGUE OJAI CALIFORNIA 24TH MARCH 1977**

KRISHNAMURTI: We were discussing how one can know what Krishnamurti is saying is true. He might be caught in his own conditioning, illusions and knowing them, and not being able to free himself from them, have put together a series of observations, words, and call them truth. How do you know whether what he is saying is actual, truthful and lasting?

Dr Bohm said that when one has an insight, a direct perception into what is being said, then there is no doubt that it is the truth. Having that insight you can work it out logically to show that the perception is true. But is that perception brief, only to be had at intervals and therefore gathering a lot of debris - those things that block perception - or is one perception enough? Does it open the door so that there is insight all the time?

Q: Does that mean that you would never have any confusion?

K: Yes, we came to that point. One has a perception, an insight, and that insight has its own capacity for reason, logic and action. That action is complete, because the perception is complete for the moment. Will further action confuse perception? Or, having perception is there no further confusion?

Q: I think we were saying that there is danger in this. If you say: My action is always right...

K: Oh, that is dangerous!

Q: We also said that logic has its danger. One could think one has an insight when one has not.

K: Suppose I have the capacity to reason it out and act and then say: That is a perfect, complete action. Some people who read the Gita act according to it and they call that insight. Their action is patterned after their reading. They say this action is complete. I have heard many of them say this; also Catholics and Protestants who are completely immersed in the Bible. So we are treading on very dangerous ground and therefore are greatly aware of it.

Q: You also said that the mind tries to find security in all this.

K: The mind has always been seeking security and when that security is threatened it tries to find security in insight, in direct perception.

Q: In the illusion of insight.

K: Yes, but it makes the insight into security. The next question is: Must there be a constant breaking of perception? That is, one day one sees very clearly, one has direct perception, then that fades away and there is confusion. Then again there is a perception and an action, followed by confusion and so on. Is that so? Or is there no further confusion after these deep insights?

Q: Are we saying this perception is whole?

K: Yes, if the perception is complete, whole, then there is no confusion at any time. Or, one may deceive oneself that it is whole and act upon it, which brings confusion.

Q: There is also a possible danger that one has a genuine perception, an insight, and is not fooling oneself and that out of that comes a certain action. But then one could fall into making whatever that action was into a formula and stop having the insight. Let's say that out of an insight which was real a certain action came. One then thinks that is the way things should be.

K: That is what generally happens.

Q: But isn't that a corruption of the perception, just making a pattern out of the action instead of continuing to look? It is like being able to really look at something, for instance looking out of the window and something is seen. But then you don't look out again and think everything is the way it was. It may have totally changed. The perception starts out being genuine, but you don't continue to look, have insight.

K: Yes. Scientists may have an insight in some specialized field and that insight is put into a category of science unrelated to their life. But we are talking of a perception that is not only in the field of action but also in daily life.

Q: As a whole and so there is a continuity.

K: Yes.

Q: But I still don't think we have gone into the question of danger. You said that one day a man came to you and said maybe you were stuck in a groove. K: Yes, caught in a rut.

Q: You didn't say immediately, "I know I am not because I have had a perfect insight."

K: Ah, that would be deadly!

Q: But rather, you said you looked at it for several days.

K: Of course.

Q: I am trying to find out what we are driving at. Perhaps we are saying that there may be an insight which never goes back into confusion. But we are not saying there is one.

K: Yes, that's right. Now would you say, when there is complete perception - not an illusory perception - there is no further confusion?

Q: It seems reasonable to say that.

K: That means from day to day there is no confusion at all.

Q: Then why did you feel it necessary to look into it?

K: Because I may deceive myself. Therefore it is dangerous ground and I must be alert, I must watch it.

Q: Are we seeing this as an insight now? - that when there is an insight of that kind there is no further confusion? But we may deceive ourselves nevertheless.

K: Yes. Therefore we must be watchful.

Q: Do you mean after the real insight you could then deceive yourself?

K: No. You have a deep insight, complete, whole. Someone comes along and says: "Look, you are deceiving yourself". Do you instantly say, "No, I am not deceiving myself because my perception was complete"? Or do you listen and look at it all afresh? It doesn't mean that you are denying the complete perception, you are again watching if it is real or illusory.

Q: That is not necessarily an intellectual process?

K: No, no. I would say both. It is intellectual as well as non-verbal.

Q: Is perception something that is always there and it is only that we...

K: That leads to dangerous ground. The Hindus say that God is always there inside you - the abiding deep divinity, or soul, or Atman, and it is covered up. Remove the confusion, the debris and it is found inside. Most people believe that. I think that is a conclusion. You conclude that there is something divine inside, a soul, the Atman or whatever you like to call it. And from a

conclusion you can never have a total, complete perception. Q: But this leads to another problem, because if you deny that, then what makes one step out of the stream? Does it mean that the stepping out is for certain individuals only?

K: When you say "certain individuals" I think you are putting the wrong question, aren't you?

Q: No. If the possibility exists for everyone...

K: Yes, the possibility exists for human beings.

Q: For the totality?

K: For human beings.

Q: Then there is some energy which...

K: Which is outside of them or which is in them.

Q: Yes. We don't know.

K: Therefore don't come to any conclusion. If from a conclusion you think you perceive, then that perception is conditioned, therefore it is not whole.

Q: Does that mean that there would not be the possibility of a deepening of perception?

K: You can't deepen insight. You can't deepen perception. You perceive the whole - that's all.

Q: What do you mean then by saying there was this mind into which you could continually go more deeply?

K: That is something else.

Q: Are you saying that perception, if it is partial, is not perception?

K: Of course, obviously not.

Q(1): So the deepening of perception would only be a partial step. That wouldn't be perception.

Q(2): You mentioned watchfulness after perception.

K: What happened was: A man came up to me and said, "You are getting old, you are stuck in a groove." And I listened to it. For a couple of days I thought about it. I looked at it and said to myself, "He may be right."

Q: You are almost suggesting that it could be possible.

K: No, I wanted to examine it. Don't say it could, or could not.

Q: I was going to ask: to be caught in habit after a perception, could that not ever happen again, at certain levels?

K: There is partial perception and total perception - let's divide it into those two. When there is total perception there is no further confusion.

Q: You don't get caught in habit?

K: There is no further confusion. Because it is so.

Q: What if something happens to the brain physically?

K: Then of course it is gone.

Q: So there seems to be a limitation to what you say, because one assumes that the brain remains healthy.

K: Of course, assuming that the whole organism is healthy. If there is an accident, your brain suffers concussion and something is injured, then it is finished.

Q(1): The major danger is that we would mistake a partial perception for the total.

Q(2): But it still means that it is "here". You are not tapping it from "out there". That energy is within you, isn't it?

K: One has to go into this question of what is perception. How do you come to it? That is very important, isn't it? You cannot have perception if your daily life is in disorder, confused, contradictory.

That is obvious.

Q: Doesn't this perception mean that there is constant renewal?

K: No. is that energy outside, or inside? She is asking that question all the time.

Q: Isn't that an artificial division: Outside and inside? Is that a real thing, or is it just an illusion?

K: She said that this perception needs energy. That energy may be an external energy, a mechanical energy, or a non-mechanistic energy which may exist deeply inside you. Both are mental concepts. Would you agree to that? Both are conclusions which one has either accepted because tradition has said so, or one has come to that conclusion by oneself. Any form of conclusion is detrimental to perception. So what does perception mean? Can I have perception if I am attached to my position, to my wife, to my property?

Q: It colours the act of perceiving.

K: Yes, but take the scientists, they have their family, their attachments, they want a position, money and all the rest of it, but they have an insight.

Q: It is not total.

K: So we are saying that total perception can only take place when in your daily life there is no confusion.

Q: May we look more closely into that, because couldn't it be that a total perception can take place in spite of that and wipe it away?

K: I can see if the windows are not clean my view is confused.

Q: Would that mean that there is a conditioned insight?

K: If I am in fear my perception will be very partial. That is a



fact.

Q: But don't you need perception to end fear?

K: Ah, but in investigating fear I have a total perception of fear.

Q: Surely if there is fear, or attachment, even one's logic would be distorted.

K: One is frightened - as we said, that distorts perception. But in investigating, observing, going into fear, understanding it profoundly, in delving into it I have perception.

Q: Are you implying that there are certain things you can do which will make for perceptions? Which means although you have fear and it distorts, the distortion is not so total that you cannot investigate it. There is still that possibility, although you are distorting through fear?

K: I realize I am distorting perception through fear.

Q: That's right, then I begin to look at fear.

K: Investigate it, look into it.

Q: In the beginning I am also distorting it.

K: Therefore I am watching every distortion. I am aware of every distortion that is going on. Q: But you see, I think the difficulty lies there. How can I investigate when I am distorting?

K: Wait, just listen. I am afraid and I see fear has made me do something which is a distortion.

Q: But before I can see that, the fear has to fade away.

K: No, I am observing fear.

Q(1): But I cannot observe fear if I am afraid.

Q(2): How can you observe it if you are not afraid?

Q(3): What is it that is observing?

K: Take a fact: you are afraid. You are conscious of it. That

means that you become aware of the fact that there is fear. And you observe also what that fear has done. Is that clear?

Q: Yes.

K: And you look more and more into it. In looking very deeply into it you have an insight.

Q: I may have an insight.

K: No, you will have insight, which is quite different.

Q: What you are saying is that this confusion due to fear is not complete, that it is always open to mankind to have insight.

K: To one who is investigating, who is observing.

Q: If you try to investigate something else while you are afraid you get lost in fear. But it is still open to you to investigate fear.

K: Yes, quite right. One suffers and you see what it does. In observing it, investigating it, opening it up, in the very unrolling of it you have a certain insight. That is all we are saying. That insight may be partial. Therefore one has to be aware that it is partial. Its action is partial and it may appear complete, so watch it.

Q: Very often it looks as if it is totally impossible to have an insight, since you say: "If you are distorting how will you look?" But you are also saying, that as a matter of fact, when you have a distortion, the one thing you can look at is the distortion.

K: That's right.

Q: That factually you have that capacity.

K: One has that capacity. Q(1): So when you are distorting something through fear or suffering, most things you look at will be distorted. But it is actually possible to look at that distortion itself.

Q(2): You can look at that. The fear which creates the distortion

can be looked at; so you can't say that no perception whatsoever is possible.

K: That's just it. Then you have locked the door.

Q: Could one say that the fear can look at itself?

K: No, no. One is afraid: in looking at that fear - not having an insight, just watching it - you see what it does, what its action is.

Q: You mean by looking, being aware of it.

K: Without any choosing - being aware. And you see what fear does. In looking at it more extensively, deeply, widely, suddenly you have an insight into the whole structure of fear.

Q: But there is still the question: in that moment of fear, I am fear.

K: How you observe fear matters - whether you observe it as an observer, or the observer is that. You perceive the observer is the observed and in this action there is distortion, confusion. And you examine that confusion, which is born of fear and in the very process of examination you have an insight. Do it, you will see it - if you don't limit yourself. In saying, "I am too frightened, I can't look", you run away from it.

Q: To simplify it perhaps too much: when we said one can't see through the window because it is dirty, it distorts, the action of examining the fear, the distorting factor, is the cleansing of the window.

K: How you observe, how you investigate, that is the real thing. That is, perception can only take place when there is no division between the observer and the observed. Perception can only take place in the very act of exploring: to explore implies there is no division between the observer and the observed. Therefore you are

watching the movement of fear and in the very watching of it there is an insight. I think that is clear. And yet you see, Krishnamurti says: "I have never done this."

Q: Never gone through all this? Then how do you know somebody else can? K: That's just it. Let's discuss it. Suppose you have not gone through all this, but you see it instantly. Because you see it instantly your capacity to reason explains all this. Another listens and says, "I'd like to get that, I don't have to go through that whole process."

Q: Are you saying that all we have been discussing just now is merely a pointer to something else? We don't have to go through all that.

K: Yes. I want to get at that.

Q: In other words, that helps to clear the ground in some way?

K: Yes.

Q: It is not really the main point.

K: No.

Q: Are you saying there is a short cut?

K: No, no short cut. Must you go through fear, jealousy, anxiety, attachment? Or can you clear the whole thing instantly? Must one go through all this process?

Q: You previously said that you have never done this. And by having that immediate total perception you are able to see what those with the dirty windows can do to clean them. But that isn't necessary, there is perhaps a direct, an immediate way for those who haven't...

K: No. First put the question, see what comes out of it. Dr Bohm says to Krishnamurti: "You have probably not gone through

all this. Because you have a direct, a total insight you can argue with reason, with logic; you can act. You are always talking from that total perception, therefore what you say can never be distorted." And another listens to all this and says: "I am frightened, I am jealous, I am this, I am that, and therefore I can't have total perception." So I observe attachment, or fear, or jealousy and I have an insight.

Is it possible through investigating, through awareness and discovering that the observer is the observed and that there is no division, in the very process of investigation - in which we are observing without the observer and see the totality of it - to free all the rest? I think that is the only way.

Q: Is it possible not to have certain fears, jealousy, attachment? Could that be part of one's conditioning if one were raised in a certain way, or went to a certain school?

K: But there may be deeper layers. You may not be totally conscious of them, you may not be totally aware of the deeper fears, etc. You may say, superficially I am all right, I have none of these things.

Q: But if one went to a certain school, the kind of learning and investigation that would take place in such a school, would that clear the way towards the possibility?

K: Obviously. What we are talking about is: Must one go through all this process?

Q: Couldn't we remove from the problem the personal aspect? We are discussing what is open to man rather than to any individual.

K: Yes. Is it open to any human being without going through all

this process?

Q: By "this process" do you mean involvement with the fear?

K: With fear, sorrow, jealousy, attachment, you go through all that, step by step. Or can a human being see the whole thing at a glance? And that very glance is the investigation and the complete, total perception.

Q: Which is what you mean when you say the first step is the last.

K: Yes, total perception.

Q: Then what would one's responsibility be towards someone who is in sorrow?

K: The response to that human being is the response of compassion. That's all. Nothing else.

Q: For instance, if you see an injured bird it is very easy to deal with that because it really doesn't require very much of you. But when you come in contact with a human being, he has a much more complex set of needs.

K: What can you do actually? Somebody comes to you and says, "I am in deep sorrow". Do you talk to him out of compassion, or from a conclusion, or out of your own particular experience of sorrow which has conditioned you, and you answer him according to your conditioning? A Hindu, who is conditioned in a certain way says: "My dear friend, I am so sorry, but in the next life you will live better. You suffered because you did this and that" - and so on. Or a Christian would respond from some other conclusion. And he takes comfort in it. Because a man who is suffering wants some sort of solace, someone on whose lap he can put his head. So what he is seeking is comfort and avoidance of this terrible pain. Will

you offer him any of those escapes? Whatever comes out of compassion will help him.

Q: Are you saying that as far as sorrow is concerned you can't directly help anyone, but the energy of compassion itself may be of help?

K: That's right; that's all.

Q: But many such wounded spirits will come to the Centre here and I think it is going to be a problem to know how to deal with them.

K: There is no problem if you are compassionate. Compassion doesn't create problems. It has no problems, therefore it is compassionate.

Q: You are saying that total compassion is the highest intelligence?

K: Of course. If there is compassion, that compassion has its own intelligence and that intelligence acts. But if you have no compassion and no intelligence, then your conditioning makes you reply whatever he wants. I think that is fairly simple. To go back to the other question: Must a human being go through the whole process? Has no human being said, "I won't go through all this. I absolutely refuse to go through all this"?

Q: But on what basis does one refuse? It wouldn't make sense to refuse to do what is necessary.

K: Of course. You see, we are such creatures of habit. Because my father is conditioned, generations after generations are conditioned and I am conditioned. And I accept it, I work in it and I operate with it. But if I say, I won't ever operate in my conditioned responses, something else may take place. Then, if I

realize I am a bourgeois, I don't want to become an aristocrat or a militant, I refuse to be a bourgeois. Which doesn't mean I become a revolutionary, or join Lenin or Marx - those are all bourgeois to me. So something does take place. I reject the whole thing. You see, a human being never says, "I will reject the whole thing". I want to investigate that.

Q: Do you mean that even to say: "I am going to get rid of the whole thing" is not necessary?

K: Of course. I mean saying, "I won't be a bourgeois" is just words.

Q: But isn't the key to this somewhere in desire? There is some sort of desire for continuity, for security.

K: That's right. Bourgeois implies continuity, security, it implies belonging to something, a lack of taste, vulgarity - all that.

Q: But Krishnaji, if you are saying that Krishnamurti never said this, never had the need to say it, we can only conclude that you are some kind of freak.

K: No, no. You can say he is a freak but it doesn't answer the question. Krishnamurti says, "I have not touched all this". Somebody asks, "Why should I go through all this?" Don't say Krishnamurti is a freak, but ask: "How does it happen?"

Q: In saying, "I won't be a bourgeois" you are discovering it in yourself.

K: No, no. That is a different matter. If somebody says to you, "I have never been through all this", what do you do? Do you say he is a freak? Or would you say: "How extraordinary, is he telling the truth? Has he deceived himself"? You discuss with him. Then your question is: "How does it happen?" You are a human being,



he is a human being: you want to find out.

Q: You ask: "In what way are we different?" He is a human being that has never been through all that, and yet he points out.

K: No, he has never been through it. Don't say he points out. Don't you ask that question: "How does it happen, must I go through all this?" Do you ask that?

Q(1): I have assumed I must.

Q(2): Krishnaji, you are taking two widely separate things. One is the uncontaminated person, who never had to go through the process because he was never in the soup.

K: Leave out why he didn't go through it.

Q: But most other people, apparently, are in some form of...

K: ...conditioning...

Q(1): ...in some form of contamination, it may be fear, or something else. Therefore the person who has already got this sickness - let's call it that - says "This man has never been sick for a day in his life." What good is it to examine that, because one is already sick in some form.

Q(2): That is an assumption. I think we are saying that if any one human being never went through all this, that says something about the essence of mankind, which is a truth for everybody.

Q(3): But one is already sick.

Q(4): That may be a conclusion.

Q(5): It is also an ascertainable fact.

Q(6): I think one is assuming that whatever this sickness is, it is in the essence, it is essentially inevitable.

Q(7): I didn't say that. But I am saying it is a fact - at least it is to me - that there is the sickness in some form or another. I don't

think that is an assumption. I think that is a fact.

Q(8): But the question is: What does the fact depend upon? You see, the fact may depend upon an assumption which people make about themselves that it will take time to overcome that sickness.

Q(9): Is it part of the sickness to ask only about small things and not the greater things?

Q(10): Aside from all that the question is: How can a human being who is sick in some way, how can he get out of it directly without going through endless self-exploration?

K: Can we put the whole thing differently? Do you seek excellence, not excellence for instance in a building, but the essence of excellence? Then everything falls away, doesn't it? Or do you seek excellence in a certain direction and never the essence of excellence? As an artist I seek excellence in my painting and get caught in that. A scientist gets caught in something else. But an ordinary human being, not a specialist, just an average intelligent human being who does not take drugs, does not smoke, is fairly intelligent and decent, if he sought the essence of excellence, would this happen? The essence would meet all this. I wonder if I am conveying something?

Q: Does it exist apart from this manifestation? K: Listen carefully first. Don't object, or reject and say 'if' and 'but'. That very demand for excellence - how you demand it - brings the essence of it. You demand it passionately. You demand the highest intelligence, the highest excellence, the essence of it, and when fear arises, then you...

Q: Where does the demand come from?

K: Demand it! Don't say: "Where does it come from?" There

may be a motive, but the very demand washes it all away. I wonder if I am conveying anything?

Q: You are saying: Demand this excellence - which we don't know.

K: I don't know what is beyond it, but I want to be morally excellent.

Q: Does that mean goodness?

K: I demand the excellence of goodness, I demand the excellent flower of goodness. In that very demand there is a demand for the essence.

Q: Does perception come from this demand?

K: Yes, that's right.

Q: Could you go into what you call this demand?

K: It is not a demand which means asking, a demand that means imploring, wanting - cut out all those.

Q: It doesn't mean those?

K: No, no.

Q: But then you are back with prayer.

K: Oh, no. Leave out all that.

Q: You are really saying that the impossible is possible to the average intelligent human being?

K: We are saying that, yes. Which is not a conclusion, which is not a hope. I say it is possible for the average human being, who is fairly clean, who is fairly decent, fairly kind, who is not a bourgeois.

Q: Traditionally we are conditioned to believe that there are special people with no conscious content of consciousness, so it is very difficult for someone like me to feel that one could really be

completely free of it. K: You see, you have not listened. K says to you: "Please listen first, don't bring in all these objections. Just listen to what he is saying. That is, what is important in life is the supreme excellence which has its own essence." That's all. And to demand does not mean begging or praying, getting something from somebody.

Q: The point is, we find we confuse demand with desire.

K: Of course.

Q: There must be no beliefs.

K: No beliefs, no desire.

Q: You see, when people feel that they want to give up desire then there is a danger of giving up this demand as well.

K: How can we put this? Let's find a good word for it. Would the word "passion" be suitable? There is passion for this, passion for excellence.

Q: Does it imply that this passion has no object?

K: You see how you immediately form a conclusion. Burning passion - not for something. The Communists are passionate about their ideas. That passion is very, very petty and limited. The Christians have passion for missionary work - that passion is born of the love of Jesus. That again is not passion, it is very narrow. putting all that aside, I say: "Passion".

Q: As you were just saying, people have had some vision, or a dream of something and that has developed a great energy. But you are saying it is not a dream, it is not a vision; but it is nevertheless some perception of this excellence.

K: All those passions feed the ego, feed the me, make me important, consciously or unconsciously. We are cutting out all

that. There is a young boy who has a passion to grow up into an extraordinary human being, into something original.

Q: He sees that it is possible.

K: Yes.

Q: And therefore he has the passion.

K: Yes, that's right. It is possible. Is that what is missing in most human beings? Not passion, but the willing up of... I don't know how to put it. There is this passion in a human being who demands the supreme excellence, not in what he writes in his books, but the feeling of it. You know this, don't you? - that may shatter everything else. Again, that human being didn't demand it. He says: "I never even asked for it."

Q: Perhaps that is due to conditioning. We are conditioned to mediocrity, not to make this demand. That is what you mean by mediocrity.

K: Yes, of course. Mediocrity is lack of great passion - not for Jesus, or for Marx or whatever it is.

Q: We are not only conditioned to mediocrity but to direction, so the demand is always to have some direction.

K: The demand is a direction, quite right.

Q: To have a demand without any direction...

K: That's right. I like the word "demand", because it is a challenge.

Q: Doesn't a demand without direction imply that it is not in time?

K: Of course. It demands no direction, no time, no person. So does total insight bring this passion? Total insight is the passion.

Q: They can't be separate.

K: Total insight is the flame of passion which wipes away all confusion. It burns away everything else. Don't you then act as a magnet? The bees go towards the nectar. In the same way don't you act as a magnet when you are passionate to create? Is it that there is this lack of fire? That may be the thing that is missing. If there is something missing I would ask for it.

Q(1): Could we talk about the relationship between the conditioned and the unconditioned mind, and whether it is only possible to ask for small things, or can we somehow leap beyond that into something bigger?

Q(2): Whatever the me asks for, the asking in a direction is the small thing.

K: Quite right.

Q: We have to ask for the unlimited, for the unconditioned.

K: She is really asking: What is the relationship between the conditioned and the unconditioned? Also, what is the relationship between two human beings, when one is unconditioned and the other is not? There is no relationship.

Q: How can you say that there is no relationship between the unconditioned and the conditioned human being?

K: There is no relationship from the conditioned to the unconditioned. But the unconditioned has a relationship to the other.

Q: But logically one could ask: Is there an essential difference between the unconditioned and the conditioned? Because if you say there is, then there is duality.

K: What do you mean by essential difference?

Q: Let's say difference in kind. If there is an essential difference

between the conditioned and the unconditioned there is duality.

K: I see what you mean. X is conditioned, Y is not conditioned. X thinks in terms of duality, his very conditioning is duality. But duality has no relationship with Y, yet Y has a relationship to X.

Q: Because there is no duality.

K: Yes. Y has no duality therefore there is a relationship. You also asked some other question: Essentially, deeply, is there a difference? Are not both the same?

Q: Could one ask the question in another way? Is the conditioning only superficial?

K: No. Then we are lost.

Q(1): Could we put it like this? When you say, "You are the world, the world is you" - does that statement include the conditioned as well as the unconditioned?

Q(2): I am not sure about that. It seems that if the unconditioned mind can be related to the conditioned, can understand the conditioned, comprehend it, then there is not really a duality, that is fundamentally, in essence. The unconditioned mind comprehends the conditioned mind and goes beyond it.

Q(3): The world couldn't be unconditioned, could it?

K: The world is `me' and `me' is the world.

Q: That is an absolute fact only to the unconditioned.

K: Oh, not at all. Be careful, it is so. It is an obvious fact.

Q: You mean that only the unconditioned can perceive that? K: That is what she says. I am refuting it. I say it isn't quite like that.

Q: I mean it in the sense that I may say, "I am the world, the world is me", but I revert to an action which is a contradiction to that. Therefore it is not an absolute fact for me. There may be

moments when the fact of it is seen by me.

K: Yes. Do you mean: "I say to myself very clearly, `I am the world and the world is me'"?

Q: I see it.

K: I feel it.

Q: I feel it, yes.

K: And I act contrary to that. Which is, I act personally, selfishly - my, me. That is a contradiction to the fact that the world is me and I am the world. A person can say this merely as an intellectual conclusion, or a momentary feeling.

Q: It is not an intellectual conclusion, because I am stating my position, but I accept that for you the position is totally different.

K: No, you don't even have to accept that. See the fact, which is, when one says, "I am the world and the world is me" there is no me. But one's house has to be insured. I may have children, I have to earn a living - but there is no me. See the importance of it. There is no me all the time. I function, but there is no me which is seeking a higher position and all that. Though I am married I am not attached, I don't depend on a wife or husband. The appearances may give you the impression that the me is operating, but actually to a man who feels, "The world is me and I am the world", to him there is no me. To you, looking at him, there is. That human being lives in this world, he must have food, clothes and shelter, a job, transportation, all that, yet there is no me.

So when the world is me and I am the world, there is no me. Can that state, that quality operate in all directions? It must operate in all directions. When you say, "I am the world and the world is me", and there is no me, there is no conditioning. I don't put the



question: In that unconditioned state does the conditioned exist?  
When a human being says, "I am the world and the world is me",  
there is no I.

Q: Therefore the other person also is not there. There is no you.

K: There is no me, there is no you. When you ask if the  
conditioned exists in this state you are asking a wrong question.  
That is what I was getting at. Because when there is no I there is no  
you.

Q: The question is: How does that person see the kind of  
confusion that arises around I and you. He sees what is going on in  
the world, that people are generally confused about this.

K: I exist: there is you and me. And you also think the same  
thing. So we keep this division everlastingly. But when you and I  
really realize, have profound insight that, "The world is me and I  
am the world", there is no me.

Q: There is no me and no you. "No" means "everything".

K: The world of living - everything.

Q: Then the question, "Is there an essential difference between  
this and that, the unconditioned and the conditioned", doesn't arise,  
because there is no "between".

K: Yes, that's right. There is no you, there is no I in that state,  
which doesn't include the conditioned state. Is this too abstract?

Q: Why do you have to say, "I am the world" first, and then  
deny this?

K: Because it is an actuality.

Q: But then you imply that the I is still there if I say, "I am the  
world".

K: That is merely a statement. It is an actual fact that I am the

world.

Q: Whatever I mean by the word "I", I also mean by the word "world".

K: Yes.

Q: So we don't need those two words.

K: Yes. You and I - remove that.

Q: There is just everything.

K: No, this is very dangerous. If you say I am everything...

Q: I am trying to find out what you mean by "the world",.

K: If you say, "I am everything", then the murderer, the assassin is part of me. Q: Suppose I say, "I am the world" instead, does that change it?

K: (laughing) All right. I see the actual fact that I am the result of the world. The world means killing, wars, the whole of society - I am the result of that.

Q: And I see everybody is the result of that.

K: Yes. I am saying the result is I and you.

Q: And that separation.

K: When I say I am the world, I am saying all that.

Q: You mean to say I am generated by the world, I am identified with everything.

K: Yes. I am the product of the world

Q: The world is the essence of what I am.

K: Yes. I am the essence of the world. It is the same thing.

When there is a deep perception of that, not verbal, not intellectual, not emotional, not romantic, but profound, there is no you or me. I think that holds logically. But there is a danger. If I say the world is me, I am everything, I'll accept everything.

Q: You are really saying that one is the product of the whole of society.

K: Yes.

Q: But I am also of the essence of the whole of society.

K: Yes. I am really the essential result of all this.

Q: Does it help to use the word "ego"?

K: It is the same thing, it doesn't matter. You see, when you say me, or ego, there is a possibility of deception that 'I' is the very essence of God. You know about that superstition.

Q: The Atman.

K: Yes.

Q: But there is still another question. Is the unconditioned mind also a product of all this? Then we come to a contradiction.

K: No, there is no contradiction. Without using the word "I" it can be said: the result of the world is this. The result of the world is that also. We are two human beings, which means the result has created the I and the you. When there is an insight into the result there is no "result". Q: The result changes and vanishes when we see it.

K: That means there is no result. Therefore 'you' and 'I' don't exist. That is an actual fact for a man who says, "I am not the result". You see what it means? There is no causation in the mind and therefore there is no effect. Therefore it is whole, and any action born of it is causeless and without effect.

Q: You have to make that clear, in the sense that you still use cause and effect concerning ordinary, mechanical things.

K: Quite. This human being, X, is a result. And Y is a result. X says I, and Y says I; therefore there is you and I. X says I see this

and investigates, goes into it and he has an insight. In that insight the two results cease. Therefore in that state there is no cause.

Q: There is no cause and no effect although it may leave a residue in the mind.

K: Let's go into it. In that state there is no result, no cause, no effect. That mind acts out of compassion. Therefore there is no result.

Q: But in some sense it would look as if there were a result.

K: But compassion has no result. A is suffering, he says to X, "Please help me to get out of my suffering." If X really has compassion his words have no result.

Q: Something happens, but there is no result.

K: That's it.

Q: But I think people generally are seeking a result.

K: Yes. Let's put it another way. Does compassion have a result? When there is result there is cause. When compassion has a cause then you are no longer compassionate.

Q(1): It is an extremely subtle thing, because something happens which seems final and yet is not.

Q(2): But compassion also acts.

K: Compassion is compassion, it doesn't act. If it acts because there is a cause and an effect, then it is not compassion: it wants a result.

Q: It acts purely.

K: It wants a result. Q: What makes it want a result is the idea of separation. Somebody says, " There is a person suffering, I would like to produce the result that he is not suffering. " But that is based on the idea that there is me and he.

K: That's it.

Q: There is no he and no I. There is no room, no place to have this result.

K: It is a tremendous thing! One has to look at it very, very carefully. Look, "The world is me and I am the world". When I say me, you exist: both of us are there. The you and the I are the results of man's misery, of selfishness, and so on - it is a result. When one looks into the result, goes into it very, very deeply, the insight brings about a quality in which you and I - who are the result - don't exist. This is easy to agree to verbally, but when you see it deeply there is no you and no me. Therefore there is no result - which means compassion. The person upon whom that compassion acts wants a result. We say, "Sorry, there is no result." But the man who suffers says, "Help me to get out of this", or, "Help me to bring back my son, my wife", or whatever it is. He is demanding a result. This thing has no result. The result is the world.

Q: Does compassion affect the consciousness of man?

K: Yes. It affects the deep layers of consciousness.

The I is the result of the world, the you is the result of the world. And to the man who sees this deeply with a profound insight, there is no you or I. Therefore that profound insight is compassion - which is intelligence. And the intelligence says: If you want a result I can't give it to you, I am not the product of a result. Compassion says: This state is not a result, therefore there is no cause.

Q: Does that mean there is no time either?

K: No cause, no result, no time.

# **1ST CONVERSATION WITH DR BOHM & DR SHAINBERG BROCKWOOD PARK 17TH MAY 1976 'TRANSFORMATION OF MAN'**

## **INTRODUCTION TO RECORDING SESSIONS:**

Questioner: Sir, we would like to know as much as we can about you before we start these dialogues. Would you please tell us where we are and who you are, and how you came to participate with Mr Krishnamurti in his teachings.

Dr Bohm: We are here in Brockwood Park in Hampshire in England. And I am David Bohm, a professor of theoretical physics at the University of London. Now as to how I came here to participate: I think it best to begin by saying a little about my work, that in my studies in theoretical physics I have always been interested in what you'd call the deeper questions, the nature of time and space and matter, causality and what is behind it all, what is universal. And in general I found that very few physicists shared this interest, and I pursued it as best I could. But when we arrived in Bristol in 1957 there was a very good public library there, and my wife and I used to go there, and we became interested in books on philosophy and religion and we picked up a book by Mr Krishnamurti called **FIRST AND LAST FREEDOM**, and I read that and found it extremely interesting, especially because it discussed the observer and the observed. That is a question which is very significant in theoretical physics and the quantum theory: Heisenberg has brought it out with the effect of the observer on the particle which is observed. Also many other questions were raised there and I felt the whole thing very interesting.

I read as many books as I could find by Mr Krishnamurti; then I wrote a letter to the publishers to ask where he was and finally I was put in contact with the Krishnamurti Foundation in England, and they said he was coming to talk. This was around 1960 or '61, I forget which. And so I arranged to come. Then while listening to the talks I sent another letter to the Foundation asking if I could talk personally with Mr Krishnamurti and they arranged a time. So we met and we talked. I think at that time I told him about my ideas in physics - he appreciated the spirit. And then every time after that, every year when Krishnamurti came to London we arranged to meet, once or twice, until later I began to go to Saanen in Switzerland and there we met more often.

And finally, around '66 or '67, there was a plan to make a school in which Krishnamurti asked me to take part and gradually the school was organized here at Brockwood Park and I have been coming regularly. You know I am a member, a Trustee of the Foundation which is responsible for this school and also I come down to discuss with people and take part generally. And we have gone on discussing the questions which you will see arising. That essentially explains how I got here.

Q: And you, Dr Shainberg? We would like to know about you.

Dr Shainberg: Well, I am a practising psychiatrist in New York City. I first came to read and think about what Krishnamurti said as early as 1949, or '48, when I was about, let's see how old was I, I was about 18 or 19 then. And through the influence of several concatenations of events, I suppose the main one was my father, who was involved at that time with reading Krishnamurti. It seemed to me at that time even then that there was something there

that was of interest in the question that the observer is the observed. How, and what the meaning, or the feeling of it was, I can say was only in a kind of intuitive awareness that this seemed to be the direction in which I wanted to move.

Then I went to college, I went to medical school, I trained as a psychiatrist, I trained as a neurologist, I trained as a psychologist. I had many different experiences. And all along I was reading Mr Krishnamurti, and still thinking about it, still trying to understand the difference between what he was saying and what western psychiatry, or western psychology was communicating. But it's only been in the last, I would say five to six years that I have really begun to feel that I have begun to understand how I can use it in my work. And most of that stimulus has come from meeting Dr Bohm, who has moved my thinking along and I have come to feel that specifically there is something about the way we think in psychiatry, which is, that all the theories deal with fragmentation and the relationships between fragmentation, and most of them do not have any understanding of the holistic action, the holism that gives birth to this fragmentation. So that very often it seemed to me, and it has seemed to me that most of the theories that we have analyse and break things down and break things into pieces which collaborate with the very problems that our patients present us with.

And again I feel, very similar to what Dr Bohm said, that we have never really got in, in psychiatry, and Mr Krishnamurti's work has begun to help me to understand that the relationship between the observer and the observed in the very patient/doctor situation is very important, and that the very theories that we create are part of



our very problem, that the fragmented people that we are, the fragmented theorists represent fragmentation and then call that the thing that we have to treat. There seems to be a basic problem here that I feel will come out in these dialogues, and I have talked with Mr Krishnamurti many times and they point the way as to how we can get through this problem of the fragmentation.

Q: Mr Krishnamurti, how can the viewer best share in these dialogues? How can he gain the most from this experience?

Krishnamurti: I think it all depends how serious you are. How serious in the sense of how deeply you want to go into these questions, which is after all your life. We are not discussing theoretically some abstract hypothesis, but we are dealing with actual daily life of every human being, whether he lives in India, or here, or in America, or anywhere else. We are dealing with the actual facts of fear, pleasure, sorrow, death and if there is anything sacred in life. Because if we don't find something real, something that is true life has very little meaning.

So if you are really serious to go into this matter very carefully and with care, with attention, then you can share a great deal. But you have to be serious, really serious. And if you listen to it, listen with care, with attention, with a sense of affection, not agreeing or disagreeing, that anybody can do, but if you really care to find out how to live properly, what is right relationship between human beings, then you will share completely, I think, with all that we discuss or have a dialogue about during the next few days.

#### DIALOGUE NO 1

Krishnamurti: What shall we talk about? What do you think is the most important thing that we three can talk about?

Dr. Shainberg: Well, the one thing I had an idea lately, you know, there has been one thing on my mind, and I have been getting it from - when we had talked before, and that is the feeling you have been conveying that life comes first and not thought or work, something like that, in other words, I find in myself, and find - I think most people are caught up in the fact that - it seems, I can't - you know you said once we live second hand lives. If we could talk about that. I think then there is second handedness of our lives.

K: What do you say?

Dr. Bohm: Well, in relation to that perhaps I would like to talk about the question of wholeness.

K: Shall we talk about that first?

B: Which first?

K: And then include yours.

S: Sure. I mean, I think this is part of that. I see that second handedness is not wholeness.

K: Quite. I wonder how we can approach this question knowing that most people are fragmented broken up and not whole. How do we tackle or approach this question?

S: Through direct awareness of the fragmentation.

K: No. I would like to - I am just asking because - are we discussing it theoretically, verbally?

S: No.

K: Or taking ourselves - you, we three - taking ourselves as we are and examining what we mean by fragmented. And then work from there to what is the whole, not theoretically or verbally? Then I think that has vitality, that has some meaning.

S: Right, right. Well, if we see the fragmentation, wholeness is

there.

K: I know. No, don't assume anything. Then we are after theory.

B: That's too fast.

S: Alright, right.

K: You know, we have been talking to lots of students here - this question. Dr. Bohm was there too. And whether we can ever be aware of ourselves at all. Or we are only aware of patches, not the totality of fragmentations. I do not know if I am conveying this.

S: Well you can. Go ahead.

K: Can one be aware, conscious, know the various fragments, examining one by one by one by one? And who is the examiner? Is he not also a fragment who has assumed an authority? So when we talk about being aware of fragments, socially, morally, ethically, religiously - business, art, you know, the whole activity is fragmented. Can one, is one aware of the movement of these fragments or do you take one fragment and examine it or say yes, I am aware of that and not the many. Do you follow what I am saying?

S: Yes, I am following. I think you are mostly aware - I think, when I think of what you are saying, I seem to be aware of that kind of many fragments.

K: Are you?

S: Well, not. One at a time, you know, like a machine-gun.

K: So you are really aware one by one.

S: Right. And caught up by the movement of the fragments.

K: One by one. Is that so? Are you sure that it is so?

S: Yes. I think, I mean it seems to be that - but then sometimes you can take a step back, or you seem to take a step back or I seem

to take a step back when I am aware of these many.

K: When Dr. Bohm asked, can't we talk over together, this question of wholeness which implies holiness, health, sanity and all that, I wonder from what source he is asking that question.

S: Yes. You mean whether he is coming from a fragmented position or he is coming from a whole position?

K: No. If he is asking from the whole position, there is no question.

S: Right.

K: Sir, I would like to, if one may ask, are we aware of the fragments as a whole, take a collection of fragments or are we aware of one fragment at each time? What do you say?

B: Generally, thing presents itself first as primarily one fragment with a background of all the other fragments perhaps dimly present in it. I mean, in the beginning one fragment seems to take emphasis pre-eminence in awareness.

S: Isn't that one fragment fragments out quickly into many little fragments. I have an idea and then that idea is in contrast to another idea and so I am immediately caught up into two fragments there. And then I have another idea which is the repetition of that first idea. So I am caught up in a movement of fragments rather than - I mean, my identity is fragmented, my relationship is fragmented, my very substance of movement is a feeling of fragmentation. I don't have any centre when I am fragmented. I am not...

K: I am not sure about that.

S: That is the question, yes.

B: No, no.

K: I am not at all sure that there is no centre when you are

fragmented.

B: Right, then definitely there is a centre.

K: There is.

B: That is the major fragment that one is aware of.

K: That's right.

S: Let us go into that more.

B: Well, I just think that there is a centre which you may sense anywhere, say here, and that seems to be the centre of everything, everything that is connected to everything.

S: I see what you are saying, but I feel that when the fragmentation is going on it is like the centre is looking for itself, it feels like it has a centre.

K: Are you aware of the fragmentation? Not, fragmentation is going on.

S: No, you know, I am not.

K: Then what are we aware of?

S: I think - that is a terrific question - because when there is fragmentation what we are aware of is like being sucked into more fragments. In other words there is a kind of movement of more fragmentation, more fragmentation, which is what we are aware of. It is what you have talked about in terms of pleasure. It is like pleasure is pulling us forward into more fragments: this would give me pleasure, that would give me pleasure, that would give me pleasure. And it is that feeling of pieces.

K: Before we go into the question of pleasure...

S: Yes.

K: ...are we aware actually, from a centre, which says, "I am fragmented"? That is the question, isn't it?

B: Yes.

S: Right. That is the question.

B: We are both aware of a centre, and from a centre, you see.

K: That's it.

B: And this centre seems to be, as you say, the fragment that is dominating, or attempting to dominate.

K: That centre is the dominating factor.

B: Yes. In other words...

K: Which is in itself a fragment.

B: Yes, I mean, well it seems to be the centre of your being, or as it were the centre of the ego, or the self, which one might think is the whole.

K: Quite, quite.

B: Because it is in contact with everything, you see.

K: Would you say having a centre is the very cause of fragmentation?

B: Yes, I would say that although at first sight it seems different.

S: At first sight - I think that is important. The difference between - at first sight it doesn't seem that way.

B: At first sight it seems that the centre is what is organizing everything into a whole.

S: Right.

K: Yes.

B: In other words one feels one wants a centre to bring everything to a whole, to stop the fragmentation.

K: Yes, try to bring about integration, try to bring a wholeness, and all that.

S: Right. If you see, if you feel the fragmentation, then you centre here and say, "I can see all the fragmentations" - but that is still centre.

K: No, but I am asking whether when there is a centre doesn't it make for fragments?

S: That I see. I see what you are saying. But I am trying to take it from what is the experience when there is fragmentation. There doesn't seem to be a centre.

K: Contradiction. Contradiction.

S: Right. But it doesn't feel like a centre.

K: No. Contradiction. Sir, when there are fragments, I am aware of the fragments because of contradiction.

S: Right.

K: Because of opposing factors.

S: Yes.

B: You mean by contradiction also conflict.

K: Conflict. Out of contradiction there is conflict. Then I am aware that there are fragments. I am working in an area of fragments.

S: Right. But then - yes, I am not aware of the fact that I have in fact got a centre. That is the self deception, right there.

K: No, sir - don't you think, if I may suggest, that where there is conflict then only you are aware of a conflict of contradiction. That is, one is aware only when there is conflict. Right? And then the next awareness, the next movement is conflict arises out of fragmentation; opposing elements, opposing desires, opposing wishes, opposing thoughts.

B: But are you saying that these oppose first before one is

aware; and then suddenly you are aware through the unpleasantness or the pain of the opposition that the conflict is unpleasant?

K: Yes, conflict is unpleasant and therefore one is aware that...

B: ...that something is wrong.

K: Wrong. Yes.

B: Yes, that something is wrong, not just simply wrong but wrong with the whole thing.

K: The whole thing, of course.

Sir, after all self consciousness, when you are aware of yourself only when there is pain, or intense pleasure. Otherwise you are not aware of yourself. So fragmentation with its conflict brings this sense of, I am aware I am in conflict - otherwise there is no awareness. I wonder if I am.?

S: Yes. Go ahead. You are saying that the very fragmentation itself breeds the centre.

K: Breeds the centre.

S: And the centre has bred the fragmentation, so it is like a...

K: Yes, back and forth.

B: Then would you say that thought in itself before there is a centre breeds conflict? Or is there thought before a centre?

K: Is there thought before the centre.

B: I mean one view is to say that the centre and thought are always co-existent and that one breeds the other.

K: One breeds the other, quite.

B: And the other view is to say that there might be thought first and that produces conflict and then that produces a centre.

K: Let's go into that a little bit.



B: Yes.

S: That's a good one.

K: Does thought exist before conflict?

B: Before a centre.

K: Before the centre. One is aware of the centre only when there is conflict.

B: Yes, because that comes in apparently to try to bring about wholeness again, to take charge of everything.

K: The centre tries to take charge, or tries to create wholeness.

B: Yes, to bring all the factors together.

K: Yes, but the centre itself is a fragment.

B: Yes, but it doesn't know that.

K: Of course, it doesn't know but it thinks it can bring all the fragments together and make it a whole. So Dr Bohm is asking the question, which is: did thought exist before the centre, or the centre existed before the thought.

B: Or are the two together?

K: Or the two together.

S: Right, right. Or he is also asking: does thought create the centre?

K: Thought creates the centre.

S: That would be the action, the very creation, a sort of after effect of the thought. In other words is the organism - is the production of thought the very cause of a centre? That I think carries...

K: Yes, let's be clear on this. Are we asking: did thought create the centre?

B: And yes, was there a kind of thought before a centre?

K: Yes. Thought before the centre. That's it.

B: Which came into contradiction.

K: Yes, thought created the centre, or the centre existed before the thought.

B: Or else the centre - I mean that is a view which is common. I mean people think the centre is me who was first.

K: Me is the first.

B: And then I began to think! Right.

K: Yes. I think thought exists before the centre.

S: Yes, then we have to ask the question - I don't know if we want to get into it at this minute - but we have to ask the question of why is there thought, what is thought?

K: Oh, that is a different matter. We will go into that.

B: That might be a long story.

S: Yes. That's not for now. But we have to get at that.

K: No.

S: Let's stay with what we started with.

K: We started out asking: can we talk about the wholeness of life. How can one be aware of that wholeness if one is fragmented? That is the next question. You can't be aware of the whole if I am only looking through a small hole.

S: Right. But on the other hand in actuality you are the whole.

K: Ah! That is a theory.

S: Is it?

B: A supposition, yes.

K: Of course, when you are fragmented how can you assume that you are the whole?

S: Well that is wonderful. I mean that is an issue because how

am I to know I am fragmented?

K: That is what we are asking.

S: Yes.

K: When are you aware that you are fragmented? Only when there is conflict.

S: That's right.

K: When the two opposing desires, opposing elements of movement, then there is conflict, then you have pain, or whatever it is, and then you become conscious.

S: Right. But at those moments it often happens that you don't want to let go of the conflict. It is like you feel your fragmentation...

K: No, that is a different matter. That is a different matter.

S: Right.

K: What we are asking is: can the fragment dissolve itself, and then only it is possible to see the whole. You cannot be fragmented and then wish for the whole.

S: Right.

K: Then it is merely...

S: All you really know is your fragmentation.

K: That is all we know.

B: That is right.

K: Therefore let's stick to that and not beat round the bush and say, let's talk about the whole and all the rest of it.

S: Right.

B: And the supposition that there is a whole may be reasonable but as long as you are fragmented you could never see it. It would be just an assumption.

K: Of course, right.

S: Right.

B: You may think you have experienced it once, but that is also an assumption, that is gone.

K: Absolutely. Quite right.

S: You know, I wonder if there is not a tremendous pain or something that goes on when I am aware of my fragmentation. That is the loneliness somehow.

K: Look sir: can you be aware of your fragments? That you are an American, that I am a Hindu, you are a Jew or whatever, Communist - you just live in that state. You don't say, "Well, I know I am a Hindu" - it is only when you are challenged, it is only when it is said, "What are you?", then you say, "I am an Indian", or a Hindu, or an Arab.

B: When the country is challenged then you have got to worry.

K: Of course.

S: So you are saying that I am living totally reactively.

K: No, you are totally living in a kind of, what? A miasma, confusion.

S: From one piece to the next, from one reaction to the next reaction.

K: Reward and punishment in that movement. So can we be aware, actually now, now, of the various fragments? That I am a Hindu, that I am a Jew, that I am an Arab, that I am a Communist, that I am a Catholic, that I am a businessman, I am married, I have responsibilities, I am an artist, I am a scientist. You follow? All this various sociological fragmentation.

S: Right.

K: As well as psychological fragmentation.

S: Right, right. That is exactly what I started with. Right. This feeling that I am a fragment, this feeling that that is where I get absorbed, being a fragment.

K: Which you call the individual.

S: That I call important, not just the individual.

K: You call that important.

S: Right. That I have to work.

K: Quite.

S: It is significant.

K: So can we now in talking over together, be aware that I am that? I am a fragment and therefore creating more fragments, more conflict, more misery, more confusion, more sorrow, because when there is conflict it affects everything.

S: Right.

K: Can you be aware of it as we are discussing?

S: I can be aware as we are discussing it a little.

K: Not a little.

S: That's the trouble. Why can't I be aware of it?

K: Look sir. You are only aware of it when there is conflict. It is not a conflict in you now.

S: Yes.

B: But is it possible to be aware of it without conflict?

K: That is the next thing, yes. That requires quite a different approach.

B: How will we consider this different approach?

K: Quite a different approach.

B: But I was thinking of looking at one point that the

importance of these fragments is that when I identify myself and say, "I am this", "I am that", I mean the whole of me. In other words the whole of me is rich or poor, or American, or whatever, and therefore it is all important because it is the whole. I think it seems that the trouble is that the fragment claims that it is the whole, and makes itself very important.

S: Takes up the whole life. This is life.

B: Then comes a contradiction and then comes another fragment saying it is the whole.

K: Look what is happening in Northern Ireland; in the Arab world, the Middle Eastern world, the Muslim and the Hindu; you know this whole world is broken up that way, outside and inside.

S: Me and you.

K: Yes, me and you, we and they, and all the rest of it.

B: But I mean that is the difference between saying we have a lot of different objects in the room which are separate and so on, which we can handle.

K: That is a different thing.

B: There is no problem there. But if we say, "I am this, I am wholly this", then I also say, "I am wholly that".

S: You are bringing in something different here. That is exactly how it is that we come to believe in these fragments. Because we look at objects and we say they are separate things, therefore I am a separate thing.

K: I question that sir. Say for instance, the Arab and the Israeli - are they aware that I am an Arab, I want to fight that somebody else who is not? Or I have an idea - you follow - an idea.

B: What do you mean? An idea that I am an Arab.

K: Yes.

B: But the idea is that that is very important, or rather I am totally in error. It is all important, that is one of the ideas. And now somebody else has the idea I am a Jew, that is all important and therefore they must destroy each other.

K: Impossible. Quite. And I think the politicians, the religious people are encouraging all this.

B: But they are also running by fragments.

K: Because they are fragmented themselves. You see that is the whole point. People who are in power, being fragmented, sustain the fragmentation.

S: Right. It is the only way to get into power, to be fragmented.

K: Of course.

B: Well he says, it is all important that I should be a politician, successful and so on.

K: Of course.

S: This movement into fragmentation, almost it seems to be caused by something. It seems to be...

K: Is this what you are asking: what is the cause of this fragmentation?

S: Yes. Right. What is the cause of the fragmentation? What breeds it? What sucks us into it?

K: Look: what brings about fragmentation?

S: Now, you know what brings it about. When the mother and child - when the child separates from the mother. Right?

K: Biologically.

S: No, psychologically. The child starts able to walk, and the child can walk away, then he runs back and then he runs back and

he looks back, he says, is she still there. Gradually moves away.  
Now the mother that is not able to let go says, "Come back here".

K: Quite.

S: Then scares the child to death because the child thinks I can't do it, if she says I can't do it, I can't do it.

K: Quite. We are asking something very important, which is: what is the cause of this fragmentation?

S: That is what I was getting into. There is some cause there and it begins there, I have got to hold on to something.

K: No. Just look at it sir. What has brought fragmentation in you?

S: Well, my immediate response is the need to hold on to something.

K: No, much deeper than that. Much more deep. Look at it. Look at it. Let's go slowly at it.

S: OK.

K: Not immediate responses. What brings this conflict which indicates I am fragmented, and then I ask the question: what brings this fragmentation. What is the cause of it?

B: Are you saying there is a conflict and there something happens that causes fragmentation in the conflict?

S: No, he is saying the fragmentation causes the conflict.

B: Then what is the cause of the fragmentation? Right. That is important.

K: That's right sir. Why are you and I and the majority of the world fragmented? What is the cause of it?

B: It seems we won't find the cause by going back in time to a certain...



S: I am not looking for genetics, I am looking for right this second to come upon a, to put it in these worlds, it seems to do that, there is a focussing or a holding on to something inside my movements.

K: Sir, look at it as though not from Dr Shainberg's point of view, just look at it. Put it on the table and look at it objectively. What brings about this fragmentation?

S: Fear.

K: No, no, much more.

B: Maybe the fragmentation causes fear.

K: Yes, that's it. Why am I a Hindu? - if I am, I am not a Hindu, I am not an Indian, I have no nationality. But suppose I have, I call myself a Hindu. What makes me a Hindu?

S: Well, conditioning makes you a Hindu.

K: What is the background, what is the feeling or what is it that makes me say "I am a Hindu"? Which is a fragmentation, obviously.

S: Right, right.

K: What makes it? My father, my grandfather, generations and generations after ten thousand or five thousand years, they have said, you are a Brahmin. And I see all that. I am a Brahmin.

S: You don't say or write, I am a Brahmin, you are a Brahmin. Right. That is quite different. You say, I am a Brahmin because...

K: It is like you saying, I am a Christian.

S: Right.

K: Which is what?

S: That is tradition, conditioning, sociology, history, culture, family, everything.

K: But behind that, what is that?

S: Behind that is man's...

K: No, no. Don't theorize. Look at it in yourself.

S: Well that gives me a place, an identity, I know who I am then, I am. I have my little niche.

K: Who made that niche?

S: Well I made it and they helped me make it. I am co-operating in this very...

K: You are not co-operating. You are it.

S: I am it. Right. That's right. The whole thing is moving towards putting me in a hole.

K: So what made you? The great great grandparent made, created this environment, this culture, this whole structure of human existence, with all its misery and with all the mess it is in, what has brought it about? Which is the fragmentation, all the conflict.

S: The same action then is there.

K: That is all I am asking.

S: The same action that makes man right now.

K: Exactly. The Babylonians, the Egyptians, we are exactly the same now.

S: Right.

B: Yes.

S: This is what I was getting at in the beginning. This is all giving me my secondhand existence.

K: Yes. Proceed. Let's go into it. Let's find out why man has bred, or brought about this state, and which we accept. You follow? Gladly or unwillingly. We are of it. I am willing to kill

somebody because he is a communist or a socialist or whatever it is. That is exactly what is going on in Northern Ireland, in the Middle East.

S: Well, everywhere, the doctors, lawyers.

K: Of course, of course. The same problem.

S: My sense of it is that it stops me, it closes me off, it keeps the movement - it's like the tree doesn't get in. If I know who I am then I don't look at the tree.

K: Yes, sir. You are not answering my question. Is it the desire for security, biological as well as psychological security?

S: You could say yes.

K: If I belong to something, to some organization, to some group, to some sect, to some ideological community, I am safe there.

B: That is not clear: you may feel safe.

K: I feel safe then. But it may not be safety.

B: Yes, but why don't I see that I am not really safe?

K: Because I am so - what? Go into it.

S: I don't see it.

K: Just look: I join a community.

S: Right. I am a doctor.

K: Yes, you are a doctor.

S: I get all these ideas.

K: You are a doctor, you have a special position in society.

S: Right. I have a lot of ideas of how things work.

K: You are in a special position in society and there you are completely safe.

S: Right.

K: You can malpractice and all the rest of it, but you are very protected by other doctors, the other organizations, a group of doctors. You follow?

S: Right.

K: You feel secure.

B: It is essential that I shouldn't enquire too far to feel secure, isn't it? In other words, I must stop my enquiry at a certain point.

K: I am a doctor - finished.

B: I don't ask many questions but if I start to ask questions...

K: ...Then you are out!

B: If I say, don't ask questions, that's all right.

K: If I begin to ask questions about my community and my relation to that community, my relationship to the world, my relation to my neighbour, I am finished. I am out of the community. I am lost.

S: That's right.

K: So to feel safe, secure, protected, I belong.

S: I depend.

K: Depend.

B: I depend wholly in one sense that if I don't have that then I feel the whole thing is sunk.

S: This is good. You see not only do I depend but every problem that I now have is with reference to this dependency. I don't know from nothing about the patient, I only know about how the patient doesn't fit into my system.

K: Quite, quite.

S: So that is my conflict.

K: He is your victim.

S: That's right, my victim.

B: It is still not clear why I should go on with it. You see in other words as long as I don't ask questions I can feel comfortable. But I feel uncomfortable when I do ask questions, very deeply uncomfortable. Because the whole of my situation is challenged. But then if I look at it more broadly I see the whole thing has no foundation, it is all dangerous. In other words this community itself is in a mess, it may collapse. Even if the whole of it doesn't collapse, you can't count on the academic profession anymore, they may not give money for universities. Everything is changing so fast that you don't know where you are. So why should I go on with not asking questions?

K: Why don't I ask questions? Because of fear.

B: Yes, but that fear is from fragmentations.

K: Of course. So is it the beginning of this fragmentation takes place when one is seeking security?

S: But why?

K: Both biologically and as well as psychologically. Primarily psychologically, then biologically.

S: Right.

K: Physically.

B: But isn't the tendency to seek security physically built into the organism?

K: Yes, that's right. It is. I must have food, clothes, shelter. It is absolutely necessary.

S: Right.

K: And when that is threatened - if I questioned the communist system altogether, living in Russia, I am a non-person.

S: But let's go a little bit slower here. You are suggesting there that in my need for security biologically I must have some fragmentation.

K: No, sir. Biologically fragmentation takes place, the insecurity takes place when psychologically I want security.

S: OK.

K: I don't know if I am making myself clear. Wait a minute. That is: if I don't psychologically belong to a group, then I am out of that group.

S: Then I am insecure.

K: I am insecure.

S: Right.

K: And because the group gives me security, physical security, I accept everything they give me, say to me.

S: Right.

K: But the moment I object psychologically to the structure of the society or the community I am lost.

S: Right.

K: This is an obvious fact.

S: Right.

B: Yes.

S: Were you suggesting then that the basic insecurity that we live in is being conditioned, the response, the answer to this is a conditioned fragmentation?

K: Partly.

S: And that the movement of fragmentation is the conditioning.

K: Sir, look, look: if there was no fragmentation, both historically, geographically, nationally, no nations, we would live

perfectly safely. We would all be protected, you would all have food - you follow - all have houses. There would be no wars, you'd be all one. He is my brother; I am him, he is me. But this fragmentation prevents that taking place.

S: Right. So you are even suggesting something more there - you are suggesting that we would help each other.

K: I would help, obviously.

B: We are going around in a circle still.

K: Yes, sir. I want to get back to something, which is: if there were no nationalities, no ideological groups, and so on and so on, we would have everything we want, instead of depending on armaments and all the rest of it, all that. That is prevented because I am a Hindu, you are an Arab, he is a Russian. You follow? All that is prevented. We are asking: why does this fragmentation take place? What is the source of it? Is it knowledge? Yes, sir.

S: It is knowledge, you say.

K: Is it knowledge; I am sure it is, but I am putting it as a question.

S: It certainly seems to be.

K: No, no. Look into it. Let's find out.

S: What do you mean by knowledge, what are you talking about there?

K: The word to know: do I know you? Or I have known you? I can never say, I know you - actually. It would be an abomination to say, 'I know you'. I have known you. Because you in the meantime are changing, you have all your - you follow - there is a great deal of movement going on in you.

S: Right.

K: To say, I know you, means I am acquainted or intimate with that movement which is going on in you. It would be impudence on my part to say, I know you.

S: That's right. Because not only that, it would be denying your effect on me which is causing a change from knowing you, and so being with you.

K: So knowing, to know is the past. Would you say that?

B: Yes, I mean what we know is the past.

K: Knowledge is the past.

B: I mean the danger is that we call it the present. The danger is that we call knowledge the present.

K: That is just it.

B: In other words if we said the past is the past, then wouldn't you say it needn't fragment?

K: What is that sir?

B: If we said, if we recognized, acknowledge that the past is the past, it is gone, therefore what we know is the past, then that would not introduce fragmentation.

K: No, it wouldn't, quite right.

B: But if we say what we know is what is present now, then we are introducing fragmentation.

K: Quite right, quite.

B: Because we are imposing this partial knowledge on the whole.

K: Sir, would you say knowledge is one of the factors of fragmentation? Sir, that is saying an awful - you follow? It is a large pill to swallow!

B: And also there are plenty of other factors.



K: Yes. And that may be the only factor.

B: But I think we should look at it this way: that people hope through knowledge to overcome fragmentation.

K: Of course.

B: To produce a system of knowledge that will put it all together.

K: Like in Bronowsky's *Ascent of Man* through knowledge, emphasizing knowledge. Is that not one of the major factors, or perhaps the factor of fragmentation? My experience tells me, I am a Hindu: my experience tells me I know what god is.

B: Wouldn't it be better to say that confusion about the whole of knowledge is because of fragmentation? In other words knowledge itself. You say, knowledge is always the cause.

K: No, I said, we began by asking...

B: That's my question.

K: Of course, of course. Sir, that is what we said yesterday in our talk; art is putting things in its right place. So I will put knowledge in its right place.

B: Yes, so we are not confused about it.

K: Of course.

S: You know I was just going to bring in this rather interesting example of a patient of mine who was teaching me something the other day. She said, I have the feeling that as a doctor the way you operate is, she said, there is a group of doctors who have seen certain kinds of patients, and if they do 'X' to them they will get a certain kind of effect. You are not talking to me, you are doing this to me hoping you will get this result. (Laughter)

K: Quite.

S: That is what you are saying.

K: No, a little more, sir, than that. We are saying both Dr Bohm and I, we are saying, knowledge has its place.

S: Let's go into that.

K: Like driving a car, learning a language and so on.

B: One could say: why is that not fragmentation? We have to make it clear. In other words if we drive a car using knowledge that is not fragmentation.

K: No, but when knowledge is used psychologically...

B: One should see more clearly what the difference is. The car itself, as I see it, is a part, a limited part and therefore it can be handled by knowledge.

S: It is a limited part of life.

B: Of life, yes. When we say I am so and so, I mean the whole of me. And therefore I am applying the part to the whole. I am trying to cover the whole by the part.

K: When knowledge assumes it understands the whole...

B: Yes.

S: Yes.

K: ...then begins the mischief.

B: But it is often very tricky because I am not explicitly spelling out that I understand the whole, but it is implicit by saying I, or everything is this way, or I am this way.

K: Quite, quite.

B: It implies that the whole is this way, you see. The whole of me, the whole of life, the whole of the world.

S: Krishnaji was saying, I mean like, "I know you", that is how we deal with ourselves. We say, I know this and that about me,

rather than being open to the new. Or even being aware of the fragmentation.

B: If I am saying about you then I shouldn't say I know all because you are not a limited part like a machine is. You see the machine is fairly limited and we can know all that is relevant about it, or most of it anyway. Sometimes it breaks down.

K: Quite, quite.

B: But when it comes to another person that is immensely beyond what you could really know. The past experience doesn't tell you the essence.

K: Are you saying, Dr Bohm, that when knowledge spills over into the psychological field...

B: Well, also in another field which I call the whole in general. You see sometimes it spills over into the philosophical field and man tries to make it metaphysical, the whole universe.

K: That is of course. I mean that is purely theoretical and that has no meaning to me personally.

B: But I mean that is one of the ways in which it does that, you see. It goes wrong. Some people feel that when they are discussing metaphysics of the whole universe that is not psychological, it probably is but the motives behind it are psychological but some people may feel that they are making a theory of the universe, not discussing psychology. I think it is a matter of getting the language.

K: Language, quite.

S: Well, you see this, what you are saying, can be extended to the way people are. They have a metaphysics about other people: I know all other people are not to be trusted.

K: Of course.

B: You have a metaphysics about yourself saying, I am such and such a person.

S: Right. I have a metaphysics that life is hopeless and I must depend on these things.

K: No, all that you can say is that we are fragmented. That is a fact. And I am aware of those fragmentations, fragmented mind, there is an awareness of the fragmented mind because of conflict.

S: That's right.

B: You were saying before that we have got to have an approach where we are not aware just because of that.

K: Yes. That's right.

B: Are we coming to that?

K: Coming, yes. So from there conflict: I said, what is the source of this conflict. The source is fragmentation, obviously. What brings about fragmentation? What is the cause of it, behind it? We said, perhaps knowledge.

S: Knowledge.

K: Knowledge: psychologically I use knowledge, I know myself, when I really don't know, because I am changing, moving. Or I use knowledge for my own satisfaction. For my position, for my success, for becoming a great man in the world. I am a great scholar. I have read a million books and I can tell you all about it. It gives me the position, a prestige, a status. So is that it: that fragmentation takes place when there is a desire for security, psychological security, which prevents biological security?

S: Right.

K: You say, right. And therefore security may be one of the

factors: security in knowledge used wrongly.

B: Or could you say that some sort of mistake has been made, that man feels insecure biologically, and he thinks what shall I do, and he makes a mistake in the sense that he tries to obtain a psychological sense of security by knowledge?

K: By knowledge, yes.

S: By knowing, yes. By repeating himself, by depending on all of these structures.

K: One feels secure in having an ideal.

S: Right. That is so true.

B: But somewhere one asks why a person makes this mistake. You see in other words if thought, if the mind had been absolutely clear, let's say, it would never have done that.

S: If the mind had been absolutely clear but we have just said that there is biological insecurity. That is a fact.

B: But that doesn't imply that you have to delude yourself.

K: Quite right.

S: But that implies that the organism - no, that's right. But it implies that that has to be met.

B: Yes, but the delusion doesn't meet it.

S: Right. That's the nub of the issue.

K: Go on further.

S: I mean there's that biological fact of my constant uncertainty. The biological fact of constant change.

K: That is created through psychological fragmentation.

S: My biological uncertainty?

K: Of course. I may lose my job, I may have no money tomorrow.

B: Now let's look at that. I may have no money tomorrow. You see that may be an actual fact, but now the question is, what happens. You see what would you say if the man were clear, what would be his response?

K: You would never be put in that position.

S: He wouldn't ask that question.

B: But suppose he finds himself without money, you see.

K: He would do something.

B: His mind won't just go to pieces.

S: He won't have to have all the money he thinks he has to have.

B: Besides that he won't go into this well of confusion.

K: No, absolutely.

S: I mean the problem 99% of the time, I certainly agree, is that we all think we need more than this ideal of what we should have.

K: No, sir. We are trying to stick to one point: what is the cause of this fragmentation?

S: Right.

K: We said knowledge spilling over into the field where it should not enter.

B: But why does it do so, you see.

K: Why does it do it? That is fairly simple.

B: Why?

K: It is fairly simple.

S: My sense of it is from what we have been saying is, it does it in a delusion of security. It thinks, thought creates the illusion that there is security there.

B: Yes, but why doesn't intelligence show that there is no security, you see?

S: Why doesn't intelligence show it?

B: Yes, in other words...

K: Can a fragmented mind be intelligent?

S: No.

B: Well, it resists intelligence.

K: It can pretend to be intelligent.

B: Yes. But are you saying that once the mind fragments then intelligence is gone?

K: Yes.

B: But now that...

S: Yes.

B: But now you are creating a serious problem, because you are also saying that there can be an end to fragmentation.

K: That's right.

B: You see at first sight that would seem to be a contradiction. Is that clear?

K: It looks like that, but it is not.

S: All I know is fragmentation.

K: Therefore?

S: That is what I have got.

K: Let's stick to it and see if it can end. Go through it.

S: Yes.

B: But if you say the fragmented mind cannot, intelligence cannot operate there.

S: I feel like one answer to your question is that, you know we talked about it in terms of conditioning. I feel like I am a victim, or I am caught by this offering. You offer me, you tell me, look old boy, I think this can help you, here is a fragment, come along. And

I feel like thought does that, you know, "Come" my mother or my father says, "Look, it is good to be a doctor", or it is good to do this.

K: Is psychological security more important than biological security?

S: That is an interesting question.

K: Go on. We have got five minutes.

S: One thing we have condensed...

K: No, I am asking. Don't move away from the question. I am asking, is psychological security much more important than biological security, physical security, biological security?

S: It isn't but it sounds like it is.

K: No, don't move away from it. I am asking. Stick to it. To you?

B: What is the fact?

K: What is the fact.

S: I would say yes, psychological security seems...

K: Not seems.

B: What is actually true.

S: Actually true, no. Biological security is more important.

K: Biological? Are you sure?

S: No. I think psychological security is what I actually worry about most.

K: Psychological security.

S: That is what I worry about most.

K: Which prevents biological security.

S: Right. I forget about the other.

K: No, no. Because I am seeking psychological security, in



ideas, in knowledge, in pictures, in images, in conclusions, and all the rest of it, which prevents me from having biological, physical security for me, for my son, for my children, for my brothers. I can't have it. Because psychological security says I am a Hindu, a blasted little somebody in a little corner.

S: No question. I do feel that psychological...

K: So can we be free of the desire to be psychologically secure?

S: That's right. That is the question.

K: Of course it is.

S: That's the nub of it, right.

K: And last night I was listening to some people - the chairman, or whatever it was - and they were all talking about Ireland, and various things. Each man was completely convinced, you know.

S: That's right. I sit in on meetings every week. Each man thinks his territory is the most important.

K: So we have given - man has given - more importance to psychological security than to biological, physical security.

B: But it is not clear why he should delude himself in this way.

K: That is, he has deluded himself because - why, why? Look, there is the answer. Why? We have got two minutes more. We will have to stop.

S: Images, power.

K: No, sir, they are much deeper. Why has he given importance?

S: He - we, not he, we seem to think that is where security is.

K: No. Look more into it. The 'me' is the most important thing.

S: Right. That is the same thing.

K: No, me: my position, my happiness, my money, my house,

my wife - me.

B: Me. Yes. And isn't it that each person feels he is the essence of the whole. The 'me' is the very essence of the whole. I would feel that if the 'me' were gone the rest wouldn't mean anything.

K: That is the whole point. The 'me' gives me complete security, psychologically.

B: But it seems all important.

K: Of course.

S: All important.

B: Yes, because people say, if I am sad then the whole world has no meaning. Right?

S: It is not only that. I am sad if the 'me' is not important.

K: No. We are saying the 'me' - in the 'me' is the greatest security.

S: Right. That is what we think.

K: No, not we think. It is so.

B: What do you mean, it is so?

K: In the world what is happening.

B: That is what is happening. But it is a delusion.

K: We will come to that later.

S: I think that is a good point. That it is so that the 'me' - I like that way of getting at it - the 'me' is what is important. That is all it is.

K: Psychologically.

S: Psychologically.

K: Me, my country, me, my god, my house, and so on.

S: It is very important to let that in, you know.

K: So it is twelve o'clock, we had better stop.

S: We have got your point.

## **2ND CONVERSATION WITH DR BOHM & DR SHAINBERG BROCKWOOD PARK 18TH MAY 1976 'TRANSFORMATION OF MAN'**

Krishnamurti: Do we go on where we left off yesterday? Or would you like to start something new?

Dr Bohm: I felt there was a point that wasn't entirely clear that we were discussing yesterday. Which is that we rather accepted that security, psychological security was wrong, was, you know, illusion; but in general I don't think we made it very clear why we think it is a delusion. You see most people feel that psychological security is a real thing and quite necessary and when it is disturbed, or when a person is frightened, or sorrowful, or even so disturbed that he might be psychologically disturbed and require treatment, he feels that psychological security is necessary before he can even begin to do anything.

K: Yes, right.

B: And I think that it isn't at all clear why one should say that it is not really as important as physical security.

K: Yes. No, I think we have made it fairly clear, but let's go into it.

B: Yes.

K: Is there really psychological security at all?

B: I don't think we discussed that fully last time.

K: Of course. Nobody accepts that. But we are enquiring into it, going into the problem of it.

Dr Shainberg: But we said something even deeper I think yesterday. And that is that - at least as I was summarising for

myself - and that is that we felt - correct me if you think I am wrong here - that conditioning sets the stage that is the importance of psychological security, and that in turn creates insecurity. And it is the conditioning that creates the psychological security as a focus? Would you agree that?

K: I think that we two mean something different.

S: What do you mean?

K: First of all, sir, we take it for granted that there is psychological security.

S: OK. Well, we think that we can get it.

K: We feel that there is.

S: Right. That's right.

B: Yes, I think that if you told somebody who was feeling very disturbed mentally that there is no psychological security he would just feel worse.

K: Collapse. Of course.

S: Right.

K: We are talking of fairly sane, rational people.

S: OK.

K: We are questioning whether there is any psychological security at all; permanency, stability, a sense of well-founded, deep-rooted existence psychologically.

S: Maybe if we could say more then, what would be psychological security?

K: After all I believe. I believe in something.

S: And that gives me...

K: It may be the most foolish belief...

S: Right.

K: ...a neurotic belief. I believe in it.

S: Right.

K: And then that gives you a tremendous sense of existence, living, vitality, and stability.

B: I think you could think of two examples: one is that if I could really believe that after dying I would go to heaven, and be quite sure of it, then I could be very secure anywhere, not matter what happens.

S: That would make you feel good.

B: Well, I'd say, I don't really have to worry, because it is all a temporary trouble and then I am pretty sure that in time it is all going to be very good. Do you see?

K: Right. That is the whole Asiatic attitude, more or less.

S: Right.

B: Or if I think I am a Communist, then I say, in time Communism is going to solve everything and we are going through a lot of troubles now but you know it is all going to be worthwhile and it will work out, and in the end it will be all right.

S: Right.

B: If I could be sure of that then I would say I feel very secure inside, even if conditions are hard.

S: OK. All right.

K: So we are questioning, though one has these strong beliefs which gives them a sense of security, permanency, whether there is such in reality, actuality...

S: It is not possible.

K: Wait!

S: The question is: is it possible?

K: Is it possible.

S: Right.

K: I may believe in god and that gives me a tremendous sense of...

S: Right.

K: ...impermanency of this world, but at least there is permanency somewhere else.

S: Yes, yes. But I want to ask David something. Do you think that, for instance take a scientist, a guy who is going to his laboratory everyday, or take a doctor, he is getting security. He takes security from the very 'routinization' of his life.

K: His knowledge.

S: Yes, from his knowledge if he keeps doing this, In the scientist, where does he get security?

B: Well, he makes belief he is learning the permanent laws of Nature, really getting something that means something.

S: Yes.

B: And also getting a position in society and being sure, being well known and respected and financially secure.

S: He believes that these things will give him the thing. The mother believes that the child will give her security.

K: Don't you psychologically have security?

S: Yes, OK. Right. I get a security out of my knowledge, out of my routine, out of my patients, out of seeing my patients, out of my position.

B: But there is conflict in that because if I think it over a little bit, I doubt it, I question it. I say, it doesn't look all that secure, anything may happen. I mean I say there may be a war, there may

be a depression, there may be a flood.

S: Right.

K: There may be sane people all of a sudden in the world!

(Laughter)

S: Do you think there is a chance?

B: So I say there is conflict and confusion in my security because I am not sure about it.

S: You are not sure about it.

B: But if I had an absolute belief in god and heaven.

K: This is so obvious!

S: It is obvious. I agree with you it is obvious, but I think it has to be - in other words, it has to be really felt through.

K: But, sir, you, Dr Shainberg, you are the victim.

S: I'll be the victim.

K: For the moment. Don't you have strong belief?

S: Right. Well, I wouldn't say strong.

K: Don't you have a sense of permanency somewhere inside you?

S: I think I do.

K: Psychologically?

S: Yes, I do. I mean I have a sense of permanency about my intention.

K: Intention?

S: I mean my work.

K: Your knowledge.

S: My knowledge, my...

K: ...status.

S: ...my status, the continuity of my interest. You know what I



mean.

K: Yes.

S: There is a sense of security in the feeling that I can help someone.

K: Yes.

S: And I can do my work. OK.

K: That gives you security, psychological security.

S: There is something about it that is secure. What am I saying when I say 'security'? I am saying that I won't be lonely.

K: No, no. Feeling secure that you have something that is impenetrable.

S: Which means - no, I don't feel it that way. I feel it more in the sense of what is going to happen in time, am I going to have to depend, what is my time going to be, am I going to be lonely, is it going to be empty?

K: No, sir.

S: Isn't that security?

K: As Dr Bohm pointed out, if one has a strong belief in reincarnation, as the whole Asiatic world has, then it doesn't matter what happens, then in the next life you have a better chance. You might be miserable this life but next life you will be happier. So that gives you a great sense of "this is unimportant, but that is important".

S: Right, right.

K: And that gives me a sense of great comfort, great - as though this is a transient world anyhow and eventually I will get there, to something permanent. This is human...

S: This is in the Asiatic world; but I think in the western world

you don't have that.

K: Oh, yes you have it.

S: With a different focus.

K: Of course.

B: It is different but we have always had the search for security.

S: Right, right. But what do you think security is? I mean for instance if you became a scientist, you went to the laboratory, you picked up the books all the time. Right? You may not go to the laboratory, but you have had your own laboratory. What the hell do you call security?

K: Security.

S: Yes, but what does he call his security?

K: Having something...

S: Knowledge?

K: ...to which you can cling to and which is not perishable. It may perish eventually but at the time, for the time being it is there to hold on to.

B: You can feel that it is permanent. Like somebody in the past, people used to accumulate gold because gold is the symbol of the imperishable.

S: We still have people who accumulate gold - we have business men, they have got money.

B: You feel it is really there.

K: There.

B: It will never corrode, it will never vanish and you can count on it, you know.

S: So it is something that I can count on.

K: Count on, hold on to, cling to, be attached to.

S: The 'me'.

K: Exactly.

S: I know that I am a doctor. I can depend on that.

K: Knowledge, experience.

S: Experience.

K: On the other hand, tradition.

S: Tradition. I know that if I do this with a patient that I will get this result. I might not get any good results but I'll get this result.

K: So I think that is fairly clear.

B: Yes it is clear enough that we have that, it is part of our society.

K: Part of our conditioning.

B: Conditioning, that we want something secure and permanent. At least we think we do.

S: I think you see that Krishnaji's point about the Eastern world, there is I think a feeling in the West of wanting immortality.

K: That's the same.

S: Same thing.

B: Wouldn't you say that in so far as thought can project time, that it wants to be able to project everything all right in the future as far as possible.

S: That is what I meant when I said loneliness: if I don't have to have my loneliness...

B: In other words the anticipation of what is coming is already the present feeling. You see if you can anticipate that something bad may come, you already feel bad.

K: That's right.

B: Therefore you would like to get rid of that.

S: So you anticipate that it won't happen.

B: That it will all be good.

S: Right.

B: I would say that security would be the anticipation that everything will be good in the future.

K: Good.

S: It will continue.

B: It will become better, if it is not so good now it will become better with certainty.

S: So then security is becoming.

K: Yes, becoming, perfecting, becoming.

S: I was thinking what you were saying the other day about the Brahmin. Anybody can become a Brahmin, then that gives him security.

K: That is, a projected belief, a projected idea, a comforting satisfying concept.

S: Right. You see I see patients all the time. Their projected belief is I will become - I will find somebody to love me. I see patients who say, "I will become the chief of the department", "I will become the most famous doctor", "I will become..." and his whole life goes like that. Because it is also focussed on being the best tennis player, the best.

K: Of course, of course.

B: Well it seems it is all focussed on anticipating that life is going to be good, when you say that.

K: Yes, life is going to be good.

B: But it seems to me you wouldn't raise the question unless you had a lot of experience that life is not so good, I mean. In other

words, it is a reaction to having had too much experience of disappointment, of suffering.

K: Would you say that we are not conscious of the whole movement of thought?

B: No, but I mean think to most people they would say that is only very natural, I have had a lot of experience of suffering and disappointment and danger, and that is unpleasant and I would like to be able to anticipate that everything is going to be good.

S: Yes.

K: Yes.

B: At first sight it would seem that that is really quite natural. But you are saying it is not now, there is something wrong with it.

K: We are saying there is no such thing as psychological security. We have defined what we mean by security.

S: Yes.

K: We don't have to beat it over and over.

S: No, I think we have got that.

B: Yes, but is it clear now that these hopes are really vain hopes, that should be obvious, shouldn't it?

S: That is a good question. You mean is it - you see, Krishnaji he is raising a good question, it is this whole business of you saying, is it meaningful to look for security. Is there such a thing?

K: Sir, there is death at the end of everything.

B: Yes.

K: You want to be secure for the next ten years, that is all, or fifty years. Afterwards doesn't matter. Or it does matter then you believe in something. That there is god, you will sit next to god on his right hand, or whatever it is you believe. So I am trying to find

out, not only that there is no permanency psychologically, which means no tomorrow psychologically.

B: That hasn't yet come out.

K: Of course, of course.

B: We can say empirically that we know these hopes for security are false because first of all you say there is death, secondly you can't count on anything, no matter, materially everything changes.

K: Everything is in flux.

B: Mentally everything in your head is changing all the time. You can't count on your feelings, you can't count on enjoying a certain thing that you enjoy now, or you can't count on being healthy, you can't count on money.

K: You can't rely on your wife, you can rely on nothing.

S: Right.

B: So that is a fact. But I am saying that you are suggesting something deeper.

K: Yes, sir.

B: But we don't base ourselves only on that observation.

K: That is very superficial.

S: Yes, I am with you there.

K: So is there then, if there is no real security, basic deep, then is there a tomorrow, psychologically? And then you take away all hope. If there is no tomorrow you take away all hope.

B: What you mean by tomorrow, is the tomorrow in which things will get better, I mean.

K: Better, greater success, greater understanding, greater...

B: More love.

K: ...more love, you know the whole business.

S: I think that is a little quick. I think that there is a jump there because as I hear you, I hear you saying there is no security.

K: But it is so.

S: It is so. But for me to say, to really say, "Look, I know there is no security".

K: Why don't you say that?

S: That is what I am getting at. Why don't I say that?

B: Well, isn't it a fact, isn't it first of all a fact that, just an observed fact, that there isn't anything you can count on psychologically?

S: Right. But you see I think there is an action there. Krishnaji is saying, why don't you.

B: Why don't you what?

S: Why don't you say there is no security? Why don't I?

K: Can I? Do you rationalize what we are saying about security? As an idea? Or actually so?

S: I actually say so, but I say, I'll keep doing it, I'll keep doing it.

K: No. We are asking, do you when you hear there is no security, is it an abstracted idea? Or an actual fact, like that table, like your hand there, or those flowers?

S: I think it mostly becomes an idea.

K: That is just it.

B: Why should it become an idea?

K: That is it.

S: That I think is the question. Why does it become an idea?

K: Is it part of your training?

S: Part, yes. Part of my conditioning.

K: Part of a real objection to see things as they are.

S: That's right. Because it moves. It feels like it moves there. Do you feel that?

B: It seems that if you see that there is no security, then it seems first of all let us try to put it that there is something which seems to be there which is trying to protect itself, namely let us say that it seems to be a fact that the self is there. Do you see what I am driving at?

K: Of course.

B: And if the self is there it requires security and therefore this creates a resistance to accepting that as a fact and puts it as an idea only. If you see what I mean. It seems that the factuality of the self being there has not been denied. The apparent factuality.

S: Right. But hasn't it? Why do you think it hasn't been? What happens?

K: Is it that you refuse to see things as they are? Is it that one refuses to see that one is stupid? - Not you, I mean one is stupid. To acknowledge that one is stupid is already - you follow?

S: Yes. It is like you say to me you refuse to acknowledge that you are stupid - let us say it is me - that means then I have got to do something, it feels like.

K: No.

S: Something happens to me.

K: Not yet. Action comes through perception, not through ideation.

S: I am glad you are getting into this.

B: Doesn't it seem that as long as there is the sense of self, the



self must say that it is perfect, and so on. Do you see?

K: Of course, of course.

S: What do you think it is? What makes it so hard to say? Is this what you mean when you talk about the destruction in creation? In other words, is there something here about the destruction that I am not.

K: You must destroy that.

S: I must destroy that. Now what makes it hard for me to destroy? I mean destroy this need for security, why can't I do it?

K: No, no. It is not how you can do it. You see you are already entering into the realm of action.

S: That I think is the crucial point.

K; But I am not. I say first see it. And from that perception action is inevitable.

S: Yes. All right. Now to see insecurity. Do you see insecurity? Do you actually see it?

K: What?

S: Insecurity.

K: No, no, no. Do you actually see...

S: ...there is no security.

K: No. That you are clinging to something, belief and all the rest of it, which gives you security.

S: OK.

K: I cling to this house. I am safe. It gives me a sense of my house, my father, it gives me pride, it gives me a sense of possession, it gives me a sense of physical and therefore psychological security.

S: Right, and a place to go.

K: A place to go. But I may walk out and be killed and I have lost everything. There might be an earthquake and everything gone. Do you actually see it?

S: I actually...

K: Sir, go to a poor man. He says, of course I have no security, but he wants it. His security is, give me a good job, beer, and constant work and a house, and a good wife and children; that's my security.

S: Right.

K: When there is a strike, he feels lost. But he has got the Union behind him.

S: Right. But he thinks he is secure.

K: Secure. And that movement of security enters into the psychological field. My wife, I believe in god, I don't believe in god. If I am a good communist I will have a good paper. The whole thing. Do you see it?

You see, the seeing, or the perception of that is total action with regard to security.

S: I can see that that is the total action.

K: No, that is an idea still.

S: Yes, you're right. I begin to see that this belief, this whole structure begins to be the whole way that I see everything in the world. Right? I begin to see her, the wife, or I begin to see these people, they fit into that structure.

K: You see them, your wife, through the image you have about them.

S: Right. And to the function they are serving.

B: Their relation to me, yes.

K: Yes.

S: That is right. That's the function they serve.

K: The picture, the image, the conclusion is the security.

S: That's right.

B: Yes, but you see why does it present itself as so real? You see I see that there is a thought, a process which is driving on, continually.

K: Are you asking why has this image, this conclusion, this all the rest of it, becomes so fantastically real?

B: Yes. It seems to be standing there real, and everything is referred to it.

K: More real than the marbles, than the hills.

B: Than anything, yes.

S: More real than anything.

K: Why?

S: I think it is hard to say why, except it would give me security.

K: No. We are much further than that.

B: Because, suppose abstractly and ideally you can see the whole thing as no security at all, I mean, just looking at it professionally and abstractly.

S: That is putting the cart before the horse.

B: No, I am just saying that if it were some simple matter, giving that much proof you would have already accepted it, you see.

S: Right.

B: But when it comes to this, no proof seems to work.

S: Right. Nothing seems to work.

B: You say all that but here I am presented with the solid reality of myself and my security, which seems to deny - there is a sort of reaction which seems to say, well, that may be possible but it really is only words. The real thing is me. Do you see?

S: But there is more than that. Why it has such potency. I mean why it seems to take on such importance.

B: Well may be. But I am saying it seems that the real thing is me, which is all important.

S: There is no question about it. Me, me, me, is important.

K: Which is an idea.

B: But it doesn't... we can say abstractly it is just an idea. The question is, how do you break into this process?

K: No. I think we can break into it, or break through it, or get beyond it, only through perception.

B: Yes.

S: Yes.

B: Yes, because otherwise every thought is involved in that therefore...

S: Because I am going to get through it because it will make me feel good, better.

B: The trouble is that all that we have been talking about is in the form of ideas. They may be correct ideas but they won't break into this.

S: Right.

B: Because this dominates the whole of thought.

S: That is right. I mean you could even ask why are we here. We are here because we want to...

K: No, sir. Look: if I feel my security lies in some image I have,

a picture, a symbol, a conclusion, an ideal and so on, I would put it not as an abstraction but bring it down. You see it is so. I believe in something. Actually. Now I say, why do I believe.

B: Well, have you actually done that?

K: No, I haven't because I have no beliefs. I have no picture, I don't go in for all those kind of games. I said, if.

S: If, right.

K: Then I would bring the abstracted thing into a perceptive reality.

S: To see my belief, is that it?

K: See it.

S: To see my belief. Right. To see that me in operation.

K: Yes, if you like to put it that way. Sir, wait a minute. Take a simple thing: have you a conclusion about something? Conclusion, a concept?

S: Yes.

K: Eh?

S: Yes, I think I do.

K: Now wait a bit. How is that brought about?

S: Well, through...

K: Take a simple thing, not complicated, take a simple thing. A concept that I am an Englishman.

B: The trouble is that we probably don't feel attached to those concepts.

K: All right.

S: Let's take one that is real for me: take the one about me being a doctor.

K: A concept.

S: That is a concept. That is a conclusion based on training, based on experience, based on the enjoyment of the work.

K: Which means what? A doctor means, the conclusion, means he is capable of certain activities.

S: Right, OK. Let's take it, concretely.

K: Work at it.

S: So now I have got the fact that there is a concrete fact that I have had this training, that I get this pleasure from the work, I get a kind of feed back, I get a whole community of feed in.

K: Yes, sir.

S: Books I've written, papers, positions.

K: Move.

S: All right. All that. Now that is my belief. That belief that I am a doctor is based on all that, that concept.

K: Yes.

S: OK. Now I continually act to continue that.

K: Yes, sir, that is understood.

S: OK.

K: Therefore you have a conclusion.

S: A conclusion.

K: You have a concept that you are a doctor.

S: Right.

K: Because it is based on knowledge, experience, everyday activity.

S: Right.

K: Pleasure and all the rest of it.

S: Right.

K: So what is real in that? What is true in that? Real meaning

actual, actual.

S: Well, that is a good question. What is actual?

K: Wait! What is actual in that? Your training.

S: Right.

K: Your knowledge.

S: Right.

K: Your daily operation.

S: Right.

K: That's all. The rest is a conclusion.

B: But what is the rest?

K: The rest: I am very much better than somebody else.

B: Or else this thing is going to keep me occupied in a good way.

K: A good way. I will never be lonely.

S: Right. I know what is going to facts because I have this knowledge.

K: Yes. So?

B: Well, that is part of it.

K: Of course, much more.

S: Yes, go ahead. I want to hear what you have to say.

B: But isn't there also a certain fear that if I don't have this then things will be pretty bad?

K: Of course.

S: Right. OK.

B: And that fear seems to spur on...

K: Of course. And if the patients don't turn up?

B: Then I have no money; fear.

K: Fear.

S: No activity.

K: So loneliness. Back.

S: Back again. Right.

K: So be occupied.

S: Be occupied doing this, completing this concept. OK.

K: Be occupied.

S: Right.

K: Now:

S: It is very important. Do you realize how important that is to all people, to be occupied?

K: Of course, sir.

S: Do you get the meat of that?

K: Of course.

S: How important it is to people to be occupied. I can see them running around.

K: Sir, a housewife is occupied. Remove that occupation, she says, please...

B: ...what shall I do?

S: We know that as a fact. Since we put electrical equipment into the houses the women are going crazy, they have nothing to do with their time.

K: But, no. The result of this, neglect of their children. Don't talk to me about it.

S: Right. OK. Let's go on. Now we have got this fact, occupied.

K: Occupied. Now is this occupation an abstraction, or actuality?

S: Now this is an actuality.

K: Which?



S: Actuality. I am actually occupied.

K: No.

B: What is it?

K: You are actually occupied?

S: Yes.

K: Daily.

S: Daily.

B: Well, what do you really mean by occupied? Do you see.

S: What do you mean?

B: Well, I can say I am actually doing all the operations. That is clear. I mean I am seeing patients as the doctor.

S: You are going to do your thing.

B: I am doing my thing, getting my reward and so on. And occupied it seems to me has a psychological meaning, further than that, that my mind is in that thing in a relatively harmonious way. There was something I saw on television once of a woman who was highly disturbed, it showed on the graph, but when you was occupied doing her mathematics, the graph went beautifully smooth. She stopped doing the sums and it went all over the place. Do you, therefore, she had to keep on doing something to keep the brain working right.

K: Which means what?

S: Go ahead.

B: Well, what does it mean?

K: A mechanical process.

S: That's right.

B: It seems the brain starts jumping all over the place unless it has this thing.

K: A constant...

B: ...content.

K: So you have reduced yourself to a machine.

S: Don't say it! (Laughter) No, it's not fair. But it is true. I have, I mean, I feel there is a mechanical...

K: Responses.

S: Oh yes, commitment.

K: Of course.

B: But why does the brain begin to go so wild when it is not occupied?

S: That's right.

B: The brain begins to jump around wildly when it is not occupied, you see. That seems to be a common experience.

K: Because in occupation there is security.

B: There is order.

K: Order.

S: In occupation there is a kind of mechanical order.

K: Mechanical order.

B: Right. So we feel our security really means we want order. Is that right?

K: That's it.

B: We want order inside the brain.

S: That's right.

B: We want to be able to project order into the future, for ever.

S: That's right. But would you say that you can get it by mechanical order?

B: Then we get dissatisfied with it, you see, you say, "I am getting sick, bored with it, I am sick of this mechanical life, I want

something more interesting".

K: That is where the gurus come in! (Laughter)

B: Then the thing goes wild again. Do you see the mechanical order won't satisfy it because it works for a little while.

S: I don't like the way something is slipping in there. You say that we are going like from one thing to another. I am looking for satisfaction and then I am not satisfied.

B: I am looking for some regular order which is good, do you see. And I think that by my job as a doctor I am getting it.

S: Yes.

B: But after a while I begin to feel it is too repetitious, do you see. I am getting bored.

S: OK. But suppose that doesn't happen. Suppose some people become satisfied with their job?

B: Well, they don't really. I mean then they become dull, you see.

K: Quite. Mechanical; so mechanical: and you stop that mechanism, the brain goes wild.

S: That's right.

B: Right. So they feel they are a bit dull and they would like some entertainment, or something more interesting and exciting. And therefore there is a contradiction, there is conflict and confusion in the whole thing. Well, take this woman who could always get everything right by doing arithmetical sums, but we can't keep on doing arithmetical sums! (Laughter) I mean somewhere she has got to stop doing these arithmetical sums.

S: Right.

B: Then her brain will go wild again.

K: Sir, he is asking what is disturbing him. He feels he hasn't put his teeth into it. What is disturbing him?

S: You are right.

K: What is disturbing you?

S: Well, it is this feeling that you see people will say that...

K: No, you say, you.

S: I will say, let's say I can get this order, I can get this mechanical order, and I can't.

K: Yes, you can.

S: From occupying myself in something I like.

K: Go on. Proceed.

S: I can do it. I mean I can do it, I can do something I like and it gets boring, let's say, or it might get repetitious, but then I will find new parts of it. And then I'll do that some more because that gives me a pleasure, you see. I mean I get a satisfaction out of it.

B: Right.

S: So I keep doing more of that. It is like an accumulative process.

K: No, you move from one mechanical process...

S: Right, right.

K: ...get bored with it, and move to another mechanical process...

S: That's right.

K: ...get bored with it and keep going.

S: That's right. That's it.

K: And you call that living.

S: That is what I call living.

B: I see that the trouble in it, even if I accept all that, the trouble

is that I now try to be sure that I can keep on doing this, because I can always anticipate a future when I won't be able to do it. You see? I will be a bit too old for the job, or else I'll fail. I'll lose the job, or something. In other words, I still have insecurity in that order.

K: Essentially, essentially it is mechanical disorder.

S: Masking itself as order.

K: Order. Now, wait a minute. Do you see this? Or is it still an abstraction? Because you know as Dr Bohm will tell you, idea means observation, the original meaning, the root meaning, observation. Do you observe this?

S: I see that, yes. I feel that, I think. I see what I see actually is I see this, a movement that goes on doing this, and then question, very much like Piaget's (?) theory. Right? In other words, there is assimilation, an accommodation and then there is seeing what doesn't fit and going on with it. And then there is more assimilation, and accommodation, and then going on with it. The psychologist, Piaget (?), the French psychologist, describes this as the enormity of human brains.

K: Yes, yes.

S: You know this.

K: I don't have to read Piaget, I can observe it.

B: Right. Then the point is, are you driven to this because you are frightened of the instability of the brain. Do you see? That would mean being occupied with this. And it seems then that is disorder. If you are doing something because you are trying to run away from instability of the brain, that is already disorder.

S: Yes, yes.

B: In other words, that will merely be masking disorder.

S: Yes. Well, then you are suggesting that this is being the natural disorder of the brain. Are you suggesting a natural disorder?

B: No, I am saying that the brain seems to be disordered. This seems to be a fact. Right? That the brain without occupation goes, tends to go, into disorder.

S: Without the mechanics we get this. That is what we know, without the mechanics.

K: So that is frightened of it.

S: Frightened.

B: Well, it is dangerous actually because one feels it is dangerous if it keeps doing this because of what is going to happen.

K: Of course, it is dangerous.

B: I mean it may do all sorts of crazy things.

K: Yes. All the neurotics, you know all that business.

B: In other words, I feel that the main danger comes from within, you see.

K: Absolutely. Now, if, when you see it, observe it, there is action which is not fragmented.

B: You see, I see one can feel that you do not know whether this disorder can stop. In other words if you were sure that it could stop, that religion, that god will take care of it, or something, then you will have security.

K: Quite.

B: That god will give you eternal bliss.

S: Then you don't feel that you can depend on anything.

B: Nothing can control that disorder. You see that this really seems to be the thing that there is nothing that can control that disorder. You may take pills, or do various things, but it is always there in the background.

S: Right.

K: Quite right.

B: I don't know whether we should say, one question is, why do we have this disorder? Do you see. If it were built into the structure of the brain, seeing this is human nature, then there would be no way out.

K: No, sir. I think the disorder arises, doesn't it, first when there are mechanical processes going on. And in that mechanical process the brain feels secure, and when the mechanical process is disturbed it becomes insecure.

S: Then it does it again.

K: Again, and again, and again, and again.

S: It never stays with that insecurity.

K: No, no. When it perceives this process it is still mechanical, and therefore disorder.

B: The question is, why does the brain get caught in mechanism? Do you see. In other words, it seems in the situation the brain gets caught in mechanical process.

K: Because it is the safest, the most secure way of living.

B: Well, it appears that way. But it is actually very...

K: Not, appears. It is so for the time being.

B: For the time being, but in the long run it is not.

S: Are you saying we are time bound, conditioned to be time bound?

K: No. Conditioned to be time bound. Conditioned by our tradition, by our education, by the culture we live in and so on and so on, to operate mechanically.

S: We take the easy way.

K: The easy way.

B: But it is also a kind of mistake to say in the beginning the mechanical way shows signs of being safer, and at the beginning the brain makes a mistake let's say, and says, "This is safer", but somehow it fails to be able to see that it has made a mistake, it holds to this mistake. Like in the beginning you might call it an innocent mistake to say, "This look safer and I will follow it". But then after a while you are getting evidence that it is not so safe, the brain begins to reject it, keep away from it.

S: Well, I think you could raise the issue whether there are certain given facts in child rearing. I mean when the mother feels the baby is crying and jams a nipple in its mouth, that is teaching the baby that you shut up and take the easy way out.

K: No, poor baby.

B: Well there is a lot of conditioning.

K: Well that is only the mothers who don't want babies when they jam in the nipples. Don't, no don't say that.

B: Well I meant that is part of the conditioning that explains how it is propagated. But you see it still doesn't explain why the brain doesn't see at some stage that it is wrong.

S: Why doesn't it see that at some stage it is wrong?

B: In other words, it continues in this mechanical process rather than seeing that it is wrong.

K: You are asking: why doesn't it see that this mechanical



process is essentially disorder.

B: It is essentially disorder and dangerous.

K: Dangerous.

B: It is totally delusory.

S: Why isn't there some sort of feedback? In other words, I do something and it comes out wrong. At some point I ought to realize that. Why don't I? For instance, I have seen my life is mechanical.

K: Now wait. You see it?

S: But I don't.

K: Wait. Why is it mechanical?

S: Well, it is mechanical because it goes like this: it is all action and reaction.

K: Why is it mechanical?

S: It is repetitious.

K: Which is mechanical.

S: Which is mechanical. I want it to be easy. That is also mechanical. I want it to be easy. I feel that that gives me the most security, to keep it mechanical. I get a boundary. It is like you say I have the house, I have got my mechanical life, that gives me security, it is mechanical because it is repetitious.

K: You haven't answered my question.

S: I know I haven't! It is mechanical. I am not sure what your question is. Your question is why...

K: ...has it become mechanical.

S: Why.

B: Why does it remain mechanical?

K: Why does it become and remain mechanical?

S: I think it remains mechanical, it is the thing we began with.

K: No, pursue it. Why does it remain mechanical?

S: I don't see it is mechanical.

K: What has caused us to accept this mechanical process, way of living?

S: I am not sure I can answer that. The feel of it is that I would see the insecurity, I would see.

K: No, look: wouldn't you be frightened?

S: I would see the uncertainty.

K: No, no. If the mechanical process of life that one lives suddenly stopped, wouldn't you be frightened?

S: Yes.

B: Wouldn't there be some genuine danger?

K: That, of course. There is a danger that things might...

B: ...go to pieces.

K: ...go to pieces.

S: It is deeper than that.

K: Wait! Find out, come on.

S: It is not just that there is a genuine danger that I would be frightened. It feels like that things take on a terribly moment-by-moment effect.

K: No, sir. Look: would total order give it complete security? Wouldn't it? Total order.

S: Yes.

K: The brain wants total order.

S: Right.

K: Otherwise it can't function properly. Therefore it accepts the mechanical, and hoping it won't lead to disaster.

S: Right.

K: Hoping it will find order in that.

B: Could you say that perhaps in the beginning that the brain accepted this just simply not knowing that this mechanism would bring disorder and it just went into it in an innocent state?

K: Yes.

B: Yes, but it is caught in a trap, you see. And somehow it maintains this disorder, it doesn't want to get out of it.

K: Because it is frightened of greater disorder.

B: Yes. It says, all that I've built up may go to pieces. In other words, I am not in the same situation as when I first went in the trap because now I have built up a great structure. I think that structure will go to pieces.

S: That's right. I heard one man - I nearly jumped out of my seat - I heard one may say to another, to one of his colleagues, he says, "I have just published my thirteenth book". He said it just like that! (Laughter) The way he said it!

K: Yes, but what I am trying to get it is, the brain needs this order, otherwise it can't function. It finds order in mechanical process because it is trained from childhood; do as you are told, etc., etc., etc. There is a conditioning going on right away: to live a mechanical life.

S: Right.

B: Also the fear induced of giving up this mechanism at the same time.

K: Of course, of course.

B: I mean that in other words you are thinking all the time that without this everything will go to pieces, including especially the brain.

K: Yes, so they break from this mechanical business and join communities, you know, all the process, which is still mechanical.

S: Right, right.

K: Which means the brain must have order. And finds order in a mechanical way. Now, do I see, do you see actually mechanical ways. Now do I see, do you see actually the mechanical way of living leads to disorder? Which is, tradition. If I live entirely in the past, which is very orderly, I think it is very orderly, and what takes place? I am already dead and I can't meet anything.

S: I am repeating myself always, right.

K: So please don't disturb my tradition! The communists say that, the Catholics say that, you follow, the same thing. And every human being says, "Please, I have found something which gives me order; a belief, a hope, this, or that; and leave me alone."

S: Right.

K: And life isn't going to leave them alone. So he gets frightened and establishes another mechanical habit. Now do you see this whole thing? And therefore an instant action breaking it all away and therefore order. The brain says, at last I have an order which is absolutely indestructible.

B: Well, I think you see it doesn't follow from what you said that this would happen. In other words, you are saying this.

K: I am saying this.

B: I mean but it doesn't follow logically.

K: It would follow logically if you go into it.

B: Go into it. You see can we reach a point where it really follows necessarily?

K: I think we can only go into it if you perceive the mechanical

structure which the brain has developed, attached and cultivated.

S: Can I share with you something, that as you are talking I find myself, I see it in a certain way though, I see it like this - don't get impatient with me too quickly! But I see it this way: it is like I can see the mechanicalness. Right? And I see that I see, and I was flashing through my mind various kinds of interchanges between people. And the way they talk, the way I talk to them at a party, at a cocktail party, and it is all about what happened before, you can see them telling you who they are, in terms of their past. I can see what they will be. This guy who said, "I have published my thirteenth book", he said it like that. It is very important that I get that information, see. And I see this. And I see this elaborate structure. This guy has got in his head that I am going to think this about him, and then he is going to go to his university and he is going to be thought that. He is always living like that and the whole structure is elaborate. Right?

K: Are you doing that?

S: When did you stop beating your wife! Of course I am doing it. I am doing it right now, I am seeing the structure right now, all of us.

K: But do you see that we were saying yesterday, fragmentary action is mechanical action.

S: That's right. It is there, Krishnaji. It is there, where we are.

K: And therefore political action can never solve any problems, human problems; or the scientist, he is another fragment.

S: But do you realize what you are saying? Let us really look at what you are saying. This is the way it is. This is the way life is.

K: That's right.

S: Right? This is the way it is. Years and years and years.

K: Therefore, why don't you change it?

S: Change it. That's right. But this is the way it is. We live in terms of our structures. We live in terms of history. We live in terms of our mechanics. We live in terms of our form. This is the way we live.

K: Which means, as we were saying at Ojai, when the past meets the present and ends there, there is a totally different thing takes place.

S: Yes. But the past doesn't meet the present so often.

K: I mean it is taking place now.

S: Right now. Right. We are seeing it now.

K: Therefore can you stop there?

S: We must see it totally.

K: No. The fact, simple fact: the past meets the present. That is a fact.

B: Let us see, how does the past meet the present? Let us go into that.

K: We have got four minutes.

S: How do you say the past meets the present? We have got two minutes now!

B: Well, I think just briefly that the past meeting the present stops, that the past is generally active in the present towards the future. Now when the past meets the present then the past stops acting. And what it means is that thought stops acting so that order comes about.

S: Do you think that the past meets the present, or the present meets the past?

K: No. How do you meet me?

S: I meet you in the present.

K: No. How do you meet me? With all the memories, all the images, the reputation, the words, the pictures, the symbol, all that, with that, which is the past, you meet me now.

S: That's right. That's right. I come to you with a...

K: No, no. The past is meeting the present.

B: Aren't you saying...

S: That's right, go ahead.

B: That the past should stop meeting the present?

S: No. He is not saying that. You can't say that.

K: I am saying something, which is...

S: Let him say it.

K: What I am trying to say is that the past meets the present.

S: And then?

K: End there. Not move forward.

S: Can it? But is that a right question? Or is it, what is the past meeting the present? What is that action?

K: I meet you with a picture.

S: Why should I stop?

K: I will show it to you. I meet you with the past, my memories, but you might have changed all that in the meantime. So I never meet you. I meet you with the past.

S: Right. That is fact.

K: That is a fact. Now if I don't have that movement going on...

S: But I do.

K: Of course you do. But I say that that is disorder. I can't meet you then.

S: Right. How do you know that?

K: I don't know it. I only know the fact that when the past meets the present and continues, it is one of the factors of time, movement, bondage, all the fear, and so on. If, when there is the past meeting the present, one see this, I am fully aware of this, completely aware of this movement, then it stops. Then I meet you as though for the first time, there is something fresh, it is like a new flower coming out.

S: Yes, I understand.

K: I think we will go on tomorrow. We haven't really tackled the root of all this, the root, the cause or the root of all this disturbance, this turmoil, travail, anxiety - you follow.

B: Why should the brain be in this wild disorder?

K: I know, wild. You, who are a doctor, an analyst and all the rest of it, you have to ask that fundamental question - why? Why do human beings live this way?

S: Right. Why do they? I ask that all the time. Why are human beings sick?



### **3RD CONVERSATION WITH DR BOHM & DR SHAINBERG BROCKWOOD PARK 18TH MAY 1976 'TRANSFORMATION OF MAN'**

Krishnamurti: Shall we start where we left off? We were asking, weren't we, why do human beings live this way?

Dr Shainberg: What is the root?

K: The turmoil, the confusion, the sorrow behind it all, conflict, violence. And so many people offering different ways of solving the problems: the Asiatic gurus, and the priests all over the world, and the new books, you know, everybody offering a new solution, a new method, a new way of solving the problems. And I am sure this has been going on for a million years. "Do this and you will be all right. Do that you'll be all right". But nothing seems to have succeeded to make man live in order, happily, you know, intelligently, without any of this chaotic activity going on. Why? Why can't human beings, so-called educated, knowing all the scientific knowledge, biology, sociology, everything is now open to every human being; why do we human beings live this way, in this appalling misery? Some of them are conscious, some of them are unconscious, some of them say, "Well, this is all right, it is only for a few years and I will die. It is a jolly good business and it doesn't matter" - so why? What is it? Why?

S: Well, I have often said they do it because the very sorrow, the very turmoil, the very problems themselves, is the security.

Dr Bohm: I don't really think so.

K: That doesn't...

B: No. I think people just get used to it. I mean they miss

anything they are used to. I mean people get used to scrap fighting and they miss it when they don't have it. But that isn't the primary reason in my view.

S: What is the primary reason in your view?

B: Whatever happens you get used to it, and you come to miss it after a while just because you are used to it.

S: Yes.

B: But that doesn't explain why it is there.

K: I was reading the other day some writer saying, historically, five thousand years historically, there have been five thousand wars, thousands of people killed, millions killed, women crying - you follow - and still we are going on.

S: That's right. I have the same experience. One time I was working, and a guy said to me that he wanted to go to Vietnam to fight because otherwise his life was every night at the bar.

K: I know, but that isn't the reason. Why?

S: That's not the reason but there is something they hope for. We hold on to the conflict and the sorrow.

K: Is it that we like it?

S: It is not that we like it; it is almost that we like not liking it. It is a kind of orientation, a kind of, I know my conflict, I know what I am at.

K: Have we all become neurotic?

S: Yes. The whole thing is neurotic.

K: Are you saying that?

S: Yes. The whole society is neurotic.

K: Which means the entire humanity is neurotic?

S: I think so. I mean this is the argument we have all the time: is

the society sick? And then if you say the society is sick, what is your judgement, what is the value you are using for comparison?

K: Which is yourself, who is neurotic.

S: Right.

K: So when you are faced with that, that human beings live this way and have accepted it for millennia; there have been saviours, there have been gurus, there have been teachers, there have been - you follow - and yet they go on this way. And you say, well, we are all half crazy, demented, from top to bottom, corrupt; and I come along and say, why?

S: Why do we do it.

K: Why?

S: Why do we keep it up. Why are we crazy? I have it with my children. I say to my children, this is a sick society. Look, they spend fifty hours a week in front of the television box. That is their whole life. My children, they laugh at me, all their friends are doing it.

K: No, moving beyond that, why?

S: Why? Without it, what?

K: No: not without it, what.

S: That is what we run into.

B: No, that is very secondary. You see I think we get to depend on it, as we were saying this morning, to occupy us and so on. And Vietnam would seem some release from the boredom of the pub, or whatever, but that is secondary.

K: And also when I go to Vietnam, or fight the war, all responsibility is taken away from me. Somebody else is responsible - the general.

S: Right.

B: In the old days people used to think that war would be a glorious thing, you see. When the war started in England everybody was in a state of high elation.

K: High, exactly.

B: They didn't know what was in store, you see.

K: And all united. Why?

S: Why?

K: Is it that we have started out on the wrong path? Is it the species don't kill themselves, you know the animal species, but we are the species that kill each other?

S: Right.

K: So looking at all this panorama of horror, the misery - I feel this very strongly because I travel all over the place and I see this extraordinary phenomena going on, in India, in America, here, everywhere, and I say why do people live this way, accept these things, read history and, you follow, it is no longer conceived. They have become cynical. It is all there.

S: That's right. They have become cynical.

B: Nobody believes anything can be done about it.

K: That's it.

S: That's it.

K: Is it that we feel that we cannot do anything about it?

S: That's for sure.

B: That's been an old story. People say human nature...

K: ...can never be altered.

B: Yes. I mean that is not new at all.

K: Not new.

S: But that's certainly true that people feel, or we feel - let's not say people - we feel, like I said this morning, this is the way it is, this is the way we live.

K: I know, but why don't you change it?

S: Why don't we change it.

K: You see your son looking at the television for fifty hours; you see your son going off to Vietnam, killed, maimed, blinded, for what?

S: Right.

K: Sorry! There have been pacifists, there have been war mongers.

S: Many people have said that we don't accept that human nature is this way, we will try to change it, and it didn't work. You know, so many people did that right thing. The communists tried it, the socialists tried it, some others tried it.

K: The utopians.

B: The utopians, and there has been so much bad experience, it all adds up to the idea that human nature doesn't change.

K: Doesn't change.

S: You know when Freud came along, Freud made his studies: he never said psychoanalysis is to change people. He said we can only study about people.

K: I am not interested in that. I know that. I don't have to read Freud, or Jung, or you, or anybody, it is there in front of me.

S: Right. So let's say - that's good. We know this. We know this fact about people and we also know the fact of the matter is they don't try to change.

K: So what is preventing them?

S: That is the question. They don't. That is another fact.

B: People have tried to change it in many cases, but...

S: OK. But now let's say that they don't try to change it.

K: They do. They go to Ashramas, a dozen ways they have tried to change.

S: Right.

K: But essentially they are the same.

B: You see I think people cannot find out how to change human nature. You see.

K: Is that it?

B: Well, I mean what ever methods have been tried are entirely...

S: Is that it? Or is it the fact that the very nature of the way they want to change it is part of the process itself?

K: That's what he is saying.

B: No, but I am saying both. I say the first point is that whatever people have tried has not been guided by an understanding, a correct understanding of human nature.

S: So it is guided by this very process itself. Right? The incorrectness?

B: Yes, let's take the Marxists who say that human nature can be improved, but only when the whole economic and politician structure has altered.

K: Altered.

S: Right.

B: Then...

K: They have tried to alter it but human nature stays the same.

B: ...they can't alter it, you see, because human nature is such

that they can't really alter it.

K: Because class society, they started of no wars, you know...

S: But they are using a mechanical way to make a mechanical change.

K: Look at it, sir: you, take yourself - sorry to be personal, if you don't mind, you be the victim!

S: Pig in the middle!

K: Right. Why don't you change?

S: Well, I...

K: No, no. Don't give explanations.

S: Well, the feel of it is, the immediate feel of it is that there is still, I guess I shall have to say there is some sort of false security, the fragmentation, the immediate pleasures that are gotten from the fragmentation; in other words there is still that movement of fragmentation. That's how come there is not the change. There is not seeing the whole thing.

K: I mean, when you say that, are you saying: political action, religious action, social action, all separate, all fighting each other almost, and we are that.

S: Right.

K: Is that what you are saying?

S: Yes, I am saying that. I mean we keep getting something back from it, we get these immediate pleasure and failures, frustrations from...

K: There is a much deeper issue than that.

S: Some more. My immediate response is: why don't I change? What is it that keeps me from seeing the total? I don't know. I keep coming up with a kind of feeling that I am getting something. I

keep getting something from not changing.

K: No. Is it the entity that wishes to change sets the pattern of change, and therefore the pattern is always the same under a different colour? I don't know if I am making myself clear?

S: Can you say it another way?

K: I want to change. And I plan out what to change, how to bring about this change.

S: Right.

K: The planner is always the same.

S: That's right.

K: But the patterns change.

S: That's right. Yes. I have an image of what I want.

K: No, the patterns change, but I, who want to change, create the patterns of change.

S: That's right.

K: Therefore I am the old and the patterns are new but the old is always conquering the new.

S: Right.

B: Now when I do that I don't feel that I am the old...

K: Of course.

B: ...but I am the new, I mean.

K: Of course.

S: Yes, I have got a new idea.

B: But I really don't feel that I am involved in that old stuff that I want to change.

K: Just now after lunch you were saying the Kabala, that thing, there is a new system.

B: Yes.



K: New, say if you study this you will be transformed.

S: That's right.

K: This has been said a hundred million times: do this and you will be transformed. They try to do it but the centre is always the same.

B: And each person who does it feels that it has never happened before.

K: Never before. Yes. My experience through that book is entirely different, but the experiencer is the same.

S: The same old thing, right.

K: I think that is one of the root causes of it.

S: Yes, yes.

B: It is a kind of sleight of hand trick whereby the thing which is causing the trouble is put into position as if it were the thing that is trying to make the change. You see it is a deception.

K: I am deceiving myself all the time by saying, I am going to change that, become that; then if it doesn't, and so on and so on. Is that it?

S: That begins to get at it.

K: No, no. Look at yourself and say, "Is that it?" You read - wait a minute - Hindu, or some book.

S: Right.

K: And say, yes, how true that is, I am going to live according to that. But the 'me' that is going to live according to that is the same old me.

S: Right, yes. That's right. We run into this, I think that all the systems, for instance, of therapy, with patients, for instance, the patient will say, the doctor is going to be the one who is going to

help him. Right? And then when they see that their doctor is...

K: ...is like you.

S: ...is like you, or is not going to help you, they are supposed to get better, they are supposed to be well, but in fact they have never touched that central issue, which is that I thought that somebody could help me. So then they go to something else, and they go to something else - most of them go to another theory.

K: Another guru.

S: Another guru.

K: After all, they are all men too. Talking about a new guru, or an old guru - you follow - it is all the same old stuff.

S: You are really getting at the issue that the fact that the root is this belief that something can help you.

K: No, the root remains the same. Right? And we trim the branches.

B: I think the root is something we don't see because we put it in the position of the one who is supposed to be seeing.

K: Yes.

S: Say that another way.

B: It is a sort of conjuring trick. You see we don't see the root because the root is put into the position of somebody who would be looking for the root. I don't know if you see it.

K: Yes. The root says, I am looking for the root.

S: Right.

B: It is like the man who says, I am looking for my glasses, and he has got them on!

S: Or like that Sufi story: I am looking for the key - you know the story? - I am looking for the key over here because it is locked.

You understand? The Sufi, the guy comes along and the guy is crawling around under the lamppost, and a guy comes along and says, "What are you doing there?" "I am looking for my key". And he said, "Did you lose it here?" "No, I lost it over there but there is more light over here".

B: We throw the light on the other part.

K: Yes, sir. So if I want to change, because I don't want to live that way, I don't want to follow anybody because they are all like the rest of the gang. I don't accept any authority in all this.

S: Yes.

K: Authority arises only when I am confused.

S: Right.

K: When I am in disorder.

S: That's right.

K: So I say, can I completely change at the very root?

B: Let's look at that because you are saying, well there seems confusion in the language because you say 'I'.

K: Confusion in the language, I know.

B: I mean it makes it hard because you say, "I am going to change", and it is not clear what I mean by 'I'.

K: The 'I' is the root.

B: The 'I' is the root, so how can I change?

K: That is the whole point.

B: You see, the language is confusing because you say, I have got to change at the root, you see, but I am the root.

K: Yes.

B: So what is going to happen?

S: What is going to happen, yes.

K: No, no. How am I not to be I?

S: That's the question.

B: Well, what do you mean by that?

S: How am I not to be I. Let's role it back a second. You state you are not going to accept any authority.

K: Who is my authority? Who? They have all told me, "Do this, do that, do the other. Read this book and you will change. Follow this system, you will change. Identify yourself with god, you will change". But I remain exactly as I was before: in sorrow, in misery, in confusion, looking for help, and I choose the help which suits me most.

S: Can we stop here for a minute? What would you say - now I mentioned something about psychiatry here, and I'd like to get something straight if we can. There is this whole theory, and gurus have it, they don't talk about it, but they have it, and there is in all psychiatry and so forth, there is the theory that if I go along with the authority to where I see my addiction to authority then I free myself from the authority. You know that?

K: Yes. All right. The communists say, "Freedom comes at the end of good discipline. And discipline is what I tell you".

S: Right.

B: Yes.

S: Right. In other words by giving myself over I will discover my error. Now what do you want to say about that?

B: Isn't that obvious.

S: Right. It is obvious that I am doing the same thing, and then I see the failure of this authority, but you see there is a thesis there. That if I see the particular of my following authority, then I will

see the universal in the root.

B: Yes, but why do you have to follow the authority to see authority? You see this is one of the questions. You see, do you have to deceive yourself in order to understand self-deception? I mean, do you say first, I deceive myself and then I look through it and I see through self-deception and I am free of it?

S: That is exactly it.

B: But I mean that is absurd because when you are deceiving yourself you don't know what you are doing. It is too late. If you don't truly deceive yourself, what is the point? But if you truly deceive...

K: Is it possible for a human being to change at the very root of his being? They have tried different ways, different, you know, Zen - you follow - ten, umpteen different ways they have tried to change man: rewarding him, punishing him, promising him. Nothing has changed, brought about this miraculous change. And it is a miraculous change.

S: It would be, yes, yes.

K: It is. Everyone promises: do this, do that, do the other.

S: Right.

K: And I, a man like we, comes along and says, look, I don't want to accept any authority.

S: Right.

K: Because you have misguided everybody - all the authorities.

S: Authority...

K: ...in itself is disorder.

S: Right.

K: Authority exists because human beings are in disorder. The

disorder has created them, not clarity, not compassion, not something entirely different. It is the disorder that has created them. So why should I follow them? Though they promise, do this, discipline yourself according to this way and ultimately you will be free. I reject all that. Not intelligently but because I see it; it isn't a cantankerous rejection; it is a reasonable, sane rejection. So how do I proceed? I have got fifty years to live, I don't know what the future may be. I'll find out, but I have got fifty years to live probably. What is the correct action?

S: What is the correct action to live properly?

K: That's all. That's all. To be sane.

S: To be sane.

K: Not to be neurotic. Who is going to tell me? The communists? Marx? Lenin? Mao? The Pope? Or the local priest? Who is going to tell me? Because they don't act rightly either.

S: We have a whole group of people who don't say that they will tell you, we have a whole group of people who say, see how you follow me and see, if you follow me, see your tendency to follow me.

K: Yes, yes.

B: I understand that.

S: And then the same business of self-deception.

B: To see through that.

S: To see through your own self deception.

B: That is really an impossible trick you see, because if you say, follow me and deceive yourself, then you must genuinely deceive yourself, and you can't, you see.

S: That is right. The thesis is that if you deceive yourself you

will see your own tendency to self-deception, which you don't see.

B: But that must be authority because it doesn't make sense to say that if I deceive myself I am going to see through deceiving myself. I mean the whole point of self-deception is that if I am really doing it right I don't know what I am doing.

S: Right.

B: Therefore how do you guarantee to me that I can see through self-deception by deceiving myself?

S: Because I am going to show you through - I am not going to participate. I am going to here, and you are going to deceive yourself and then you can see this authority in action, the way you need authority.

K: You are talking of group therapy.

S: I am talking about a kind of psychotherapy.

K: Psychotherapy.

B: You see, why do I need to go through all that to see self-deception? You see it is not clear.

S: No, it is not clear. But that is the only way. You are so desperately in need.

B: Yes.

S: You need me desperately.

K: I don't need you.

S: No, but he does.

K: That is fundamentally wrong.

B: I am accepting authority. Right?

S: Yes, but he is fundamentally wrong. Here he is, he is fundamentally wrong.

K: Tell him that. Tell him that.

S: You are fundamentally wrong, did you hear me?

K: No. Don't allow him to appeal to you.

S: Don't play along in this authority?

K: I can't help you.

S: I can't help you.

K: Because I am like you.

B: Then I'll take my trade elsewhere!

S: You'll go somewhere else.

K: So if everybody said, "I can't help you", you have to do it yourself, look at yourself, then the whole thing is beginning to act.

S: Right. But the whole thing doesn't work like that. There are a lot of people who will be willing to deceive themselves for two dollars.

K: So we know they are all neurotic people.

S: Right.

K: Here is a man who says, "I am neurotic. I won't go to any other of neurotic to become sane". I know. What does he do? He doesn't accept any authority, because I have created out of my disorder the authority.

B: Yes, well that is merely the hope that somebody knows what to do, you see.

K: Yes.

B: Because I feel this chaos is too much for me and I just assume that somebody else can tell me what to do. But that comes out of this confusion.

S: Yes, the disorder creates the authority.

B: The authority, yes.

K: In the school I have been saying: if you behave properly



there is no authority. The behaviour we have all agreed to - punctuality, cleanliness, this or that. If you really see it, you have no authority.

S: Yes, I see that. That I think is a key point: that the disorder itself creates the need for authority.

K: Look what has happened in India. Mussolini is a perfect example.

B: It doesn't actually create a need for authority. It creates among people the impression that they need authority to correct the disorder, you see. That would be more exact.

K: Right.

B: Because the authority they don't need at all because it is just destructive.

S: Right, right.

K: So let's start from there. I reject all this - being not insane. In the rejection of authority I have become very sane, I am beginning to become sane.

S: Right.

K: So I say, now I know I am neurotic, as a human being, I say I know, now what shall I do? What is the correct action in my life? Can I ever find it, being neurotic?

S: Right.

K: I can't. So I won't ask what is the right action. I will say, now can I free my mind, the mind, from being neurotic, is it possible? I won't go to Jerusalem, I won't to - you follow - to Rome, I won't go to any authority - Park Avenue, doctors, nobody.

S: Right.

K: Because I am very serious now. I am deadly serious because

that is my life.

B: But then you see you have to be so serious because then you say in spite of the immense pressure to escape...

K: I won't.

B: ...you won't. But I am saying that one will feel at this juncture that there will probably be an intense pressure towards escape, saying this is too much.

K: No. No, sir. You see what happens?

S: What happens?

K: When I reject authority I have much more energy.

S: Tremendous energy.

B: Yes, if you reject authority.

K: Because I am now concentrated to find out.

S: That's right. That is what happens.

K: I am not looking to anybody.

S: That's right. In other words then I have to be really open to 'what is', that is all I have got.

K: So what shall I do?

S: When I am really open to 'what is'?

K: Not open. Here I am, here is a human being, caught in all this, what shall he do? No authority, knowing social discipline is immoral. Right?

S: Then there is intense alertness.

K: No. Tell me. Tell me, you are a doctor, tell me what I am to do. I reject you.

S: Right.

K: Because you are not my doctor, you are not my authority.

S: Right.

K: You don't tell me what to do because you are confused.

S: Right.

K: So you have no right to tell me what to do.

K: So I come to you as a friend...

S: Right.

K: ...and say, let's find out. Because you are serious and I am serious.

S: That's right.

K: Let's see how...

S: ...we can work together.

K: No, no, be careful. I am not working together.

S: You are not going to work together?

K: No. We are together investigating.

S: OK we won't call it that. We are investigating together.

K: No, no. Working together means co-operation.

S: Right.

K: I am not co-operating. I say, you are like me. What are we going to co-operate with?

S: You don't want to co-operatively investigate?

K: No, no. Because you are like me.

S: That's right.

K: Confused, miserable, unhappy, neurotic.

S: Right, right.

K: So I say, well why should we, how can we co-operate? We can only co-operate in neuroticism.

S: That's right. You mean we will collude essentially to deceive ourselves. So what are we going to do?

K: So can we investigate together?

S: That is a very interesting question. Can we? How can we both investigate together if we are both neurotic?

K: No. So I say, look, I am going to first see in what ways I am neurotic.

S: OK. Let's look at it.

K: Yes, look at it. In what way am I neurotic, a human being, who comes from New York, or Tokyo, or Delhi, or Moscow, or wherever it is. He says, I know I am neurotic, society is neurotic, the leaders are neurotic, and I am the world and the world is me. So I can't look to anybody. Do you see what it does?

S: It puts you straight up there in front.

K: It gives you a tremendous sense of integrity.

S: Right. You have got the ball in your hands, now run with it.

K: Now can I - I being a human being - can I look at my neuroticism? Is it possible to see my neuroticism? What is neuroticism? What makes me neurotic? All the things that are put into me - into me in the sense of the me that has collected all this, which makes the me. Can my consciousness empty all that?

S: Your consciousness is that though.

K: Of course.

B: Is it only that?

K: For the moment I am limiting it to that.

S: That is my consciousness. The proliferation of my fragmentation, my thought is my neuroticism. What am I going to do with this, what am I going to do here, what am I going to get this, or do there, or how am I going to - I mean this me is made out of the proliferation of these fragments. Isn't that right?

K: Of course. But also it means it is a tremendous question, you

follow. Can I, can the consciousness of man, which began five, ten million years ago, with all the things that have been put into it, generation after generation, generation after generation, from the beginning until now; we are asking all that is neurotic, old boy, all that is a fragmented collection: can you take one at a time and look at it? Or can you take the whole of it and look at it? I don't know if I am?

S: Yes. Can you take the whole of it and look - that's not clear. How can you take the whole of it and look at it?

B: It seems a waste, a language problem there because you say you are that, how are you going to look at it?

K: I'll show you in a minute. We'll go into it.

B: I mean it is a difficulty stating it.

K: I know, stating it. It is a verbal - you know, the words are wrong.

B: Right, the words are wrong.

S: The words are made by this very system.

B: So we shouldn't take these words too literally.

K: Too literally, of course.

B: Could we say that the words can be used flexibly?

S: Right. Now that's a good point.

K: No, the word is not the thing.

S: That's right. The word is not the thing but the word points at something much bigger than itself.

K: No. The word is not the thing. It may be the big thing or the little thing but the word is not that.

B: No, but we are using words and the question is how are we to understand them. You see they are in some way an...

K: ...an impediment and...

B: ...in some way a clue to what we are talking about. It seems to me, you see, that one trouble with the words is the way we take them. We take them to mean something very fixed, like say...

K: ...this chair.

B: ...this is exactly a chair. My consciousness is just so, you see. I am the neurosis, therefore we take it very fixed.

K: It is moving.

B: Yes, it is moving. It is changing, therefore you can't just exactly say I am the neurosis or I am not the neurosis.

K: It is constantly in flux.

B: Right.

S: But he is saying something bigger which is the fact that the very thing that we are investigating is the way we use words as the thing is the very movement that we are investigating. That is the consciousness.

K: That's it. Would you repeat that once more?

S: Yes. That the very act of the word being seen as the thing by consciousness, that very movement is the thing we must investigate.

B: Yes.

S: That is...

K: Now, can you look at it without the word? Is that possible? The word is not the thing. The word is a thought. And as a human being I realize I am neurotic - neurotic in the sense that I believe, I live in conclusions, in memories, which are all neurotic processes.

S: In words.

K: In words. Words, pictures and reality. I believe.

S: That is how you live.

K: My belief is very real, it may be illusory - all beliefs are illusory, but because I believe so strongly they are real to me.

S: Right.

B: Right.

S: They are very real to you.

K: Very. So can I look at the nature of the belief, how it arose, look at it?

S: Look at how I am living in the world in which I am trapped by the belief that the word is the thing. Look at that movement.

K: Don't expand that. I understand that. You have got a belief, haven't you?

S: Oh, yes.

K: Now look at it. Can you look at it?

S: I saw, I mean this morning we were talking about the fact that the belief is doctor, word, thing.

K: Don't expand it. Can you look at that fact that you have a belief? Whatever it is, god, the State is the most important, or whatever.

S: Right.

K: Marxist is nearest god, or Mao and so on and so on.

S: But I believe it is true.

K: No, no. Can you look at that belief?

S: As a belief and not as a fact.

K: Ah, no. It is a reality to you when you believe in it. Go to a Catholic or a Hindu, or a Marxist...

S: Right. But how am I going to look at it if I really believe it? In other words, look: I say there is a god.

K: Right.

S: Right. Now you are telling me to look at my belief in the god.

K: Why do you believe? Who asked you to believe? What is the necessity of god? Not that I am an atheist, but I am asking you.

S: God is there for me, if I believe.

K: Then there is no investigation, you have stopped. You have blocked yourself. You have shut the door.

S: That's right. So how are we going to - well you see we have got such beliefs.

K: Ask him.

B: What?

K: We have tried hundreds of times to show somebody who has a very strong belief, he says, what are you talking about? This is reality.

B: That's right. That is the thing of how our word becomes reality. Can we investigate that?

S: How can we get at this? Because I think we have loads of these unconscious beliefs that we don't really shake: like the belief in the me.

K: He is asking some other question.

B: How thought, the word, becomes the sense of reality, you see.

K: Why words have become reality.

B: You see I think a deeper question is, how the mind sets up the sense of reality, do you see. I mean if I look at things I may think they are real, sometimes mistakenly, you know, that's an illusion but you know, even with objects you can say a word and it



seems real when you describe it that way. And therefore in some way the words sets up in the brain a construction of reality. Then everything is referred to that construction of reality.

S: How are we to investigate that?

K: What created that reality? Would you say everything that thought has created is a reality, except nature?

B: Thought didn't create nature.

K: No, of course not.

B: Can't we put it that thought can describe nature.

K: Yes, thought can describe nature, poetry and all the rest of it.

B: And also imagination.

K: Imagination and all the rest of it. Can we say thought, whatever it has put together is reality? The chair, the table, all these electric lights; nature it hasn't created but it can describe it.

B: And also make theories about it.

K: Make theories and all the rest of it. And also the illusion it has created is a reality.

S: Right.

B: But isn't it to a certain extent, this construction of reality has its place because you see if I feel that the table is real although the brain has constructed it, it is OK. But at some stage we construct realities that are not there, you see. We can see this sometimes in the shadows on a dark night, constructing realities that are not there.

K: That there is a man there.

B: Yes. You see and also tricks and illusions are possible by conjurors and so on. But then it goes further and we say that mentally we construct a psychological reality, which seems

intensely real, very strong. But it seems to me the question is: what is it that thought does to give that sense of reality, to construct reality? Can we watch that?

K: What does thought do to bring about, to create that reality?

S: Yes. You mean like if you talk to someone who believes in god, they say to you that is real, that it is really there, it is not a construction. And if you talk to somebody who really believes in their self, I mean I have talked to many people and you have been talking to the psychotherapists, they say the self is real, that it exists, it is a thing. I mean you heard a man once say, a psychotherapist say to Krishnaji, "We know the ego exists. we have got a theory, it exists".

B: Well, it is not only that you see, but I think people have felt its reality and what happens is that the illusion builds up very fast; once you construct the reality also its events are referred to it as if they were coming from that reality. You see, and it builds up a tremendous structure, a cloud around it of support.

S: Right. So how am I to investigate my reality making a mechanism of it?

K: We have got five minutes more. So let's come to it. What are we doing now?

S: We are moving. It's moving.

K: What are we doing? We have said no authority, nobody can say to another, "This is the right thing to do", because we are trying to find out what is the correct action in life. I can only find that out if there is no disorder in me. Right? Me is the disorder.

S: Right. That's right.

K: However real that me is, that is the source of disorder.

S: Right.

K: Because that separates, that divides - me and you, and we and they, and my nation, my god - me.

S: Right.

K: Now we are asking: with its consciousness, can that consciousness be aware of itself? - aware like thought thinking.

B: Thinking about itself?

K: Put it very simply: can thought be aware of its own movement?

B: Yes.

S: That's the question.

B: That's the question. It could be say, self reference of thought, thought understanding its own structure.

S: And its own movement. But is that thought that is aware of itself? Or is it something else?

K: Try it! Try it!

S: Try that.

K: Do it now - four minutes you have!

S: Right.

K: Do it now. Whether you can be aware - not you - whether your thought can be aware of itself, of its movement.

(Long pause)

B: It stops.

K: What does that mean?

S: It means what it says: it stops, that it can't be. With the sense of the observation of thought, thought stops.

K: No, don't put it that way.

S: How would you put it?

K: It is undergoing a radical change.

B: So the word thought is not a fixed thing.

K: No.

B: The word thought does not mean a fixed thing. But it can change.

K: That's right.

B: In perception.

K: You have told me, and other scientists have told me, in the very observation through a microscope of the object, the object undergoes a change.

B: In the quantum theory the object cannot be fixed apart from the act of observation.

S: This is true with patients in psychoanalysis. Being with the patient they change automatically.

K: Forget the patient, you are the patient!

S: I am the patient, right. It changes.

K: What takes place when thought is aware of itself? You know, sir, this is an extraordinarily important thing.

B: Yes.

K: That is, can the doer be aware of his doing? Can I move this vase from here to there, can I be aware of that moving?

S: Yes.

K: I can physically. That is fairly simple.

S: Right.

K: I stretch out the arm and so on and so on.

S: Yes.

K: But is there an awareness of thought which says, "Yes, thought is aware of itself, its movement, its activity, its structure,

its nature, what it has created, what it has done in the world, the misery, and all the rest of it"?

S: Is there an awareness of the doing of the brain? Let me ask you something? Why do you think you can be aware of...

K: It's time.

S: I want to save that question for tomorrow. The question is: when you are aware of your movement of the vase, it doesn't stop. But when you are aware of the movement of the brain it does stop. Isn't that interesting?

B: The irrelevant thoughts stop.

## **4TH CONVERSATION WITH DR BOHM & DR SHAINBERG BROCKWOOD PARK 19TH MAY 1976 'TRANSFORMATION OF MAN'**

Krishnamurti: You know I don't think we answered yesterday the question: why human beings live the way they are living. I don't think we went into it sufficiently deeply. Did we answer it?

Dr Shainberg: We got to the point, we never answered that question. I left here feeling our discussion...

K: I was thinking about it last night, I mean this morning rather, and it struck me that we hadn't answered it fully. We went into the question of can thought observe itself.

S: Right.

Dr Bohm: Right, yes.

K: But I think we ought to answer that question.

B: But I think that what we said was on the way to answering it. I mean it was relevant to the answer.

K: Yes, relevant. But it is not complete.

S: No, it's not complete, it doesn't really get hold of that issue: why do people live the way they do, and why don't they change? Why, knowing this, they don't change.

K: Yes. Could we go into that a little bit before we go on?

S: Well, you know my immediate answer to that question was that they like it; we came up against that and then pulled away.

K: I think it is much deeper than that, don't you? Because what is involved, if one actually transformed one's conditioning, the way one lives, economically, you might find yourself in a very difficult position.

S: Right.

K: And also it is going against the current.

S: That's right.

K: Completely against the current.

B: Are you saying that it might lead to a certain objective insecurity.

K: Objective insecurity.

B: It is not merely a matter of the imagination.

K: No, no, actual insecurity.

B: Yes, you see because a lot of things we are discussing yesterday, was some illusion of security or insecurity. In addition there is some genuine...

K: ...genuine insecurity.

B: ...insecurity.

K: And also doesn't it imply you have to stand alone.

S: Definitely, you would be in a new - I mean, you would be in a totally different position.

K: No, because it is like completely - not isolated - away from the stream. And that means you have to be alone, psychologically alone; and whether human beings can stand that.

S: Well certainly this other is completely to be together.

K: That is herd instinct, which all these totalitarian people use, and also everything is together: be together, with people, don't be alone.

S: Be like them, be with them - it is all based on competition in some way: I am better than you.

K: Of course, of course. It is all that.

B: Well, it is unclear because in some sense we should be

together but...

K: Of course.

B: ...society, it seems to me, is giving us some false sense of togetherness which is really fragmentation.

K: Quite right.

B: But it is called being together.

K: Right.

B: It makes you feel that way.

K: So would you say the reason, one of the main reasons, that human beings don't want to radically transform themselves is that they are really frightened not to belong to a group, to a herd, to something definite, which implies standing completely alone? And I think from that aloneness you can only co-operate; not the other way round.

S: Certainly. I mean empirically people don't like to be different, and that we know.

K: You must have seen on the television Chinese boys training, the Russians, all the eastern satellite people, all of them training, training, never alone.

S: Right.

B: Yes.

K: I once talked to an FBI man. He came to see me and he said, "Why is it that you walk alone all the time? Why are you so much alone? I see you among the hills walking alone, and why?" You follow? He thought it was very disturbing.

B: Well, I think that even anthropologists find that in the more primitive people, the sense of belonging to the tribe is even stronger, they feel completely lost, their entire psychological



structure depends on being in the tribe.

K: And I think that is one of the reasons why we don't want to - we are frightened. After all, cling to the misery that you already know, than come into another kind of misery that you don't know.

S: That's right. But there is a whole action/reaction scheme. That is, by being with others...

K: ...You are safe.

S: ...you are safe. And I mean it even goes further: there is an action. It is almost as if you could say that being with others is the off-shoot of always living from, you're this, I compare myself with you and therefore, I am together with you, is the afterthought. In other words, that is part of the circle.

B: Even if you leave off comparison, there is something deeper in the sense that people feel this togetherness, this sense of belonging to a group, you know even if they are not comparing, they just feel it is safe, they will be taken care of, like their mother may have taken care of them, and that you are sort of gently supported, and that fundamentally it will be all right because the group is large, it is wise, it knows what to do. I think there is a feeling like that, rather deep. The church may give that feeling.

K: Yes. You have seen those animal pictures? They are always in herds.

B: Yes.

S: Except the mountain lion. Did you ever read about the lion? There have been some studies done by this fellow Shaller, in which he shows that always in lion groups there is always one who goes off alone.

K: Yes, I have read about that.

S: You have read about that?

K: Yes, I have heard about it.

B: Anyway the cats are not humans.

K: The feeling of aloneness is much more, it has got a great deal in it. It isn't just isolation.

S: Right, right.

B: I was asking, now people are seeking that sense, that from the group you have some support from the whole.

K: Of course.

B: Now, isn't it possible that you are discussing an aloneness in which you have a certain security? You see, that people are seeking in the group a kind of security, it seems to me, that can arise actually in aloneness.

K: Yes, that is right. In aloneness you can be completely secure.

B: I wonder if we could discuss that because it seems there is an illusion there: people sense that you might feel that you should have a sense of security.

K: Quite right.

B: And they are looking for it in a group, the group being representative of something universal.

K: The group is not the universal.

B: It isn't, but it is the way we think of it.

K: Of course.

B: The little child thinks the tribe is the whole world, you know.

K: I mean a human being as he lives this way, if he transforms himself he becomes alone, he is alone. That aloneness is not isolation and therefore it is a form of supreme intelligence.

B: Yes, but could you go into that a little further about it not

being isolation, because at first when you say alone, the feeling that I am here, entirely apart. Right?

K: It is not apart, no.

B: But that is...

S: What do you think it is that a person experiences? I think there is one part of it that people, all people, seem to gravitate, like they have to be together, they have to be like other people. What would change that? That is one question. What would change anybody from that? And second of all: why should anybody change from that? And third: what would such a person experience when they are alone? They experience isolation.

K: I thought we dealt with that fairly thoroughly the other day. That is, after all when one realizes the appalling state of the world, and oneself, the disorder, the confusion, the misery and all the rest of it, and when one says there must be a total change, a total transformation, he has already begun to move away from all that.

S: Right. But here he is altogether, being together.

K: No. Being together, what does it really mean?

S: I mean being in this group.

K: Yes, what does it really mean?

S: Being together is different from this having to be...

K: No. Identifying oneself with the group, and remain with the group, what does it mean? What is involved in it?

S: That's right. What is involved in it? I think one of the things that is involved in it, is what I said before, it sets up this comparison.

K: No, no, apart from all that superficiality, what is involved in it? The group is me. I am the group.

S: Right, right.

K: Therefore it is like co-operating with myself.

B: Well, I think you could say like Descartes said, I think, therefore I am. Meaning that I think implies that I am there. You say I am in the group, therefore I am. You see if I am not in the group where am I? You see?

K: Yes.

B: In other words, I have no being at all. That is really the condition of the primitive tribe, for most of the members anyway. And there is something deep there because I feel that my very existence, my being psychologically, is implied in being first in the group. The group has made me, everything about me has come from the group. I say I am nothing without the group.

K: Yes, quite right. I am the group, in fact.

S: Right, right.

B: And therefore if I am out of the group I feel everything is collapsing. That seems to me deeper than the question of competing: who is the chief, or who is the big shot.

S: Right.

B: That is a secondary affair.

S: Well, except I wasn't really saying that that was important so much as I was saying that the very action - what I am trying to get at is some of the moment to moment experiences of being in the group, which is occupied.

B: Could I say that the more striking thing is what happens when a person is taken out of the group and he feels lost, you see. In other words, all that stuff seems unimportant because he doesn't know where he is.

S: Right, right. He doesn't know, he has no orientation or anything.

B: To life, or to anything.

S: Right.

B: And therefore you see that might be the greatest punishment that the group could make, to banish him.

K: Yes, they used to do that.

S: Oh, yes.

K: Look what is happening in Russia: when there is a dissenter he is banished.

S: Right, right.

K: Solzhenitsyn and all those people are against the group.

S: Right. Right.

B: Because such a banishment sort of robs them of his being, it is almost like killing him, you see.

K: Of course. I think that is where it is, that the fear of being alone. Alone is translated as being isolated from all this.

B: Right. Could we say from the universal?

K: Yes, from the universal.

B: It seems to me you are implying that if you are really alone, genuinely alone, then you are not isolated from the universe.

K: Absolutely. On the contrary.

B: That is what he is saying. And therefore we have to be free of this false universal first.

S: This false identification with the group.

B: Identification of the group as the universal, you see. Treating the group as if it were the universal support of my being, or something.

S: Right, right. Now there is something more to that. What is being said is that by the localised identification that I am the group, that me, that false security is dropped, then one is opened up to the participation in...

K: No, there is no question of participation; you are the universe.

S: You are that.

B: You see as a child I felt that, I was in a certain town, and I felt that was the whole universe, then I heard of another town beyond that which felt almost beyond the universe. That must be the ultimate limit of all reality, you see. So that the idea of going beyond that would not have occurred to me. (Laughter) And I think that is the way that the group is treated, you see. We know abstractly it is not so but the feeling you have, it is like the little child.

K: Therefore is it that human beings love, or hold on to their own misery, confusion, and all the rest of it because they don't know anything else?

B: Yes.

K: The known is so far, then the unknown.

S: Right. Right, yes, yes.

K: Now to be alone implies, doesn't it, to step out of the stream.

S: Of the known.

K: Step out of the stream of this utter confusion, disorder, sorrow and despair, hope, travail, all that, to step out of all that.

S: Right.

K: And if you want to go much deeper into that: to be alone implies, doesn't it, not to carry the burden of tradition with you at

all.

B: Tradition being the group, then.

K: Group; tradition also being knowledge.

B: Knowledge, but it comes basically from the group.

Knowledge is basically collective.

K: Collective.

B: It is collected by everybody.

K: So to be alone implies total freedom. And when there is that great freedom it is the universe.

B: Could we go into that further because you see to a person who hasn't see this, you know, it doesn't look obvious.

S: Well, it doesn't look obvious. I think David is right there. To a person, to most people, I think, and I have tested this out recently, that the idea, or even the deep feeling, that you are the universe, that you don't have to do anything, that seems to be so...

K: Ah, sir, that is a most dangerous thing. That is a most dangerous thing to say. How can you say you are the universe when you are in total confusion? When you are unhappy, miserable, anxious, you follow, jealous, envious, all that, how can you say you are the universe? Universe implies total order.

B: Yes, the Cosmos in Greek meant order.

K: Order, of course.

B: And chaos was the opposite, you see.

K: Yes.

S: But I...

K: No, listen: universe, Cosmos, means order.

S: Right.

B: And chaos is what we are.

K: Chaos is what we live with.

S: That's right.

K: How can I think I have universal order in me? That is the good old trick of the mind which says, disorder is there, but inside you there is perfect order, old boy. That is an illusion. It is a concept which thought has put there and it gives me a certain hope, and therefore it is an illusion, it has no reality. What has actual reality is my confusion.

S: Right.

K: My chaos. And I can imagine, I can project a Cosmos.

S: Right.

K: But that is equally illusory. So I must start with the fact of what I am.

S: Right.

K: Which is I am in a chaos.

S: I belong to a group.

K: Chaos; chaos is the group.

S: Right.

K: They have political leaders, religious, you follow, the whole thing is a chaos. So to move away from that into Cosmos, which is total order means not that I am alone, there is a total order which is not associated with disorder, chaos. That is alone.

B: Yes, well can we go into that. Suppose several people are doing that, in that state, moving into Cosmos, into order out of the chaos of society.

K: That's right.

B: Now then, are they all alone?

K: No, of course.



B: We want to get it clear.

K: No, they don't feel alone there. There is only order.

B: Are there different people?

K: Sir, would you say, suppose - no, I can't suppose. We three are in Cosmos, there is only Cosmos, not you, Dr Bohm, Dr Shainberg and me.

B: Therefore we are still alone.

K: Which is, order is alone.

B: Because I looked up the word 'alone' in the dictionary; basically it is all one.

K: All one, yes, yes.

B: In other words there is no fragmentation.

K: Therefore there is no tree; and that is marvellous, sir.

S: But you jumped away there. We got chaos and confusion. That is what we have got.

K: So, as we said, to move away from that most people are afraid, which is to have total order. Alone, as he pointed out, is all one. Therefore there is no fragmentation, then there is Cosmos.

S: Right. But most people are in confusion and chaos. That is all they know.

K: So move. How do you move away from that? That is the whole question.

S: That is the question. Here we are in chaos and confusion, we are not over there.

K: No, because you may be frightened of that.

S: May be frightened of that.

K: Frightened of an idea of being alone.

S: How can you be frightened of an idea?

B: That is easy!

K: Aren't you frightened of tomorrow? Which is an idea.

S: OK. That is an idea.

K: So they are frightened of an idea which they have projected, which says, my god, I am alone, which means I have nobody to rely on.

S: Right, but that is an idea.

B: Well, let's go slowly.

S: Yes, this is very important.

B: We have said to a certain extent it is genuinely so. You are not being supported by society and all that. You do have a certain genuine danger because you have withdrawn from the nub of society.

K: Yes. If you are a Protestant in a Catholic country it becomes very difficult.

S: I think we are confused here. I really do, because I think if we have got confusion, if we have got chaos...

K: Not 'if', it is so.

S: It is so, OK. I go with you. Now you have got chaos and confusion, that is what we have got. Now if you have an idea about being alone while in chaos and confusion that is just another idea, another thought, another part of the chaos.

K: That is all.

S: Is that right?

K: That's right.

S: OK. Now that is all we have got, chaos and confusion.

B: We must watch the question of language because you see when you use the word 'all' it closes things. You see, in other

words...

S: All right.

B: ...we were saying yesterday that language has to be more free in its usage, perhaps, and if you use this word 'all' you have to watch it.

S: All right. But we have this.

B: We have chaos.

S: OK. Now that is what we have. Now I have an idea, let me say what my idea is: that most people are let's say unaware, unwilling, don't believe in, don't know anything about this 'all one'.

K: I am not talking about that. We are not talking about that.

S: That's right, we don't have that.

K: No.

S: All we have got right now is chaos.

K: Sir.

B: Leave out the word 'all'.

S: OK. We have got chaos. (Laughter) Chaos.

K: Chaos. Now wait a minute: being in chaotic conditions, to move away from that they have the feeling that they will be alone.

S: Right.

B: A sense of isolated.

K: Isolated.

S: Right.

K: Isolated.

S: That's what I am getting at.

K: They will be lonely.

S: That's right.

K: Isolated.

S: That's right.

K: Of that they are frightened.

S: Not frightened, in terror.

K: Yes. Therefore they say, "I would rather stay where I am, in my little pond, rather than face isolation".

S: That's right.

K: And that may be one of the reason that human beings don't radically change.

S: That's right.

B: That's like this primitive tribe: the worst punishment is to be banished, you see, or isolated.

S: You don't have to go to a primitive tribe: I see people and talk to people all the time; patients come to me and say, "Look, Saturday came, I couldn't stand to be alone, I called up fifty people looking for somebody to be with."

B: Yes, that is much the same.

S: "I had to join this group".

B: It is much the same. I think it comes in a more simple and pure form there, when people just frankly admit it and they know that is the case, you see.

S: Right.

K: So that may be one of the reasons why human beings don't change. The other is we are so heavily conditioned to accept things as they are. We don't say to ourselves, "Why should I live this way?"

S: That is certainly true. We don't. We definitely are conditioned to believe that is all.

K: No.

B: Well, that is important. That is an explanation, we are conditioned to believe that is all that is possible, you see. But this word 'all' is one of the traps.

S: Maybe that is the very fact. Right.

B: You see if you say "this is all that can be", then what can you do?

K: Nothing, nothing.

B: You see that is the use of language. You see this way of using language may be changed, you see.

K: Quite right, sir.

S: It is the condition.

B: But the word 'all'...

K: That is what he is pointing out.

B: The word 'all', you see the word...

K: When you say, "This is all I know", you have already stopped.

S: Right, right.

B: Because what does the word 'all' do, you see. It closes.

K: It closes it.

B: This thing is all reality, you see. It's got to be real.

K: Yes, quite right.

B: One thing it turns an idea into reality because apparently it gives that sense of reality to the idea, because if you say that is all there is, then that has to be real, do you see? You get me?

S: Yes. I think that is a very good point. I mean that is very much like the points that we have been making where the very act of the thinking, that thought is complete, a thought becomes reality - that is also. So again the language itself is the condition.

K: So shall we say human beings don't radically transform themselves, they are frightened of being isolated from the group, banished from the group. That is one reason.

S: That's one reason.

K: And also traditionally we are so conditioned that we would rather accept things as they are; our misery, our chaos, all the rest of it, and not say, "For god's sake, let me change this".

S: Right.

B: Well, we have to get out of this conviction that the way things are is all that can be, you see.

K: Yes, that's right. You see the religions have pointed this out by saying there is another world: aspire to that. This is a transient world, it doesn't matter, live as best as you can in your sorrow, but hand over your sorrow to Jesus, or Christ, or somebody, and then you will be perfectly happy in the next world.

S: Right.

K: So the communists say there is no next world, but make the best of this world.

B: Well I think they would say that there is happiness in the future in this world, you see.

K: Yes, yes. Sacrifice your children for the future; which is exactly the same thing.

B: But it seems that it is sort of a transformation of the same thing: if we say we have this society as it is and we want to give it up but we invent something similar...

K: Yes, quite.

B: ...to go to.

S: We have to invent, it has to be similar if we are inventing it.

B: Yes, but it seems it is an important point, that there is a subtle way of not being alone.

K: Quite right.

S: You mean to go ahead and make it out of the old ideas?

B: Yes. To make heaven for the future.

K: So what will make human beings change, radically?

S: I don't know. I think that, well even the idea that you are suggesting here is that they say it can't be different, or it is all the same, that is part of the system itself.

K: Agreed.

S: All...

K: Agreed. Now wait a minute. May I ask you a question? Why don't you change? What is preventing you?

S: I would say that it is - oh, it's a tough question! I suppose the answer would be that - I don't have any answer!

K: Because you have never asked yourself that question. Right?

S: Not radically.

K: We are asking basic questions.

S: Right. I don't really know the answer to the question.

K: Now sir, move away from that, sir. Is it as our structure, as our whole society, all religions, all culture, is based on thought, and thought says, "I can't do this, therefore an outside agency is necessary to change me"?

S: Right.

K: Whether the outside agency is the environment, the leader, Hitler, this, or Stalin, or Mao, or somebody outside, or god. God is your own projection of yourself, obviously. And you believe in god, you believe in Mao, you believe, but you are still the same.

S: That's right. Right.

K: You may identify with the State and so on and so on, but you are still - the good old me is operating. So is it thought doesn't see its own limit? And know, realize it cannot change itself? Realize it. it.

B: Well, I think that something more subtle happens: thought loses track of something and it doesn't see that it, itself is behind all this.

K: Of course. We said that. Thought has produced all this chaos.

B: But thought doesn't really see, you know, abstractly. But I think you see it is in the bones.

S: What about the whole business that thought, what thought does in fact is that it communicates through gradual change.

K: That is all invention of thought.

S: Yes, but that is where I think the hook is.

K: No, sir, please sir, just listen.

S: Sure.

K: Thought has put this world together.

S: Right.

K: Technologically as well as psychologically. And the technological world is all right, leave it alone, we won't even discuss that. It would be too absurd.

S: Right.

K: So psychologically thought has built all this world in me and outside me - the churches, society and so on. And does thought realize it has made this mess, this chaos?

B: I would say that it doesn't. It tends to look on this chaos as



independently existent, do you see.

K: But it is its bogey!

B: It is, but it is very hard for it to see that. You see we were discussing that at the end of the hour yesterday really.

K: Yes, really we are coming back to that.

B: This question of how thought gives a sense of reality. You see we were saying that technology deals with something that thought made but it is actually an independent reality once it is made.

K: Made; like the table, like those cameras.

B: But you could say that thought also creates a reality which it calls independent but isn't, you see. I thought of a good example, that is: the Corporation, you see...

K: Yes, yes.

B: You see people are there working for the Corporation, it makes money, it loses money, they strike against the Corporation and so on. But actually you could say, where is the Corporation? It is not in the buildings because...

K: They are part of it.

B: ...well anyway if all the people were gone the buildings would be nothing. And if the buildings all burnt down the Corporation would still exist, as long as people think it exists.

S: Right. And it pays taxes, the Corporation pays taxes, not the individuals.

K: So, does thought realize, see, aware that it has created this chaos?

S: No.

K: Why not? But you, sir, do you realize it?

S: I realize that...

K: Not you - does thought? You see! I have asked you a different question: does thought, which is you, thinking, does your thinking realize that the chaos it has created?

B: You see, thinking tends to attribute the chaos to something else; either to something outside, or to me who is inside. I mean at most I would say that I have done it, but then thinking is attributing, saying that I am doing the thinking. Do you see what I am driving at?

K: Yes, yes.

B: But there is something thinking. I was going to say it is like the Corporation, thinking has invented a sort of a Corporation who is supposed to be responsible for thinking. Do you understand? We could call it 'Thinking Incorporated'!

K: 'Thinking Incorporated' - quite, quite.

B: And you see the Corporation is supposed to be thinking.

S: Yes, yes.

B: So we attribute, we give credit for thought to this Corporation called me.

S: Yes.

K: Thought has created me.

B: Me, because...

S: Me is an Institution.

B: But also thought has said that me is not thought, but in reality it is.

K: Of course, of course.

B: You see thought treats the Corporation as if it were there, just standing like the buildings. It says it is a reality, it is not a

mere... I think it is in this question of reality, you see, if you say there are certain realities which are independent of thought, there are certain things that are appearances, like if you are standing on a cliff looking at the ocean, you see all the play of light which is not independent reality but it is due to the sky, the sea, and me, you see, all interrelated.

K: Of course, of course.

B: So it is important to keep clear whether it is a reality that is dependent on this whole movement, or whether it stands self-generated, you know - independent. Thought is treating me as an independent reality.

K: Of course.

B: And thought is saying it is coming from me and therefore it doesn't take credit for what it does.

K: To me thought has created the me.

S: That's right.

K: And so the me is not separate from thought. It is the structure of thought.

S: Right, right.

K: The nature of thought that has made me.

S: Right.

K: Now: does thought, does your thinking, or does your thought realize this?

S: I would say, yes and no.

K: No, no.

S: In flashes it does.

K: No, not in flashes. You don't see that table in a flash, it is always there.

S: I think what actually happens though is that you see the act. If one can be really honest about this, completely true about it, what happens, what is the actuality of thought seeing this creation?

K: No. We asked a question yesterday, we stopped there: does thought see itself in movement?

S: Right.

K: The movement has created the me, created the chaos, created the division, created the conflict, jealousy, anxiety, fear and all that.

S: Right. Now what I am asking is another question: that yesterday we came to a moment where we said thought stops.

K: No, that is much later. Please just stick to one thing.

S: OK. Thought - what I am trying to get at is what is the actuality of thought seeing itself.

K: Tell me. You want me to describe it?

S: No, no, I don't want you to describe it. What I am trying to get at is what is my actuality. I mean what is the actuality that thought sees. And as I observe this - we get into language here, the problem of language - but it seems that thought sees and forgets.

K: No, no, please. I am asking a very simple question. Don't complicate it.

S: Right.

K: Does thought see the chaos it has created? That's all. Which means, is thought aware of itself as a movement? Not I am aware of thought. The I has been created by thought.

B: I think the question that is relevant is: why does thought keep on going? You see how does it sustain itself? Because as long as it sustains itself it does produce something like an independent

reality, an illusion of one.

K: Why does thought...

B: Why does thought keep on going?

S: What is my relationship to thought?

K: You are thought. There is not a you related to thought.

B: That's the way when the language says there is, when it says, 'I am the entity who is doing, producing the thought'.

K: Of course, of course.

B: Which is to say, like General Motors says, "I am the Corporation which is producing automobiles".

S: Right. But look, look: you are right. The question is: I say to you, "What is my relationship to thought?", you say to me, "You are thought". In some way what you say is clear, but that is still what's coming from me, do you see? That is still the way thought is moving, to say it is my relationship to thought.

B: Well that's the point, you see. Can this very thought stop right now? Do you see.

K: Yes.

B: What is sustaining this whole thing, at this very moment, was the question I was trying to get at.

S: Yes, that's the question.

B: In other words, say we have a certain insight, but something happens to sustain the old process nevertheless right now.

K: That's right.

S: Right now thought keeps moving.

K: No, he asked, Dr Bohm asked a very good question which we haven't answered. He said why does thought move?

B: When it is irrelevant to moving.

K: Why is it always moving?

S: That's right.

K: So what is movement? Movement is time. Right?

S: That's too quick. Movement is time.

K: Obviously, of course.

B: But I think...

S: Movement is movement.

K: No, no. From here to there.

S: Right, just like that.

K: Yes, from here to there.

S: Right.

K: Physically, from here to London, from here to New York.

And also psychologically from here to there.

S: Right.

K: I am this; I must be that.

S: Right. But a thought is not necessarily all that.

K: Thought is the movement. We are examining movement, which is thought.

S: Thought...

K: Look: if thought stopped there is no movement.

S: Yes, I know. This has to be made very clear.

B: I think there is a kind of step that might help, you see. To ask myself what is it that makes me go on thinking or talking. In other words, I often can watch people and see they are in a hole just because they keep on talking: if they would stop talking the whole problem would vanish. I mean it is just this flow of words, because what they say then comes out as if it were reality in them, and then they say, that is my problem, it is real, and I have got to think some

more. I think there is a kind of a feedback. Suppose I say, 'Well, I have got a problem, I am suffering'.

S: You have got an 'I' though.

B: Yes. I mean I think that, you see, therefore I have a sense I am real. I am thinking of my suffering but in that it is implicit that it is I who is there, and that the suffering is real because I am real.

S: Right.

B: And then comes the next thought, which is: since that is real I must think some more.

S: Right.

B: Because if it were that would be the case.

S: It feeds on itself.

B: Yes. And then one of the things I must think, what is my problem, which is that I am suffering. And I am compelled to keep on thinking that thought all the time. Do you see? And maintaining myself in existence. Do you see what I am driving at? That there is a feedback.

K: Which means that as thought is movement, which is time, as there is no movement I am dead! I am dead.

B: Yes, if that movement stops, then the sense that I am there being real must go, because that sense that I am real is the result of thinking.

K: Do you see this is extraordinary.

S: Of course it is.

K: No, no, actually. In actuality, not in theory.

S: No, right.

K: One realizes thought as movement. Right?

S: Right.

K: There is not, "I realize thought as a movement", thought itself realizes it is a movement. It is in movement.

S: Right.

B: And in this movement it creates an image of...

K: Of me, or...

B: ...that is supposed to be moving.

K: Yes, yes.

S: Right.

K: Now when that movement stops there is no me. The me is the time, is time, put together by time, which is thought.

S: Right.

K: So do you, listening to this, realize the truth of it? Not the verbal logical truth, logical statement, but the truth of such an amazing thing?

Therefore there is an action entirely different from that. The action of thought as movement brings about a fragmentary action, a contradictory action. When the movement as thought comes to an end there is total action.

B: Can you say then that whatever technical thought comes about has an order?

K: Of course.

B: In other words it doesn't mean that thought is permanently gone.

K: No, no.

S: It can still be a movement in its proper place. In its fitting order. Right and proper.

K: Of course.

S: And it comes about. I mean the brain can still do that thing.



B: Yes.

K: So am I - not, am I - a human being, is he afraid of all this? Unconsciously, deeply, he must realize the ending of me. Do you understand? And that is really a most frightening thing: my knowledge, my books, my wife - you follow the whole thing which thought has put together. And you are asking me to end all that.

B: I mean, can't you say it is the ending of everything? Because everything that I know is in there.

K: Absolutely. So you see really I am frightened, a human being is frightened of death - not the biological death.

S: To die now.

K: Death of this coming to an end. And therefore he believes in god, reincarnation, a dozen other comforting things but in actuality when thought realizes itself as movement and sees that movement has created the me, the divisions, the quarrels, the political - the follow - the whole structure of the chaotic world, when thought realizes, it sees the truth of it and ends. Therefore it is in Cosmos. Then there is Cosmos. Now you listen to this: how do you receive it?

S: Do you want me to answer?

K: Receive it.

S: Receive it.

K: I offer you something. How do you receive it? This is very important.

S: Yes. Thought sees its movement...

K: No, no. How do you receive it? How does the public, who listens to all this, say how am I listening to this, what is he trying to tell me.

S: How?

K: He says I am not telling you anything. He says listen to what I am saying and find out for yourself whether thought as movement, in that movement it has created all this, both the technological world which is useful, which is necessary, and this chaotic world.

S: Right.

K: How do you receive, listen to it; or the public, another who is not here, listen to it? How do you listen to it? How do you? What takes place in you when you listen to it?

S: Panic.

K: No. Is it?

S: Yes.

K: Eh?

S: There is a panic about the death, a sort of fear of the death. There is a seeing, there is a sense of seeing and then there is a fear of that death.

K: Which means you have listened to the words, the words have awakened the fear.

S: Right.

K: But not the actuality of the fact.

S: I wouldn't say that. I think that is a little unfair. They awaken the...

K: I am asking you.

S: ...they awaken the actuality of the fact, and then there seems to be a very quick process. There is an actuality of the fact and there seems to be a silence, a moment of great clarity that gives way to a kind of feeling in the pit of the stomach where things are

dropping out and then there is a kind of...

K: Withholding.

S: ...withholding, right. I think there is a whole movement there.

K: So you are describing humanity.

S: Yes, I am trying. Yes; no, I am describing me.

K: You are the humanity.

B: You are the same.

S: Right.

K: You are the viewer, the people who are listening.

S: Right. That's right. So there is a sense of what will happen tomorrow?

K: No, no. That is not the point. What will happen...

S: That is, I am telling you, that is the fear.

K: No. When thought realizes as a movement, and that movement has created all this chaos, total chaos, not just patchy, but complete disorder, when it realizes that, what takes place, actually? You are not frightened, there is no fear. Listen to it carefully: there is no fear. Fear is the idea brought about by an abstraction. You understand? You have made a picture of ending, and frightened of that ending.

S: You are right. You are right. There's stop...

K: There is no fear.

S: No fear, and then there is...

K: There is no fear when the actuality takes place.

S: That's right. When the actuality takes place there is silence.

K: With the fact there is no fear.

B: But as soon as the thought comes in...

K: That's right.

S: That's right. Now wait a minute, no don't go away.

(Laughter) When thought comes in...

K: We have got two minutes more.

S: OK. Three minutes.

K: Go on.

S: The fact and the actuality, no fear.

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

S: Right. But then thought comes in.

K: No. Then it is no longer a fact. You can't remain with the fact.

B: Well that is the same as to say that you keep on thinking.

K: Keep on moving.

B: Yes. Well I mean as soon as you bring thought in it is not a fact, that is an imagination or a fantasy which is felt to be real, but it is not so.

S: Right, no.

B: Therefore you are not with the fact any longer.

K: We have discovered something extraordinary: when you are faced with fact there is no fear.

S: Right.

B: So all fear is thought, is that it?

K: All. That's right.

S: That's a big mouthful here.

K: No. All thought is fear, all thought is sorrow.

B: That goes both ways: that all fear is thought, and all thought is fear.

K: Of course.

B: Except the kind of thought that arises with the fact alone.

S: I want to interject something right here, if we have got one second. And that is, it seems to me that we have discovered something quite important right here, and that is at the actual seeing, then the instant of attention is at its peak.

K: No. Something new takes place, sir.

S: Yes.

K: Something totally that you have never looked at, it has never been understood or experienced, whatever it is. There is a totally different thing happens.

B: But isn't it important that we acknowledge this in our thought, I mean in our language?

K: Yes.

B: As we are doing now. In other words, that if it happened and we didn't acknowledge it then we are liable to fall back.

K: Of course, of course.

S: I don't get you.

B: Well, we have to see it not only when it happens, but we have to see it happens and we have to say that it happens.

S: Well then are we creating a place to localise this, or not?

K: No, no. What he is saying is very simple. He is saying, does this fact, actuality, take place. And can you remain with that, can thought not move in but remain only with that fact. Sir, it is like saying: remain totally with sorrow, not move away, not say it should be, shouldn't be, how am I to get over it, self pity and all the rest of it, just totally remain with that thing, with the fact. Then you have an energy which is extraordinary.

S: Right.

K: Can you?

## **5TH CONVERSATION WITH DR BOHM & DR SHAINBERG BROCKWOOD PARK 19TH MAY 1976 'TRANSFORMATION OF MAN'**

Krishnamurti: When we were talking about the necessity of human beings changing, and why they don't change, why they accept these intolerable conditions of the human psyche, I think we ought to go, or approach the same thing from a different angle: who has invented this unconscious?

Shainberg: Who has invented it? I think there is a difference in what we call the unconscious and what is the unconscious. The word is not the thing.

K: Yes, the word is not the thing. Who has thought it up?

S: Well, I think the history of thinking about the unconscious is a long and involved process. I think it began...

K: May we ask, have you an unconscious?

S: Have I? Again, we are into a language problem here.

K: No.

S: Have I an unconscious.

K: Are you aware of your unconscious? Do you know if you have an unconscious that is operating differently, or trying to give you hints, you know, all that, are you aware of all that?

S: Yes. I am aware of an aspect of myself. I look at it a little differently: I look at it that there is an aspect of myself that is aware incompletely. That is what I call the unconscious. Is aware of my experience, aware of the events in an incomplete way. That's what I call the unconscious. Now it uses symbols and different modes of telling, of understanding, in other words a dream where I

am discovering jealousy in the dream that I wasn't aware of.

K: Do you also give importance, Dr Bohm, to a feeling that there is such a thing?

Bohm: Well, I don't know what you mean by that. I think we can say that there are some things we do whose origin we are not aware of. You see, we react, we use words in an habitual way.

S: We have dreams.

B: We have dreams, I mean I suppose we...

K: I am going to question all that because I am not sure...

S: You are not questioning that we have dreams?

K: No. But I want to question, or ask the experts, if there is such a thing as the unconscious. For me somehow I don't think it has played any important part in my life at all.

S: Well, it depends on what you mean.

K: I will tell you what I mean. Something hidden, something incomplete, something that I have to go after consciously or unconsciously, you know, go after and discover, unearth it, explore it and expose it.

S: Right, right.

K: See the motive, see the hidden intentions.

S: Right, right.

B: Well, could we make it clear? There are some things people do where you can see they are not aware of what they are doing, but some things of the nature of thought.

K: I don't quite follow.

B: Well, people, for example, this Freudian slip of the tongue, somebody makes a slip of the tongue which expresses his will.

K: Yes, yes, I didn't mean that. Quite.

S: That would be unconscious. That is what people would think of as the unconscious.

You see I think there are two problems here, if I can just put in a technical statement here. There are those people, and there has arisen in the history of thinking about the unconscious, people who think that like the unconscious is a thing and that there are things in the unconscious which are there and must be lifted out. Then I think that there are a large group of people now who think of the unconscious as areas of behaviour, areas of response, areas of experience that we aren't aware of, totally aware of all that goes into what happens; so that in the daytime you might have, let's say, an experience of stress, or like you would say, disorder, you didn't finish with the experience and at night you go through reworking it in a new way.

K: I understand all that.

S: You know about that. So that would be the unconscious in operation. You get other things, let's say, from the past or from previous programmes of action.

K: I mean, the collective unconscious, the racial unconscious.

B: Let's say somebody has been deeply hurt in the past, and you can see his whole behaviour is governed by that. But he doesn't know, he may not know it.

K: Yes, that I understand.

S: But his response is always from the past.

K: Yes, quite. What I am trying to find out is why we have divided it, the conscious and the unconscious. Or is it one unitary total process, moving? Not hidden, not concealed but moving as a whole current. And we come along, these clever brainy birds come



along and split it up and say there is the unconscious and the conscious, the hidden, the incomplete, the storehouse of racial memories, family memories and all that.

S: The reason that happened, I think, is that, well just partially explained, is the fact that Freud and Jung and these people that were seeing patients, out of which grew so much of the knowledge about the unconscious, would see patients, people who had separated it, had fragmented off this movement which you are talking about.

K: That's what I want to get at.

S: Right. In other words, a woman who says - the whole history of hysteria, you know, where patients couldn't move their arms, you know.

K: I know.

S: You know about that. And then if you open up the memories and then they eventually can move their arms. They put two and two together, they don't think it worked that way but that is the way they did it. Or there were people who had dual personalities.

K: Is it an insanity - not insanity - is it a state of mind that divides everything, that says, there is the unconscious, conscious? It is a process of fragmentation also.

S: Right.

B: Well, wouldn't you say that certain material is made, even Freud has said, that certain material is made unconscious by the brain because it is too disturbing.

K: That is what I want to get at.

S: It is fragmented.

B: I mean that is well known in all schools of psychology.

S: That's right. That is what I am saying. That it is fragmented off and that then was called the unconscious. What is fragmented is the unconscious.

K: I understand that.

B: But would one say that the brain itself is on purpose in some sense holding it separate to avoid it?

S: Right.

K: Yes, avoid facing the fact.

S: That's right.

B: Yes. So that it is not really separate from consciousness.

K: That is what I want to get at. You see?

S: Right. It isn't separate from consciousness, but the brain has organized in a fragmented way.

B: Yes, but then it is a wrong terminology to call it that. The word 'unconscious' already implies a separation.

K: That's right, separation.

B: To say there are two layers, for example, the deep unconscious and the surface consciousness, that structure is implied. But this other notion is to say that structure is not implied, but rather, certain material wherever it may be is simply avoided.

S: That's right. That is the way I think about it.

K: I don't want to think about somebody because he has hurt me. That is not the unconscious, it's I don't want to think about him.

S: That's right.

K: I am conscious he has hurt me and I don't want to think about it.

B: But there is a kind of paradoxical situation arise, because

eventually you would become so good at it that you don't realize you are doing it. I mean that seems to happen, you see.

K: Yes, yes.

B: People become so proficient at avoiding these things that they cease to realize they are doing it.

K: Yes.

B: It becomes habitual.

S: That is right. I think this is what happens. That these kinds of things, the hurts...

K: The wound remains.

S: ...the wound remains and we forgets that we have forgotten.

K: The wound remains.

B: We remember to forget, you see!

K: Yes.

S: We remember to forget and then the process, actually the process of therapy is helping the remembering and the recall, to remember you have forgotten, and then to understand the connections of why you forgot, and then the thing can move in a more holistic way, rather than being fragmented.

K: Do you consider, or feel that you have been hurt?

S: Yes.

K: And want to avoid it? Or, being hurt, resist, withdraw, isolate, the whole picture being the image of yourself being hurt and withdrawing, and all that - do you feel that when you are hurt?

S: Yes, I feel - how shall I put it? I think, I think it is...

K: Are you interested in this? Let's go into this.

S: Yes, I feel there is definitely a move not to be hurt, not to have that image, not to have that whole thing changed because if it

is changed it seems to catapult into that same experience that was the hurt. You see it may not. This is hurt but this has a resonance with that unconscious which reminds me. You see, I am reminded of being hurt deeply by this more superficial hurt.

K: I understand that.

S: So that I avoid hurt, period.

K: Can the brain have a shock? Of course, the biological, physical shock, but the psychological brain, if we can call it that, must it be hurt? Is that inevitable?

S: No, I don't think so. It is only hurt with reference to something.

K: No. I am asking: can such a psychological brain, if I can use those two words, never be hurt under any circumstances? You know, family life, husband, wife, bad friends, so-called enemies, all that is going on around you and never get hurt? Because apparently this is one of the major wounds in human existence, to get hurt; the more sensitive you are, the more aware, you get more and more hurt, more and more withdrawn. Is this inevitable?

S: I don't think it is inevitable, but I think it happens frequently, I mean more often than not. And it seems to happen when there is - how can I describe it? - an attachment is formed and then the loss of the attachment. You become important to me, what you think. You become important to me, I like you, or I am involved with you, then it becomes important to me that you don't do anything that disturbs that image.

K: That is, in that relationship between two people the picture that we have of each other, the image, that is the cause of hurt.

B: Well, it also goes the other way: that we hold those images

because of hurt, I mean.

K: Of course, of course.

B: Where does it start?

K: That is what I want to get at.

S: That is what I want to get at too.

K: No, he pointed out something.

S: Right. I know he did, yes.

B: Because the past hurt gives tremendous strength to the image, the image which helps us to forget it.

S: That's right.

K: Now is this wound in the unconscious - we use the word unconscious in quotes for the time being - is that hidden?

S: Well, I think you are being a little simplistic about that, because what is hidden is the fact that I have had the event happen many times, it happened with my mother, it happened with my friends, it happened in school, where I cared about somebody and then the image - it's like you form the attachment and then the hurt.

K: I am not at all sure through attachment it comes.

S: I think it is something. May be it is not attachment, that is the wrong world, but there is something there that happens. What happens is that I form a relationship with you where an image becomes important? What you do to me becomes important.

K: You have an image about yourself.

S: That's right. And you are saying that I like you because you are confirming my image?

K: No, apart from like and dislike, apart from like and dislike, you have an image about yourself.

S: Right.

K: I come along and put a pin in that image.

S: No, first you come along and confirm it.

K: No.

B: The hurt will be greater if you first come along and be very friendly to me and confirm the image, and then suddenly you put a pin in me.

K: Of course, of course.

B: But even somebody who didn't confirm it, if he puts the pin in properly he can produce that hurt.

S: That's right. That's not unconscious. But how come, like you said, why did I have the image to begin with? That is unconscious.

K: Is it unconscious? That is what I want to get at. Or it is so obvious that we don't look? You follow what I am saying?

S: I follow, yes. I am with you on this.

K: We put it away. We say it is hidden. I question whether it is hidden at all; it is so blatantly obvious.

S: I wonder if all the ingredients of it are. I tell you, I don't feel all parts of it are obvious.

B: I think we hide it in one sense, you see, shall we say that this hurt means that everything is wrong with the image, but we hide it by saying everything is all right, you see, for example. In other words, the thing that is obvious may be hidden by saying it is unimportant, that we don't notice it.

S: Yes, we don't notice it, but it like I get the feeling as we are talking personally, I get the feeling there is a kind of, well, I ask myself what is it that kind of generates this image, what is that hurt?

K: Ah, we will come to that. We are enquiring, aren't we, into

the whole structure of consciousness.

S: Right, right. That is just what we are enquiring into.

K: Into the nature of consciousness. We have broken it up into the hidden and the open. It may be the fragmented mind is doing that.

S: That's right.

K: And therefore strengthening both.

S: Right.

K: The division grows greater and greater and greater.

S: The fragmented mind is...

K: ...doing this. Now most people have an image about themselves, practically everybody.

S: Right. Practically everybody.

K: It is that image that gets hurt. And that image is you, and you say, "Well, I am hurt".

B: It is the same as we were discussing this morning.

K: Yes.

B: You see, if I say I have a pleasant self image, then I attribute the pleasure to me and say, that's real. When somebody hurts me then the pain is attributed to me and I say, that's real too. It seems that if you have an image that can give you pleasure then it must be able to give you pain.

K: Pain, yes.

B: There is no way out of that.

K: Absolutely.

S: Well, the image seems to be self perpetuating, like you were saying.

B: I think people hope that the image will give them pleasure.

Right?

K: Pleasure only.

B: Only pleasure, but the very mechanism that makes pleasure possible makes pain possible because you see the pleasure comes if I say, "I think I am good", and that I is also sensed to be real, which makes that goodness real; but then if somebody comes along and says, "You are no good, you are stupid", and so on then that too is real, and therefore very significant. I mean it makes it hurt. Right?

K: The image brings both pleasure and pain.

B: Yes.

S: Right.

K: To put it very, very simply.

B: I think people would hope for an image that would bring only pleasure.

S: People do hope that, there is no question. But people not only hope for the image but they invest all their interest in their image, they say, "I should not be this way because I am in fact the image". So that they go both ways at the same time. That is the most curious thing about the mind. I am the image but when I discover that I am not the image then I should be that way because I really am that. So it works both ways.

B: But the image, you see I think that if you make the self image and you get what is implied in that; that is to say everything depends on having the self image right, you see. In other words...

S: That's right.

B: ...the value of everything depends on this self image being right. So if somebody, you know, shows it's wrong, therefore everything, you know, is no good, everything is wrong.



S: That's right.

K: But we are always giving new shape to the image.

S: That's right.

B: I think that this image means everything, so it gives it tremendous power.

S: The entire personality is directed to the achievement of this image. Everything else takes second place.

K: Are you aware of this?

S: Yes, I am aware of it.

K: How? What is the beginning of this?

S: Well...

K: Please, just let me summarize first. Every human being practically has an image of themselves, of which he is unconscious, or not aware.

S: That's right. Usually it's some sort of idealized...

K: Idealized, or not idealized, it is an image.

S: That's right. It is an image, it's idealized and they must have it.

K: They have it.

B: They have it.

S: They have money, they must get all their actions towards 'must have it'. In other words to accomplish it.

B: I think one feels one's whole life depends on the image.

K: Yes, that's right.

S: Depression is when I don't have it.

K: We will come to that. The next question is: how does it come into being?

S: Well, I think it comes into being when as children there is

this hurt and there is the feeling that there is no other way in which this hurt can be assuaged. Really it works in the family in some way. You are my father and I understand through my watching you that if I am smart you will like me. Right?

K: Quite. We agree.

S: I learn that very quickly. So I am going to make sure I get that love, so I am going to go from here to there. I am going to become that.

K: It is all very simple. But I am asking: the beginning of it? The origin of making images about oneself.

B: You see if I had no image at all then I would never get into that, would I?

K: Yes, that is what I want to get at.

B: You see why does...

S: If I never made images.

B: Yes. If I never made any image at all, no matter what my father did that would have no effect, would it?

K: I think this is very important.

S: That is the question.

B: I am saying may be the child can't do it, but suppose so.

K: I am not sure, I am not at all sure.

B: Perhaps he can, but I am saying under ordinary conditions he doesn't manage to do it.

S: You are suggesting that the child already has an image that he has been hurt.

K: Ah, no, no. I don't know. We are asking.

B: But suppose there were a child who made no image of himself.

S: OK Let's assume he has no image.

B: Then he cannot get hurt.

K: He can't be hurt.

S: Well, there you see I think you are in very hot water psychologically because a child...

K: No, we said, 'suppose'.

S: Suppose.

B: Not the actual child, you know, but suppose there were a child who didn't make an image of himself so he didn't depend on that image for everything. You see the child you talk about depended on the image that his father loves him.

S: That's right.

B: And therefore everything goes when his father doesn't love him, everything has gone. Right?

S: Right, right.

B: Therefore he is hurt.

S: That's right.

B: But if he has no image that he must have his father love him, then he will just watch his father.

S: The child who is watching his father... But let's look at it a little more pragmatically: here is the child and he is actually hurt.

B: Well wait, he can't be hurt without the image.

S: Well, that's...

B: What is going to get hurt?

K: It is like putting a pin into the air.

S: Now wait a second, I am not going to let you guys get away with this! Here you have got this child, very vulnerable in the sense that he needs physiological support. He has enormous tensions.

K: Sir, agreed to all that. Such a child has an image.

S: No, no image. He is simply not being biologically supported.

K: No. Eh?

B: Well, he may make an image of the fact that he is not biologically supported. You see you have to get the difference between the actual fact that happens biologically and what he thinks of it. Right? Now you see I have seen a child sometimes drop suddenly, he really goes to pieces not because he was dropped very far but because that sense of...

K: Loss, insecurity.

B: ...insecurity from his mother was gone. It seemed as if everything had gone. Right? And he was totally disorganized and screaming, but he dropped only about this far, you see. But the point is he had an image of the kind of security he was going to get from his mother. Right?

S: That is the way the nervous systems works.

B: Well, that is the question, is it, everything we are discussing. Is it necessary to work that way? Or is this the result of conditioning?

S: Yes, I would say yes.

K: This is an important question.

S: Oh, terribly important.

K: Because whether in America or in this country, children are running away from their parents, thousands are running away. The parents seem to have no control over them. They don't obey, they don't listen, they don't - you follow? They are wild.

S: Yes.

K: And the parents feel terribly hurt. I saw on the TV what is

happening in America. And the woman was in tears - you follow? She said, "I am his mother, he doesn't treat me as a mother, he just orders me, give me a bottle of milk", and all the rest of it. And he has run away half a dozen times. And this is growing, this separation between the parents and the children is growing all over the world. They have no relationship between themselves, between each other. So what is the cause of all this, apart from sociological, economic pressures and all that, which makes the mother go and work and leave the child alone, and he plays, you know, all that, we take that for granted, but much deeper than that? Is it the parents have an image about themselves and the parents insist in creating an image in the children?

S: I see what you are saying.

K: And the child refuses to have that image but he has his own image. So the battle is on.

S: That is very much what I am saying when I say that initially the hurt of the child...

K: We haven't come to the hurt yet.

S: Well, that is where I am trying to get; what is in that initial relationship? What is the initial relationship between child...

K: I doubt if they have any relations. That is what I am trying to get at.

S: That's right. I agree with you. There is something wrong with the relationship. They have a relationship but it is a wrong relationship.

K: Have they a relationship?

S: They have a...

K: Look: young people get married, or not. They have a child

by mistake, or intentionally they have a child. The young people, they are children themselves, they haven't understood the universe, Cosmos or chaos, they just have this child.

S: That's right. That is what happens.

K: And they play with it for a year or two and then say, "For god's sake, I am fed up with this child", and look elsewhere. And the child feels left, lost.

S: That's right.

K: And he needs security, from the beginning he needs security.

S: Right.

K: Which the parents cannot give, or are incapable of giving, psychological security, the sense of "you are my child, I love you, I'll look after you, I'll see that throughout life you will behave properly, care". They haven't got that feeling.

S: Right.

K: They are bored with it after a couple of years.

S: That's right.

K: Right?

S: Yes.

K: Is it that they have no relationship right from the beginning, neither the husband, nor the wife, boy or girl? It is only a sexual relationship, the pleasure relationship; in accepting that, they won't accept the pain principle involved with the pleasure principle.

S: That's right. They won't and not only that, they won't let the child go through that.

K: The child is going through that.

S: Yes, but they do things that don't let the child have the pleasure that goes all the way, nor do they let the child have the

pain that goes all the way.

K: What I am trying to see is that there is actually no relationship at all, except biological, sexual, sensual relationship.

S: Yes, OK.

K: I am questioning it, I am not saying it is so, I am questioning it.

S: I don't think it is so. I think that they have a relationship, but it is a wrong relationship, there are all kinds of...

K: There is no wrong relationship: it is a relationship, or no relationship.

S: Well then we will have to say they have a relationship. Now we will have to understand the relationship. But I think that most parents have a relationship with their child.

B: Wouldn't you say it is the image that is related? You see, suppose the parent and child have images of each other, and the relationship is governed by those images, the question is whether that is actually a relationship or not, or whether it is some sort of fantasy of relationship.

K: A fanciful relationship.

B: Yes.

K: Sir, put it: you have children - forgive me if I come back to you - you have children. Have you any relationship with them? No, in the real sense of that word.

S: Yes.

K: Eh?

S: In the real sense, yes.

K: That means you have no image about yourself.

S: Right.

K: And you are not imposing an image on them.

S: That's right.

K: And the society is not imposing an image on them.

S: There are moments like that.

K: That is not good enough. It is like a rotten egg!

S: This is an important point.

B: If it is moments, it is not so. It is like saying a person who is hurt has moments when he is not hurt, but he is sitting there waiting to explode when something happens.

K: Happens, yes.

B: You see. So he can't go very far. It is like somebody who is tied to a rope, and as soon as he reaches the limits of that rope he is stuck.

S: That is right.

B: So you could say, I am related as long as certain things are all right, but then beyond that point it just sort of blows up. You see what I am driving at? That mechanism is inside there, buried, so it dominates it potentially.

S: In fact what you just said is fact.

B: Yes.

S: I will verify that that is what happens. In other words, there seems that there are moments in which there are...

B: Well, it is like the man who is tied to a rope and says there are moments when I can move wherever I like, but I can't really because if I keep on moving I am bound to come to the end.

S: That does seem to be what happens, in fact, that there is a reverberation in which there is yank-back.

B: Either I come to the end of the cord, or else something yanks



the cord and then - but the person who is on the cord is really not free ever.

S: Well, that's true, I mean, I think that is true.

B: You see in the same sense the person who has the image is not really related ever, you see.

K: Yes, that is just the whole point. You can play with it.

S: Yes.

K: You can play with it verbally, but the actual is you have no relationship.

S: You have no relationship as long as it is the image.

K: As long as you have an image about yourself you have no relationship with another. This is a tremendous revelation. You follow? It is not just an intellectual statement.

S: Let me share with you something: I resent this.

K: I see that.

S: You see that. I mean I am rather angry with you. (Laughter)  
There is a real - we have seen this in other places.

B: It always happens.

S: It happens. But I was thinking we had psychotherapy, the meaning of the psychotherapists, this came up. There is a tremendous resentment to say that because I have the memory of times when I do have what I think is a relationship, yet I must be honest with you and say that after such relationship there inevitably seems to be this yank-back.

B: The end of the cord.

S: Yes. A yank-back. So that I must... (Laughter) There is that. There is no question that the image - there is a place where you say you have a relationship with somebody but you will go just so far.

B: Yes.

K: Of course. That is understood.

B: But then really the image controls it all the time because you see the image is the dominant factor. If you once pass that point, no matter what happens, the image takes over.

S: That's right.

K: So, the image gets hurt. And the child, do you impose the image on the child? You are bound to because you have an image.

S: You are trying to.

K: No.

S: Well no, you are working at it and the child picks it up, or he doesn't pick it up.

K: No, no. Because you have an image about yourself you are bound to create an image in the child.

S: That is right.

K: That is it. You follow, you have discovered? And society is doing this to all of us.

B: So you say the child is picking up an image just naturally, as it were, quietly and then suddenly it gets hurt.

K: Hurt. That's right.

B: So the hurt has been prepared and preceded by this steady process of building an image.

S: That's right. Well you know, there is evidence, for instance, we treat boys differently from the way we treat girls.

K: No. Look at it: don't verbalize it too quickly.

B: You see if the steady process of building an image didn't occur then there would be no basis, no structure to get hurt. You see that it is. In other words, the pain is due entirely to some

psychological factor, some thought which is attributed to me in saying, "I am suffering this pain". Whereas I was previously enjoying the pleasure of saying, "My father loves me, I am doing what he wants." Now comes the pain: "I am not doing what he wants, he doesn't love me".

S: But what about the initial hurts?

K: No, if you once...

B: I think we have gone beyond that point.

K: Beyond that point.

S: I don't think we touched on the biological situation of the child feeling neglected.

B: Well that is still, if the child is neglected, I mean, I think he must pick up an image in that very process.

K: Of course. If you admit, once you admit, see the reality that as long as the parents have an image about themselves they are bound to give that image to the child, an image.

B: It is the image that makes the parent neglect the child.

S: Well you are right there.

K: It is right.

S: There is no question as long as the parent is an image-maker and has an image, then he can't see the child.

K: And therefore gives an image to the child.

S: Right. He will condition the child to be into something.

K: Yes.

B: Yes. And at first perhaps through pleasure he will get hurt. But if he begins by neglecting him, you see the process of neglect is also the result of an image and he must communicate an image to the child as he neglects the child.

S: Which is neglect.

B: Yes, neglect is the image.

S: Right.

K: That's right. And also the parents are bound to neglect if they have an image about themselves.

B: That's right.

S: That's right. They must. Right.

K: It is inevitable.

S: Because they are fragmenting rather than seeing the whole.

B: Yes, the child will get the image that he doesn't matter to his parents.

S: Except in that fragment.

B: In the fragment, they like and so on.

S: So if you are this way, I am with you, if you are not that way...

K: But you see society is doing this to every human being. Right? Churches are doing it; churches, religions, every culture around us is creating this image.

S: That is right.

K: And that image gets hurt, and all the rest of it.

Now, the next question is: is one aware of all this, which is part of our consciousness?

S: Right, right.

K: The content of consciousness makes us consciousness. Right? That is clear.

S: Right.

K: So one of the contents is the image making, or may be the major machinery that is operating, the major dynamo, the major

movement. Being hurt, which every human being is, can that hurt be healed and never be hurt again? That is, can a human mind which has accepted the image which creates the image, put away the image completely and never be hurt. And therefore in consciousness a great part of it is empty, it has no content. I wonder.

S: Can it? I really don't know the answer to that.

K: Why?

S: I know the answer only that I believe you could.

K: Who is the image maker? What is the machinery or the process that is making images, making images? I may get rid of one image and take on another: I am a Catholic, I am a Protestant, I am a Hindu, I am a Zen monk, I am this, I am that. You follow? They are all images.

S: Who is the image maker?

K: You see after all if there is an image of that kind, how can you have love in all this?

S: We don't have an abundance of it.

K: We don't have it.

S: That's right. We have got a lot of images. That is why I say I don't know. I know about image making.

K: It is terrible, sir, to have these. You follow?

S: Right. I know about image making and I see it. And I see it even when you are talking about it. I can see it there and the feeling is one of, it is like a map, you know, you know where you are at because if I don't make this image I will make another.

K: Of course, sir.

S: If you don't make this one you will make another.

K: We are saying is it possible to stop the machinery that is producing images? And what is the machinery? Is it wanting to be somebody?

S: Yes. It is wanting to be somebody, it is wanting to know where, wanting to have, to reduce, somehow or other it seems to be wanting to handle the feeling that if I don't have it I don't know where I am at.

K: Being at a loss?

S: Yes.

K: You see how clever? You follow? The feeling that you are at a loss, not to rely on anything, not to have any support, breeds more disorder. You follow?

B: Well, that is one of the images because communicated to it as a child to say that if you don't have an image of yourself you don't know what to do at all.

K: That is...

B: You don't know what your parents are going to do if you start acting without an image. I mean you may do something and they may just simply be horrified.

S: That's right.

K: The image is the product of thought. Right?

S: It is organized.

K: Yes, a product of thought. It may go through various forms of pressures and all the rest of it, a great deal of conveyor belt, and at the end produces an image.

S: Right. No question. I agree with you there, yes. It is definitely the product of thought and that thought seems to be like, you know, the immediate action of knowing where you are at; or in

trying to know where you are at. It is like there is a space.

K: Can the machinery stop? Can thought which produces these images, which destroys all relationship, and therefore no love - not verbally, actually no love. Don't say, "I love my..." - when a man who has got an image about himself says, "I love my husband", or wife, or children, it is just sentiment, romantic, fanciful emotionalism.

S: Right.

K: So: as it is now there is no love in the world. There is no sense of real caring for somebody.

S: That is true. People don't.

K: The more affluent the worse it becomes. Not that the poor have this. I don't mean that. Poor people haven't got this either; they are after filling their stomachs, and clothes and work, work, work.

B: But still they have got lots of images.

K: Of course. I said both the rich and the poor have these images, whoever it is.

S: Right.

K: And these are the people who are correcting the world. Right? Who say, this must... you follow? They are the ordering of the universe. So I ask myself, can this image making stop: stop, not occasionally, stop it. Because I don't know what love means, I don't know how to care for somebody. And I think that is what is happening in the world because children are really lost souls, lost human beings, I have met so many, hundreds of them now, all over the world. They are really a lost generation. You understand? As the older people are a lost generation. So what is a human being to

do? What is the right action in relationship? Can there be right action in relationship as long as you have an image?

S: No.

K: Ah! No, sir, this is tremendous, you follow.

S: That is why I was wondering. You see it seemed to me you made a jump there. You said all we know somehow or other is images, and image making. That is all we know.

K: But we have never said, can it stop.

S: We have never said, can it stop. That is right.

K: We have never said, for god's sake, if it doesn't stop we are going to destroy each other.

B: You see, you could say that now the notion that we might stop is something more that we know, that we didn't know before. You see, in other words...

K: ...it becomes another pieces of knowledge.

B: But I was trying to say that when you say all we know, it is the same thing as before. I feel that a block comes in.

S: Right.

B: You see it is not much use to say, all we know.

S: Because he said, can it stop - that is more.

B: If you say, it is all we know, then it can never stop.

K: He is objecting to your use of 'all'.

S: I am grateful to you.

B: That is one of the factors blocking it.

S: Well, if we come down to it, I mean: what do we do with that question, can it stop? I mean there we are, we have got this question.

K: I put that question to you. Do you listen to it?



S: I listen to it. Right.

K: Ah, do you?

S: It stops.

K: No, no. I am not interested in whether it stops. Do you listen to this statement, can it stop? We now examine, analyse, or examine this whole process of image making, the result of it, the misery, the confusion, the appalling things that are going on: the Arab has his image, the Jew, the Hindu, the Muslim, the Christian, the non - you follow - the communist. There is this tremendous division of images, symbols and all the rest of it. If that doesn't stop, you are going to have such a chaotic world - you follow? I see this, not as an abstraction, but as an actuality, as that flower.

S: Right.

K: And as a human being, what am I to do? Because I personally have no image about this. I really mean I have no image about myself: a conclusion, a concept, an ideal, all these are images. I have none. And I say to myself, what can I do when everybody around me is building images, and so destroying this lovely earth where we are meant to live happily, you know, in human relationship, and look at the heavens and be happy about it. So what is the right action for a man who has an image? Or, there is no right action?

S: Let me turn it back. What happens with you when I say to you: can it stop?

K: I say, of course. It is very simple to me. Of course it can stop. You don't ask me the next question: how do you do it? How does it come about?

S: No, I just want to listen for a minute to when you say, "Yes,

of course". OK, Now, how do you think it can?

K: Five minutes, we have only five minutes.

S: OK. Well, let's just touch on it. How can it stop? Let me put it to you straight. Let's see if I can get it straight. I have absolutely no evidence that it can, no experience that it can.

K: I don't want evidence.

S: You don't want any evidence.

K: I don't want somebody's explanation.

S: Or experience.

K: Because they are based on images.

S: Right.

K: Future image, or past image, or living image. So I say: can it stop. I say it can: definitely. It is not just a verbal statement to amuse you. To me this is tremendously important.

S: Well I think we agree that it is tremendously important, but how?

K: Not 'how'. Then you enter into the question of systems, mechanical process, which is part of our image making. If I tell you how, then you say, tell me the system, the method, and I'll do it every day and I'll get the new image.

S: Yes.

K: Now I see the fact that is going on in the world.

S: I have got it. I am with you, yes.

K: Fact. Not my reactions to it, not romantic, fanciful theories, what it should not be. It is a fact that as long as there are images there is not going to be peace in the world, no love in the world - whether the Christ image, or the Buddha image or the Muslim, you follow. There won't be peace in the world. Right. I see it as a fact.

Right? I remain with the fact. You follow? Finished. As this morning we said if one remains with the fact there is a transformation. Which is, not to let thought begin to interfere with the fact.

B: The same as the morning, more images come in.

K: More images come in. So our consciousness is filled with these images.

S: Yes, that is true.

K: I am a Hindu, Brahmin, I am my tradition I am better than anybody else, I am the chosen people, I am the Aryan, you follow. I am the only Englishman: all that is crowding my consciousness.

B: When you say, remain with the fact, one of the images that may come in that it is impossible, it can never be done.

K: Yes, that is another image.

B: You see in other words if the mind could stay with that fact with no comment whatsoever.

S: Well, the thing that comes through to me when you say that, is that when you say remain with the fact, you are really calling for an action right there. To really remain with it is that the action or perception is there.

K: Sir, why do you make it so much? It is on you. You are involved in it.

S: But that is different from remaining with it.

K: Remain with that.

S: To really see it. You know how that feels? It feels like something carries forward because we are always running away.

K: So our consciousness, sir, is this image: conclusions, ideas, all that.

S: We are always running away.

K: Filling, filling and that is the essence of the image. If there is no image making then what is consciousness? That is quite a different thing.

B: Do you think we could discuss that next time?

K: Tomorrow.

## **6TH CONVERSATION WITH DR BOHM & DR SHAINBERG BROCKWOOD PARK 20TH MAY 1976 'TRANSFORMATION OF MAN'**

Krishnamurti: As you are such a well known physicist and scientist, practically every schoolboy knows about you throughout the world, I would like to ask after all these four, five dialogues that we have had, what will change man?

Bohm: Well. (Laughter)

K: What will bring about a radical transformation in the total consciousness of human beings?

B: Well, I don't know that the scientific background is going to be very relevant to that question.

K: No, probably not, but after we have talked considerably at length, not only now but in the previous years, what is the energy - I am using energy not in any scientific sense, just an ordinary sense, the vitality, the energy, the drive - which seems to be lacking? I mean after all if I listen to you as a viewer, to the three of us, I would say, "Yes, it is all very well for these philosophers, or these scientists, these experts, but it is outside my field. It is too far away. Bring it nearer. Bring it much closer so that I can deal with my life."

B: Well, I think at the end of the last discussion we were touching on one point of that nature, because we were discussing images.

K: Images, yes.

B: And the self image. And questioning whether we have to have images at all.

K: Of course, we went into that. But you see I want, as a viewer, totally outside, listening to you for the first time, the three of you, I would say, "Look how does it touch my life? It is all so vague and uncertain and it needs a great deal of thinking, which I am unwilling to do". You follow? "So please tell me in a few words, or at length, what am I to do with my life. Where am I to touch it? Where am I to break it down? From where am I to look at it? I have hardly any time: I go to the office; I go to the factory; I have got so many things to do - children, wife nagging, poverty". You follow? "The whole structure of misery and you sit there, you three, and talk about something which "c'est ne me touche pas" - it doesn't touch me in the least. So could we bring it down to brass tacks, as it were, where I can grapple with it as an ordinary human being?"

B: Well, could we consider problems arising in daily relationship as the starting point?

K: That is the essence, isn't it. I was going to begin with that. You see my relationship with human beings is in the office, in the factory, on a golf course.

B: Or at home.

K: Or at home. And at home it is pretty, you know, routine, sex, children, if I have children, if I want children, and the constant battle, battle, battle all my life. Insulted, wounded, hurt, everything is going on in me and around me.

B: Yes, there is continual disappointment.

K: Continual disappointment, continual hope, desire to be more successful, more money, more, more, more of everything. Now how am I to alter, change my relationship? What is the raison

d'etre, the source of my relationship? If we could tackle that a little bit this morning, a little bit and go on to what we were discussing, which is really very important, which is not to have an image at all.

B: Yes. But I mean it seems as we were discussing yesterday, we tend to be related almost always through the image.

K: Through the image, that's right.

B: You see I have an image of myself and of you as you should be in relation to me.

K: Yes.

B: And then that gets disappointed and hurt and so on.

K: But how am I to change that image? How am I to break it down? I know after you have talked to me as an ordinary human being, I see very well I have got an image and it has been put together, constructed through generations. And I have got it. I am fairly intelligent, I am fairly aware of myself and I see I have got it. How am I to break it down?

B: Well the point, as I see it, is that I have got to be aware of that image, to watch it as it moves, you see.

K: So am I to watch it - I am taking the opposite - am I to watch it in the office?

B: Yes.

K: In the factory, at home, at the golf club, because in all these areas are my relationships.

B: Yes. I would say I have to watch it on all those places, and also when I am not there.

K: When I am not there. So I have to watch it all the time, in fact.

B: Yes.

K: Now am I capable of it? Have I got the energy because my wife wants sex, I don't want it, or I enjoy sex, I go through all kinds of miseries, and at the end of the day I crawl into bed. And you say I must have energy. So I must realize relationship is the greatest importance.

B: Yes.

K: Therefore I am willing to give up certain wastages of energy.

B: What kind of wastage?

K: Drink.

B: Drink, yes.

K: Smoke, useless chatter.

B: Yes.

K: Endless crawling from pub to pub.

B: That would be the beginning, anyway.

K: That would be the beginning. But you see I want all those plus more. You follow?

B: But if I can see that everything depends on this...

K: Of course.

B: ...then I won't go to the pub, if I see that that interferes.

K: So I must, as an ordinary human being, I must realize the greatest importance is to have right relationship.

B: Yes. It would be good if we could say what happens when we don't have it.

K: Oh, if I don't have it, of course.

B: Everything goes to pieces.

K: Everything goes to pieces; not only everything goes to pieces, I create such havoc around me. So can I by putting aside smoke, drink, pubs and you know the endless chatter about this or



that, will I gather that energy?

B: Well, that is the beginning.

K: That I am asking: will I gather that energy which will help me to face the picture which I have, the image which I have?

B: Yes. That means also must go ambition and many other things.

K: Of course. You see I begin by obvious things, like smoke, drink, pubs and all the rest.

Shainberg: Well, let me just stop you here. Suppose my image is that you are going to do it for me, and my real image is that I can't do it for myself.

K: That is one of our favourite conditionings, that I can't do it myself therefore I must go to somebody to help me.

S: Or I go to the pub because I see I can't do it for myself, so I create the condition, several things come from my going to the pub: one is I am in despair because I can't do it for myself, so I am going to obliterate myself through drink, so I no longer feel this pain.

B: At least for the moment.

S: That's right. And also too I am proving to myself that my image that I can't do it for myself is right. Look at me: I am on the ground, in the gutter. You going to deny that? Second of all, by treating myself in such a way I am going to prove to you I can't do it for myself. May be you can do it for me.

K: No, no. I think we don't realize, any of us, the utter and absolute importance of right relationship. I don't think we realize it.

S: I agree with you, we don't.

K: With my wife, with my neighbour, with the office, wherever

I am, I don't think we realize - with nature also - a relationship which is easy quiet, full, rich, happy, the beauty of it, the harmony of it. We don't realize that. Now can we tell the ordinary viewer, the listener, the great importance of that.

S: Let's try. How can we communicate to somebody the value of a right relationship? You are my wife. You are whining, you are nagging me. Right? You think I should be doing something for you when I am tired and don't feel like doing anything for you.

K: I know. Go to a party.

S: That's right. Let's go to a party, you never take me out.

K: Yes.

S: Right. You never take me anywhere.

K: So how are you, who realize the importance of relationship, to deal with me? How are you to deal with me? We have got this problem in life.

B: I think it should be very clear that nobody can do it for me. You see whatever somebody else does it won't affect my relationship.

S: How are you going to make that clear?

B: But isn't it obvious?

S: It is not obvious. I feel very strongly, I am the viewer, I feel very strongly that you ought to be doing it for me. My mother never did it for me, somebody has got to do it for me.

B: But I mean, isn't it obvious that it can't be done? I mean, I am saying that that is just a delusion because whatever you do I will be in the same relationship as before. I mean suppose you live a perfect life. I mean I can't imitate it so I'll just go on as before, won't I? So I have to do something myself. Isn't that clear?

S: But I don't feel able to do anything myself.

B: But then can you see that if you don't do anything for yourself it is inevitable that it must go on. Any idea that it will ever get better is a delusion.

S: Do you want to say that? Or can we say that right relationship begins with the realization that I have to do something for myself?

K: And the utter importance of it.

S: Right. The utter importance. The responsibility I have for myself.

K: Because you are the world.

S: Right.

K: And the world is you. You can't shirk that.

B: Perhaps we could discuss that a bit because it may seem strange to the viewer, to someone to say, "You are the world".

K: After all, all that you are thinking, you are the result of the culture, the climate, the food, the environment, the economic conditions, your grandparents, you are the result of all that.

S: Well, you can see that. I think you can see that.

B: That's right. That's what you mean by saying you are the world.

K: Of course, of course.

S: Well, I think you can see that in just what I have been laying out here about the person who feels that he's entitled to be taken care of by the world: the world is in fact moving in that direction of all the pleasure and the technological...

K: No, sir. This is a fact. You go to India, you see the same suffering, the same anxiety, and you come to Europe, to America,

it, in essence, is the same.

B: Each person has the same basic structure of suffering and confusion, and deception and so on. Therefore if I say, I am the world, I mean that there is a universal structure and it is part of me and I am part of that.

K: Part of that, quite. So now let's proceed from that. The first thing you have to tell me as an ordinary human being, living in this mad rat race, you have to tell me, "Look, realize the utter, greatest important thing in life is relationship". You cannot have relationship if you have an image about yourself, or if you create a pleasurable image and stick to that.

S: Or the image that you are entitled to, it comes before...

K: Any form of image you have about another, or about yourself prevents the beauty of relationship.

S: Right.

B: Yes. You see the image that I am secure in such and such a situation, for example, and not secure in a different situation, that prevents relationship.

K: That's right.

B: Because I will say that I demand of the other person that he put me in the situation that I think is secure, you see.

S: Right.

B: And then he may not want it.

S: Right. So that my relationship if I have the image of the pleasurable relationship, then all my actions are with reference to this other person, that I try to force him to move me into doing that, so that I have, a) I say to him, you should be this way because that would complete my image: b) I have what I call claims on the

other person, in other words, I expect him to act in such a way that he acknowledges that image.

B: Yes. Or I may say that I have the image of what is just and right. So in other words it is not that it is personally so but I would say that would be the right way for everybody to behave.

S: Right. In order to complete my image.

B: Yes. So for example the wife would say, "Husbands ought to take their wives out to parties frequently", that is part of the image.

S: Right.

B: Husbands have corresponding images and therefore that image gets hurt. Do you see?

S: Right. Now: but I think we have to be very specific about this. Each little piece of this is with fury.

B: With energy.

S: Energy and fury and necessity to complete this image in relationship, therefore relationship gets forced into a mould.

K: Sir, I understand all that. But you see most of us are not serious, we want an easy life. You come along and tell me: look, relationship is the greatest thing. I say, quite right. And I carry on the old way. What I am trying to get at is: what will make a human being listen to this, even seriously for two minutes? They won't listen to it.

S: Right.

K: If you went to one of the big experts on psychology, or whatever it is, they won't take time to listen to it. They have got their plans, their pictures, their images, you follow, they are surrounded by all this. So to whom are we talking to?

B: Well to whoever can listen.

S: We are talking to ourselves.

K: No, not only that. Whom are we talking to?

B: Well, whoever is able to listen.

K: That means somebody who is somewhat serious.

B: Yes. And I think you see that we may even form an image of ourselves of not being capable of being serious, and so on.

K: That's right.

B: In other words, that it is too hard.

K: Too hard, yes.

B: That is an image to say, I want it easy, which means it comes from the image that this is beyond my capacity.

K: Quite. So let's move from there. We say as long as you have an image, pleasant or unpleasant, created, etc., etc., put together by thought and so on, there is no right relationship. That is an obvious fact. Right?

S: Right.

B: Yes, and life ceases to have any value without right relationship.

K: Yes, life ceases to have any value without right relationship. Now my consciousness is filled with these images.

S: Right.

K: Right? And the images make my consciousness.

S: That is right.

K: Now you are asking me to have no images at all. That means no consciousness, as I know it now. Right sir?

B: Yes, well could we say anyway that the major part of consciousness is the self image? Is that what you are saying? There may be some other parts, but...

K: We will come to that.

B: We come to that later. But most of it, for now - well, we are mostly occupied with the self image.

K: Yes, that is right.

S: What about the self image? And the whole way it generates itself, what do you think?

B: Well, I think we discussed that before, that it gets caught on thinking of the self as real, and that is always implicit, you know, to say that for example the image may be that I am suffering in a certain way, and you see I must get rid of this suffering. You see there is always the implicit meaning in that that I am there, real, and therefore I must keep on thinking about this reality. And it gets caught in that feedback we were talking about. You see the thought feeds back and builds up.

S: Builds up more images.

B: More images, yes.

S: So that is the consciousness.

K: Wait. The content of my consciousness is...

S: ...is all images.

K: ...is a vast series of images, interrelated, not separated, interrelated.

B: But they are all centred on the self.

K: On the self, of course. The self is the centre.

B: Yes, because they are all aimed at, or they are all for the self in order to make the self right, you know, correct. And the self is regarded as all important.

K: Yes.

B: That gives it tremendous energy.

K: Now what I am getting at is: you are asking me, who am fairly serious, fairly intelligent, as an ordinary human being, you are asking me to empty that consciousness.

S: Right. I am asking you to stop this image making.

K: Not only the image making, the images that I have, and prevent further image making.

S: Right, right.

K: Both are involved.

S: Yes, I am asking you to look at the machinery of consciousness.

K: Yes. Wait a minute. I want to get at that. This is very important because...

S: OK. Let's go!

K: You are asking me, and I want to understand you because I really want to live a different way of living because I see it is necessary. I don't play with words. I don't want to be high faluting. I want to deal with this thing. You are asking me to be free of the self, which is the maker of images, and to prevent further image making.

S: Right.

K: And I say, please tell me what to do, how to do it. And you tell me, the moment when you ask me how to do it, you have already built an image, the system, the method.

B: Yes, I mean one could say, you see when you say, how am I to do it, so you have already put 'I' in the middle.

K: In the middle.

B: The same image as before with a slightly different content.

K: So you tell me, don't ever ask how to do it, because the 'how'



involves the me doing it.

S: Right, right.

K: Therefore I am creating another picture.

B: So that shows the way you slip into it, because you say how to do it, the word 'me' is not there but it is there implicitly.

K: Implicitly, yes.

B: And therefore you slip in.

K: How am I to do it - of course.

B: Yes. It usually slips in because it is there implicitly and not explicitly. That is the trick, I mean.

K: Explicit, yes, yes.

S: Right.

K: So now you stop me and say, proceed from there. How am I to free this consciousness, even a corner of it, a limited part of it, what is the action that will do it? I want to discuss it with you. Don't tell me how to do it. I have understood. I have understood, I will never again ask, how to do it. The 'how', as he explained, implies implicitly the me wanting to do it, and therefore the me is the factor of the image maker.

S: Right.

K: I have understood that very clearly. Then I say to you, I realize this, what am I to do?

S: Do you realize it?

K: Yes. I know it. I know I am making images all the time. I am very well aware.

S: Yes, but...

K: Wait, wait. Let me finish. I am very well aware of it. My wife calls me an idiot; already registered in the brain, thought takes

it over, it becomes the image which I have about myself and is hurt.

S: Yes.

K: Right?

S: Yes.

K: So this process I know, I am very well aware of this.

S: Right.

K: Because I have discussed with you. I have gone into it. I see because I have realized right from the beginning during these talks and dialogues that relationship is the greatest importance in life; without that life is chaos.

S: Yes.

K: That has been driven into me. And I see every flattery, and every insult is registered in the brain. And thought then takes it over as memory and creates an image, and the image gets hurt.

S: That is right.

B: So the image is the hurt because the image is the pleasure and with the new content, you know, of insult, when the content is flattery the image is pleasure, and when the content is insult the image is hurt.

S: That's right.

K: So Dr Bohm, what is one to do? What am I to do? There are two things involved in it: one to prevent further hurts and to be free of all the hurts that I have had.

B: But they are both the same principle.

K: I think - you explain to me - I think there are two principles involved.

B: Are there?

K: One to prevent it, the other to wipe away the hurts I have.

B: Yes.

S: I want to put it a little bit of another way. It is not just that you want to prevent the further hurt, but it seems to me that you must first say, how am I to be aware of the fact that I take flattery. How are you going to get aware? I want you to see that if I flatter you, you get a big inner gush, you start feeling big inside your belly, and then you get a fantasy about, well if you are so wonderful this way, then you will be twice as wonderful. So now you have got an image of yourself as this wonderful person who fits this flattery. Now I want you to see yourself eat my candy.

K: No, you have told me very clearly it is two sides of the same coin.

S: Right.

K: Pleasure and pain are the same.

S: The same, exactly the same.

K: You have told me that.

S: That's right. I am telling you that.

K: I have understood it.

B: They are both images, yes.

K: Both images. So please, you are not answering my question. How am I, realizing all this, I am a fairly intelligent man, I have read a great deal, an ordinary man - I personally don't read, so an ordinary man I am talking about - I have read a great deal, I have discussed this and I see how extraordinarily important all this is. And I say, I realize that the two sides are the same coin. The brain registers and the whole thing begins. Now how am I to end that? Not the 'how', not the method, don't tell me what to do. I won't

accept it because it means nothing to me. Right, sirs?

B: Well, I mean we were discussing whether there is a difference between the stored up hurts and the ones which are to come.

K: That's right. That's the first thing I have to understand. Tell me.

B: Well, it seems to me that fundamentally they also work on the same principle.

K: How?

B: Well, if you take the hurt that is to come, my brain is already disposed to set up in order to respond with an image.

K: I don't understand it. Make it much simpler.

S: Well it seems to me...

K: Ah, I am asking him. You are an expert at it. You have dozens of victims, he has only one victim here.

B: Well, you see there is no distinction really between the past hurts and the present one because they all come from the past, I mean come from the reaction of the past.

K: So, that is right. You are telling me, don't divide the past hurt or the future because the image is the same.

B: Yes. The process is the same.

K: The process, therefore the image is receiving. Right?

B: Yes. It really doesn't matter because I may just be reminded of the past hurt, that is the same as somebody else insulting me.

K: Yes, yes. So you are saying to me, don't divide the past or the future hurt; there is only hurt; there is only pleasure: so look at that. Look at the image, not in terms of the past hurts and the future hurts, but just look at that image which is both the past and the

future.

B: Yes.

K: Right?

B: But we are saying look at the image, not at its particular content but its general structure.

K: Yes, yes, that's right. Now then my next question is: how am I to look at it? Because I have already an image, with which I am going to look. That I must suppress it, you promise to me by your words, not promise exactly, but give me hope that if I have right relationship I will live a life that will be extraordinarily beautiful, I will know what love is and all the rest of it, therefore I am already excited by this idea.

B: But then I have to be aware of the image of that kind too.

K: Yes, yes. Therefore, how am I - that is my point - how am I to look at this image? I know I have an image, not only one image but several images, but the centre of that image is me, the I; I know all that. Now how am I to look at it? May we proceed now? Right. Is the observer different from that which he is observing?

B: Yes, well, that is...

K: That is the real question.

B: ...that is the question, yes. You could say that is the root of the power of the image.

K: Yes, yes. You see, sir, what happens? If there is a difference between the observer and the observed there is that interval of time in which other activities go on.

B: Well, yes, in which the brain sort of eases itself into something more pleasant.

K: Yes, yes.

B: Yes, that is all right.

K: And where there is a division there is conflict. So you are telling me to observe in a different way, to learn the art of observing, which is, that the observer is the observed.

B: Yes, but I think we could look first at our whole tradition, our whole conditioning, which is the observer is different from the observed.

K: Different, of course.

B: We should perhaps look at that for a while.

K: Yes.

B: Because that is what everybody feels.

K: That the observer is different.

B: Yes. And I think it ties up with what I was saying yesterday about reality, saying everything we think is reality of some kind, you see, because at least it is thought, real thought. But we make a distinction in reality between that reality which is self reference, self sustaining, it stands independent of thought and the reality which is sustained by thought.

K: Yes, reality sustained by thought.

B: The reality which may have been made by man but it stands by itself, like the table, or else like nature which...

K: ...is different.

B: ...is different.

K: Yes, that we went through the other day.

B: And now the observer, ordinarily we think that when I am thinking of myself, that self is a reality which is independent of thought. Do you see?

K: Yes, we think that is independent of thought.

B: And that that self is the observer who is a reality.

K: Quite.

B: Who is independent of thought and who is thinking, who is producing thought.

K: But it is the product of thought.

B: Yes, but that is the confusion.

K: Yes, quite, quite, quite. Are you telling me, sir, as an outsider, that the observer is the result of the past?

B: Yes, one can see that.

K: My memories, my experiences, all the rest of it, the past.

B: Yes, but I think if we think of the viewer, he might find it a little hard to follow that, if he hasn't gone into it.

S: Very hard, I think, how to communicate it.

K: It's fairly simple.

S: What do you mean?

K: Don't you live in the past?

S: Right.

K: Wait, no, no. Your life is the past.

S: Right.

K: You are living in the past. Right?

S: That's right, yes.

K: Past memories, past experiences.

S: Yes, past memories, past becomings.

K: And from the past you project the future.

S: Right.

K: Hope, hope it will be better, hope that I will be good, I will be different. It's always from the past to the future.

S: That's right. That's how it is lived.

K: Now I want to see, that past is the me, of course.

B: But it does look as if it is something independent, just that you are looking at.

K: Is it independent?

B: It isn't but to see that may be...

K: I know, that is all we are asking. Is it, is the me independent from the past?

B: It looks as if the me is here looking at the past.

K: Yes, of course, quite. The me is in a jar.

B: Right.

S: That's right.

K: But the me is the product of the past.

S: Right. You can see that but what is that jump that we go through where we say the me - I can say to you that I can see that I am the product of the past. I can see that.

K: How do you see it?

B: Intellectually.

S: I see it intellectually.

K: Then you don't see it.

S: Right. That is what I am coming to.

K: You are playing tricks.

S: I see it as an intellectual - that's right, that's right, I see it intellectually.

K: Do you see this intellectually?

S: No.

K: Why?

S: There is an immediacy of perception there.

K: In the same way, why isn't there an immediacy of perception



of a truth which is, that you are the past? Not to make it an intellectual affair.

S: Because time comes in. I imagine that I have gone through time.

K: What do you mean imagine?

S: I have an image of myself at three, I have an image of myself at ten and I have an image of myself at seventeen, and I say that they followed in sequence in time, and I see myself having developed over time. I am different now than I was five years ago.

K: Are you?

S: I am telling you that is how I have got that image. That image is of a developmental sequence.

K: I understand all that, sir.

S: In time.

B: Yes.

S: And I exist as a storehouse of memories of a bunch accumulated incidents.

K: That is, time has produced that.

S: Right. That is time, right. I see that. Right.

K: What is time?

S: I have just described it to you. Time is a movement in...

K: It is a movement.

S: Right.

K: It is a movement.

S: That's right.

K: Right? The movement from the past.

S: That's right. I have moved from the time I was three.

K: From the past, it is a movement.

S: That's right. From three to ten, seventeen.

K: Yes, I understand. It is a movement.

S: Right.

K: Now, is that movement an actuality?

S: What do you mean by actuality?

B: Or is it an image?

K: Eh?

B: Is it an image or is it an actuality?

K: Yes.

B: I mean, you see if I have an image of myself as saying, "I need this", but that may not be an actual fact. Right. It is just...

K: Image is not a fact.

S: Right. But I feel...

K: No. What you feel is like saying my experience. Your experience may be the most absurd experience.

S: No, but that is casting me aside by saying, look, you have got this going on. I am describing an actual...

B: But that is the whole point about the image, that it imitates an actual fact, do you see, you get the feeling that it is real. In other words, I feel that I am really there, an actual fact looking at the past, how I have developed.

S: Right.

B: But is that a fact that I am doing that?

S: What do you mean? It is an actual fact that I get the feeling that I am looking at it.

B: Yes, but I mean is it an actual fact that that is the way it all is, and was, and so on, you see, that all the implications of that are correct.

S: No, it is not. I can see the incorrectness of my memory which constructs me in time. I mean obviously I was much more at three than I can remember, I was more at ten than I can remember, and there was much more going on obviously in actuality at seventeen than I have in my memory.

B: Yes, but the me who is here now is looking at all that.

S: That's right.

B: But is he there and is he looking? That is the question.

S: Is the me that is...

K: An actuality.

S: ...an actuality.

K: As this is.

S: Well, let's...

K: Stick to it, stick to it.

S: That is what I am going to do. What is an actuality is this development, this image of a developmental sequence.

B: And the me who is looking at it?

S: And the me who is looking at it, that's right.

B: You see, I think that is one of the things we slip up on, because you see we say, there is the developmental sequence objectively so implying me is looking at it like I am looking at the plant.

S: Right.

B: But it may be, in fact it is, that the me who is looking at it is an image as is the developmental sequence.

S: Right. You are saying then that this image of me is...

K: ...is non-reality, is no reality.

B: Well, the only reality is that it is thought. It is not a reality

independent of thinking.

K: So we must go back to find out what is reality.

S: Right.

K: Reality, we said, is everything that thought has put together: the table, wait a minute, the illusion, the churches, the nations, everything that thought has contrived, put together, is reality. But nature is not reality.

S: Right.

K: Is not put together by thought, but it is a reality.

B: It is a reality independent of thought. But you see, is the me, who is looking, a reality that is independent of thought like nature?

K: That is the whole point. Have you understood?

S: Yes, I am beginning to see. Let me ask you a question: can you say anything about the difference for you between your - not, that's not fair. I was going to say, is there any difference for you between this perception, perception of this and your perception of the me?

K: This is real: me is not real.

S: Me is not real, but your perception of me?

K: It doesn't exist.

B: Suppose you perceive...

S: What is your perception of the image?

K: I have no image. I see if I have no image where is the me?

S: But I have an image of me.

B: Well, could I put it another way?

S: What is my perception of me?

B: Could I put it another way? Suppose you are watching a conjuring trick and you perceive a woman being sawn in half, you

see. And then when you see the trick you say, what is your perception of this woman who is being sawn in half. You see, it isn't because she isn't being sawn in half. You see I am trying to say that as long as you don't see through the trick, what you see is apparently real is somebody being cut in half. But you have missed certain points but when you see the points that you have missed you don't see anybody being cut in half.

S: Right.

B: You just see a trick.

S: Right. So I have missed the essence of it.

K: Sir, just let's be simple. We said we have images; and I know I have images and you tell me to look at it, to be aware of it, to perceive the image. Is the perceiver different from the perceived? That is all my question is.

S: I know. I know.

K: Because if he is different then the whole process of conflict will go on endlessly. Right? But if there is no division the observer is the observed, then the whole problem changes.

S: Right.

K: Right? So is the observer different from the observed? Obviously not. So can I look at that image without the observer? And is there an image when there is no observer? Because the observer makes the image, because the observer is the movement of thought.

B: Well, we shouldn't call it the observer then because it is not looking. I think the language is confusing.

K: The language, yes.

B: Because if you say it is an observer that implies that

something is looking, do you see.

K: Yes, quite.

B: What you are really meaning is that thought is moving and creating an image as if it were looking but nothing is being seen.

K: Yes.

B: Therefore there is no observer.

K: Quite right. But put it round the other way: is there a thinking without thought?

B: What?

K: Is there a thinker without thought?

B: No.

K: Exactly. There you are! If there is no experiencer is there an experience?

So you have asked me to look at my images, and you said, look at it, which is a very serious and very penetrating demand. You say, look at it without the observer, because the observer is the image maker, and if there is no observer, if there is no thinker there is no thought. Right? So there is no image. You have shown me something enormously significant.

S: As you said, the question changes completely.

K: Completely. I have no image.

S: It feels completely different. It's like then there is a silence.

K: So I am saying, as my consciousness is the consciousness of the world, in essence, because it is filled with the things of thought, sorrow, fear, pleasure, despair, anxiety, attachment, detachment, hope, it is a turmoil of confusion, a sense of deep agony is involved in it all. And in that state you cannot have any relationship with any human being.

S: Right.

K: So you say to me: to have the greatest and the most responsible relationship is to have no image.

S: That is to be responsive to 'what is'.

K: Don't translate it.

S: Well it is. I mean this means to be responsive.

K: Yes.

S: To open it up.

K: So you have pointed out to me that to be free of images, the maker of the image must be absent; the maker of the image is the past, is the observer who says, "I like this", "I don't like this", 'my wife, my husband, my house' - you follow - the me who is in essence the image. So you see I have understood this.

Now the next question is: is the image deep, hidden? Are the images hidden which I can't grapple, which I can't get hold of? You follow, sir? Are they in the cave, in the underground, somewhere hidden, which you have told me there are, all you experts have told me, yes, there are dozens of underground images. How am I, because I accept you, I say, "By Jove, they must know, they know much more than I do, therefore they say so, and so I accept it." So I say, "Yes, there are underground images. Now how am I to unearth them, expose them, out?" You see you have put me, the ordinary man, into a terrible position.

S: You don't have to unearth them if this is clear to you there is no...

K: But you have established already in me the poison.

S: You don't exist anymore. Once it is clear to you that the observer is the observed...

K: Therefore you are saying there is no unconscious.

S: Right.

K: Ah! You, the expert has said that!

S: No, I said...

K: You, who talk endlessly about unconscious with your patients.

S: I don't.

K: Therefore you say there is no unconscious?

S: Right.

K: I agree with you! I say it is so.

S: Right.

K: The moment when you see the observer is the observed, the observer is the maker of images, it is finished.

S: Finished. Right.

K: Right through.

S: If you really see that.

K: That's it. So the consciousness which I know, in which we have lived, has undergone a tremendous transformation: has it? Has it to you?

S: Mm.

K: No, sir, I mean has it to you? And if I may ask Dr Bohm, both of you, all of us, realizing that the observer is the observed, and therefore the image maker is no longer in existence, and so the content of consciousness, which makes up consciousness, is not as we know it. Right? What then?

S: I don't know how you say it.

K: You follow? I am asking this question because it involves meditation. I am asking this question because all religious people,



the really serious ones, I am not talking of the gurus and all that, the real serious people who have gone into this question, as long as we live in daily life within the area of this consciousness - anxiety, fear and all the rest of it, with all its images, and the image maker - whatever we do will still be in that area. Right? I may join one year Zen, become a Zen monk, shave my head and do all kinds of stuff; then another year I will become some guru follower and so on and so on, but it is always within that area.

S: Right.

K: So what happens when there is no movement of thought, which is the image making, what then takes place? You understand my question? When time, which is the movement of thought, ends then what is there? Because you have led me up to this point. I understand it very well. I have tried Zen Buddhism, I have tried Zen meditation, I have tried Hindu meditation, I have tried all the kinds of miserable practices and all that, and I meet you, I hear you and I say, "By Jove, this is something extraordinary these people are saying. They say the moment when there is no image maker the content of consciousness undergoes a radical transformation and thought comes to an end, except when it absolutely has its place, knowledge and all the rest of it." So thought comes to an end, time has a stop. What then? Do you understand? Is that death?

S: It is the death of the self.

K: No, no. We have got three minutes more, one minute more.

S: It is self destruction.

K: No, no, sir. It is much more than that.

S: It is the end of something.

K: No, no. Just listen to it. When thought stops, when there is

no image maker, there is a complete transformation in  
consciousness because there is no anxiety, there is no fear, there is  
no pursuit of pleasure, there is none of the things that create  
turmoil, division, and what comes into being, or what happens?  
Not as an experience because that is out. What takes place in that?  
Because, you follow, I have to find out. You may be leading me up  
the wrong path!

## **7TH CONVERSATION WITH DR BOHM & DR SHAINBERG BROCKWOOD PARK 20TH MAY 1976 'TRANSFORMATION OF MAN'**

K: After this morning, as an outsider, you have left me completely empty, completely without any future without any past, without any image. So where am I?

S: But, sir, somebody said that was watching us this morning, or one of the people around here said, "How am I going to get out of bed in the morning?"

B: Oh yes.

K: No, I think that is fairly - that question of getting out of bed in the morning - is fairly simple. I have to get up and do things, because life demands that I act, not just stay in bed for the rest of my life.

S: Mm-m

K: You see, I have been left as an outsider who is viewing all this, who has listened to all this, with a sense of.. 'blank wall'. A sense of - I understand what you have said really, because it has been made very clear to me. I have, at one glance, I have rejected all the systems, all the gurus - the Zen Buddhism, this buddhism, this meditation that meditation and so on - I've discarded all that because I have understood the meditator in the meditation. But I am still feel, have I solved the problem of sorrow, do you know what it means to love? Do I understand what is compassion? Not understand intellectually, I can spin a lot of words, but at the end of all this, this dialogue, after discussing with you all, listening to you all, have I this sense of astonishing energy which is compassion,

the end of my sorrow, do I know what it means to love somebody, love a human being?

S: Actually love.

K: Actually, actually.

S: Not talk about it?

K: No, no. I've gone beyond all that. And you haven't shown me what death is.

B: Yes.

K: I haven't understood a thing about death. You haven't talked to me about it.

So there are these things we should cover before we have finished this evening - a lot of ground to cover.

B: Could we begin on the question of death.

K: Yes. Let's begin on death.

B: One point that occurred to me, you know we discussed in the morning, saying that we had come to the point where we see the observer is the observed then that is death, essentially is what you said. Right?

K: Yes.

B: Now, this raises a question, you know, if the self is nothing but an image - right? - then what is it that dies? You see if the image dies that's nothing, that's not death - right?

K: No

B: So is there something real that dies?

K: There is biological death.

B: Well, we're not discussing that at the moment.

K: No.

B: I mean you were discussing some kind of death.

K: I was discussing, when we were talking this morning, I was trying to point out that if there is no image at all...

B: Yes

K:... if there is no variety of images in my consciousness, there is death.

B: Well that's the point exactly. What is it that has died? You see death implies something has died.

K: Died? The images have died, me; me' is dead.

B: But is that a genuine death in the sense that...

K: That's what I want to know - is it a verbal comprehension?

B: Yes. Or more deeply is there something that has to die? You see, I'm trying to say, something real.

S: Some thing.

B: In other words, if an organism dies, I say, I see that, up to a point. Something real has died, you see.

K: Yes, something real has died.

B: Ah, but when the self dies... ?

K: Ah, but I have accepted so far the self has been an astonishingly real thing.

B. Yes.

K: You come along - you three come along - and tell me that that image is fictitious, and I understand it, and I'm a little frightened that when that dies, when there is no image - you follow - there is an ending to something.

B. Yes, well what is it that ends?

K: Ah, right. What's it that ends?

B. Because is it something real that ends? You see, you could say an ending of an image is no ending at all, right?

K: At all.

B. If it's only an image that ends, that's an image that's ending. I mean, I'm trying to say that nothing much ends if it's only an image.

K: Yes, that's what I want to get at.

B. You know what I mean?

K: If it is merely an ending of an image...

S. Right, then there is nothing much.

K: There is nothing.

B. No, it's like turning off the television set.

K: Yes, it leaves me nothing.

S. Right.

B: Is that what that is, or is there something deeper that dies?

K: Oh, very much deeper.

B. Something deeper dies.

K: Yes.

S. Well, how about the image-making process?

K: No, no. I would say it is not the end of the image which is dead, but something much deeper than that.

B But it's still not the death of the organism you see.

K: Still not the death of organism, because the organism...

B... will go on, up to a point. Right.

K: Up to a point, yes. Till it's diseased, accident, old age, senility and so on. But death: is it the ending of the image, which is fairly simple and fairly, you know, acceptable and normal, but...

B: Right.

K:... but logically, or even actually. But it is like, you know, a very shallow pool. You have taken away a little water and there is

nothing but mud left behind. There is nothing. So is there something much more?

S: That dies?

K: No. Not that dies, but the meaning of death.

S: Well, is there something more than the image that dies, or does death have a meaning beyond the death of the image?

K: Of course, that's what we are asking.

S: That's the question.

K: That's what we are asking.

B: Is there something about death that is bigger than the death of the image?

K: Obviously. It must be.

B: Will this include the death of the organism, this meaning?

K: Yes. The organism might go on. I mean the organism might go on, but eventually come to an end.

B: Yes. But if we were to see what death means as a whole, universally, then we would also see what the death of the organism means, right? But is there some meaning also to the death of the self image, the same meaning?

K: That's only, I should say, that's only a very small part.

B: That's very small. Right.

K: That's a very, very small part.

B: But then, is there, say, one could think there might be the death of the self-image, then there might be a process or a structure beyond the self-image that might die, that creates the self-image.

K: Yes, that is thought.

B: That's thought. Now are you discussing the death of thought?

K: Yes, that's only also again superficial.

B: It's very small.

K: Very small.

B: And is there something beyond thought itself that should...

K: That's what I want to get at.

S: We're trying to get at the meaning of death..

B: We're not quite clear.

S:.. which is beyond the death of the self, thought or the image.

K: No, just look. The image dies. Image, that's fairly simple. Is a very shallow affair.

B: Right.

K: Then there's the ending of thought, which is the ending, the dying to thought.

B: Right. You would say thought is deeper than the image but still not very deep.

K: Not very deep. So...

B: All right.

K: So, we have removed the maker of the image and the image itself.

S: Right. Right.

K: Now, is there something more?

B: In what sense something more? Something more that exists or something more that has to die, or..?

S: Is it something creative that happens?

K: No. No, we are going to find out.

B: But I mean your question is not clear when you say, "Is there something more?"

K: Is there.? No. Is that all death?

B: Oh, oh I see. Is that all that death is.



K: Yes.

S: This is death.

K: No. No. I understand image, maker of image.

S: Right.

K: But that's a very shallow affair.

S: Right. So then is something else..?

K: And then I say, "Is that all, is that the meaning of death?"

S: I think I'm getting with you - is that the meaning of death only in that little part. Is there a meaning that's bigger?

K: Death must have something enormously significant.

S: Right.

B: Are you saying death has a meaning, a significance for everything? For the whole of life?

K: Yes, whole of life.

B: Yes, now first could you say why do you say it? Do you see, in other words, first it's not generally accepted if we're thinking of the viewer, that death is that sort of thing. In other words the way we live now, death...

K: Is at the end.

B:... is at the end and you try to forget about it, you know, and try to make it unobtrusive, and so on.

K: But if you, as you three have worked at it, pointed out, my life has been in a turmoil. And my life has been a constant conflict, anxiety, all the rest of it.

B: Right.

K: That's been my life. I have come to the known, and therefore death is the unknown. So I am afraid of that. And you come along, we come along and say, look death is partly the ending of the

image, the maker of the image, and death must have much more, greater significance, than merely this empty saucer.

B: Well, if you could make more clear why it must have, you see.

K: "Why it must have". Because...

S: Why must it.

K: Is life just a shallow empty pool? With mud at the end of it?

S: Well, why would you assume that it's anything else?

K: I want to know

B: But, I mean, even if it's something else, we have to ask why is it that death is the key to understanding that, do you see.

K: Because it's the ending of everything.

S: All right. Every thing

K: Reality.

B: Yes.

K: And all my concepts, images - end of all the memories.

B: But that's in the ending of thought, right?

K: Ending of thought. And also it means, ending of time.

B: Ending of time.

K: Time coming to a stop totally. And there is no future in the sense of past meeting the present and carrying on.

B: You mean psychologically speaking.

K: Yes, psychologically speaking, of course.

B: Where we still admit the future and the past.

K: Of course.

S: That's right, OK, yes.

K: Ending - psychological ending of everything.

S: Right

K: That's what death is.

B: Right. And when the organism dies then everything ends with that organism?

K: Of course. When the organism - this organism dies, it's finished.

S: Right

K: But wait a minute. If I don't end the image, the stream of image-making goes on.

B: Yes, well again it's not too clear where it goes on, you see; and other people are in...

K: It manifests itself in other people. That is: I die.

S: The organism.

K: I die, the organism dies, and at the last moment I'm still with the image I have.

B: Yes, what happens to that?

K: That's what I'm saying. That image has its continuity with the rest of the images - your image, my image.

S: Right.

K: Your image is not different from mine.

B: Right.

S: We share that.

K: Not share it. It's not different.

S: Right

K: It may have a little more frill, a little bit more colour, but essentially the image, my image is your image.

S: Right.

K: Now, so there is this constant flow of image-making.

B: Well, where does it take place? In people?

K: It is there, it manifests itself in people.

B: Oh, you feel that in some ways its more general, more universal.

K: Yes, much more universal.

B: That's rather odd.

K: Eh?

B: I say, it's rather strange, I mean to think of that.

K: Yes.

S: It's there.

K: It is.

S: It's a river, yes, like a river, it's there. And it manifests itself in streams which we call people.

K: Manifest, no. That stream is the maker of images and images.

B: So, in other words, you're saying the image does not originate only in one brain, but in some sense it is universal.

K: Universal. Quite right.

B: Yes, well that's not clear. You're not only saying that it's just the sum of the effects of all the brains, but are you implying something more?

K: Is the effect of all the brains, and it manifests itself in people, as they're born; genes and all the rest of it.

B: Yes

K: Now. Is that all? That's, yes.

B: Yes.

K: Does death leave me - me - does death bring about this sense of enormous, endless energy which has no beginning and no end? Or is it just, I have got rid of my images and the image-maker, I

can stop it, it is very simple, it can be stopped, and yes. But I haven't touched the much deeper things, there must be, life must have infinite depth.

B: That's death which opens that up.

K: Death opens that up.

B: Is the death, you see, we say, that it's more than the death of the image making, so this is what is not clear. Is there, for example... what I'm trying to say... something real which is blocking that from realizing itself?

K: Yes, is blocking itself through image and thought maker, the maker of images.

S: Yes, that's what's blocking it though, the image making and thought-making is blocking the greater.

B: Yes.

K: Wait, wait, blocking that.

S: Blocking that, right.

K: But there are still other blocks, deeper blocks.

B: That's what I was trying to get at. That there are deeper blocks that are real.

K: That are real. Now.

B: And they really have to die?

K: That's just it.

S: So, would that be like this stream that you're talking about, that's there?

K: No, no. There is a stream of sorrow, isn't there?

B: Yes, now in what sense? Is sorrow deeper than the image?

K: Yes.

B: It is. Well, that's important then.

K: It is.

S: You think so?

K: Don't you?

S: I do. I think...

K: No, no, be careful dir, it's very serious, this thing.

S: That's right, that's right.

B: I mean, would you say sorrow and suffering are the same or just different words?

K: Oh, different words.

B: All right, just to clear it up.

S: Deeper than this image-making is sorrow.

K: Isn't it? Man has lived with sorrow for a million years.

B: Well could we say a little more about sorrow. You see, what is it. It's more than pain you see.

K: Oh, much more than pain; much more than loss; much more than losing my son and my parent or this or that.

S: It's deeper than that.

K: It's much deeper than that.

B: Right. Right. It goes beyond the image, beyond thought.

K: Of course. Beyond thought.

B: Oh. Beyond what we would ordinarily call feeling.

K: Oh, of course. Feeling, thought. Now can that end?

S: Well, before you go on, are you saying that the stream of sorrow, if I can be so naive, is a different stream from the stream of image-making? If you had to say it's there, is it two different streams, or..?

K: No, it's part of the stream.

S: Part of the same of the same stream.

K: But much deeper.

S: Much deeper.

B: Are you saying, then, there's a very deep stream - image-making is on the surface of this stream.

K: That's all. That's all. But we have been left with that you see, I want to penetrate.

B: Well, could you say we've understood the waves on the surface of this stream which we call image making.

K: Image making. That's right.

B: Right. And whatever disturbances and sorrow comes out on the surface as image-making.

K: That's right.

S: So now we have got to go deep sea diving.

B: River.

K: River diving.

B: But what is, you know, sorrow?

K: You know, sir, there is universal sorrow.

B: But let's try to make it clear. You see, it's not merely that the sum of all the sorrow of different people?

K: No, no, it is this: could we put it this way - the waves on the river doesn't bring compassion - compassion and love are synonymous so we'll keep to the word compassion. The waves don't bring this. What will? Without compassion human beings - as they are doing - they are destroying themselves. So, does compassion come with the ending of sorrow which is not the sorrow created by thought.

B: Yes, right. So, let's say in thought you have sorrow for the self - right?

K: Yes, sorrow for the self.

B: Which is self-pity, and now you say there's another side, I think we haven't right got hold of it. There's a deeper sorrow...

K: There is a deeper sorrow.

B:... which is universal, not merely the total sum but rather something universal.

K: That's right.

S: Can we spell that out, go into it?

K: Don't you know it?

S: Yes.

K: Without my - I'm just asking - don't you know or are aware of a much deeper sorrow than the sorrow of thought, self pity, the sorrow of the image.

B: Does this sorrow have any content? I mean to say it's sorrow for the fact that man is in this state of affairs which he can't get out of.

K: That's partly it. That means partly the sorrow of ignorance.

B: Yes. That man is ignorant and cannot get out of it.

K: Cannot get out - you follow?

B: Right. Yes.

K: And that the perception of that sorrow is compassion.

S: Right.

B: Right, so the non perception is sorrow then.

K: Yes, yes. Are we saying the same thing?

S: No, I don't think so.

K: Say for instance, you see me in ignorance.

B: I see the whole of mankind.

K: Mankind in ignorance.



S: Yes. Right.

K: And after living for millennia, they are still ignorant - ignorant in the sense we are talking that is, the maker of the image and all that.

B: Now, let's say if my mind is really right, good, clear, that should have a deep effect on me? Right?

K: Yes.

B: Right?

K: Yes.

S: What would have a deep effect?

B: To see this tremendous ignorance, you see, this tremendous destruction.

K: We are getting at it.

S: Right.

K: We are getting it.

B: Right.

K: We are getting it.

B: Right. But then if I don't fully perceive, if I start to escape the perception of it, then I'm in it too?

K: Yes, you are in it too.

B: But the feeling is still with me. That universal sorrow is still something that I can feel, I mean, is that what you mean to say?

K: Yes.

B: Although I am not very perceptive as to what it means.

K: No, no, no. You can feel the sorrow of thought.

B: The sorrow of thought. But I can sense, or somehow be aware, of the universal sorrow.

K: Yes. You can

S: Right. You say the universal sorrow is there whether you feel it or not.

K: You can feel it. You can feel it.

B: Feel it or sense it.

S: Right.

K: Sorrow of man living like this.

B: Is that the essence of it?

K: I'm just moving into it. Let's move in.

B: Is there more to it?

K: Oh, much more to it.

B: Oh well, then perhaps we should try to bring that out.

K: I am trying to, There is...

S: Sorrow, yes.

K: You see me. I live the ordinary life: image, sorrow, fear, anxiety, all that. I have the sorrow of self-pity, all that. And you who are enlightened in quotes, look at me and say, my god; aren't you full of sorrow for me? Which is compassion?

B: I would say that is a kind of energy which is tremendously aroused because of this situation.

K: Yes.

B: Right?

K: Yes

B: But that, what do you call it, sorrow, or you'd call it compassion.

K: Compassion, which is the outcome of sorrow.

B: But have you felt sorrow first? Has the enlightened person felt sorrow and then compassion?

K: No.

S: Or the other way?

K: No. No, no - be careful old man. Go very carefully. You see, sir, you are saying that one must have sorrow first to have compassion.

B: I'm not saying, just exploring it.

K: Yes, we are exploring. Through sorrow you come to compassion.

B: That's what you seem to be saying.

K: Yes, I seem to be saying, which implies, that I must go through all the horrors of mankind.

S: Right. Experience.

K: In order.

S: Right.

K: No.

S: No?

B: But let's say...

K: That's the point.

B: Well, let's say that the enlightened one, enlightened man, sees this sorrow, sees this destruction, you know - sees this - and he feels something, he senses something which is a tremendous energy...

K: Yes.

B:... we call it compassion. Now does he understand that the people are in sorrow...

K: Of course.

B:... but he is not himself in sorrow.

K: That's right.

B: Yes.

K: That's right.

B: But he feels a tremendous energy to do something.

K: Yes. Tremendous energy of compassion.

B: Compassion. Feeling for them.

K: Compassion.

S: Would you then say that the enlightened man perceives or is aware of the - I hate to use the word, inefficiency - but the conflict, he's not aware of sorrow, he's aware of the awkwardness, the blundering, the loss of life.

K: No, sir. Doctor Shainberg just listen. You have been through all this, suppose you have been through all this.

S: Sorrow

K: Image, thought, the sorrow of thought, the fears, anxiety, and you say. I have understood that. It's over in me. But you have left very little: you have energy, but it is a very shallow business.

S: Right.

K: And is life so shallow as all that? Or has it an immense depth? Depth is wrong word, but...

B: Has inwardness..?

K: And great inwardness. And to find that out don't you have to die to everything known?

B: Yes, but how does this relate to sorrow at the same time?

K: I am coming to that. You might feel I am ignorant, my anxieties, all the rest of it. You are beyond it, you are in the other side of the stream as it were. Don't you have compassion?

S: Yes, yes, I do.

K: Not up here.

S: No, I know. But I see it and I...

K: Compassion.

S: Yes.

K: Is that the result of the ending of sorrow, universal sorrow.

B: Why the universal sorrow?

K: Universal sorrow.

B: Wait - you say the ending of sorrow. You're talking about a person who was in sorrow to begin with.

K: Yes.

B: And in him this universal sorrow ends. Is that what you're saying?

K: No. No, it is more than that.

B: More than that, then we have to go slowly, because if you say the ending of universal sorrow the thing that is puzzling is to say it still exists, you see.

K: What?

B: You see if the universal sorrow ends, then it's all gone.

K: Ah! It's still there, no.

B: It's still there. You see there is a certain puzzle in language. So in some sense the universal sorrow ends but in another sense it persists.

K: Yes. Yes, that's right.

B: But could we say that if you have an insight into the essence of sorrow - the universal sorrow - then in that sense sorrow ends in that insight. Is that what you mean? Although you know it still goes on.

K: Yes, yes, although it still goes on.

S: I've got a deeper question now. The question is...

K: I don't think you have understood.

S: I think I understood that one, but my question comes before: which is that here is me - the image-making has died. Right, that's the waves. Now, I come into the sorrow.

K: You've lost the sorrow of thought.

S: Right. The sorrow of thought has gone, but there's a deeper sorrow.

K: Is there? Or are you assuming that there is a deeper sorrow?

S: I'm trying to understand what you are saying.

K: Ah! No no. I am saying, is there compassion which is not related to thought, or is that compassion born of sorrow?

S: Born of sorrow?

K: Born in the sense when the sorrow ends there is compassion.

S: OK. That makes it a little clearer. When the sorrow of thought...

K: Not personal sorrow!

S: No. When the sorrow...

K: Not the sorrow of thought.

B: Not the sorrow of thought, but something deeper.

S: Something deeper. When that sorrow ends then there is a birth of compassion, of energy.

K: Now. Is there not a deeper sorrow than the sorrow of thought?

S: There's the sorrow - David was saying there's the sorrow for ignorance is deeper than thought. The sorrow for the universal calamity of mankind trapped in this sorrow; the sorrow of a continual repetition of wars and history and poverty and people mistreating each other, that's a deeper sorrow.

K: I understand all that.

S: That's deeper than the sorrow of thought.

K: Can we ask this question: what is compassion which is love - we're using that one word to cover a wide field. What is compassion? Can a man who is in sorrow, thought, image, can he have that? He can't. Absolutely he cannot. Right. Right?

B: Yes.

K: Now. When does that come into being? Without that life has no meaning. You have left me without that. So if all that you have taken away from me is superficial sorrow, thought and image, and I feel there's something much more.

B: I mean just doing that leaves something emptier, you know?

K: Yes.

B: Meaningless.

K: Something more. Much greater than this shallow little business.

B: Is there, you see, when we have thought producing sorrow and self pity, but also the realization of the sorrow of mankind and could you say that the energy which is deeper is being in some way..

K: Moved.

B: You see, well, first of all in this sorrow this energy is caught up in whirlpools.

K: Yes, that's right, in small fields.

B: It's deeper than thought but there is some sort of very deep disturbance of the energy...

K: Yes. Quite right.

B:... which we call deep sorrow.

K: Deep sorrow.

B: Ultimately its origin is the blockage in thought, though, isn't it?

K: Yes, yes. That is deep sorrow of mankind.

B: Yea. The deep sorrow of mankind.

K: For centuries upon centuries, it's like, you know, like a vast reservoir of sorrow.

B: It's sort of moving around in, in some way that's disorderly and...

K: Yes.

B:... and preventing clarity and so on. I mean perpetuating ignorance.

K: Ignorance. Perpetuating ignorance, right.

B: That's it. Because, you see, if it were not for that then man's natural capacity to learn would solve all these problems. Is that possible?

K: That's right.

S: All right.

K: Unless you three give me, or help me, or show me, or have an insight into something much greater, I say, "Yes that's very nice", and I go off - you follow?

B: Yes.

K: What we're trying to do, as far as I can see, is to penetrate into something beyond death.

B: Beyond death.

K: Death we say's not only the ending of the organism, but the ending of all the content of the consciousness and the consciousness which we know as it is now.

B: Is it also the ending of sorrow?



K: Ending of sorrow of that kind, of the...

B: Superficial.

K:... of the superficial kind. That's clear.

B: Yes.

K: And a man who's gone through all that says, that isn't good enough, you haven't given me the flower, the perfume. You've just given me the ashes of it. And, now, we three are trying to find out that which is beyond the ashes.

B: Right. You say, there is that which is beyond death?

K: Absolutely!

B: I mean, would you say that is eternal or..?

K: I don't want to use this word.

B: No, not use the word, but I mean in some sense beyond time.

K: Beyond time.

B: Therefore 'eternal' is not the best word for it.

K: Therefore, there is something beyond this superficial death, a movement that has no beginning and no ending.

B: But it is a movement?

K: It's a movement. Movement not in time.

B: Not in time.

S: What is the difference between a movement in time and a movement out of time?

K: That which is constantly renewing, constantly - 'new' isn't the word - constantly fresh, flowering, endlessly flowering, that is timeless. This whole flowering implies time.

B: Yea, well I think we can see the point.

S: I think we get that. The feel of renewal in creation and in coming and going without transition, without duration, without

linearity, that has...

K: You see, let me come back to it in a different way. Being normally a fairly intelligent man, read various books, tried various meditations - Zen and this and that and the other thing - at one glance I have an insight into all that, at one glance it is finished, I won't touch it! And it may be the ending of this image-making and all that. There a meditation must take place to delve, to have an insight, into something which the mind has never touched before.

B: Right. I mean even if you do touch it, then it doesn't mean the next time it will be known.

K: Ah! It can never be known in the sense..

B" It can never be known, it's always new in some sense.

K: Yes it's always new. It is not a memory stored up and altered, changed and call it 'new'. It has never been old.

B: Yes.

K: I don't know if I can put it that way.

B: Yes, yes, I think I understand that, you see. Could you say like a mind that has never known sorrow.

K: Yes.

B: And to say that it might seem puzzling at first but it's a move out of this state which has known sorrow and...

K: Quite right.

B:...to a state which has not know sorrow.

K: Not yet, that's quite right.

B: In other words, there's no you.

K: That's right. That's right.

S: Can we say it this way too: could we say that it's an action which is moving where there is no 'you'?

K: You see, when you use the word 'action', action means not in the future or in the past, action is the doing. And most of our actions are the result of the cause, or the past, or according to the future - ideals and so on.

S: This is not that.

K: That's not action.

S: No, no.

K: That's not action, that is just conformity.

S: Right. No, I'm talking about a different kind of action.

K: So. No, I wouldn't, action implies - see, there're several things involved. To penetrate into this, the mind must be completely silent.

S: Right.

K: Right?

S: Right.

K: Otherwise you are projecting something into it.

B: Right.

S: Right. It is not projecting into anything.

K: Absolute silence.

S: Right.

K: And that silence is not the product of control: wished for, premeditated, pre-determined. Therefore that silence is not brought about through will.

S: Right.

K: Right?

B: Right.

K: Now, in that silence there is the sense of something beyond all time, all death, all thought. You follow? Something - nothing!

Not a thing. Nothing! And therefore empty. And therefore tremendous energy.

B: Is this..?

S: Moving.

K: Energy. Don't - leave it! Leave it!

B: Is this also the source of compassion?

K: That's it.

S: What do you mean by 'source'?

B: Well, that in this energy is compassion, is that right?

K: Yes, that's right.

S: In this energy...

K: This energy is compassion

B: Is compassion.

S: That's different.

K: Of course.

S: This energy is compassion. You see, that's different from saying 'the source'.

K: You see, and beyond that there is something more.

B: Yes

S: Beyond that?

K: Of course.

B: Beyond that. Well, why do you say 'of course'? What could it be that's more?

K: Sir, let's put it, approach it differently. Everything thought has created is not sacred, is not holy.

B: Yea, well, because it's fragmented.

K: Is fragmented, we know, and putting up an image and worshipping it is a creation of thought; made by the hand or by the

mind, is still an image. So, in that there is nothing sacred, because - as you pointed out - thought is fragment, limited, finite, it is the product of memory and so on.

B: Is the sacred, therefore that which is without limit.

K: That's it. There is something beyond compassion...

B: Beyond compassion.

K:... which is sacred.

B: Yes. Is it beyond movement?

K: Sacred. You can't say movement, or non movement.

B: You can't say anything.

K: A living thing; a living thing, you can only examine a dead thing.

B: Right.

K: A living thing, you can't examine. What we are trying to do, is to examine that living thing which we call sacred, which is beyond compassion.

B: Well, what is our relation to the sacred then?

K: To the man who is ignorant there is no relationship. Right? Which is true.

B: Right.

K: To the man who has removed the image, all that, who is free of the image and the image-maker, it has no meaning yet. Right?

B: Yes.

K: It has meaning only when he goes beyond everything, beyond - he dies to everything. Dying means, in the sense, never for a single second accumulating anything psychologically.

S: Would you say that there is any - you asked the question, what is the relationship to the sacred - is there ever a relationship to

the sacred or is the sacred..?

K: No, no, no, he is asking something.

S: Yes.

K: He is asking, what is the relationship between that which is sacred, holy, and to reality.

B: Yes, well, it's implicit anyway.

K: Eh?

B: I mean, that's implied.

K: Of course. We talked about this question some time ago, which is: reality which is the product of thought has no relationship to that because thought is an empty...

S: Right. Right.

K:... little affair. That may have a relationship with this.

B: In some way.

S: Right.

K: And the relationship comes through insight, intelligence and compassion.

S: What is that relationship? I mean, what is intelligence I suppose we're asking.

K: Intelligence? What is intelligence?

S: I mean, how does intelligence act?

K: Ah! Wait! Wait! You have had an insight into the image. You have had an insight into the movement of thought, moment of thought which is self-pity, creates sorrow, and all that. You have had a real insight into it. Haven't you?

S: Right.

K: It's not a verbal agreement or disagreement or logical conclusion, you have had a real insight into that business. Into the

waves of the river. Now, isn't that insight intelligence? Which is not the intelligence of a clever man - we're not talking of that. So there is that intelligence - you've already got that intelligence.

S: That's right.

K: Now move with that intelligence, which is not yours or mine, intelligence - not Dr Shainberg's or K's, or somebody's: it is universal intelligence, global or cosmic intelligence - that insight. Now, move a step further into it.

S: Move with, yes

K: Have an insight into sorrow, which is not the sorrow of thought, and all that, the enormous sorrow of mankind, of ignorance, you follow, and out of that insight compassion. Now, insight into compassion: is compassion the end of all life, end of all death? It seems so because you have thrown away, mind has thrown away all the burden which man has imposed upon himself. Right? So we have that tremendous feeling, a tremendous thing inside you. Now, that compassion - delve into it. And there is something sacred, untouched by man - man in the sense, untouched by his mind, by his cravings, by his demands, by his prayers, by his everlasting chicanery, tricks. And that may be the origin of everything - which man has misused. You follow? Not that it exists in him because then we get lost.

B: Would you say it's the origin of all matter, all nature.

K: Of everything, of all matter, of all nature.

B: Of all mankind.

K: Yes. That's right. I'll stick by it! So, at the end of these dialogues, what have you, what has the viewer got? What has he captured?

S: What would we hope he'd capture? Would you say what'd we hope that he would capture, or what has he actually captured?

K: What he has actually, not hope.

S: Right.

K: What has he actually captured. Has his bowl filled.

S: Filled with the sacred.

K: Or will he say, "well, I've got a lot of ashes left, very kind of you, but I can get that anywhere". Any logical, rational human being say "Yes, by discussing you can wipe out all this and I am left nothing".

S: Or has he got..?

K: Yes, that's what... He has come to you - I have come to you three wanting to find out, transforming my life, because I feel it is absolutely necessary. Not to - you know - get rid of my ambition, all the silly stuff which mankind has collected. I empty myself of all that. I, please when I use the word 'I' it's not 'I' - I can't empty myself, I dies to all that. Have I got anything out of all this? Have you given me the perfume of that thing?

S: Can I give you the perfume?

K: Or, yes sir, share it with me.

S: I can share it with you. Has the viewer shared with us...

B: Yes

S:...the experience we've had being together.

K: Have you, have you two shared this thing with this man?

B: Right.

S: Have we shared this with this man?

K: If not, then what, what? A clever discussion, dialogue, that we have fed up. You can only share when you are really hungry,



burning with hunger. Otherwise you share words. So I have come to the point, we have come to the point when we see life has an extraordinary meaning.

B: Well, let's say it has a meaning far beyond what we usually think of.

K: Yes, this is, this is so shallow.

B: Well, would you say the sacred is also life?

K: Yes, that what I was getting at.

B: Well.

K: Life is sacred.

B: And the sacred is life.

K: Yes.

S: And have we shared that?

K: Have you shared that. So, we mustn't misuse life.

B: Right.

K: You understand? We mustn't waste it because our life is so short. You follow?

B: You mean you feel that each of our lives has a part to play in this sacred that you talk about.

K: What sir?

B: Each of our lives has an important part in some sense to play.

K: It's there

B: It's part of the whole...

K: Oh, yes.

B:... and that misusing it is - well, to use it rightly has a tremendous significance.

K: Yes. Quite right. But to accept it as a theory is as good as any other theory.

B: Right.

S: There's something though. I feel trouble. Have we shared it?  
That burns. that question burns. Have we shared the sacred?

K: Which means, really, all these dialogues have been a process of meditation. Not a clever argument. A real penetrating meditation which brings insight into everything that's been said.

B: Oh, I should say that we have been doing that.

K: I think that we have been doing that.

S: We've been doing that.

B: Yes.

S: And have we shared that?

B: With whom? Among ourselves?

S: With the viewer.

B: Well, I should think...

K: Ah!

B:... that's the difficulty.

K: Are you considering the viewer or there is no viewer at all?  
Are you speaking to the viewer or only that thing in which the viewer, you and I, everything is? You understand what I'm saying?  
You've got two minutes more.

S: Well, how would you respond then to what David said, he said, "We have been in a meditation", you say "We have been" and I say "We've been in a meditation". How've we shared in our meditation?

K: No. I mean, no. Has it been a meditation?

S: Yes.

K: This dialogue?

S: Yes.

K: You know meditation is not...

S: Yes.

K:... just an argument.

B: Right.

S: No, we've shared. I feel that.

K: Shared the truth of every statement.

S: Right.

K: Or the falseness of every statement.

S: Right.

K: Or seen in the false the truth.

B: Right.

S: And aware in each of us and in all of us of the false as it comes out and is clarified.

K: See it all, and therefore we are in a state of meditation.

S: Right.

K: And whatever we say must, must then lead to that ultimate thing. Then you are not sharing.

S: When are you?

K: There is no sharing. we have got one moment. There is no sharing. It is only that.

S: That. The act of meditation is that.

K: No. There is no - there is only that. Don't...

S: Oh - OK

## **SAANEN 2ND PUBLIC TALK 12TH JULY 1977.**

May we go on with what we were talking about the day before yesterday morning? I hope you aren't too hot.

We were concerned at the last talk with the awakening of intelligence, that intelligence which is not yours or mine. We arrived at that point logically, sanely, and holistically. We said that all thought, however divine the thought may be, or it may think itself totally divine, it is still the movement of the past - the past being experience, knowledge, stored up in the brain as memory. And our lives are dictated by the past. And thought tries to find security in the things that it has created. We talked about that. That is, belief, in ideological philosophical projections, in conclusions which invariably are the result of an experience retained by memory and making them more and more definite. I hope we are communicating with each other all about these matters.

We said also that thought can never solve our human problems, psychological problems, it may solve the problems of better food, shelter and so on, physical comforts for the whole of mankind. But that is not possible when there is nationalistic, ideological divisions - which we talked about too. So we are concerned with the desire to be secure, psychologically as well as physiologically, and in that desire to be secure we create all kinds of illusions, which we talked about. Illusions in the future, there is the old theory that god, divinity descends on earth and helps man to grow, to evolve, to live nobly. That is the old tradition of the countries in the east, and also in a different way in the west. In that there is a great deal of comfort, a great deal of feeling that you are at least secure in

something, that there is somebody who is looking after you and the world. This is a very old theory and you know all about it. It has no meaning whatsoever, because the future, whether the teachings are for the future or some kind of Utopian outlook for the future is made by the present, obviously. What one is now, unless there is a radical transformation, the future is the modified continuity of 'what is'. We talked about that. May I go on?

So to realize that the things that thought has put together, in those there is no security whatsoever. I wonder how many of us really understand this? How many of us have gone into it sufficiently, intelligently, rationally and sanely to find out for ourselves if there is really any structure, either in the future, or in the past, or in the present, if there is any structure whatsoever, philosophical, religious, or ideological, or economical and so on, whether there is any kind of security in that. And to find that out there must not only be the clear thinking, logically, sanely, rationally, objectively, but also that very thinking, that very reasoning, if it is pursued very deeply begins the awakening of that intelligence that we talked about the day before yesterday. All right? May we go on from there?

And also thought seeks security in authority. There is the authority of the surgeon, and there is the authority of tradition, the guru, the bishop, the pope and so on. There are the two authorities well established in the world. The authority of the dictator, the totalitarian authority and all that. Now we must go into this very carefully because we are going to find out if there is any kind of security in authority - religious, economic, or psychological.

We accept very easily the path that is the most satisfying, the

most convenient, the most pleasurable. It is very easy to move into that groove. And authority dictates, lays down religiously and psychologically a system, a method by which, or through which you will find security. This is well known. And so we are going to go into this question as to whether there is any kind of authority, psychological, apart from technological, medicine and so on, if there is any kind of psychological authority whatsoever. Because if we see that there isn't anything, security in any authority, including the speaker's, then we are going to find out whether it is possible to live without any guidance, without any control, without any effort. This is asking a tremendous lot. Right? Because we are educated, conditioned to accept authority because that is the most convenient and the easiest way to live. Put all our faith and all our trust in somebody, or in some idea, or in some conclusion, or in some teaching, and give ourselves to that hoping that we shall find some deep satisfaction, deep security - the guru, those teachings have done all the work and you just have to follow! Now an intelligent person, a fairly aware, awakened in the normal sense, objects to that totally. Living in a free country like this where there is freedom of speech and so on, you would object tremendously to a totalitarian state; but you would accept the authority of psychologists, the guru, the teachings that would promise you something marvellous in the future, but not now, you'd accept all that because it is very satisfactory. So we are going to demolish all that - if you are willing - because otherwise you will not be able to awaken that intelligence of which we are talking.

So where there is authority, psychologically, there is conformity. Right? To conform to the pattern set by another

through various sanctions, or the authority of your own which you have experienced, which you have felt and from that conclude and have security in that conclusion. You are following all this? So is there any security in psychological authority, in any teachings? You are following all this? In any teachings - including the speaker's teachings, the so-called religious teachings and the top guru's - you know, all that stuff! So is there any security in all that? And yet if you observe, millions and millions are following that path, that way of thinking, hoping that eventually some day, in some future life, or somewhere there is going to be security. Now we are going to question and ask ourselves if in it there is any kind of truth. Right?

Please, we are working together - right? We are exploring together. We are really thinking out this problem together, so that I am not thinking and you merely listening, but we are sharing the thing together to find out the truth of this enormous weight that man has carried hoping thereby to find somewhere some security and happiness. So please it is your responsibility as well as the speaker's to go into this question very, very carefully, to find out whether one can live a daily life, a nonconforming life, non-imitative life, not following any particular tradition, because if you have got a tradition, a sanction, a pattern, you will invariably conform to that, consciously, or unconsciously. So we are asking whether it is possible for a human being fairly awake, fairly intellectually alive, seeing the problems of the world, because the world is based on this, on authority, whether it is the authority of Lenin or Marx, or whatever they are, or the authority of some extraordinary self assuming guru...

So we are going to investigate into this whether the mind can be free to find out the truth of this matter, so that you will never, under any circumstances, conform to any pattern, psychologically. When you are conforming to a pattern - religious, psychological, or the pattern which you have set out for yourself, there is always a contradiction: the pattern and what you are. I hope you are following all this. May I go on? The pattern and what you actually are and so there is always a conflict. Right? And this conflict is endless. If you haven't got one pattern you go to another pattern. We are educated in the field of conflict because we have got ideals, we have got patterns, we have got conclusions, beliefs and so on. So there is always conflict when there is any kind of pattern - the pattern which you have created for yourself, or the pattern given by some so-called illumined person. An illumined person, if he is at all illumined, will never have a pattern, because if you have a pattern you are never free, if you have a pattern you don't know what compassion is. If you have a pattern you are always battling and therefore giving importance to yourself, then the self becomes extraordinarily important - the idea of self-improvement.

So, is it possible to live without a pattern - the pattern being tradition, a conclusion, an ideal, a future assumption that there is a divinity which will help you in the future to evolve and so on - you know, all that business. Now how are you going to find out the truth of this? You understand my question? Not accept what the speaker is saying but for yourself as a human being, who is the total representative of all mankind, how are you going to find out the truth of this matter? Because if your consciousness is changed radically, profoundly - no, revolutionized rather than changed -



then you affect the consciousness of the whole of mankind. Please see this - right? If your consciousness, which is the consciousness of man - man, not the European man or the Chinese man, but a human being - when there is that radical transformation of that consciousness then you affect the whole consciousness of mankind, which is a fact. Stalin affected the whole of mankind - right? So has Hitler, so have the various preachers, or prophets, or priests affected the whole of the consciousness of mankind; the whole Christian world is affected by the dictums, beliefs, rituals of a Catholic structure - the whole of the European world is modified and continues in that structure. So please see the truth of this, then you become tremendously responsible, then you are not just worrying a little bit about your own particular little worry, whether you have a little sex, or no sex, or should smoke, or not smoke - you know all those kinds of petty little affairs.

So we are going to see, investigate together, whether there is a life in which there is not a spark of authority. Now how are we going to investigate it? Because all our educated backgrounds, consciously, or unconsciously, is bound by this tradition of obedience - obey. They know better than you do, therefore the wise, the aristocracy of the wise is the salvation of the foolish. You know, you have heard about this. So how are we going to go into this problem, which is your problem, a human problem? With what capacity do you investigate? Investigation implies the mind must be free of cause and effect. Mustn't it? You understand? To investigate there must be freedom from motive. Right? I wonder if you see this? No? I want to investigate into the question of authority. My background says you must obey, you must follow.

And in the process of investigation my background is always projecting, is always distorting my investigation. So can I be free of my background so that it doesn't interfere in any way with my investigation? My urgency to investigate, to find the truth, my urgency, my immediacy, my demand to find out the truth of it puts the background in abeyance, because my intensity is so strong to find out the background doesn't interfere. You see the point? I wonder if you do. The background is so strong, my education, my conditioning has accumulated for centuries, consciously I can't fight it, I can't push it aside. Right? I can't battle with it. I have no time to take it through analysis, step by step. Life is too short. So my very intensity to find out the truth of authority makes my background much further away. Do you follow what I mean? It is not impinging on my mind. Do you see that? It is reasonable, isn't it? It is logical, it is sane. To fight the background intensifies the background. Right? But the urgency to find out the truth of authority, the urgency, because it is tremendously important to discover the truth because then there is the freedom to look, to investigate, to find out. Right? I hope I am not pushing you through my interest.

So are you prepared to investigate this whole question of psychological, external imposed authority of human beings by other human beings, to find the truth of it? Which means to find the truth there must be no motive, no cause for the investigation into the truth of authority. You understand this? I wonder if you do. This is asking a tremendous lot, isn't it? Are we prepared for this? Or are we all too old? It doesn't matter. If you are too old it is your affair, if you are not intense it is your affair. I want to find out the

truth of it, as a human being - not me, I have gone through all this for the last fifty years so I am out. It doesn't mean a thing to me - any authority. But assuming I am a representative of the human beings, I say to myself I want to find the truth of this matter, which is: whether one can live a life without any conformity, without any conflict, without having a goal, a purpose, a projected ideal, which all creates, brings about conflict. You understand this? Right? The intensity of the investigation depends on the urgency to find the truth of it, to have tremendous energy to find out.

Most of us dissipate this energy through conflict, Right? 'What is' and 'what must be'. If we see that 'what must be' is an escape or an avoidance of the fact of 'what is; or thought incapable of meeting 'what is' projects 'what should be' and uses that as a lever to remove 'what is.' Do you follow all this? Obviously. So is it possible to look, observe 'what is' without any motive? Not to change it, transform it, to make it conform to a particular pattern that you or another has established? You are following all this? Or is it getting too much? I wonder why you are all here? I would like to find out, if I may, why you are all here. You can't answer me, naturally, each one. But are you here out of curiosity, or to listen to some Asiatic person with some peculiar philosophy, or are you here because he has a reputation, or you have read some books and say, "Well, I wonder by reading the books I can't understand the man but I will go and listen to him and find out if I can understand". So you should ask yourself, if one may point out, why you are here. Because, as we said, this is a very, very serious matter. It is a matter of life and death. I mean it. In a world that is totally disintegrating, in a hypocritical, monstrous world, immoral

world, where they are preparing for wars through all kinds of instruments. Right? You know all this. Is it that you want to escape from all that and listen to somebody who is talking about something which you hope to understand? Or seeing all that, seeing what the world is, there are divisions, the conflicts, the corruptions, the pollution, the horrors of killing each other - all that is going on in the world - seeing all that you say there must a way out of all this, an intelligent, rational, sane way out of all this mess? If that is your intention, then you are serious. But if you just come here casually and listen casually and agree or disagree - you know, that has no meaning whatsoever.

So let's proceed. We are assuming - the speaker is assuming that you are really desperately serious, in a nice, humanistic way serious. And being serious together we are going to investigate into the question of authority and see the truth of it - not opinions, not judgements, not 'it is necessary', or 'it is not necessary', but see the truth of it and therefore be totally free of authority - authority of a book, authority of a priest, authority of psychologists with their latest desperate inventions and so on and so on and so on.

I said to investigate there must be no motive, because the motive will dictate what you will discover. If there is a cause the effect is dependent on the cause. So the effect is not the truth, it is a reaction. So can your mind be free of every motive to investigate - whatever will happen at the end of it? Which means can you be free of this authoritarian education that one has received from childhood, and that freedom can only come into being when there is the present necessity and the urgency to find out the truth of the matter. Therefore the background fades away. You see? Because if

I am very intent to understand what you are saying I forget myself. I forget I am a Hindu, a Christian, a Buddhist, all my background, I am only interested to understand fully what you mean. Therefore the whole thing disappears, the background, the motive is not because I am interested to find out. You get what I am talking about? Some of you?

So the intensity is necessary to investigate. And that intensity can only come into being when there is no cause and no effect and therefore no reaction. Are we together? Are you doing this with me? Not you must, but together, we said, and that is why you are here, you have taken a journey, you have taken a lot of trouble, expense and all the rest of it, you are here to find out the truth of the matter. Not what you think, or what I think, which has relatively no value at all, but the truth of something so that you are free for ever from this beastly authority. Sorry to use such an adjective. You understand what it implies? It implies that you must be completely alone in your investigation. Right? Alone - the word alone means all one. Isn't that strange? Please I will repeat it so that you get it. Alone, the meaning of that word, the root meaning of that word means all one. Aloneness doesn't mean isolation, it doesn't mean you have withdrawn, that you have built a wall around yourself. Alone means you are all one. Oh, you don't see all this. Right?

So: as humanity, general humanity, has a background, a motive, a purpose, a goal, a pattern to live by and therefore they never find out the truth of authority, here we are trying to find out the truth of authority. Here we are trying to find out the truth of it. So if you are at all serious to find the truth of it you must observe. Observe

not outside as it were, but observe why you have authority, why you accept to obey somebody, with a beard, with garlands. Why you obey psychologically. I obey a surgeon, when he tells me I have got cancer and he says, "Look old boy you have got to go under the knife" and he takes X-rays and all the rest of it and shows me how dangerous it is, and I naturally obey him. That is a natural, self-preserving instinct. But the other is not a self-preserving instinct, it is a cultivated instinct, it is an educated instinct, it is a conditioned instinct.

So why do we grown-up human beings, so-called civilized, obey? I am not talking about law, the policeman and all the rest of it. Psychologically, why is it that we obey? Is it because in that obedience to an authority there is deep rooted desire for security? Or we think there is security in that? Right? Otherwise you wouldn't be here, would you? Would you honestly?

So in obedience to some person, idea, authority and so on psychologically, we hope to live a life without conflict, without any kind of uncertainty, which is very, very disturbing, leading to neuroticism. So being already psychologically neurotic one gives oneself over to somebody to be dictated what to do. Aren't you doing that? So in that obedience there is the root, the root of the desire for satisfaction and security. Please see this. And is there security in any teaching? Teaching, in any idea? Or in any person? You understand? You have to find out. A speaker like me comes along and says, "There is truth, there is an ecstasy" - the word 'ecstasy' means to be outside of oneself - not inside of yourself and then have a great feeling of happiness, but ecstasy implies - the root meaning - implies that you are completely outside of yourself.

There is no self. So when a person like me comes along and says, "There is a state of mind which is beyond death and conflict and sorrow and therefore a mind that is full of compassion and intelligence" - he says that, the speaker says that. And you come along and say, "Yes, what a marvellous idea, I wonder how he has got it". And he says, if he is silly enough - I am not - he says, "Well, obey what I say, obey completely, the more totally you obey the greater your likelihood of having it". And in your eagerness to have this extraordinary state you obey. Right?

The other day on the BBC I heard one of the disciples of one of these people, a European girl, saying to the interviewer that she has left her family, her friends, all the past and joined this particular group of ideas and she said, "My guru will tell me exactly what I should do, when to marry, when to have children, when to have sex, babies. I have given myself over to him." Right? This is what the Catholic church has done for centuries. Right? Only this new thing is rather attractive because it comes from the Orient, slightly romantic - you know, scented and chants and songs and all the rest of it, and you fall for it because there is the desire inside you to have this extraordinary sense of security so that you are never, never disturbed, never uncertain. Right?

So in investigating rationally into the question of authority, if there is any form of obedience - because in obedience there is security - when you see that in that very obedience there is great illusion, then you drop obedience instantly. You understand what I am saying? Do you actually observe, are you aware, as you are aware of your heart beat, or your pulse, are you so deeply aware that in any form of obedience there is not only division, but there is

conflict, there is imitation, conformity, and therefore endless trouble, which ultimately leads to various kinds of illusion. Right? Do you see this? If you see this, this morning, then it is over. Then you have dropped it. Then you will never, under any circumstances, obey anybody, including Jesus, or the Buddha, or Krishna or whoever it is, including the speaker. Then you are a total human being representing all humanity, your consciousness has undergone a change. Right? Which is, it has undergone through perception which is the awakening of intelligence. That intelligence says, finished forever with authority. Because you have finished with authority the awakening of intelligence comes. You understand? And therefore it affects your consciousness.

And from that one asks: is it possible to live a life without any pattern, without any goal, without any idea of the future, to live without conflict? Is it possible? Because we are educated to conflict - right? If I am this, I must fight it, I must suppress it, I must control it. Now please listen.

Is it possible to live without conflict? The speaker says yes. And you might say, "Oh, don't be silly, you are deceiving yourself. You like to think you are living without conflict but you actually aren't." And it is no good arguing with such a person because he has made up his mind. But when the speaker says it is possible to live without any conflict whatsoever, either he is speaking the truth, or he is indulging in some kind of hypocritical illusion. So we have to examine not only the illusion, the hypocrisy of oneself, and also find out if it is possible to live a life without conflict. Right? The speaker says, "I will tell you about it." Don't accept it, because if you accept it that becomes the authority and you are back in the old



game. He says it is possible. It is only possible when you live completely with 'what is'. Right? With 'what is' means with what actually is taking place - live with it. That is, don't try to transform it, don't try to go beyond it, don't try to control it, don't try to escape from it, just look at it, live with it. You understand what I am saying? Will you do it now? Do it now for god's sake, not tomorrow. There is no tomorrow. To live with 'what is', that is, to live, if you are envious, or greedy, jealous, or you have problems, whatever it is, sex, fear, whatever it is, to live with that without any movement of thought that wants to move away from it. You understand? You understand what I am saying? Am I communicating with some of you? That is, I am envious of you because you are intelligent, you are bright, you look nice, you speak so intelligently, you know I am envious of you, you have a big car, a big house, I am envious of you, I want, I am envious. My education has been to deny it, which means I must control it, I must suppress it, I must try to go beyond it. That has been my background, my education. You come along and tell me: look, there is a different way of living, which is, don't condemn it, don't evaluate it, don't throttle it, don't run away from it, just look at it, like a newborn child, terribly ugly - the baby, the actual baby, you have seen them, terribly ugly, but the mother says "It is my baby, I am living with it, it is not ugly, it is the most beautiful child I have." So in the same way live with it - which means what? You are not wasting your energy in control, in suppression, in conflict, in resistance, in escape - all that energy has been wasted. Now you have gathered it - because you see the absurdity of it, the falseness of it, the unreality of it, you have now got the energy to live with

'what is'. You understand what I am saying? Am I making myself clear? Very clear? Good. Then do it! Then you have that energy to observe without any movement of thought. It is the thought that has created jealousy, and thought says, I must run away from it, I must escape it, I must suppress it, that is my education, my background, my conditioning, but somebody says to me, "Don't do all that, that is too childish, you can't solve this problem of envy that way. Live with it". That means don't move away from this thing which thought has created. You understand? Don't let another kind of thought say, 'Run away from it, resist it'. After all envy is created by thought - thought awakening a reaction which is emotional, sentimental, romantic and all the rest of it, that thought has created this reaction which is called envy. Thought has created it. And thought says now, also, I must run away from it, I don't know what to do with it. I must escape, resist, swallow. So we are saying if you see that the falseness of escape, resistance, suppression, then that energy which has gone into suppression, resistance, escape is gathered to observe. You understand? You see it? Then what takes place? You do it. Please do it with me as we go along together, otherwise there is no point in my talking.

So now you are not escaping, not resisting, and you are envious, which is the result of the movement of thought. The envy is comparison, is measurement - I have, you have not, you have. So thought has brought about this feeling of envy. And thought itself says, I must run away from this enormous thing I don't know. I have been educated to run away. Now, because you see the falseness of it you stop, and you have this energy to observe this envy. The very word envy, the very word is its own condemnation

- you understand what I am saying? Isn't it? When I say, I am envious there is already a sense of pushing it away. So the word - you follow, the word - one must be free of the word to observe. All this demands tremendous alertness, tremendous watchfulness, you know, awareness, so that not to escape and see the word envy - the word has created the feeling - or without the word is there a feeling? You follow all this? Now if there is no word and therefore no movement of thought - right, you understand what I am saying - then is there envy? You understand? I am envious - envy implies comparison, measurement, desire to be something other than 'what is' and so on, or to have something which I have not got. My education has been to run away from it, to suppress it and so on. Now by listening to what you are saying very, very carefully, I see the absurdity of it, the very perception of it puts it all away from me, therefore there is a gathering of energy.

I am investigating envy - has the word created the feeling - because the word is associated with the feeling? Right? Communism is associated with a certain pattern of life and so on and so on. So the word is dictating my feeling. Can I observe without the word? You understand sirs? Do it! Do it! Can you observe your envy without the word? Which means, the word is the movement of thought used to communicate - communicate with itself, or with another. So when there is no word there is no communication between the fact and the observer. I wonder if you see all this? Therefore the movement of thought as envy has come to an end - come to an end completely, not temporarily. You can look at a beautiful car and observe the beauty, the lines, and that is the end of it.

So to live with 'what is' completely implies no conflict whatsoever, therefore there is no future as transforming it into something else. The very ending of it is the gathering of supreme energy which is a form of intelligence. You understand? So at the end of this talk, communication with each other, are you really free from all authority, free from all conclusion, free from all sense of going towards something? Which doesn't mean you live in despair; on the contrary. There is only despair when there is a projection of hope, when you are living with 'what is' there is neither future, nor past - there it is. I wonder if you get all this?

So can you, by having listened seriously, with care, I hope, have you discovered for yourself the truth that authority is the most destructive psychological factor? And therefore when there is no authority of any kind, which is pattern, idea and so on, you are living entirely in the world actually of timelessness, which is living with 'what is' in which there is no time. You understand? Therefore there is an awakening of intelligence with which we are concerned - at least with which the speaker is concerned. And that by talking, by discussing, going into it step by step with you, it is the intention of the speaker, it is the urgency of the speaker to awaken that intelligence in you. He is not awakening it in you but working together, listening over the thing together it is naturally awakened. Right?

## OJAI 5TH PUBLIC TALK 16TH APRIL 1977

So we're going to go together, if we may, into the question of what is love. You understand? Because part of our consciousness, one of the fragments of consciousness, is fear, and the pursuit of pleasure. So is love a fragment of our consciousness, in which there is fear and pleasure, the pursuit of pleasure? So we're asking, and I hope we are sharing in this, though the speaker is putting the question, when there is fear, is there love? And when there is the mere pursuit of pleasure, is there love? Is love pleasure, and desire, or has it nothing whatsoever to do with fear, pleasure and desire? We are going together to explore this very complex problem. Our minds, the brain, if you've observed it for yourself, brain in the sense, though the speaker is not an expert or a specialist in the brain structure and so on, but one can observe, read this whole history of mankind in oneself, if one has the capacity, the energy, the drive, the passion, to find out. Because you are the whole history, the story of mankind. And so you are the world and the world is you.

Our brains through constant habit in which it has found security has become mechanical. I do not know if you have not observed it. Mechanical in the sense habitual, following certain definite patterns, repeating that pattern over and over again in a different field, but it's still a pattern. And the routine of daily life. The brain has become, if you observe, mechanical. The repetition of it, pleasure, the burden of fear, and not being able to resolve it. So gradually the brain, or part of the brain, has become mechanical, mechanical in the sense we are using the word, repetitive, both

biologically as well as psychologically, repetitive, caught in certain patterns of belief, dogma, ideologies - the American ideology, the Russian ideology, the ideologies of India and so on. Where there is the pursuit and a direction, which becomes mechanical, the mind and the brain deteriorate. Please follow this, if you will, kindly.

When we live a life that is repetitive, however pleasant, however desirable, however complex, a repetitive life, which is the same belief from childhood to death, the same rituals, whether it is church or the temple or wherever it is, the rituals, the tradition of it, over and over again. The repetition of pleasure, sexual, or the pleasure of achievement, the pleasure of possession, the pleasure of attachment, all these make the brain deteriorate, because they are repetitive. I hope we are meeting each other in this question.

So long as there is the pursuit of pleasure as a repetitive process, and the burden of fear which man has not resolved but has run away from it, escaped from it, rationalized it, but it still remains. We are saying that the brain or part of the brain deteriorates. And this is very important, it seems to me, to understand. Because here is a country that's very young, historically speaking. And is it already deteriorating? Or is there a new life being born, regenerated, creative, not in the technological sense, not in the inventive sense, not in writing new books, and new ideas, but a mind, a brain that is incapable of a repetitive way of life. That repetitive pursuing pleasure everlastingly does bring about the deterioration of the brain. If you have observed that, and I hope in talking over together, you are observing your own mind.

The words that the speaker is using and the speaker himself, please use the words and the speaker as a mirror, in which you see

actually, factually, not theoretically, not as an idea, but actually use him as a mirror in which you see without distortion. And then when you see without distortion you can destroy the mirror. So the mirror doesn't become the authority. You're following all this?

So we're not exercising any authority whatsoever, because in spiritual matters, in matters of that which we are going to go into, any kind of authority, any kind of following, any kind of acceptance, as a guide, does destroy the total perception, and therefore the perception of what is true.

So if that is clearly understood, that the speaker is not your guru, under any circumstances. And gurus in this country are becoming a nuisance - to put it mildly. And there are gurus in India by the thousand, and so they are destroying that country, because they accept followers, they assume the authority, as though they knew everything, but they are traditional, following a certain pattern, rituals and all the rest of it.

What we are saying, is something entirely different. So together we are going to question, explore, investigate and find out for yourself, not through the speaker, find out for yourself so that you are free human beings.

So we're asking, what is love? Is it pleasure? Pleasure in the sense sexual, repetitive sexual act, which generally we call love. And the love of your neighbour, the love of your wife or boyfriend, in which there is a great deal of pleasure, possession, comfort, based on desire. Is that love? Where there is possessive attachment to another, there must be jealousy, there must be fear, and basic antagonism. Right? These are obvious facts, we're not saying anything extraordinary or ideological, but we are moving together

from fact to fact, from the actual to the actual, from 'what is' to 'what is'.

So we are asking, what is love? Do you love your wife or your girl friend or boy friend - when I use husband or wife, you know, it implies both so I won't repeat it over and over again - man and woman. Is that love, actually, not theoretically? In that love is there attachment? And is attachment love? And what is the basis of attachment? Why is one attached to something, to a property, to an idea, to an ideology, to a person, to a symbol, to a concept which you call God?

Why is there attachment? Because if we do not fully understand the significance of attachment, then we will never be able to find out the truth of love. Is not the basis of attachment the fear of being alone, the fear of being isolated, the fear of loneliness, the emptiness, the sense of insufficiency in oneself? Please examine all that we are saying. Don't accept a thing that the speaker is saying, but look at it. But to look at it, to observe it, put away your personal prejudices, what you believe in, your experiences, what you think about it, because you're all here after all, taken the trouble to come, wherever you come from, to find out what the speaker has to say. But if you are full of ideas and conclusions about what you think love is, or don't think what love is, then there is no possibility of communicating with each other.

So we are attached to people or ideas, to symbols, or to a concept, because in that we think there is security. Is there security in any relationship? You understand my question? Is there security, which is really the essence of attachment, in your wife or husband? And if you want security in the wife or the husband or the girl and



so on, then what takes place? You must possess, legally or not legally. And where there is possession, there must be fear of losing, and therefore jealousy, hatred, divorce and all the rest of it.

So we're asking, is love attachment? Can there be love when there is attachment, with all the implications of that word, in which there is fear, jealousy, guilt, irritation, leading to hatred - all that, when we use the word 'attachment' is implied. So where there is attachment can there be love? We're asking factual questions, not theoretical questions, we are dealing with daily life, not an extraordinary life, because we can only go very deeply and very far if you begin with very near, which is you. If you don't understand yourself, you can't move far. And we're going to delve into problems which are tremendously important in our daily life.

So one has to go into this question logically, rationally, sanely, and then go beyond it, because logic is not love, reason isn't love, and the desire to be loved and to love is not love. So we're asking what is love? And we're saying that the negation of what is not love in daily life, every moment of your life, the negation, to put aside what is not love, then out of that negation comes the positive thing called love. You understand? We're understanding each other, not theory, not verbal understanding, but actually in our daily life, otherwise if you do not know how to love, if there is no love, then our society, the structure of our society becomes immoral, as it is, and if you love your children they'll be totally different.

So one asks, if you are a parent, do you love your children, if you have children, or you are merely attached, attached to them while they are very young, and then push them away, let them lead

their own life, and having no relationship with you as the parent. And so where there is no love, you'll have wars, your children will be killed and maimed, and the other people's children will be killed and maimed. This is what is actually happening in the world.

So what is the relationship of love to suffering? You understand my question, because we are going into this question of suffering, which mankind throughout the ages has carried with him like a shadow. We are not philosophizing - philosophy means the love of truth, the love of wisdom; not as it's turned out now in the modern world, a lot of theories put together, clever philosophers use their brain and their thought, always thinking.

So thought has become extraordinarily important. And as we discussed the other day, thought is a fragment, it's very limited, and thought cannot solve this problem of what love is, thought cannot make, cultivate love, because thought is a fragment, thought is the movement of time from here to there, both physiologically as well as psychologically. The man who says I am this and I must become that, psychologically, thought has brought about the space which is called time, and the measure.

So we are not philosophizing in the modern sense. We are saying, we are dealing with daily actual everyday facts, and if we cannot understand them or run away from them, you lead the most extraordinary, miserable conflicting life. So we're asking, what is the relationship of love to suffering? What is suffering? Why has man throughout the ages suffered? There is the suffering when animals, the earth is destroyed, when the earth is misused, there is suffering. When you kill animals and watch them suffering, there is that kind of suffering.

There is the suffering - if you have ever watched yourself - there is suffering when you see a man who is dishonest, who is crooked, who says one thing, does another - that's another kind of suffering. There is suffering when someone dies on whom you have relied, who you think you love. And so on. There is that kind of suffering. Then there is the suffering of physical pain. There is the suffering of not being able to achieve, to become something, which is not fulfilling, as you call it.

And there is the suffering of a human being, when he says, "I must achieve the greatest worldly possessions, power, money." There is that kind of suffering. And also there is the suffering which is not self-pity, a suffering when there is the perception of what human beings can be and are not. You're following all this?

So there is vast human suffering. Wars have brought enormous suffering to mankind. I do not know if you saw some time ago on the television the maimed soldiers returning home. Once I was taken to a hospital where there were the people who are wounded from the wars, in a state of appalling suffering. That is our inhumanity to man.

So there is this vast human suffering. When you think you love your wife or your husband and he or she turns away from you, there is suffering. So you as the human being suffers, and humanity suffers. Everything man has done brings about suffering. The technological advancement has brought great benefits to humanity but also it has brought great suffering. You have watched all this?

So what is suffering, why does man put up with it, why do you tolerate it? You understand my question? Why do you allow these things to happen? Which is, asking the question, why do you live

this way? You understand, sirs?

One mustn't become emotional, one must observe these things factually, not escape from them, and then only we'll be able to do something about it. When you make an abstraction, that is, move away from 'what is', which is an abstraction, you understand? Move away, run away, escape from 'what is', which is a movement of abstraction, then that abstraction becomes an idea, and you live according to that idea, but not according to facts. You see the difference? This is what we have done, all our life. And now we are saying, please listen without abstraction, which is, man suffers, man doesn't know the enormous beauty, the depth and the significance of love. And if you make an abstraction of it, that is, make an idea of it, make a conclusion about it, then you are not facing fact. So together we're examining without making a concept of it, which is so easy, because we think having a concept, a conclusion, makes us much more capable of dealing with 'what is'. But whereas if you look at 'what is' without the idea, then you can get your teeth into it.

So why does man, woman, even the liberated woman, why do they put up with this suffering? Why worship suffering, which the Christians do, apparently? Why man, you, comprehend what is the meaning of suffering. You understand, sir? What is it that suffers? When you say, "I am suffering, I suffer because I see animals ill-treated, I suffer because my neighbour's son is killed." You follow? Who is it - please listen to this, give a little attention to what is being said, because nobody will tell you these things. - when you say, "I suffer," who is it that is suffering? What is the centre that says, "I am in agony of jealousy, of fear, of a loss." Now what is

that centre, you follow, I'll use the word the 'essence' of man, you as a human being who says, "I suffer, I shed tears."? Please find out with me, though I have found out, but yet we are going together in it, is it the whole movement of time, time being the past, the present, and the future, both psychologically as well as chronologically, is it the movement of time, is it the movement of thought as time, which creates the centre?

So when you say, "I suffer," what is that 'I', how has that 'I' come into being? Having come into being, then you say, "I suffer, I am anxious, I am frightened, I am jealous, I am lonely." "I must be this." Is that 'I' which is never stationary, which is always moving, 'I desire this and I desire that, and then I desire something else,' it's a constant movement. That movement is time, isn't it, that movement is thought, isn't it?

So, sir, when you say, 'I', there is the whole philosophy or whole concept in the Asiatic world, the 'I' is something which is beyond time. Or the concept that there is a higher 'me' is still in the Asiatic world. In the Western world, the 'I' has never been thoroughly examined. You have attributed qualities to it, the Freuds and the Jungs and all the psychologists have given an attribute, given a description of it, given attributes. You follow? But never gone into this question of what is the nature and the structure of the 'I' which says, "I suffer."

And we're saying, is there, that 'I' is as you observe one day I say, "I must have that." And a few days later you want something else. There is the constant movement of desire. Constant movement of pleasure, constant movement of what you must be, what you want to be and so on. We are saying, this movement is

time. This movement is the structure and the nature of thought.

[The poor child is crying.]

So the 'I' who says, "I suffer", is put together by thought.

Obviously. The thought says, "I am K., I am John, I am this, I am that," And thought identifies itself with the structure, with the name and with the form, which is the 'I', with all the content of consciousness, which is the 'I', fear, hurts, loneliness, despair, anxiety, guilt, the pursuit of pleasure, the sense of loneliness, all that, which is the content of your consciousness, which is the essence of your 'I'.

So when you say, "I suffer", what is that? Is the image that thought has built about itself, which is the form, the name and all that, is it that that suffers? You're following this question? Because, please, if you don't, I will go into it in ten different ways. Because one can be free totally from sorrow. And when sorrow ends, there is not only wisdom but also there is tremendous passion, not lust, passion, which has nothing whatsoever to do with desire, with enthusiasm.

So without escaping, when you say, "I suffer", when you shed tears, when there is somebody that you love is lost, is gone, without escaping, running away from this sense of anxiety, loneliness, despair, not to run away from it, but to remain with it totally. You understand? Because sorrow is the summation of energy.

You know, any challenge, any challenge, the deeper the challenge, the wider the challenge, the more intense the challenge is, the greater energy is demanded to meet it. Sorrow is this challenge. And it is the essence of that challenge to which you

have to respond. But if you respond to it by escaping from it, by seeking comfort from it, then you are dissipating the energy that you need to meet this thing.

So when there is no escape, and there is no escape, because if you do escape, sorrow is always there, like your shadow, like your face, it's always with you, and without escaping, to remain with it without any movement of thought. You understand? Are you doing this? We are talking together, we are looking together into this. So are you doing it now, not tomorrow - do it now as we are talking.

We are saying, don't escape from suffering, whatever that suffering is. Naturally physical suffering, you need to alleviate it, you need to quieten it. But we are talking about psychological suffering, the deep inward pain of man. If you run away from it, you have not solved it, but if you remain with it, not identify yourself with it, because you are that suffering. But if you say, "I must identify with it, I must accept it, I must rationalize it." you're moving away from the actuality of suffering.

So without escaping, remain with it. Which means, all energy, all your energy is present to meet this extraordinary thing that has happened. And out of that comes passion. The word 'suffering' has its root in passion, in the dictionary, if you go into it - I don't want go into all that.

So there is a solution, there is an ending to sorrow, as there is an ending to fear, completely. Then only there is a possibility to love, because a man who suffers does not know what love is. But we think that we will learn something from suffering, that suffering is a lesson to be learnt. But when you observe suffering in yourself, not escape from it, remain with it totally, completely, without any

movement of thought, of alleviation, comfort, just completely hold it, then you will see some strange, psychological transformation takes place.

So love is passion, which is compassion. And compassion has its own intelligence. I wonder how much of this you understand, because without that passion and compassion, with its intelligence, we are acting in a very limited sense. All our action is limited. Where there is compassion that action is total, complete, irrevocable. I wanted to talk also in relation to this, the question of death.

You know, death is something, not only mysterious, but also it is a great act of purgation. You understand? You understand the word, to cleanse. You know that which has continuity, is degenerating. I wonder if you understand this. That which continues, which is repetitive, which is in the same movement, in the same pattern, whether the pattern may vary according to countries, according to climate, according to circumstances, but it's the same pattern, moving in any pattern brings about a continuity. Right? Do you see that?

And that continuity is part of the degenerating process of man. Whereas, when there is an ending to continuity, something new can take place. You understand - this is simple. You need a great deal of time to go into this question of what is death. Either you can understand it instantly, because you have understood, you have lived and understood the whole movement of thought, of fear, hate, love - you follow - all that, and you can then grasp the significance instantly, of what death is. But as most people don't do this kind of work, we'll have to work together to go into this, though I'm not



your guru, so don't be a follower, of anybody.

What is death? When you ask that question, thought has many answers. Right? Thought says - I don't want to go into all the miserable explanations of thought. Haven't you noticed, when you ask that question, every human being has an answer to it, according to his conditioning, according to his desire, according to his hope, according to the demands of his comfort. You follow? He always has an answer.

So without having an answer, if you can, look at, let's find out, without answering it. You understand? The answer will invariably be intellectual, verbal, put together by thought. But we are examining something totally unknown, totally mysterious - death is a tremendous thing. I hope you can do this.

We are asking, what is death. Obviously the organism dies, the organism, please listen to it a little bit carefully if you really want to go into this very deeply, please give your attention, though you may be a little tired after an hour, and five minutes or ten minutes. When we ask that question, what is death, one realizes the organism, the body, with its brain, having been misused, in various forms of self-indulgence, contradictions, effort, constant struggle, wears itself out mechanically, it's a mechanism. And with it dies the brain. The brain is the residue, the holder of memory. Right? Memory as experience, as knowledge, and from that knowledge, experience, stored up in the cells of the brain, as memory, from which thought arises, when the organism comes to an end, the brain also comes to an end.

And so thought comes to an end, because we said, thought is a material process, thought has nothing etheric or spiritual, it is a

material process based on memory. Memory is held in the cells of the brain. And its response is thought. And when the organism dies, thought dies. You understand? And thought has created the whole structure of the 'me'. No? I wonder if you understand all this. The 'me' that wants this, the 'me' that doesn't want that, the 'me' that is fearful, anxious, despairing, longing, lonely, fearful - you follow - the 'me'. That movement is brought about by thought which is also a movement, so that 'me' put together by thought, and when the organism dies, thought with its material process, also comes to an end. Wait, go into it very slowly.

And, you say, is that all? You understand? You follow? One has lived, struggled, acquired knowledge, suffered and so on, and you say, "Well is that the end of it? What is the value of it?"

What is the value of a human being who has lived, struggled, experienced, value in the sense, what is the significance of it? Just to acquire, live such an ugly, stupid, miserable wicked life, and then end? You follow? So thought says, "No, this is not the end." So thought says, "There is another world." That other world is still the movement of thought. You're following all this? So thought invents the other world. The world where you will be happy. (Laughter) The world where you will have all your desires fulfilled, where you will be most extraordinarily rewarded, sitting next to God. All that is the movement of thought also. You're following all this? See what thought does, see the danger of thought in the wrong place. Thought has a right place, which is to function where it is absolutely necessary, technology, language - you follow - all that. But when thought invents and says, "That is, it is there," it is still the movement of thought.

So when one asks, when the brain comes to an end through disease, through old age, through an accident, through misuse, the misuse of living in an illusion, living in a belief - all beliefs are illusory, all ideals are not based on fact. There is only fact, no ideals. So the brain comes to an end with the organism, and so thought comes to an end. Thought realizes this very deeply, because thought is fairly cunning. So thought realizes this is not the end, I must continue. So it continues in an idea, in an illusion, in a heaven. Or in hell everlastingly suffering, because you didn't obey the laws of some priest.

Please follow this. So we are saying, is that the whole meaning of living. You understand, sir? Do you understand my question? You bear children, you have pain, you struggle, you go through such misery, wars, hate each other, like each other. And suddenly end. So one says, then what is the meaning of living? You're following all this? One is always asking - again, please listen - one is always asking what happens after death. We are asking quite a different question - what is before death, not what is after death. You understand what I am saying? What is before death, which is your life. Right? What is your life? Go to school, to college, university, get a job, live, man and woman live together, sex, he goes off to the office, she goes off earning some more money, they have children, pain, anxiety, each man fighting. You're following it? Going to an office for the next fifty years, what a life you lead.

This is your life, before death. And you want to know, living such a miserable life, you want to know what is after death. See what you are doing, sirs. I want to weep for you. But it's no good weeping for you. So is that all? That is an apparent fact, isn't it?

Right? Are you following? Without inventing another world, without saying, "Yes, there is life after death, there is this," you follow? - the things thought has produced, and they have written volumes about it - all based on thinking. Right? All saying, "I believe."

So if you put aside all that, literally, actually do it, put all that aside, then what are you faced with? The actual fact, the fact that you, who is put together by thought, comes to an end. Can you bear that? You follow what I'm saying? Can you see the fact of that? All your anxieties, all your longings - when you die the brain, which holds thought, comes to an end.

Now, if that is so, as it so, then we can go into something which is entirely different. So we are asking, when all this ends, what is there? You understand? I wonder if you do. Look, sir, actually, when you're living, as you're living now, with vigour, with energy, with all the travail of life, as now, can you live meeting death now? Please, do you understand my question? Which is, I'm living with my vigour, energy, capacity, pain and all the rest of it - I'm living. And death means an ending to that living. Right? Now can I bring the ending into my living? That is, to live with death all the time. That is, I'm attached to you, end that attachment, which is death, isn't it? I wonder if you see this. I'm greedy, and when you die, you can't carry greed with you. So end the greed, not in a week's time, or ten days time - end it, now. So you're living a life full of vigour, energy, capacity, observation, see the beauty of the world, beauty of the earth, and also the ending of that instantly, which is death.

So to live before is to live with death. Have you captured something? Which means that you are living in a timeless world.

You understand? You're living a life of constant - everything that you acquire, you are ending, so that there is always a tremendous movement, not a certain place, you're fixed. I wonder if you see all this. Can you do all this? Will you do all this, or will you just listen and say, well, this is another idea, another concept. This is not a concept. When you invite death, which means the ending of everything that you hold, dying to it, each day, each minute, then you will find - not you, there is no 'you' finding it, because you have gone - then there is that state of a timeless dimension in which the movement as we know as time, is not. This is the depth of meditation. You understand? It means the emptying of the content of your consciousness, so that there is no time, time comes to an end, which is death. You understand? Not ten years later or fifty years later, but now.

# **BROCKWOOD PARK 1ST PUBLIC TALK 27TH AUGUST 1977**

I presume that most of you are here because you are serious people, that you are really concerned with the radical transformation of one's consciousness, its movement, which is the structure, and its nature. And if one is not serious I don't see the point of you coming here at all. It is a waste of your energy, it is a waste of your money, waste of all kinds of things that you might be doing otherwise. So please we are rather serious people - at least the speaker is, and we should consider the various issues that face us in our daily life - political, economical, social, personal and global.

Perhaps some of you are already familiar with what we are talking about, but familiarity does not necessarily lead to contempt, or neglect, or saying it is all repetitive stuff. But rather together, and we mean together, actually together, you and I, go into these problems, sharing them together, investigating them together, exploring the whole content of our consciousness, and therefore our action in our daily life. That is what we are primarily concerned with. And if one is at all serious please give your attention to this for at least an hour this morning - at least for an hour.

I don't know quite where to begin but we'll plunge into it, it's simpler.

I think one should be aware of three fundamental issues in our daily life: which is compassion, clarity and skill. We are educated in the field of being very skilful in dealing with our life - skillful in

the sense of being clever, applying a great deal of knowledge which we have acquired through education, through experience, and act skilfully, both in a factory, in a business, in our daily life. That skill becomes a routine, a repetitive action. And that skill when it is highly developed, as it should be, becomes the means of self perpetuation, self importance, self aggrandizement. So the skill has lead us to this present state, both technologically as well as in our relationships, how to deal with each other rather skilfully: not clearly, not with compassion, but skilfully. So is there an action which is skilful in our daily life and yet not perpetuating the self, the 'me', the importance given to oneself and to one's activities, one's self-centred existence - to act skilfully without strengthening the self.

So is there an action in our daily life which is both skilful and yet not perpetuating the self? That is one problem. Because through our education we have developed, through experience, this enormous skill, and therefore it has given us a great deal of strength, vitality and comfort in the realm of skill and therefore perpetuating the self. Now is there an action that is free of that and yet skilful? And to go into that, one has to question what is clarity, because you cannot act skilfully without clarity. I hope we are travelling together - not my talking to myself, I can do that in my room, but if you will kindly join, take the responsibility to investigate what we are talking about together, then it will have some value.

So what is clarity? Because we see if there is clarity then there is action which is skilful and not self perpetuating. We will go into that. Clarity can exist only when there is freedom to observe, when

one is capable of looking, observing, watching. That is only possible when there is complete, total freedom, otherwise there is always distortion in our observation. I think that is fairly simple: simple in words but in action it becomes terribly difficult. So is it possible to be free of all the distorting factors in our outlook?

When you observe yourself or another, society, the politicians, the environment, the whole cultural religious movement that is going on in the world - so-called religious movement - can you observe without any prejudice, without taking any sides, without projecting your own personal conclusions, your beliefs, your dogmas, your experience and knowledge, and therefore be totally free of all that to observe clearly? That is the second problem.

The third problem is compassion. The word is not the thing. One may describe what is compassion in a most eloquent and poetic manner, but whatever is expressed in words is not the thing. So we are going to find out these three things: what is compassion, because without compassion there is no clarity, without clarity there is no skill - they are totally interrelated with each other. So we are going to investigate these three problems: whether human beings, as we are now, can have this extraordinary sense of compassion in our daily life, not a theory, not an ideal, not something to be achieved, to be practised and all the rest of it, to have it totally, completely, at the very root of our being. That is one question.

Then from that arises: can there be clarity? Because one can be very clear in our thinking, objectively, rationally, sanely but reason, however logical, however objective is very limited - obviously. Right? I hope we are travelling together, moving



together. And clear thinking has not solved our problems. The philosophers, the scientists, the so-called religious people have thought very clearly about certain things, but in our daily life clear thinking has not resolved our issues - right? One may think very clearly why one is envious or violent but the ending of violence cannot be brought about through clear thinking. Clear thinking implies a limitation because thought itself is limited, thought itself is conditioned, thought itself has its own boundaries. And thought may try to go beyond its boundaries and invent a logos, a deity, a Utopian State and so on but it is still limited because thought is the movement of memory, which is experience, knowledge and that is always from the past; therefore thought is time-bound. Can I go on with all this? You are following somewhat? Please I am not preaching. I am not doing any propaganda. We are not trying to convince of anything. And we really mean that - at least I mean it. Absolutely no sense of authority, no sense of trying to persuade you to think in a particular direction, do any kind of propaganda, trying to convince you of something, or trying to make you join something - nothing.

So is it possible to see the limitations of thought and give it its right place, and therefore giving the right place to thought brings about clarity - right? We mean by right place - the art of that intelligence which comes through investigation, through exploration, that art - the very meaning of that word is to put everything where it belongs, put everything in our life where it belongs, and to find out where it belongs you need tremendous intelligence. And that intelligence can only come about when there is compassion, not directed by will, not following a certain pattern

of thought, but in the process of investigating what is compassion, in that movement, or out of that movement comes an intelligence, which is not personal or individual, it is intelligence. That is what we are going to find out - right? Is it possible to awaken that intelligence which will bring about order in our daily life, and therefore socially, politically, in every direction? Because we are the centre of society - right? We make what society is, so we are essentially the product of the past, and whatever we do is limited by the past, by time and any revolution, whether physical or psychological, brought about by thought, is limited.

So we are going to find out, examine together, what is compassion: what is clarity: and a skill that is born out of clarity and compassion - not skill by itself, because that has lead us to all kinds of misery, obviously. One can see it. So where shall we begin? With compassion? Or with clarity? Or with skill? Bearing in mind that clarity can only come out of compassion, and any skill born out of that clarity is not giving importance to the self. Right? I wonder? We are meeting somewhat with each other? Yes sir?

So I would like to begin with compassion. To understand the whole meaning and the depth of that word one has to investigate the movement of our consciousness, of our consciousness, yours. Which means you are the world, and the world is you. That is an obvious fact, one must go into it a little bit, which is: wherever you go in the world, east or west, north or south, human beings psychologically have great anxiety, uncertainty, always seeking security in some form or another - physiologically or psychologically. They are full of violence, right through the world. This is an extraordinary phenomenon when you watch it - violence,

greed, envy, hatred and in our consciousness there is the good and the bad. We will use those simple words to convey a great deal. So that is our consciousness, in which there is religious beliefs, political adherence to a particular party and so on and so on. All that is our consciousness, which is the consciousness of the whole of humanity - right? I do not know if you see this or if you want to discuss it.

So in investigating one's consciousness, which is the global consciousness, not your consciousness, because you are the result of all the culture, the social structure, education, the religious assertions, two thousand or ten thousand years of propaganda, you are the result of all that. And in investigating the good and the bad we find the bad is increasing - right? You understand the word 'bad' - we are using it very simply. The bad is increasing because the good has become static, the good is not flowering. It is accepting the patterns and living according to that pattern, or ideals and so on, therefore instead of flowering it is withering, therefore giving strength to the bad. I don't know if you notice all this. There is more violence, more hatred, national divisions, religious divisions, every form of antagonism, right through the world, racial, communism, and so on and so on. That is on the increase because the good is not flowering. Right? Now to be aware of this fact without any effort - please the moment we make an effort we are giving importance to the self, which is the bad - right? So to observe the actual fact of the bad without any effort, just to observe it without any choice - because choice is a distorting factor. So to observe the world with all its violence, brutality, all that is going on, the political nastiness, all that without any choice, but to

observe it freely. And when you observe it so openly, so freely, then the good begins to flower. Not that you pursue the good, and thereby give it strength to flower but when the bad, the evil, the ugly is understood completely the other naturally flowers. Are we making some sense out of this?

So are we, each one of us who is at all serious, are we aware of this fact? That in us, in our consciousness, there is this duality. and therefore conflict between the two. And the outcome of conflict is, the bad grows more and more and more. But when you observe, without any choice, observe without any prejudice, without any conclusion - and therefore without any effort - that which is ugly, evil, the bad, declines and gives strength to the good. Is that clear? Are we doing it now, as we are talking? Or are we going to think over it tomorrow? Because if you think over it tomorrow you are not paying attention to it now. If you are not paying attention now you will not pay attention to it tomorrow. It is so obvious. That is, it is a tremendous thing, what we are talking about. You are in a crisis, the world is in a crisis, there must be different kinds of organizations, political and so on, but that can only come about rationally, sanely when this is understood by every person in the world: that where there is conflict between that which is bad, evil and ugly and when there is conflict that very conflict gives strength to the ugly, to the evil, to the bad. In us is that very clear because we are examining our consciousness, we are investigating the way you think, the way you act, the way you live, which is the very essence of our consciousness.

And also in our consciousness we have given, through a great deal of skill, the structure and the nature of the self. The self is

violence, the self is the greed, envy and all the rest of it - that is the very essence of the self. And as long as there is that centre as the 'me' every action must be distorted. Obviously. Because you are acting from a centre, and giving action a direction. And therefore when there is direction in action it is distortion. You may develop a great deal of skill in this way but it is always unbalanced - not balanced - not harmonious - whatever word you like to use. So we are trying to find out in our exploration whether consciousness, with its movement, can undergo a radical transformation, not brought about by will, because will is desire, desire for something, and therefore when there is desire, a motive, it is a distorting factor in observation? Is this somewhat clear between us? Or are we making confusion more confused?

Look sirs, let us make it very simple. What is one to do in this world, surrounded by so much violence, where there are so many conclusions about everything, where there are so many gurus with their latest whatever it is, you are surrounded by all this - propaganda, influence, reward and punishment - facing all this what is one to do?

Q: Run.

K: Are you saying drown yourself?

Q: Run.

K: Run. When you run away from something it pursues you. What is one to do? What are you going to do? You understand my question? You may escape, go to all these camps, or entertainments that are going on right through England, where thousands and thousands of people are walking in mud and singing and all the rest of it. That is a marvellous escape. But that doesn't solve a thing. So

one asks, very seriously, if you are all deeply concerned with the world, with what is happening with human beings, how they are destroying each other, what are you going to do? What is your action? Follow some guru? Accept a new sense of direction? New ideologies? All those are escapes from the fact - right? From the fact that we human beings are extraordinarily brutal, violent, ugly, occasional flashes of affection, consideration, compassion - occasionally! In asking that question, and if you want an answer which is truthful and therefore which is always true not just now truth and the next day it is false - one has to examine oneself very, very deeply - right? One has to go into oneself tremendously to find out. And to investigate into oneself you cannot follow anybody - right? Obviously. If you follow somebody who will tell you how to investigate yourself you are following what he is saying. You are not examining yourself. Therefore in examining yourself all authority of every kind must come to an end - psychologically. Are we capable of that? Are you really capable of putting aside all authority, psychologically - the authority of the priest, the authority of society, the authority of your own experience, the authority of your own knowledge or the knowledge of somebody else - can you put all that aside and begin to look at yourself? Will you? Which means you are brought to that position to look at yourself because it is a crisis. In a crisis all energy is centred, and that energy demands that you look at yourself. Nobody is forcing you; because you yourself see what is happening, you yourself are fully aware of the social, political, economic conditions of this world, the deteriorating factors and so on and so on. So that very crisis makes you observe. And it doesn't

- if you are serious - it doesn't make you run away from it. On the contrary you are totally committed.

And in examining yourself, since there is no authority, you are looking at yourself as you are. But in our consciousness there is this duality - the good and the bad. So we are always looking with the eyes of the good and also with the eyes of the bad, so there is a conflict. I don't know if you follow? Now we are trying to eliminate all conflict altogether. That is only possible when you observe without any choice - just to observe yourself. Therefore in that way you eliminate the conflict between the good and the bad. You understand? Do it please as we are talking about it, if you are serious do it together.

So we are observing ourselves without any sense of compulsion - not according to any psychologist, Freud, Jung and all the old generation or the new generation, but looking at ourselves without any choice. Right? Are we doing it? Which means, are you looking at yourself, recognizing that there is violence in you, there is greed, envy, the desire for power, the desire for position, all these factors - can you look at them all without the least effort and without any choice? To be choicelessly aware is the essence of observation. Right? Can we proceed from there?

So: out of that choiceless observation comes clarity, obviously. Because there is no direction, there is no motive, nobody is forcing you to do this or that, nobody is offering a reward and if you don't do it nobody is going to punish you, you are free of all that nonsense. And in that observation comes clarity. And if that clarity is not related to compassion your action will be unskillful, because clarity comes with compassion. Clarity by itself has no meaning,

any more than skill by itself has no meaning. So compassion, clarity, skill is related to the art of listening, the art of seeing, and the art of learning. There is the art of listening, there is the art of seeing, there is the art of learning. And if you have not got the art, which is to put everything in its right place, then you will not understand what is compassion - because we are going to learn about it. Learn that which is not compassionate - right? Because only through negation you come to the positive, not the other way round. We start with certainties - we all do. I believe, I know, I think. Those are all certainties. And when you begin with certainties you end up in uncertainties. You know man has given all his life, seventy years of his life with certainties, at the end he says, "I am utterly confused, I don't know where I am". Whereas if we start with uncertainties, not knowing, hesitant, then we end up with clarity, with certainty.

So compassion is related naturally to love. That is, is there a love free of all the taint of civilization, taint of jealousy, possessiveness, remembrance, the pursuit of pleasure? So is there a love which is free from all this? Please sirs, this is a very, very serious question. It is your life, not my life, so you have to answer this question. Is there love in our heart, or wherever it is, in which there is not a shadow of corruption - not a remembrance which makes you think that you love? And is love the product of thought? And is there love which is whole, complete, not broken up - "I love" and "I hate", or I love but in me I am possessive of something or other. You understand? So if there is not that quality of love in us, compassion becomes impossible - because compassion is related to sorrow and that is quite an enormous



problem. So we will go into it later on perhaps, as we have only four talks we must make it all concise.

So we are concerned with the transformation of our consciousness, the movement of our consciousness. The movement is bound by thought, is propelled by thought, given energy to that movement by thought. But thought, as we said, is very limited because it is the response of the past which is memory, therefore it is of time. Is love of time? If I remember my sexual pleasure of yesterday, or of ten years ago, and I say to the person, "I love you" - is that love? Go on sirs, you have to find this out. Unless you break through this circle there will be no compassion. And when there is no compassion you have no clarity. And you may develop skill, but the skill will always be self-centred, distorting, cruel. You understand? So we are investigating very seriously into the whole movement of consciousness.

Do you want to discuss any of this now?

Q: When we come to that point when we see that will is desire, we can observe that. But in a crisis, there seems to be a natural movement to wish to solve it and the very attempt to solve it is a distorting factor. So it seems.

K: Sir, you see one of our problems in meditation - if you have gone into it, we can go into it again - is to be free of will, because will is based on desire - desire for enlightenment, desire for truth, desire for happiness. So where there is desire there must be will to fulfil that desire. And in the understanding of desire, is there freedom from choice? Because desire chooses - I like this, I don't like that, I want that, I don't want that. So we have to go into the question again of what is desire. Why do we have desires, so many

desires? If we have a little we want more. If we have more we want something better. We think by putting the parts together we will understand the whole. That is one of the objects of desire. By putting the parts, gathering them together we think we will have comprehended the whole and can go beyond the parts, the more. So one has to go into this question of what is desire - not the object of desire, because that varies from time to time, from childhood till death the objects vary. When you are a child you want something, when you grow up and so on and so on. So one has to go to the very root of desire. Again to observe desire without any choice, say "I must not", "I must" - just to observe desire. What is desire? How does it come about? Go on sirs. Doesn't it come about, to put it very simply, through visual perception first? Seeing something, then contact - right? Touching it, smelling it, tasting it. And from that sensation. Then thought comes in and says 'more' or 'less'. So the desire is perception, seeing, sensation, contact, sensation, and desire with its images - right? I am not inventing this to make you accept this or reject it, just look at it for yourself and you will see how desire comes into being. You see something beautiful and the sensation and the desire to possess it. The desire, because the image that is brought about through desire to have it, possess it and the enjoyment and so on and so on. Or seeing something ugly and not wanting it, and resisting it, which is part of desire. Will to achieve, will to deny, which is born of desire.

Now is there an action, in daily life, please listen to this, find out, is there an action in daily life in which desire doesn't operate? It is very exciting to find out for oneself if there is such an action at all, because we are accustomed, we are trained, it is our condition

to act upon desire. The politicians, all the rest of it, the whole world is based on that. We are asking a question quite the contrary and therefore it is difficult to penetrate into that unless you are free of the other you cannot go into this question. That is, to find out an action which must be skilful and yoga - skill in action is yoga, not just doing exercises and so on, skill in action is part of yoga - and to find that out one has to see the whole movement of desire - how it arises, how it demands fulfilment, and then there is frustration, when there is not fulfilment, there is anger, bitterness, all the things that follow when there is frustration. And when there is fulfilment of that desire, the opposite to that.

So is there an action without motive, which is desire, without a goal, without an end in view? Because if you have a goal, an end in view, you have already limited your action according to the motive and the end. Action is only the means, there is no other - right? I wonder if you understand? That is, there is a means of action, of right action, when there is no direction. Direction is from the 'me', my demands, my desires, my importance, my security, that gives a distorting factor in action. But when there is no centre as the 'me' then there is action without desire. You have to go into this very much otherwise it becomes merely verbal and meaningless.

Q: Is there an experiencer sir, as such?

K: Is there an experiencer as such. What is the experiencer? Who is the experiencer? Answer it sirs. Is there an experiencer without experience? Is there a collection of experiences which becomes knowledge, identified with the 'me'? You understand? The 'me' is the centre of experience. I have experienced happiness. I have experienced sex, I have experienced hurt, I have

experienced a dozen things. All these accumulated experiences bring about the experiencer which is the 'me', separate from the experience. Right? The 'me' is going to experience something. So we are asking: is the experiencer different from the experience, or both are the same? That is, the experiencer, with all the memories of the accumulated past, and all its knowledge, is going to experience something different. Is that thing that is different really different? Or when I recognize it as an experience is it part of me already? I wonder if you see this? You understand sir? I experience something, in that is involved a remembrance of the past, recognition of that experience according to the past. Otherwise it is not experience. If I don't recognize it as an experience, it is not an experience - right? To recognize it, it must come out of the past, therefore what I am experiencing is already experienced, if I recognize it.

Now it is only a mind that has no centre and therefore very clear, it is only such a mind that has no experience. Therefore the observer is the observed. Right? When a man says "I have had a new experience" - it is not new at all because he has recognized it and he has called it new, and given it a verbal significance. But it is born out of the past and therefore it is not new at all. So why should we have experiences at all? Is it that most of us are asleep, therefore somebody comes along and shakes you, and you call that experience? If you are totally awake, completely awake, there is no need for experience. I wonder if you get it.

Q: How does one recognize a new kind of love which one is not used to? One is used to the love which is of jealousy.

K: How do you recognize, the gentleman asks, the new kind of

love.

Q: I know the love which is with jealousy and possessiveness.

K: I understand. We said, sir, you can't recognize it. Then if you recognize it, it is not new. We said very clearly that through negation of what it is not, it is - through negation of what it is not. Love is not remembrance - right? Love is not jealousy. Love is not violence. When you deny all that the other is, you don't even have to say "I have it" or "I have not it" - you don't experience it. You experience the negation but the positive you can never experience - it is.

So sirs, we will go on with this tomorrow. But we have to be serious in our investigation about ourselves. It doesn't mean that you become selfish in investigating. On the contrary. In investigation you find you are like the world, like all the rest of humanity. And you are the essence of all that humanity, obviously. Because you suffer, you are in anxiety, a sense of loneliness, despair, unhappy, just like the man in India, just like the man in Russia, or China or America. So you are the essence of humanity psychologically. You may have fair skin, or dark skin, or black skin or whatever, that is all superficial. But when you penetrate into yourself you will find you are like the rest of the world. So you are the world. And that is a profound fact which affects all your thinking, all your observations, if you realize you are the essence of humanity. Then you are no longer concerned with yourself, with your petty little worries and idiosyncrasies, you are like everybody, it gives you an extraordinary strength.

Q: One small question sir. Is there psychological time different from chronological time?

K: Oh, that's fairly simple, isn't it?

Q: Thank you very much sir.

K: You don't have to thank me sir. It is fairly simple, isn't it?

When I have hope, I am hoping I will be all right, both mentally, psychologically and in every way, that is psychological time. The other is chronological time. I must catch a bus at a certain time otherwise I will miss my rendezvous. That is all.

## **SAANEN 1ST PUBLIC TALK 10TH JULY 1977.**

As there are going to be seven talks and discussions I think we must begin - if it is possible - by thinking over together - to think together. Which doesn't mean that you accept or reject, or be of a similar mind, but rather in talking over thoughtfully the various problems and questions and the travails of life, and reasoning together, and communicating that reasoning over together, then we will find as we go along that reason doesn't solve any problems - as has become so very obvious both politically, economically and socially. Reason has not solved our human problems, nor logic, but we are going to find out together in thinking over together, and so communicating with each other, that there is quite a different approach to all these problems of our life. And we are going to discover it together. Please let's be very clear about this from the beginning. I am not your guru. I hope that is clearly understood from the beginning. That you are not my followers, because those who follow somebody destroy truth. We are not proselytizing or convincing you of anything. We are going to reason together, talk over together, investigate together, explore together, and therefore there is no authority, there is no spiritual leader, but together through very careful thinking over together, exploring together, investigating together we shall come upon something that is beyond reason - because reason, as we said, has not solved any of our political, economic, social problems. Reason has also not solved our human problems between two people. It becomes more and more obvious in a world that is going to pieces, that has become quite insane, quite disorderly, and a dangerous place to

live in. So all reason, though up to a point we must reason together, logically, sanely, holistically, then perhaps we shall be able to find out for ourselves a different state of mind, a different quality of a mind that is not bound by any dogma, by any belief, by any experience, and therefore a mind that is free to observe and through that observation and perception see what exactly is and therefore there is energy to transform 'what is'.

So from the beginning please let us work together. You are not listening to me. You are listening to the speaker as though you are listening to yourself. And therefore to reason together one must not start from any conclusion, from any belief, from any dogma which conditions the mind so that we cannot reason together. Because I am not an Hindu, nor a Christian, nor a Buddhist, nor any of those things. The speaker is not starting from any conclusion, from any belief, from any experience, therefore from a mind that is free to observe, to learn, to move, to act. And I think such a mind is a compassionate mind, because compassion has no cause, it is not a result. Please understand this. It is very important because we are going to go into this very deeply: that compassion comes when the mind is free. And such compassion has no cause and therefore no effect. But when there is this compassion it brings about fundamental psychological revolution. That is what we are talking about from the beginning to the end.

So we will begin by asking ourselves: what is it that we are seeking? What is it that we are wanting, each one of us? Please this is a serious question, don't brush it aside as though this is easily answered, it is not. What is it that we want? Physical comfort? Physical security? Or deep down there is the demand, or a desire to



be totally secure in all our activities, in all our relationships, to be stable, certain, secure, permanent - is that what we are seeking? We cling to an experience and that gives us a certain quality of stability, a certain sense of identification which gives us a sense of permanency, well being. In that there is security. Right? In a belief there is security. Identification with a particular dogma, conclusion, nation, or an idea, gives a security. And that is why there are so many gurus springing up all over the world offering security. "Follow me and you will know how to act, how to be secure." Is that what you are seeking? Please go into it yourself, find out.

If we are old, aged, we find security or happiness in remembrance of things past, in the experience that we have known, in the love that we have had, and we cling to that. The past becomes very important. And if we are young and alive and cheerful we are satisfied for the moment, not thinking about the future or the past. And gradually youth slips into old age and begins the trouble - the desire to be secure, the anxiety of uncertainty, not being able to depend on anything or anybody, and yet demanding, desiring deeply security, to have something to cling to. Don't you do that? If you are really deeply honest you are bound to come to that perception.

Please may I again remind you all, if I may, this is not an entertainment: this is not something that you come to on a Sunday morning to listen to somebody oriental and say, "Good Lord, what is he talking about? Is he a mystic, is he this or that" - you know, all that nonsense. And also, if I may point out very carefully that this is a serious gathering. For me at least what we are talking

about is very, very serious. One has spent over fifty years at this, and it would be a pity if you are not responsible for yourself and for the world, and are merely satisfied superficially and live for the day and are not concerned for tomorrow. So this is not an entertainment: this is not something ideological which you accept or deny; but together in the very process of thinking one becomes serious, in the very process of observation, reasoning, thinking logically, objectively you become inevitably very, very serious. And that is the purpose, if I may use the word, of these meetings: not exchanging one set of ideas for another, or rejecting one guru and accepting another, or trying to find a new experience, and if you are not able to find that experience be disappointed. We are together seriously going into the problems of our daily life with all its misery, confusion, uncertainty. So please be responsible, not casual.

So we are asking: what is it that human beings seek - you as a human being, who is the total summation of all humanity - you understand? You are the summation of all humanity, whether they live in India, Russia, China or in America or here, you are the representative of every human being. And when you realize that you become tremendously important and responsible. But most of us don't want to recognize that because we don't want to be responsible. So if I may say again that we are together as human beings trying to find out deeply what it is that we are seeking, what is it that we want. You understand my question? The world about us is very uncertain, it is becoming more and more insane, dangerous, violent. You know what is happening? People are being killed casually for the fun of it. You have read all about it, you

know all about it. Politics have not solved our problems, have not put an end to this human violence, nor any religion either. On the contrary religions have been tremendously responsible for killing millions of people. You know all this, I don't have to go into the history of mankind, you know it very well if you read at all.

So, as one observes thought, reason, logic, though necessary, have not solved our human problems. And if they have not, then what is the solution for all this? So in asking that question: what is the solution for all this? - one inevitably comes to "What is it that I, as a human being, really recognizing that I am the world, what is it essentially I want?" - because I represent the world - you understand? Every human being is responsible, every human being is the whole of mankind, because if you go to India they think like you, they worry, they are miserable, unhappy, sorrowful, poverty, degradation, which exists all over the world, the same phenomena. So you are like every other human being, whether you like it or not. So in finding out what you want then we can proceed.

Is it that you desire essentially, deeply, irrevocably, that you are concerned to find out if you want security, a sense of being identified with something, an idea, a person, a group, a conclusion that will give you tremendous satisfaction, and you say, "I have done, I have reached, I have gained, I know"? You understand my question? So we begin to find out slowly, carefully, if you desire satisfaction in security, whether that security be in a person, in an experience, in a conclusion, or in a romantic idealization, as god then we must examine logically, sanely if there is such a thing as security. You understand my question? Can I go on?

We want security, every child, every boy demands security.

And because parents, society don't give them security, nor education, they become violent. That is what is happening in the world, how the youth is going to destroy itself. You see all this. So they must have security, both physiological as well as psychological. You understand my question? Are you following all this, or am I talking to a wall?

So are we seeking psychological security, which may destroy physiological security, and if you are seeking physiological security then the psychological security becomes unnecessary. So we must find out what it is we are seeking.

I pause because I can go on talking, but there must be pauses so that you and I can communicate with each other both verbally and non verbally. Because if you are thinking along the same lines communication becomes extraordinarily easy, we understand each other instantly. But we may not want to examine closely our psychological structure because we are frightened, we don't know where it may lead to. It may destroy everything that we hold as the most essential necessity for a human being. So we rather examine superficially and agree and disagree and go away. And that is what the speaker is trying to prevent. You examine very closely, hesitantly, knowing that reason, logic, thought has not solved our problem, and yet thought must be used as we are presently going to go into all that business.

So from the beginning we are asking: what is a human being seeking, you? Aren't you really seeking security, Both physical as well as psychological? You must have food, clothes and shelter otherwise you can't function. Whether you function in a community, or in a chaotic society, you must have a certain kind of

security, which gives a sense of well being from which you can begin to think, observe and go into all that. And also one demands, probably much more deeply, psychological security. One may not have physical security but psychological security becomes extraordinarily important - doesn't it? Have you not noticed in yourself how deeply the craving for psychological security in our relationships, in our action, in our attitude towards life, in our experience, how we hold on to our experience, because that gives a tremendous sense of security?

So we have to examine closely whether there is psychological security at all. Please, if there is no psychological security will a human being go insane? You understand? Will he become totally neurotic because he has no security psychologically? You understand? And therefore he becomes neurotic and probably the majority of human beings are fairly neurotic. So we have to go and find out for ourselves whether you want psychological security. And what do you mean by the word security? When we say, "I am secure with my wife" - or with my girl-friend, or with my ideas and conclusions, or as a Communist, as a Catholic, Protestant and the Hindus, they are secure in their belief. Right? They have no fear because they cling to this. And when you begin to investigate, or question them or reason with them they stop at a certain point, they won't examine further because it is too dangerous, because they feel they are being threatened - if you have talked to a Communist, Catholic, anybody, they go up to a certain point and refuse to go further. Probably you are doing the same and then communication ceases. You understand? And to that which your mind clings - whether it be a person, an object or an idea, or a conclusion, or

something that you have deeply experienced - have they any significance, have they any deep significance at all? I will show you what I mean.

If I cling to my particular form of experience, and that gives me an enormous satisfaction and I cling to that, what is then my relationship with another? You follow? He clings to his experience, or his belief, or his particular idea, so there is division, naturally. You understand this? Obviously. You follow this? So communication ceases completely. Right? So are you doing that - are you blocking yourself because you are afraid to examine that to which you are attached, to that which you are clinging? And therefore thought, logic, reason will not break through. You understand my point? You have got it? Right, may I go on?

Look: if I am deeply convinced of my Buddhism, or Zen, or certain forms of meditation, convinced and hold on to them, and you think something entirely different, where is the communication between us two? You understand? That is what is taking place in the world: either you are a Communist, or a European Communist, or a Capitalist, or a Catholic - you follow? - division, division, division. Because each human being clings to his particular dogma, to his particular conditioning. Right? Are you doing that? Sorry to bring it home! Then if you are doing that, you may reason, think logically up to a certain point and therefore you are incapable of breaking through to a different dimension altogether. Do you follow?

So we are asking, knowing that all human beings, practically the whole of humanity, clings, is attached to some form of an idea, to some form of thought which has created a belief, to some form

of an experience which is a reaction to 'what is', and clings to that. So generally throughout the world this is the phenomena. Right? If you are deeply convinced of Communism - or rather Marxism and Leninism - then you are stuck in a groove. Right? You won't investigate anything else, and so on and on and on. So does that give security? Does thought - please follow this - does thought, which has created all these beliefs, dogmas, experiences, divisions, give security? You understand my question? Because you function with thought, all your activity is based on thought, horizontal or vertical - whether you are aspiring to great heights it is still the movement of thought vertically. Or if you are merely satisfied to bring about a social revolution and so on and so on, you are still the horizontal movement of thought. Right? So does thought fundamentally, basically, give security psychologically? You are getting my point? I can go to my guru - I haven't got any, thank god, but I may go to a guru: the action of going to a guru is based on thought, thought hoping that he will give me some kind of security in this uncertain world, he will lead me to some kind of happiness, to some kind of enlightenment. All that is the movement of thought. Right? And I am asking: does thought give security - psychologically? Right? And yet thought has its place, but when thought assumes that it can bring about a psychological security then it is living in illusion. You are getting it? Because look: if you believe in Jesus and all the rest of it, it is the movement of thought, isn't it? And thought can create every kind of romantic illusion. Right? And when the mind psychologically seeks in the dogma of the church, or the non-church, or whatever it is, it is the structure of thought. And thought is essentially - what - is the movement of the

past, through the present - isn't it - modified. Please go into it, you will see it. Thought is the response of memory. Right? Memory is the result of experience, stored up as knowledge, which is all the past. Right? No? Somebody contradict me for god's sake!

So thought, which is the response of memory, knowledge, experience, stored up in the brain as knowledge, memory, that response is always moving from the past. Now is there security in the past? You are following? Please use your reason, logic, all your energy to find out. Is there security in the past, which is tradition - tradition may be one day old, or ten thousand years old, it is still tradition, which is the past - and any activity of thought, which is the essence of the past, can that give security? You have got my point? Go into it sir, think it out. Our religions are based on the past, organized religions, their rituals, dogmas, and all the circus that goes on, meaningless, is essentially a tradition, which is the past. And the thought is seeking - see what is happening - is seeking security in the thing it has created itself. Right? I wonder if you see this?

Mankind has created through thought the idea of god. I am not discussing whether there is god or not god, we will go into that much later. Thought wanting ultimate security has created a thing called god. And humanity clings to that idea. The other day the speaker tried to get a passport to a certain country and one of the questions asked was: "Do you believe in god?". That is respectable, safe, then you belong to the gang! So thought has created it and thought seeks in that which it has created security. Follow the sequence of it. That which it has created, in that it seeks security. And that security is in the past. Right? Because thought is the past,



though it may project in the future and say there is the future of god, I am going to obtain godhood, but that movement of thought has created it. And thought is the essence of the past. I wonder if you see all this? You are seeking security in the past, in the things that you have created. So one asks: is there security in the past? You are following? Go into it step by step you will find out for yourself. Is there security in the past? Or recognizing there is no security in the past thought then projects an idea, an idealistic state or an idealistic mind and finds security in that, in the future. It is still the movement of the past. Right?

So is there security in the movement of thought at all? Now I have explained it. Have you got it? So far we have reasoned together - right? And we are asking: is there security in the very things which we hold together as dear, holy, etc., which are all the movements of thought which is the essence of the past, is there in thought total security? Right? You understand? If there is not, then what? You understand my question? I have throughout my life - suppose - a human being, throughout his life has depended on thought and the things that thought has put together as being holy, unholy, moral, immoral and all the rest of it, and to that, a human being holds all that as most essential. You come along and say, now look, all that is the movement of the past - after having reasoned with him logically and so on. And he says why not, what is wrong with holding on to the past because thought is the past, he acknowledges it, and, I'll hold to it, what is wrong? Go on. That is, I have had an experience in my relationship with you as a human being, as another human being, I have had an experience with you, and to that experience I cling, which is memory, which is the past.

So what happens to our relationship? I am living in the past. Right? And obviously a relationship is only in the present. Right? No? If I am living in the past, and you are living in the past, where is our relationship?

So some thoughtful people realizing this have gone into it, then their problem is: if thought and all the things, however noble, ignoble, the churches, the temples, the mosques, all that, whatever it has created is the result of the past; and when the human mind lives in the past and holds to the past, then it is incapable of living, or perceiving what is truth. Right? Isn't it? You admit that? So if there is no security in thought - and there must be security, otherwise you are lost - if there is no security in thought then what? Do you face that problem as intensely, as vitally, as urgently now? Or you are just thinking about it? Are we meeting each other somewhere?

Sorry, if I am sitting on a platform, it is only for convenience so that we can see each other. But sitting on the platform doesn't give one authority. Right? So don't look to me to answer it for you. I'll answer it much later, but we must go through the whole phenomena of thinking actively together.

Why do you say in thought there is no security? - if you say it. Do you understand my question? We have come to a certain point in our dialogue - a dialogue being a conversation between two people. We have come to a certain point in our dialogue, which is: we recognize, we see or we think we understand that thought, with all the things it has created, the most extraordinary technological things - the missiles, have you heard of the missiles, and what the Russians have done, and so on and so on, the most technological,

the most extraordinary things, and technologically human beings are destroying the earth, polluting the lakes, the rivers, all that is happening - and thought also has created the so-called religious structure, the popes, the anti-popes, you know, all what is going on. And we say, "Yes, I see that, and I recognize logically that in that there is no security because when that is questioned there is fear, therefore there is no security". Right? So when we say, do you see that, what do we mean by that word 'see'? Do you understand it? Is it a logical understanding, a verbal understanding, a linear understanding, or an understanding which is so profound that that very understanding breaks down without your effort, that very understanding breaks down the whole movement of thought? Do you understand what I am talking about? Am I explaining it? Or shall I go over it again?

I listen to you very carefully, at what you are saying. So far logically, reasonably, without too many details, you have gone into this. I have listened to you, that thought is the past, thought is the essence of the past, and thought has created all this world, both the technological world and the so-called religious world, moral world and all that, and we try to find in that, psychological security. That security is the result of thinking. Right? And you ask; is there in that structure, or in the very process of thinking, in the movement of thought, is there security? Right? You may say, yes. Or you may say, there isn't. If you say there is, then it is obvious that you are not thinking logically to the very end because people are breaking away from one form of conditioning - Catholic, Protestant, Communist, Leninism, and going off to another conditioning - which is the same. It is like a Catholic becoming a Buddhist, or a

Hindu, which they are trying to become, which is so absurd, and they remain in their isolated fields. Right? And therefore there is no communication between the two. And when there is no communication there is division. And when there is division there must be conflict. It is inevitable. Right? And if you say, "Well that is life, conflict is necessary, violence is necessary, brutality, wars, every ugliness, torture is necessary," then that is all right, for you. You understand? If you say yes, that is the end result. But if you say thought is not the answer, then what do you mean by saying "I understand thought does not solve this problem". You understand, thought is the essence of the past and therefore whatever it does is still in the past' - right? - whatever it does, and therefore in that there is no security. We have gone into it. And we are saying, when you say, "I understand what you are saying", what do you mean by that word 'understand'? That is what I am talking about. What do you mean by saying "I understand"? Do you mean you understand the English words? Right? Because you and I perhaps speak the same language. If I spoke in French and you say... you understand? Is it an understanding of the words, the meaning of the words, the explanation of the word and therefore you are understanding at a very superficial level? Right? Or when you say "I understand", you mean you actually see, observe the truth of what thought is. You understand? You actually feel, taste, observe in your blood as it were, that thought, whatever it creates, has no security, then you and the speaker can commune. But if you say, let's remain on the surface, we will remain on the surface but then there is no understanding. You get my point? Am I making myself clear?

Look sir: when I say, "I love you", you understand very deeply

if I really love you, don't you? There is instant emotional response. And with a very complex problem like thought, when you say you understand, is there an equal total response to it? When somebody says "I love you" - you follow - the heavens are open! And in the same way we are asking when you say "I understand what you are saying", is there an equal burst of energy, total energy? Or you are still saying "Explain to me some more, let me think about it much further, give me several days, let me listen to you for the next week, another year, then I will begin to understand" - is that your position? If it is, then you will never understand because you are postponing your direct challenge. It is like the house is on fire and you say, "Please I am going away" - you know how your house is burnt. I wonder if you see all this.

So you cannot but respond instantly. When I say, "I love you", you respond instantly, don't you - that is, if you like my love? Then you respond instantly. In the same way when you see that thought does not give security at all, whatever its creation is, the object, the person, the idea, whatever it is, in that there is no security, when you see that wholly, then what takes place? You understand my question?

If I see, observe, logically have thought out, and deeply comprehended in my blood, not just intellectually, wholly, that all nationalities are a danger, (which doesn't mean I accept Communism,) is a danger because it divides people, I see that completely with all my blood, with all my being, then there is no problem, I have dropped it. But if I see security in my nationality and cling to that, however logically you may point out the irrationality of it, I will still hold it. So are we dealing with

irrational people? Right? Neurotic people? Or with reasonable somewhat sane people? You must be somewhat sane, somewhat, because you are here. I don't say you are totally sane, but you will be at the end of the talks!

Q: One hopes!

K: One hopes! Sorry!

So when we say "I understand", either it is verbal, or real. You see the truth of it and therefore you are free of it. So the seeing the truth of it is the essence of intelligence. Right? I wonder if you see that. Intelligence is not reason, logic, the very careful dialectical explanation, that is not intelligence. That is merely the exposition of thought in various forms. And thought is never intelligent. If it was, our world would be different. So the perception of the truth is intelligence. And in that intelligence there is complete security, because that intelligence is not yours or mine, that intelligence is not conditioned because we have finished with all that, because we said thought in its very movement creates conditions. When you understand that movement that very understanding is intelligence. And in that intelligence there is security, from that there is action. Do get some of this? Are you like that? Have you got that intelligence? Not 'got' it - is there that intelligence taking birth in you, like a child? If not, what is the point of you're sitting there and listening to this poor chap?

So we will talk about this question in different ways, in different fields, like fear, pleasure, sorrow, death, meditation, and all that, but the essence of this is this: that thought is the movement of the past, therefore of time, and therefore it is measurable. And that which is measurable can never find what is immeasurable,

which is truth. And that can only take place when your mind sees actually the truth that whatever thought has created, in that there is no security and the very observation of that is intelligence. And when there is that intelligence then it is all finished. Then you are out of this world, though you are living in it, trying to do something, you are completely an outsider. And our question is during the next six talks and gatherings and so on; is it possible in this dialogue between you and the speaker to awaken this tremendous intelligence? That is the function of the speaker, to awaken this intelligence. And if you don't want it, don't sit there - want it in the sense that you want food, when you want sex, it is a tremendous thing. In the same way you have to find out with all your energies, with all your total being to see if there is this intelligence in each one of us.

## **SAANEN 4TH PUBLIC TALK 17TH JULY 1977.**

If we may we will go on with what we were talking about the other day, when we met here. Some of you may not have been here and so I will go over it very briefly. First of all I would like to point out that we are a gathering of serious people - at least I hope so. Not a gathering for intellectuals, or romantics, or sentimentalists because we are dealing with facts - the facts of daily life, the way of living. And if one is not at all serious then one doesn't see the point of coming here, taking all the trouble and sitting down here for an hour. And I hope all of us who are here are really quite serious because we are concerned with our daily living, which are daily facts. And most of us make those facts into an abstraction - to abstract from the fact an idea, a conclusion, and we become prisoners to those ideas and conclusions. We may ventilate those prisons but still we live there because most of us make abstractions of facts in prison. Please, therefore, be good enough to understand that we are not dealing with ideas, some exotic philosophy, or dealing with abstractive conclusions. We are here - if I may again point out, as I have been doing for the last three or four gatherings here, that we are sharing this thing together. We are going into problems that require a great deal of care, a great deal of attention, one must be very, very serious because the house is burning. I do not know if you are aware of all this. There is the Communist world pressing all the time to make us believe in certain ideologies and if we don't we are either sent to a concentration camp or a mental hospital, and so on. That is gradually closing in. One may not be aware of it now, but if you are aware of the world situation,



what is happening in the world economically, socially, politically, and in preparation for wars, one has to become terribly serious. It isn't a thing you play around with, one has to act.

And, as we were saying, action based on skill, which we discussed the last time that we met here, last Thursday, action based on skill must inevitably lead to separative, fragmentary action. Please follow it. I will go into it again as we did last Thursday. Because our education, our environment, sociological demands, urge everyone to develop a particular skill. And that skill brings about not only a sense of power, position, but also such action born of that skill is very limiting, it emphasizes the importance of oneself. One builds the structure of oneself, the I, the ego. And without clarity skill becomes destructive. Clarity - we mean by that - the clarity that comes when there is the art of listening, the art of seeing, the art of learning. And we mean by that word 'art' to put everything in its right place, where it belongs. Then out of that action, which is to give everything its proper place, out of that comes clarity.

Clarity is not born of logic, reason, or objective thinking, but clarity one must have to act clearly, wholly, completely. One must understand the meaning of listening, the meaning of seeing and the art of learning. We said the art of listening means that you listen not to your own prejudices, not to your own conclusions, to your own experiences, with which you are quite familiar. And if you with those prejudices, conditionings listen, then you don't listen at all. Then you are merely judging what is being said with what you already know, therefore there is no actual communication or clarity.

And the art of seeing - to look without any direction, without any motive, to look at the world, to look at what is happening around you, politically, religiously, and all the things that the gurus are unfortunately bringing over to Europe - to see all that clearly without any personal demand, without any personal prejudice or want. That again needs a great deal of attention.

And also to learn. I think this is very important to understand. To learn implies, as most of us know, to learn knowledge, facts, information, and that information, knowledge, experience is stored in the brain and according to that knowledge you act skilfully, or not skilfully. So when thought, which is the result of accumulated knowledge, experience, and memory, and therefore reaction to that memory, which is thought, when thought spills over, as it were, into psychological fields then it creates havoc - which we talked about sufficiently the other day. So if you don't mind we will not go into that again, because we have a lot of things to talk about still.

So the art of listening, the art of seeing what is happening around you, what is happening inside you, what is taking place in your relationship with another, man, woman, to see it very clearly, then the art of learning brings about an extraordinary quality of clarity. If you have done it, as you are sitting there do it actually, not theoretically, follow it step by step and do it, then you will have an extraordinary clarity from which action takes place. And in that clarity there comes naturally the skill. But what we are doing now is to develop skill without clarity and therefore whatever we do in the world, in our daily life, leads to constant conflict, misery and confusion. That again is very obvious. And we are saying that

without compassion clarity has in itself very little meaning.

So we are going to go into this question this morning of what is the meaning and the significance of compassion. Before we go into that it becomes important to understand that we are dealing with daily life and nothing else, because that is the basis of all relationship and therefore of all life.

Most of us are mediocre. The word 'mediocre' means - the root meaning of that word - to go half way up the hill. You understand? We just go half way up, and that is mediocrity. Excellence means going to the very top of it. So we are asking for excellence, not mediocrity - mediocre action. Right? Is that clear? To go all the way, not go half way, otherwise we are going to be smothered, destroyed as human beings by the politicians, by the ideologists, whether they are Communists, Socialists and so on. So we are demanding of ourselves the highest form of excellence. And that excellence can only come into being when there is compassion, clarity, and from this compassion and clarity comes skill - not the other way round. And that is what we are trying to do: to develop a skill and have clarity and then compassion. We are saying quite the contrary.

So we are going into this question of what is compassion. What is the structure and the nature of this extraordinary quality, which if the human mind has not got, it will destroy the world, and therefore destroy human beings. We have also said in our talks that each human being - you as a human being - is the representative of the whole of humanity. Which isn't an idea or an abstraction, but an actual daily fact. That is, wherever you go - India, Asia, America or Europe, or even Russia or China - human beings are going

through anxiety, fear, uncertainty, great sense of loneliness, insecurity, they are caught in the stream of sorrow. This is a fact right through the world. So every human being, that is you who are here in this gathering, and outside are actually the entire essence of all humanity. That is a fact: you must not only realize it intellectually but realize it with all your being, with your blood and your guts, which is an absolute fact. So it becomes very important for each human being, when he realizes this, to see that he is responsible. When you feel utterly responsible then you care; then you care what kind of education your children have, what kind of literature, everything you care about.

So we are going to go into this question of compassion. As we said we are examining this thing together. We are reasoning over it together. We are exercising our highest excellent logic. But reason, clear objective thinking, and excellent logic does not bring about compassion. But we must exercise the qualities that we have, which is reason, careful observation, and from that excellence of clear sight. So we are taking the journey together and please see the importance of this. If you merely listen and accept or reject then we are not communicating with each other. The speaker wants to discuss it all with you, go into it because he feels tremendously urgent about this matter. And as we are sharing together this question: what is the implication of compassion? - then it becomes your responsibility to think clearly, not with your personal prejudices, not with your particular form of experience, or certain conclusions that you have derived through experience or by learning, reading and so on, as those conclusions, experiences will prevent you from sharing together with another. I think that is very

clear.

So we are going together to explore, to investigate, not intellectually but factually in our daily life, whatever that life be, ugly, sometimes happy, sometimes very depressing, and so on, whatever it is we are going to go together and examine all this. So please give your care, your attention, be serious for god's sake, for your own sake. The future is what you make of it today. If you are negligent, if you are merely superficially living, then you are creating a world for the future which will be most destructive. I do not know if you know what is happening in the world, how the technology is so far advanced, military and all the rest of the horror that is going on, and if you realize it you have got to do something. So let's proceed to find out, not from the speaker, because I am not your guru, we are not asking for anyone to follow because the follower destroys truth. There is no guru, there is no follower, there is no authority here of any kind. We are together as two human beings, deeply concerned, not only with our lives but the lives of humanity, to bring about a radical psychological transformation in our consciousness. The content makes consciousness - the content, what it is, what is inside that consciousness makes consciousness. Sorry if I am rather emphatic about all this. I am not being dogmatic. If you look at it, go into it, you will find it out for yourself.

So we are concerned with the transformation of the content of our human consciousness. The human content is all the things that thought has put into it, like politics, the division in politics, my country and your country, the ideologies, the Communist ideologies according to Marx or Lenin, or EuroCommunism with

their particular brand of Communism - the content is all the religious dogmas, rituals, beliefs, the demand that you obey because the priests, or the popes, or the representatives, they think they are the representative of god or Christ. And the content is fear, pleasure, pain, anxiety, loneliness, despair and the enormous sense of great sorrow, and the fear of death. All that is the content, of every human being in the world, whether they live in China, Asia, India, America or here. And when there is a transformation in consciousness it affects the whole of mankind. If you have gone through it you will find it. Do it and you will find out.

So we are going to examine together the various contents of consciousness, in which compassion doesn't exist. There is pity in it, there is sympathy, there is tolerance, there is the desire to help, there is a peculiar form of love, but all that is not compassion. So we are going to examine this thing. Please understand that although the speaker is sitting on a platform it doesn't give him any authority whatsoever. He is sitting here for convenience so that you can see the man who is speaking. That's all. Because we have accepted for so long the feeling of obedience - 'Tell us what to do and we will do it' - that is not what we are saying. When there is understanding of what is compassion and so on, out of that comes your own clarity and action, then you are outside of all the misery and the confusion, and therefore you can bring about a different consciousness in the world.

Now let's proceed. We are asking whether compassion or love is pleasure? So we are going to investigate together - please bear in mind, together - what is the significance and the meaning of pleasure, which every human being is seeking, which every human

being is pursuing at any cost. What is pleasure - the pleasure derived from possessions, the pleasure derived from capacity, talent, the pleasure when you can dominate another, the pleasure of being, of having tremendous power, politically, religiously or economically? Then there is the pleasure of sex, the pleasure that money gives so that you have a great sense of freedom. And they are all multiple forms of pleasure. And if you observe very carefully, look at yourself as though you are looking at yourself in a mirror, you will see that you are pursuing the same - pleasure. It may not be money, it may not be many possessions, but it may be through sex, or clinging to a particular form of experience, which has given you great delight, holding on to that, or a particular conclusion, an ideological conclusion and that gives you a sense of great superiority, which is a form of pleasure.

So, what actually is the meaning of pleasure? You understand? The word, not the pleasure derived from something, but the essence of pleasure. Because we discussed the other day when we met, the nature of fear, and whether human beings, you as a human being representative of all humanity, can be free completely, totally of fear. We went into that very carefully and I do not think we will go into it again today because we won't have time. So we are asking: what is the nature and the structure of pleasure, which every human being is seeking? In pleasure there are several things, which are: there is enjoyment, there is a sense of joy - pleasure, enjoyment, joy, and further on, ecstasy. In the field of pleasure these are involved - pleasure, joy, taking delight in something, and the sense of ecstasy. The meaning of the word 'ecstasy' - please understand what it means - the root meaning is to be beyond

yourself. You understand? There is no self to enjoy. The self, that is, the 'me', the ego, the personality has all totally disappeared, there is only that sense of being outside. That is ecstasy. But that ecstasy has nothing whatsoever to do with pleasure. So we are going to look carefully at pleasure, the meaning of it, in which is included joy, taking a delight in something and so on. I hope you want to go into this. You may not want to go into this because you may be frightened because you say, "For god's sake if you take away pleasure what have we in life?" We are not taking away pleasure. We are not saying it is ugly, wrong, anything of that. We are examining it. But if you say, "Don't examine it too closely because I am frightened", then please don't examine it. But if you want to understand it, see the significance of it, go into it very deeply, then there must be no blockage by your fear.

We said: what is pleasure? You take a delight in something. The delight that comes naturally when you look at something very beautiful. At that moment, at that second, there is neither pleasure, nor joy, there is only that sense of great observation. And in that observation the self is not. Right? When you look at that mountain with its snow cap, with its valleys, the grandeur, the magnificence, the extraordinary line of it, that drives away all thought. There it is, that great thing in front of you. That is a delight. Then thought comes along and says, what a marvellous thing that was, what a lovely experience that was; then the memory of that perception is cultivated, then that cultivation becomes pleasure. So where thought interferes with the sense of beauty, the sense of greatness, grandeur, of anything, a piece of poetry, a sheet of water, or a marvellous tree in a lonely field - seeing it and not registering it.



You follow? This is important. Please understand it. The moment you register it, the beauty of it, then that very registration sets thought into action. Then the seeing of that beauty and the desire to pursue that beauty becomes pleasure. Get it? Do you understand? Are we moving together somewhere? One sees a beautiful woman, or a man, and instantly it is registered in the brain. Right? It is a fact, isn't it? Then that very registration sets thought into motion and you want to be in her company and all the rest of it follows. So pleasure is the continuation and the cultivation of an incident by thought, which gives a continuity. You have had sexual experience last night or two weeks ago, you remember it and desire the repetition of it, which is the demand for pleasure. That is fairly obvious.

So the point here is: is it possible not to register? You understand? The function of the brain is to register because in registration it is secure, it knows what to do. Right? And in registration, knowing what to do, in which there is security, there is the development of skill. Right? Then that skill becomes a great pleasure which is a talent, a gift, all that is the movement of the continuation of thought through desire and pleasure. You understand this? Good. Can we go on from there? Please. I can go on, the speaker can go on. But are you going on, along with the speaker, doing it actually, seeing for yourself what is going on and realize the whole explanation, the discovery, the exploration of it. Right?

So is it possible to register only that which is absolutely necessary, and not register anything else? Look: take a very simple thing. Most of us have had pain, physical pain of some sort or

another. And that pain is registered because my brain says I must be very careful not to have that pain again tomorrow, or a week later, because physical pain is distorting. Right? You can't think clearly when there is great pain. So the brain registers it. It is the function of the brain to register that pain so as to safeguard itself, so that it doesn't do things that will bring about pain. So it must register. Then what takes place? Look at it carefully for yourself. It has registered and then there is the fear of that pain happening again later. Right? So that registration has caused fear. Right? So we are asking: is it possible, having had that pain, to end it, not carry it on? Are you following this? Am I making it clear?

We are talking from actual facts, not a theory, because we have all had pain of some kind or another, great pain or a little pain. And having that pain, end it, don't carry it over. Then the brain has the security of being free and intelligent. You see that? Because the moment you carry it over it is never free of fear, it is never free. But having had that pain, at the end of the day end it, don't think about it, don't let it worry you, "My god it is going to happen again tomorrow. I'll have to consult the doctor, take drugs" and all the rest of it, but end it. And then you will see for yourself.

So we are saying, we are asking together - I am asking, you are also asking - whether it is possible not to register at all excepting the things that are absolutely necessary? The necessary things are knowledge - how to drive a car, how to speak a language, technological knowledge - please follow this carefully - technological knowledge, the knowledge of reading, writing, and all the things involved in that, but in our human relationship, man and woman, every incident in that relationship is registered. Right?

Are you following this? It is registered and therefore what takes place? The woman gets irritated, nagging, or friendly, kindly, or says something just before you go off to the office, which is ugly - so you build up through registration the image about her, and she builds up an image about you. This is an actual fact - no? Oh for god's sake, am I talking, saying something extraordinary?

So in human relationships, with man and woman, or between a neighbour and so on, the image making is the process of registration. Right? That is when a wife says something ugly, to listen to it and end it, not register it. You understand? Or when the husband says something ugly, listen to it carefully, end it, not carry it on. Then you will find that there is no image making at all, because if there is no image between the man and the woman, then relationship is quite different, entirely different. But when there is an image between the two the relationship is between one thought opposed to another thought. Right? And that we call relationship, which actually is not. It is just an idea that you are my wife or my girl friend, just an idea. Do you get all this? I hope you are equally active, as the speaker is.

So we are enquiring into the question of what is the nature and the structure of pleasure? Pleasure is the continuation of an incident, given that continuation by thought. So thought is the root of pleasure. Right? If you had no thought and you saw a beautiful thing, there it would end. But thought says, no I must have that - you know the whole movement of thought. So what is the relationship of pleasure to joy? You understand this? Joy comes to you uninvited, it happens. You are walking along a street, or sitting in a bus, or wandering in the woods, seeing the flowers, the hills,

and the clouds and the blue sky and suddenly there is the extraordinary feeling of great joy. Then registration, thought says what a marvellous thing that was, I must have more of it. So joy is made into pleasure by thought. You are following all this? This is not analysis; this is mere observation. That is, seeing things as they are, not as you want them to be. Seeing things exactly without any distortion, seeing what is taking place. Right? When you do that we are together, we are journeying together, we are exploring together.

So from that: what is love? What is love? Please again we all have so many opinions about it. We have got such extraordinary ideas about it. Love is this, love is not that, you mustn't talk about love in front of a girl - you know - extraordinary things we have. Now we are going to examine the thing clearly - right? Examine it together. The speaker is not telling you what love is, or you telling the speaker what love is; but we are examining it. Right? So you must be free of your prejudice. You must be free of your opinions of what love should be. You are free to look. So what is love? Is it pleasure? Is love pleasure which is the movement of thought and the continuation of an incident through the movement of thought, which is pleasure? We have explained this very carefully: it is not my explanation, you can observe it for yourself. And we say is that pleasure? Is the movement of thought love? You understand? Is love a remembrance, a thing that has happened, a boy and a girl, a man and woman, that happened, and the remembrance of it, and living in that remembrance and feeling that remembrance which is over, resuscitating it and saying, "What a marvellous thing that was when we were together under that tree; that was love". That is the

remembrance of a thing that has gone. Is that love? Is love the pleasure of sex, in which there is tenderness, kindness, etc., etc., etc. - is that love? We are not saying it is, or that it is not. We are questioning, as you must question everything in life, doubt everything. But if you doubt everything you will have nothing left. But doubt must be kept on a leash; as you keep a dog on a rope or a leash, so doubt must be kept on a leash. And you must know when to let it go and when to hold it back. That is the art of doubting.

So we are doubting, questioning everything that man has put together and then says, "This is love". So we said: is love pleasure? If it is, then pleasure gives emphasis to the remembrance, to past things, brings about the importance of the 'me' - my pleasure, my excitement, my remembrances. So is that love? And is love desire? Ask these questions, burn with these questions, because you have got to find out because we have reduced love into pleasure, which is a daily fact. Is love desire? So what is desire? I desire a car, I desire a house, one desires prominence, power, position. There are a dozen things one desires. To be as beautiful as you are, to be as intelligent, as clever, as smart as you are - desire. Then what is desire? Does desire bring clarity? Please question this with me. The thing that you call love, we are saying is that love based on desire - desire to possess a woman, to sleep with a woman, or sleep with a man, desire to hold her, possess her, dominate her, control her, she is mine, not yours. And the pleasure derived in that possession, in that dominance. Man dominates the world and so there is the woman fighting for domination. So what is the nature and the structure of desire? Desire, not for something - not for the house, or a good car, or position, power, be prominent in your little

society, in your little pond. So we have to find out what is desire.

We are not saying that we shouldn't have desire. That is what the churches throughout the world say, the organized religions have said suppress desire. If you want to serve god you must be without desire. And the priests have maintained that and although they talk about being without desire they are burning with desire, burning with it. They may not want worldly things but to become the bishop, the archbishop, the pope - you know climb the ladder of spiritual success.

So what is desire? Does desire bring about clarity? And therefore that clarity is skill in action. In the field of desire does compassion flower? You have to ask these questions. So to find out the truth of the matter you must examine what is desire, not desire for the object, the objects are not important - you vary, from childhood you desire a toy and so on, as you grow older you desire something else. So we are not discussing, or talking over together the objects of desire, but actually what is desire? If it does not bring clarity, and if desire is not the field in which beauty and the greatness of compassion flower, then what place has desire? Right? So you must go into it and find out, not according to any psychologist, any preacher, including the speaker, but together to find out. We are insisting that we think together, reason together, find out together. Not I find and then you accept, or reject, but together find out.

So what is desire? Desire for a better society, and the cultivation of that desire which becomes passion for an idea. Right? People are so committed to Communism, they are passionate about it - or to any other form of ideological projections. So it becomes very

important to go into this question of what is desire - not how to suppress it, how to run away from it, how to make it more beautiful, but just what is desire? How does it come about that human beings are caught in this? One year you are a Christian, or for thirty years a Christian, then you throw that out and join some other label called Hindu, or Buddhist, or whatever it is, or Zen.

So in enquiring we must deal with facts, not with opinions, not with judgements - then you have your opinions and the speaker may have his opinions and so there is a battle, therefore there is no communication. But we are going into facts - not your fact or my fact, but the fact that human beings have colossal desires, absurd desires, illusory desires. So what is desire? How does it come? Go into it. Look at it. You have your own desires, unfortunately, or fortunately. Desire to be good - you know. How does that desire arise in you? You see a beautiful woman or a beautiful man - see. Perception, the seeing, then the contact, then the sensation, then that sensation is taken over by thought, which becomes desire with its image. Right? Follow it yourself and you will see it. You see a beautiful vase, a beautiful sculpture - I don't mean the modern sculpture, sorry, somebody may like it, somebody may like that but personally I don't like it - you see a beautiful statue, the ancient Egyptian, or the Greek, and you look at it. As you look at it, if they allow you to touch it, you touch it. See the depth of that figure as he sits on a chair, or cross legged. And then from that there is a sensation, isn't there? What a marvellous thing. And from that sensation the desire says, I wish I had that in my room. Right? I wish I could look at it every day, touch it every day. And the pride of possession to have such a marvellous thing like that. You

understand? That is desire, isn't it? Seeing, contact, sensation; then thought using that sensation to cultivate the desire to possess, or not to possess. Right? This is obvious. This is not my explanation. It is a factual explanation.

Now comes the difficulty: realizing that the religious people throughout the world have said, "Don't look. When a woman comes near you look at something else. Think of her as your sister, mother, god," - or whatever it is! (Laughter) You laugh but you are born in this. You are conditioned to this. So all the religious people have said, "Take vows of celibacy. Don't look at a woman. If you do look, treat her as your sister, mother, whatever you like, because you are in the service of god and you need all your energy to serve him. In the service of god you are going to have great tribulations, therefore be prepared, but don't waste your energy." But the thing is boiling - right? So we are trying to understand that which is boiling. Not to look at a woman or a man, but that which is the desire which is constantly boiling, wants to fulfil, wants to complete itself. So we said desire is the movement of perception, seeing, contact, sensation, thought as desire with its image. Right? Now we are saying, see, touch - sensation, that is normal, healthy - end it there. Don't let thought come and say, yes, take it over and make it into a desire. Get it? No, do understand this and then you will see that there will be no suppression of desire. That is, you see a beautiful house, well proportioned, lovely windows, beautiful garden, well kept, with a roof that melts into the sky, walls that are thick and part of the earth. You look at it, there is sensation. You touch it, you may not actually touch it but you touch it with your eyes, you smell the air, the herbs, the newly cut grass. And can't



you end it there? Why does sensation become desire? You follow? You are following this? Am I making it clear? When there is perception, contact, sensation, it is natural, it is beautiful to see the lovely things, or an ugly thing. Then to end it there, say it is a beautiful house. Right? Then there is no registration as thought which says, I wish I had that house - which is desire - you understand? - and the continuation of desire. You can do this so easily. And I mean easily, if you understand the nature of desire.

So we are asking is pleasure love? Is remembrance love? Is desire love? So pleasure, remembrance, desire are the movements of thought. Right? Therefore one asks; does thought cultivate love? Is thought love? You understand? Am I making this clear? Please come on. So find out! If it is not pleasure, because pleasure has its place, it is not desire, it is not remembrance although they have their places, then what is love? Right? Is love jealousy? Is love a sense of possession - my wife, my husband, my girl, possession? Has love within it, fear? Ask these questions and find out. Therefore if it is none of these things, entirely wiping away all these things, to end them, putting all these things in the right place, then love is. You understand? Then love is.

So we are saying that through the negation the positive is. You understand? Through negation. That is, is pleasure love? And we examine pleasure and we see it is not quite that, though pleasure has its place it is not that. Right? So you negate that. You say it is not remembrance though remembrance is necessary. Right? So we put remembrance in its right place, therefore you have negated remembrance as not being love. You have negated desire, though desire has a certain place. Therefore you say through negation the

positive is - you understand? But we on the contrary posit the positive and then get caught in the negative. Right? That is, one must begin with doubt, completely doubting, then you end up with certainty. But if you start with certainty, as all of you do, then you end up in uncertainty and chaos.

So in negation the positive is born. You understand? I have finished, sirs. I have finished for this morning. We will continue next Tuesday.

## **SAANEN 7TH PUBLIC TALK 24TH JULY 1977.**

It is really a lovely morning - I don't know why you are sitting in this hot tent!

There are several things that we ought to talk over together, though we have discussed many things, many human problems, and to go beyond all those problems, to be free. I would like this morning, if I may, to go into rather perhaps complex problems, complex issues, and I think they should be talked over together. Perhaps some of you are here for the first time, so if I may point out this is not a lecture where you listen, agreeing or disagreeing, or are put to sleep by the words, however eloquent they may be. But we are travelling together on a journey of a serious character, and unless one partakes in that journey, shares and walks in that journey seriously, what we are saying will have very little importance and very little effect - not that one wants to make an effect.

We have talked about authority; we have talked about fear, pleasure, love, sorrow and the very deep issue of death. And also we said during these talks - and I believe this is the last talk - we said man has developed through centuries a great deal of skill, and that skill gives him certain importance, prestige and money. But without clarity, which comes through compassion, that skill becomes merely a destructive factor in life. We have talked a great deal about that too.

Now if we may, let us talk over together the question of decision, whether it is necessary to decide at all, and the place of will; and also we are going to discuss or talk over together the

question of time and space. And perhaps if we have time we can go into the question of meditation too. So we are going to talk over together the machinery that makes one decide, the action that is born of will, and what is the nature and the structure of time, and the importance of space. And from there move, if we can, into the question of what is meditation.

Meditation is not something separate from all that we have talked about. It is not at the end of the parcel. When we talked about authority, that is part of meditation, the nature of fear and whether man can ever be free of fear both outwardly and inwardly, and the structure and the pursuit of pleasure. All that is part of meditation. And we also talked about the nature of love. And to investigate together you need a certain quality of mind that is meditative, that is not jumping to conclusions, that is not affirming or rejecting, but investigating - investigating without any prejudice, without any conclusion, without any end. After all that is a good scientist - not the scientist that is employed by governments, but the scientist who really wants to find truth, at whatever level. And also we talked about relationship, the importance of human relationship without conflict. That was also the deeper meaning of meditation.

So we would like this morning, if we may, to talk over together - and we mean talk over together, though the speaker is sitting on a platform using words, we are taking the journey together, walking together, exploring together because we have created this monstrous world, the world that is becoming mad with violence, division, wars, sorrow and all the rest of it. So as we have created the society in which we live, we are responsible to bring about a

transformation in that immoral society. So it is our responsibility as a human being. And each human being is the representative of total humanity - we talked about that. So we are taking a journey, exploration, an investigation together into why human beings decide - decide to do this and decide not to do that, to become this or not that, to follow somebody or not to follow somebody. All our life is a process of decision. And we are asking if you are aware that your life is based on various forms of deciding. We should also ask why we decide at all. Is it necessary - both physiologically in the world of technology, and also psychologically, inwardly, what is the necessity of any form of decision? This is very important because when we are going to go into the question of meditation one must know the nature of decision, because meditation is not something you decide, it is not something that is set down by some guru, or some neurotic person. So it is very important to understand why human beings throughout the world for millenia upon millenia have always exercised this faculty of decision.

What is decision made of, what is the cause of decision? Would you decide if you are very clear? Is there any decision necessary when you see something very, very dangerous? Is there any necessity for decision? That is to act in a certain manner, or not to act in another way. Is the mind capable of observing the totality of the movement of thought, the totality, the wholeness of thought, the holistic - the meaning of the word 'holistic' is the same as the other - whole. Whole means, the root meaning of that word is health, sanity, and holy - H-O-L-Y. That means the whole totality of life, not just departmentalized life.

Now we are asking: when there is decision there is always resistance. Right? One decides to do something and then there is always the uncertainty whether it is the right thing to do, there is always anxiety that your decision should be made upon something reasoned out, clarity, which has deep significance. So we are questioning that: whether there is a way of living in daily life, in which there is no decision at all? It is like a tremendous river with a volume of water with great depth, it moves, if there is any obstruction it goes round it, but it is always moving. It is only when there is no total movement of that nature, holistic movement, then there comes decision. Please see this for yourself. We are taking the journey together. I am not talking to myself and you agreeing or disagreeing, we are thinking this out together very deeply. So please be serious.

We are going to find out in our examination whether it is possible to live a life where there is a holistic movement, a movement that is whole, non-fragmented. And when there is a movement of such nature there is no necessity for decision at all. And that implies an action of will. What is will? Why do we depend so much on will? I will do this, and I will not do that. This is good, that is bad, that I'll follow - the capacity to exercise will. And we think will is part of freedom - free will and all the rest of it. We are going to question all that together, because we have questioned everything here. Right? We have questioned all the religious attitudes. We have questioned authority. We have questioned whether human beings can be utterly, totally and completely free of fear. And also we are questioning what is love and so on because when one accepts, obeys and follows, you end

up in uncertainty. But if you begin with uncertainty, that is, you are questioning, doubting, then you end up in certainty. But we unfortunately start the other way.

And we are asking what is the nature of will and why is it that human beings depend on that capacity, and give such importance to the man who has strong will? So we are going to ask together what is the nature and the structure of will? Will is desire, heightened, strengthened by constant exercise of desire. It is the essence of desire - will. And where there is desire there must be illusion. We went into it the other day. And so we are asking whether will in action does not lead to not only illusion but to every form of resistance and therefore exclusion, therefore isolation? And is it possible to live a daily life without any kind of will?

We are educated from childhood to the exercise of will. You must when you are children concentrate, you must obey, you must do this, you cannot do that. And our whole way of life is based on that. And will implies choice. Right? I hope we are carefully reasoning together, logically, sanely, going into this question. We are not asserting anything. We are reasonable people, I hope, serious people, therefore we are capable of examining without any prejudice, conclusion, belief. So we are saying where there is will there is choice. Right? And choice comes about when there is no clarity, both objectively and inwardly. When there is no clarity then the choice begins and I choose to do that, which is the exercise of will, which is the essence of desire. We went also into the question of what is desire? We said desire is the movement of seeing, perception, contact, sensation. And thought makes that

sensation into desire, and the image that goes with the desire. I won't go into all that - there is no time for all that now. We have explained enough, about what is the nature and the structure of desire.

So we are questioning what is the necessity of choice, and from choice the exercise of will, and will is the essence of desire. I hope you are following all this. When there is clarity, to see things exactly as they are, not romantically, emotionally, with prejudice, with what you would like it to be, but to see things absolutely as they are in daily life, brings about an extraordinary quality of clarity. Right? And when there is clarity there is no need for the exercise of will or choice. You see this? See the beauty of it. So one can live in daily life without any kind of will, choice or resistance. If there is something that is an impediment, you go round it, move like water. So there is - this is rather interesting, I am just discovering it - there is a movement which is likened to water. A river cleanses itself as it moves, but if there is too much pollution dropped in it, it can never clean itself. That is what is happening to us. Society, education, authority - except the authority of the surgeon, doctor, and so on, we have discussed that very clearly - so the stream is constantly being polluted, our human life, which is really a marvellous stream if there is no pollution. And one of the deep causes of this pollution is this lack of clarity. When there is lack of clarity there is choice, will and action, confined to a very narrow field. If you see that, not theoretically, intellectually or merely through words, but actually have an insight into the nature of this activity of will then that very insight clears away the pollution which is called the will. Right?



We have also talked about when there is clarity, that clarity must go with compassion. You can be very clear intellectually - most thoughtful, intellectual people are very, very clear, but their clarity is limited because there is no compassion with it. We went into the nature of compassion. We said compassion comes through the understanding of pleasure - please follow this. Compassion is like a flower that is born, you cannot be compassionate, you cannot cultivate compassion, you cannot cultivate love, but when you understand the nature and the structure of pleasure, whether it is sexual, or the pleasure of a position, a status and so on - the pleasure, the pursuit of pleasure. That pursuit of pleasure is the movement of thought in time. And without understanding pleasure, love becomes a very shoddy little affair. And we went also into where there is suffering, various forms of suffering which we talked over together the other day, out of that suffering with the understanding of what love is, compassion is born. That compassion is not mine, nor yours. Out of that compassion comes intelligence.

So intelligence cannot operate when there is the activity of will. I wonder if you see this? Will is desire. Desire is not compassion. We went through this very deeply the other day. So we are asking - taking the journey together, exploring together - whether it is possible to live a life in which the action of will doesn't exist at all, which means effort, the constant effort brought about through the action of will? To have an insight into this is to be free of it completely. And we said to have an insight the mind must be empty - empty of your conclusions, your prejudices, your experiences, your hopes - must be empty to have an insight from

which arises intelligence. We talked about this the other day.

Right? So to have an insight into the whole nature and the structure of will and decision, out of which comes this enormous trouble. So there is an ending to effort, struggle, and all the forms of resistance, and escapes and neuroticism, when you understand the nature and the structure of will, which is born of choice and effort. Right.

From there we can move to the question of time. We are going into this because it is necessary to understand the whole movement of meditation. Because that word has been ruined, polluted by all the systems, the various forms of assertions, by the gurus - you know, they have recently invaded this country, Europe, with this word meditation. And one must understand together the nature of time because for us time is very important, both chronologically as well as psychologically. We are talking over together the psychological movement of time, not the time by the watch. The time by the watch is absolutely necessary otherwise you and I wouldn't be here at 10.30. Or if you want to catch a bus, and so on and so on, such time, chronological time is necessary. But we are going to investigate together - and we mean together - what is psychological time upon which we depend so enormously?

Surely time is movement. That is very simple. From here to there, both chronologically as well as psychologically. A distance to be covered, a distance between 'what is' and 'what should be'. The distance to arrive at a goal, at a purpose requires time. If one wants to learn a language that requires time. So perhaps we have brought over from the learning of something which requires time, into the field of the psyche. Do you follow? You understand what I

am saying? You need time to learn a new technique, to drive a car, to learn a language, to understand and work the electronics and so on, you need a great deal of time to fly an aeroplane. That same attitude has brought over into the psychological field: we need time to be perfect. We need time to get over something. We need time to be free of our anxieties, to be free of our sorrow, to be free of our fears and so on. See what we have done. Where time is necessary, which is in the field of technology, that need has been introduced into the psychological world and we have accepted it. For all nations to wipe away their nationalities needs time. To become brotherly we need time and so on and so on. Now we are questioning that together. We are questioning whether there is any psychological time at all. Because psychological time implies hope - the world is mad, let's hope in the future there will be a sane world. So we are questioning together whether there is an action which is not involved in time at all. We are meeting together? Action brought about by a cause, by a motive needs time. Right? Action which has a pattern of memory, and to put that pattern into action needs time. If you have an ideal, however noble, however beautiful, romantic and all the rest of it, however nonsensical even, it needs time to arrive at that idealistic state. So to arrive at that, destroy the present. It doesn't matter what happens to you but what is important is the future. For the sake of the marvellous future sacrifice yourself! And that future is established by the ideologists - Marx, Engels, you know, all the rest of it, all the religious teachers and so on, throughout the world. So we are questioning that: whether there is any psychological time at all, and therefore - please go into this very carefully - no hope? Dante in his Inferno,

said, those who enter here have no hope. You know, all that. We are questioning this. This is a very serious thing. Please don't come to any conclusion yet - "What shall I do if I have no hope?" Hope is so important because it gives you satisfaction, energy, drive, to achieve something.

Now when you look closely, non-sentimentally, logically, is there psychological time at all? There is psychological time only when you move away from 'what is'. Right? You are getting this? That is, there is psychological time when one realizes one is violent, and one proceeds to enquire how to be free of it, that movement away from 'what is' is time. But after investigation and so on, if one is totally completely aware of 'what is', then there is no time. I wonder if you see this. Do you?

Look: most of us are violent. Violence is not only hitting somebody physically - anger, jealousy, acceptance of authority, conformity, imitation, accepting the edicts of another - all those are forms of violence. And human beings are violent. That is the fact, violence. The very word condemns it. I don't know if you see it. The very usage of the word 'violence', by that usage you have already condemned violence. Right? See the intricacies of this. So being violent and not being capable, or negligent, or lazy, we move away from it and invent ideological non-violence. That is time. The movement from 'what is' to 'what should be'. Right? Now that time comes to an end completely when there is only 'what is', which is non verbal identification with 'what is'. Get it sirs? I am just finding it out. Come on!

There is anger, which is a form of violence, or hatred, jealousy. The word 'anger', the word 'jealousy', 'hate', in themselves are

condemnatory. When one sees one is angry and says, "I have been angry", that verbalization of a reaction strengthens the reaction. I wonder if you see that? Do you? I am angry. When I say, "I am angry", it is I have recognized from the past angers the present anger, so I am using the word 'anger' which is the past, and identifying with that word the present. So the word becomes extraordinarily important. But if there is no usage of that word but only the fact, the reaction - are you following this? - then there is no strengthening of that feeling.

So we are saying that it is possible to live psychologically without tomorrow. You understand? "I love you, I will meet you tomorrow." Which is the remembrance of that affection, or whatever it is, in memory and projected tomorrow. See the importance of all this sirs. So that there is an activity without time at all. Love is not time. Right? Love is not a remembrance. If it is, it is not love, obviously. "I love you because you gave me sex, or you gave me food, or flattered me, or you said you needed a companion, I am lonely therefore I need you" - all that is not love surely? When you are jealous, when there is anxiety, hatred, that is not love. So then what is love? Love is obviously a state of mind in which there is no verbalization, no remembrance, but an immediate fact.

So it is possible through very careful examination, observing, which is totally different from analysis - we went into that, and there is no time now. My goodness there is so much to talk about! So there is a way of living in daily life where time as movement from this to that, has gone. Do you know what that means? What happens when you do that? You have an extraordinary vitality, an

extraordinary sense of clarity. You are then only dealing with facts, not with ideas. But as most of us are imprisoned in ideas and we have accepted that as a way of life, it is very difficult to break away from that. But to have an insight into it, then it is finished. Right?

Then there is the question of space. I think, if one may point out, it is very important to understand this. When we talk about space, we conceive space, or look at space from an object. Right? But to look, to observe space, or to be aware of space without the object, and therefore without the subject. You understand this? Please look at it, let's go slowly into this. Because our minds are so cluttered up - with knowledge, with worries, with problems, with money, with position, prestige, you know, so burdened, there is no space at all. Right? And without space there is no order. Right? And we are asking: what is space? Look, we are sitting here and we know the space from this tent. From a centre observe: or observe without a centre. Which means to observe without the centre implies non-verbalization. This becomes too difficult for you. May I go on? You are sure?

Space implies no direction. Right? When I look at this valley from a height, if there is a direction because I want to see where I live, then I lose the vast space. Just see the sanity of it. So where there is direction there is no space. Where there is a purpose, a goal, something to be achieved, there is no space. Right? Look at it sirs, don't agree. Look at yourself. If I have a purpose in life and for which I am living, concentrating, where is the space? I have very little space. Whereas if there is no direction, there is vast space. Look at it. Go into it. You will see it for yourself.

So where there is an object, a centre and from that centre we look, then space is very, very limited. When there is no centre, no object, no structure of the 'me' put together by thought, there is vast space. And without space there is no order, there is no clarity, there is no compassion. Because our lives are very limited, enclosed and to break that enclosure we do all kinds of things.

So where there is resistance there is no space. Right? Where there is a centre from which you are acting, there is no space. Where there is direction, a motive, an end in view, there is no space. But space is necessary. Space is necessary because - the word 'because' implies cause, remove it! - it is necessary to have space. When there is space you can observe very clearly. From the top of a mountain on a clear day you see everything, the beauty of the whole valley, the mountains, the clarity. But our minds are so heavily conditioned, so heavily burdened, there is no space. Now to have an insight into it. Right? To see how important it is to have space.

From there we can go into the question of meditation. But without understanding all that - that is, the freedom from all authority, from all psychological authority, to be completely free psychologically of any imposition by another. Right? There is no guru, no teacher and therefore you have to be completely and totally a light to yourself. And we said every human being is the representative of all humanity. Then when he is a light to himself - you understand? - he lights the world, lights the rest of humanity. You understand this?

And we said there is no possibility of meditation, and the depth of it, and the beauty of it, the greatness of it, when there is any

form of fear - obviously. Fear distorts, fear clouds the mind. And also we said if we do not understand the nature and the structure of pleasure then you turn meditation into an act of pleasure, and pursue that pleasure through various practices - the Zen, the various systems, methods, and all the rest of it. That is still the pursuit of pleasure, to be gained at the end. And we said the pursuit of pleasure is the movement of thought. Thought is memory, stored up in the brain as knowledge and experience. And the response of memory is thought. Thought is time, not the chronological time only but the whole nature of time psychologically.

So there must be compassion, clarity, skill. After that we can examine, go into the question of meditation, knowing or living where there is no effort, where there is no action of will, where there is tremendous space. Then what is meditation? We said from the beginning of these talks until now, all that is part of meditation. If you have not taken the journey deeply together you cannot go into this very deeply, you may superficially talk about it, but you cannot really understand or live the greatness of meditation. Which is not that you must meditate. The idea to determine to meditate is the most absurd action. "I will meditate, spend twenty minutes in the morning, twenty minutes in the afternoon, twenty minutes in the evening" - that is a siesta! It is nothing else but absurd nonsense.

But understanding the nature of all this, and in that understanding comes great beauty, not only the observation of the beauty of the mountains, of the hills, the rivers and nature, but also the beauty of a person, whether it be a man or a woman, the beauty. Beauty exists only when there is no me. Not the beauty of a



picture painted by a well known artist, painter, or by Michelangelo etc., etc. You may look at it, go to a museum and observe it, see the lines, the colours, the shapes, how it is grouped together, all the rest of it, but when there is no me there is beauty and you need not go to any museum. And that is part of meditation, to see the enormous greatness of beauty.

So what then is meditation? We have only dealt with the waves - authority, fear - the waves on the surface of an ocean. Now if you have gone so far we are going into the depth of the ocean. You understand? We have only dealt with the superficiality of it - of course you must understand it, be free of it, know how to dive deeply - not you dive - it comes about.

First of all there is a difference between concentration, choiceless awareness and attention. (Please, are you all tired? I am afraid there is no other talk so please pay attention to this. There will be a discussion on Wednesday - five dialogues between us. But if you are tired it doesn't matter, don't listen. Don't make an effort to listen because that is a waste.) There are these three things which we must understand: concentration, choiceless awareness and attention. Concentration implies resistance - concentration on a particular thing, on the page you are reading, or on the phrase you are trying to understand: to concentrate, to put all your energy in a particular direction. That is one thing. I needn't enlarge on that, need I? In that concentration there is resistance and therefore there is effort and division. I want to concentrate, thought goes off on something else, I bring it back. The fight. And if you love something you concentrate very easily. All that is implied in the word to concentrate, to put your mind on a particular object, or a

particular picture, a particular action. That is one thing.

Choiceless awareness implies to be aware both objectively, outside, and inwardly, without any choice. Just to be aware of the colours, of the tent, of the trees, the mountains, nature - just to be aware. Not choose, say, "I like this", "I don't like that" or "I want this", "I don't want that". Right? To observe without the observer. The observer is the past, which is conditioned, therefore he is always looking from that conditioned point of view, therefore there is like and dislike, my race, your race, my god, your god, and all the rest of it. We are saying to be aware implies to observe the whole environment around you, the mountains, the trees, the ugly wars, the towns, aware, look at it. And in that observation there is no decision, no will, no choice. Get it? You understand it?

And attention - concentration, choiceless awareness and attention. In attending there is no centre. Right? You are completely attentive. Are you now - if I may ask - attending to what is being said? If you are completely, totally attending there is no you who is attending - is there? You understand? If you are listening completely with your heart and with your blood, everything, there is no me attending. Right? There is no me that limits that attention. Then attention is limitless. Right? Therefore attention then has complete space. Attention then is not directed. Whereas concentration is, therefore it limits space.

So we have to go into this very deeply and see if you have it. After understanding all the waves on the surface - fear, authority, all those petty little affairs compared to what we are going into. So the mind then - because insight implies emptiness - emptying the whole of the consciousness of its content. Empty it. Which is not

through action of will, which is not through desire, which is not through choice, but seeing the nature of consciousness, your consciousness, not mine, your consciousness, with its content - fear, anxiety, my country, your country, I must be good - the content of it, sorrow, longing, loneliness, the ache of that loneliness, separation, conflict, all that is the content of your consciousness. Right? And the content makes consciousness. Without the content there is no consciousness. You understand? Now we are saying when you have an insight into all this naturally there comes about the emptying of the content. Therefore consciousness is totally different, is of a totally different dimension.

And meditation then is: because there is space, because there is emptiness there is total silence - not induced silence, not practised silence, which are all just the movement of thought and therefore absolutely worthless - but when you have gone through all this - and there is great delight in going through all this, it is like playing a tremendous game - then in that total silence there is a movement which is timeless, which is not measured by thought because thought has no place in it whatsoever. And therefore there is something totally sacred, timeless. May I go?

## SAANEN 5TH PUBLIC TALK 19TH JULY 1977

We have been talking over together whether it is possible to awaken the intelligence. That is our chief concern. And for those who are serious and who have followed the past four talks - or rather talking over things together - this morning I would like to go into something that I think is equally important.

This awakening of intelligence implies having an insight into all our problems - psychological problems, crisis, blockages and so on. The word 'intelligence', according to a good dictionary, means reading between the lines, partly. And also really, deeply, the significance of intelligence is to have deep true insight - not an intellectual comprehension, not resolving the problems through conflict, but having an insight into a human issue, that very insight awakens this intelligence. Or, having this intelligence there is the insight - both ways. And having insight involves no conflict, because when you see something very, very clearly, the truth of the matter, there is the end of it, you don't fight against it, you don't try to control, you don't make all these calculated, motivated efforts. From that insight, which is intelligence, there is action - not a postponed action but immediate action. That is what I would like to talk over together, if we may, this morning, a little bit, and then we will go on to some other problems if we have time.

We are educated from childhood to exercise as deeply as possible every form of effort. If you observe yourself you will see what tremendous efforts we make to control ourselves, to suppress, to adjust, to modify ourselves to certain conclusions, pattern ourselves according to some patterns, or according to an objective

that you or another has established, and so there is this constant struggle. You must have noticed it. One lives with it, and one dies with it. And we are asking if it is possible to live, the daily life, without a single conflict? And as most of us are somewhat awakened to all the problems, political, religious, economic, social, ideological and so on, when we are a little bit aware of all that there must be discontent, and most of us are dissatisfied. When you are young this dissatisfaction becomes like a flame, and you have passion to do something: so you join some political party, the extreme left, the extreme revolutionary, the extreme forms of Jesus freaks and so on and so on and so on. And by joining, adopting certain attitudes, certain ideologies, that flame of discontent fades away, because you are then satisfied. You say, "This is what I want to do" and then you pour your heart into it. And gradually you find, if you are at all awake to all the problems involved, that it doesn't satisfy. But it is too late: you have already given half your life to something which you thought would be completely worthwhile, but when you find a little bit later on that it is not, then I am afraid one's energy, capacity, drive has withered away. One must have noticed our discontent with regard to politics, why we are governed, by whom we are governed, for what purpose are we governed, the discontent that questions the religious attitudes, the religious dogmas, the orthodoxy of the priest, the guru - the discontent questions it, doubts it. And gradually you like somebody, or some idea, or your girl-friend says that this is the right thing to do old boy, go after it, and as you want to please her you adjust yourself to that pattern. So gradually this real flame of discontent withers away. You must have noticed it in yourself, in

your children, in young people, and the old - you see the pattern that has followed on all the time, generation after generation.

We are talking over together, I am not laying down the law, we are investigating, exploring into something that is really worthwhile if you go into it very, very deeply. Most of us fortunately, if you are at all alive to things, are discontented, and not to allow this discontent to be squashed, destroyed by the desire to be satisfied, by the desire to adjust oneself to the environment, to the establishment, or to a new ideal, to a Utopia. But to allow this flame to keep on burning, not be satisfied with anything, then the superficial satisfactions have no place. This very dissatisfaction is demanding something much greater than the ideals, the gurus, the religions, the establishment, all ecology that becomes totally superficial. And that very flame of discontent, because it has no outlet, because it has no object in which it can fulfil itself, that flame becomes a great passion. And that passion is this intelligence. You are following? Am I making this clear - not verbally? Is it clear to you, who must be dissatisfied - with your husband, with your wife, your girl-friend, or boy, with the society, with the environment, with all the ugly things that are going on in the name of politics, government. If you are not caught in some of these superficial things, reactionary, essentially reactionary, all of them, then that extraordinary flame is intensified. And that intensity brings about a quality of mind that has a deep insight instantly into things, and therefore from that there is action.

So as most of us are here, and I hope it is a fact, that you who are here are dissatisfied. Right? Why are you governed? By whom are you governed, for what purpose are you governed? That is one

question. Why do you accept religious patterns of any kind - whether it is the religious patterns of the ancient Hindus, their tradition, their superstition, their authority, their worship of tradition, or the Zen Buddhism, Zen meditation, or the transcendental meditation, everything - not to be satisfied? It doesn't make you nervous. It doesn't bring about imbalance. There is imbalance only when this dissatisfaction is translated, or caught in a trap of some kind or another, then there is distortion, then there are all kinds of fights, inwardly.

So since you are here, and you must obviously, if I may point out, you must be dissatisfied, including with what we are saying - that's right. And to be aware of this flame and not allow superficial temptations and be caught by them. Right? Are we doing this now as we are talking it over together? Or having been caught in these various traps, can you put them aside, wipe them out, destroy them - do what you like but have this tremendous flame of discontent now? It doesn't mean that you go and throw bombs at people, destroy, physical revolution, violence, but when you put aside all the traps that man has created around you, and that you have created for yourself, then this flame becomes a supreme intelligence. And that intelligence gives you insight. And when you have insight, from that there is immediate action. Right? Are you following something. Right sirs? I am very keen on this because to me action is not tomorrow. An action - which has been a great problem with a great many people, with deep thinkers - an action without cause, action without motive, action not dependent on some ideology, which ideology is in the future and there is constant adjustment to that ideology, therefore there is conflict. So it has

been one of the demands of serious people to find out if there is an action which is per se, for itself, which is without cause and motive. I don't know if you have ever asked this question of yourself - and I hope you are asking it now. Is there an action in life, in daily life, in which there is no motive, there is no cause, and therefore, see what is implied in it, no regrets, no retention of those regrets and all the sequence that follows from that regret, it doesn't depend on some past or future?

So one is asking: is there an action, in daily life - the daily life which we know, what it means, what is involved in it, where action is always free? And this action is possible only when there is insight born of intelligence. Right? I wonder if you get it? Am I making it clear? Verbally perhaps, but dig deeply, have an insight in it, into what the speaker is saying?

So our question then is: is it possible to live a daily life without any conflict whatsoever? Most people would say you must have conflict otherwise there is no growth. Part of life is conflict. A tree in a forest fights, struggles to reach the sun. That is a form of conflict. Every animal and so on makes conflict, but we are human beings, supposed to be intelligent, supposed to be educated, supposed to have sufficient knowledge, historical, and yet we are constantly in conflict. Now discontent says, "Why should I be in conflict?" You understand? Are you doing this now?

We are educated to conflict - conflict implies comparison, imitation, conformity, adjustment to a pattern, modified continuity of what has been through the present to the future. Right? All this is a process of conflict. The deeper the conflict the more neurotic one becomes. And therefore not to have conflict at all. One



believes in something most deeply, you believe in god most deeply and say "His will be done" - and we create a monstrous world. Right? - which is his will being done! And conflict implies, as I said, comparison. To live without comparison - you understand? Please do it now. Which means no ideal, no authority of a pattern, no conformity to a particular idea or ideology, and therefore freedom from the prison of ideas. Right? Are you doing it? So that there is no comparison, no imitation, no conformity, therefore you are stuck with 'what is' - right? Actually 'what is'. Because comparison comes only when you compare 'what is' with 'what should be', or 'what might be' or try to transform 'what is' into something which it is not. All this implies conflict. Right?

Thousands go to India, from America and from Europe, to find enlightenment, to find the real guru, because they realize their religions, their outlook is very limited, materialistic, and India is supposed to be tremendously spiritual - which it is not - and there people go and try to find out. The guru, the patterns, the traditions say, "Do this, then that" - conformity. And they try every way - which is to bring about greater conflict in themselves. Right? This is what is happening right throughout the world. And so we are asking: is it possible to live without conflict? Now, it is possible when you have an insight into what is being said; to find out actually, in daily life, to live without comparison. Right? Therefore you remove a tremendous burden. Right? I wonder if you see that? And if you remove the burden of comparison, imitation, conformity, adjustment, modification, then you are left with 'what is'. Right?

Conflict exists only when you try to do something with 'what is'.

Right? May I go on? When you try to transform it, modify it, change it, or suppress it, run away from it, then conflict arises. But if you have an insight into 'what is' then conflict ceases. You understand? Are you doing it? When there is no comparison, and so on, then you are left with 'what is'. Conflict arises only when you are moving away from 'what is'. Right? And what happens with 'what is'? I'll show you.

One is greedy, or envious, or violent. The fact is that you are violent, greedy, envious - that is a fact. The non-fact is non-violence, you must not be greedy, you must be noble, etc., etc. So there is movement away from 'what is' and therefore that is conflict. Come on, sirs! So when you do not move away from 'what is', when thought does not move away then there is only 'what is'. Right? I am violent - one is violent. That is a fact. There is no escape from it whatsoever, suppressing all the violence, which is another form of violence. So you are left with violence, or with greed, or with envy. Can you have an insight into violence? Violence implies conflict, violence implies running away from 'what is', violence implies having an ideal of non-violence. So when you put away all that, you are left with 'what is', and to have an insight into that. That is, that can only happen - please follow this, give your heart to this - that can only happen when you are completely free from any form of having a desire to change 'what is'. Right? You understand this? Are we all together in this? Or am I just talking to myself? Please, life is very short. To find out a way of living which is righteous, and righteousness is only when there is no conflict; and how do you have an insight into 'what is'? You understand my question? We are governed - why are we governed?

What is government? You follow? Everything. And that is 'what is'. And how do you have an insight into 'what is'? Which is - I am taking an example of violence - all forms of government are violent - the extreme right, and the extreme left or even the centre. There is violence. Human beings are violent. They say it is part of man's nature, and therefore you must accept it. Being aware one doesn't accept anything, we question. We said the day before yesterday that there is the art of doubt. The art of doubt is to let doubt express itself and also to learn when not to.

So how does one have an insight into this, into violence? Without analysis - you understand, you see the problem? Because if you analyse, as we went into it, if you escape from it, and so on, they are all forms of the activity of thought which avoids the solution of 'what is'. Right? Are you understanding? For god's sake, come on! And how do I, or you, have an insight into this question of violence? What is the state of the mind - please listen - what is the state of your mind when you are looking at 'what is'? You understand what I am saying? I am asking you: what is the state of your mind when you are not escaping, not trying to transform, or deform 'what is'? What is the state of that mind that is looking? I may say something that may be shocking, but please go into it with me. The state of the mind that has an insight is completely empty. Right? Because it is free from escapes, free from suppression, analysis and so on. So when all these burdens are taken away - right - because you see the absurdity of them, it is like taking away a heavy burden, so there is freedom. Freedom implies an emptiness to observe. Right? And that emptiness gives you insight into violence - not the various forms of violence, but the whole nature

of violence and the structure of violence, and therefore there is immediate action about violence, which means you are free completely from all violence. You get it? For god's sake get it. Is your mind, when you look at 'what is', greed, envy, jealousy, whatever it is, is it empty to observe so that there is instant insight and action, and therefore freedom from 'what is' - get it?

We are not playing intellectual games, or analytical games. We are concerned with the awakening of intelligence. As I said, intelligence means, according to the dictionary, reading between the lines. See what is implied in reading between the lines. You must be so awakened so as not to be caught by words, but to see clearly, see the clarity in which there is no print. Do you get it? I wonder? Because in between the lines there is no printing, and there is only white space, which is clarity. And that clarity, if you have it, gives you insight into what is being said on the page. Insight implies observing 'what is' with a mind that is completely free and therefore empty to observe 'what is' - and therefore you have an insight. That is, when you are violent - please follow this - when you are violent and you do not escape from violence, avoid it, try to transform it into some nonsensical non-violence and so on and so on, then you are free of all that burden. Being free the mind is empty, that emptiness gives you insight. And when you have insight into violence you are no longer violent. You see without effort - that is what I want to get at. Are you all too old to follow this?

So we are pointing out that it is possible to live, a daily life, in which there is not a shadow of conflict. You know what it means to live a life without conflict? Find out for yourself what it means.

Because conflict is the strengthening of the self, the 'me', and therefore there is separation - the 'me' and the 'you', we and they. You understand? So it is possible to live a life without conflict - not because the speaker says so but because you, you have discovered it, the truth of it, not mine nor yours.

So from discontent not to allow that flame to be smothered through any trap, and to understand the nature and the structure of insight. And that can only happen when you are not caught in any trap. Right?

Now we can move to something else. Is this very clear? Can I go on to something else? Next week we are going to discuss, have a dialogue about all these questions - dialogue, a conversation between two friendly people. I hope you are friends. So we are going to have a dialogue. So if there is anything that is not clear let's discuss it, talk about it.

The other thing that I would like to go into this morning is sorrow. We have talked about authority. We have talked over together about the desire for security, the nature and the structure of authority. We have talked about fear, pleasure, love. And if we may, we should also talk over together this enormous problem of suffering. I hope you are not tired - are you? We are going to have an insight into suffering.

There is not only a particular human being with his suffering but there is the suffering of the world. Right? There is suffering through poverty, ignorance; there is suffering brought about through death; there is suffering out of great pity; there is suffering when you see animals tortured, killed, maimed; there is suffering when there is war, thousands of mothers and sisters and wives,

girls crying their hearts out because we have accepted war - I don't know why we have accepted it, but we have. So wars have brought about immense suffering. The totalitarian, the authoritarian dictators have brought immense suffering - concentration camps, one may not have been in them but you see it, one knows it is happening and you suffer.

So there are these various kinds of suffering, not only personal but the suffering of the whole of humanity. You are aware of it, aren't you? And we have accepted it. We say love is part of suffering. When you love somebody it brings about suffering. Right? So we are going to question together whether it is possible to be free of all suffering; and when there is this freedom from suffering in the consciousness of each human being who is listening here, then that freedom from suffering brings about a transformation in consciousness and therefore that consciousness, that radical change in consciousness, affects the whole of mankind's suffering. You understand? That is part of compassion - not saying, "I suffer, my god, my god, my god, why do I suffer? Why should I suffer"? - and from that suffering act neurotically and try to escape from that suffering through various forms of religious, intellectual, social work and so on - escape from it. So we are saying: is it possible for every human being here to be free of this enormous burden of suffering? Where there is suffering you cannot possibly love. That is a truth, a law. When you love somebody and he or she does something of which you totally disapprove, you suffer, and it shows that you don't love. Right? You understand? I am not laying down the law, but see the truth of it. How can I suffer when my wife - if I have a wife, or a girl - who

throws me away and goes after somebody else? You understand? And we suffer from that. We get angry, jealous, envious, hateful; and at the same time we say, "I love my wife" - or my girl. I say such love is not love. Right? So is it possible not to suffer, and yet have immense love, the flowering of it?

So we are going to find out what suffering is. There is physical suffering. Right? Headaches, operations, malformed bodies, accidents that bring about amputations, some form of ugly deformity. There is suffering from the various unfulfilled desires - I hope you are following all this. There is suffering from the loss of a person whom you think you love. After all what is the structure and the nature and the essence of suffering? You understand? The essence of it, not the various forms of it. What is the essence of suffering? I am asking myself for the first time. I am going to find out, together we are going to find out. Is it not the total expression at that moment of complete self-centred existence? What do you say? It is the essence of the 'me', the essence of the ego, the person, the limited, enclosed, resisting existence which you call the 'me' - the form, the name, all that. When there is an incident that demands investigation and understanding, an insight, that very incident brings about the awakening of the 'me', the essence, and that I call suffering. What do you say? If there was no me, would you suffer? You would help, you would do all kinds of things, but you wouldn't suffer.

So suffering then is the expression of the 'me', which includes self-pity, loneliness, trying to escape, trying to be with the other who is gone - all that is implied which is the very me, which is the past. The image of the past which is me, the knowledge, the

remembrance of the past, which is me. So what relationship has suffering, the essence of the 'me', to love? Please think it out, let's think it out together. We are asking: is there any relationship between love and suffering? Is love put together by thought, whereas the 'me' is put together by thought. Oh, come on! I see something. Are you following?

Is love put together by thought - the experience, the memories, the remembrances, the pain, the delight, the pleasures, and the pursuit of pleasure, sexual or otherwise, the pleasures of possession, possessing somebody and the somebody liking being possessed - all that is the structure of thought, which we have gone into? And the 'me' with its name, with its form, the essence of me is the nature and structure put together by thought. Obviously. So what is the relationship between love and suffering? If love is not put together by thought - please go into this, put your heart into this - if love is not put together by thought then suffering has no relationship to it, therefore action from love is different from action from suffering - get it? Why am I so intense about all this? Why aren't you so intense?

So to have an insight - please follow this - to have an insight into suffering, which means what place has thought in relationship to love, and in relationship to suffering? Right? To have an insight into it, which means you are neither escaping, wanting comfort, frightened to be lonely, isolated, therefore your mind is free; therefore that which is free is empty. And therefore if you have that emptiness, which means freedom, you have an insight into suffering. Therefore suffering as the 'me' disappears. There is immediate action because that is so. So your action then is from



love, not from suffering. Do you get what I am talking about?

Then one discovers that action from suffering is a continual action of the 'me' modified, and therefore constant conflict. Right? You can see the logic of it all, the reason for it. So it is possible to love without a shadow of suffering. And what is the action of compassion? You understand? If love is not the result of thought, thought which is the response of memory stored up in the brain as knowledge and experience, that thought is not love, and our action is based on thought. Now I must do this, this is my motive, I will - you follow - it is based on the movement and the modification of thought. When thought is not love, then what is the action of compassion, love? We can say then, from there, what is the action of an insight out of which there is intelligence? We are saying compassion is intelligence. What is the action of intelligence - which is not the outcome of thought? Right? What is the action of intelligence? Can one ask such a question? If you have intelligence it is operating, it is functioning, it is acting. But if you say, what is the action of intelligence, you want thought to be satisfied. Right? You see what I mean? When you say what is the action of compassion - who is asking it? Is it not thought? Is it not the 'me' that is saying, if I could have this compassion I would act differently? Therefore when you put that question you are still thinking in terms of thought. But with an insight into thought then thought has its right place and intelligence then acts. Have you got it?

Is that enough for this morning? It is enough for me, for the speaker. So you see sirs what is implied in all this: how important it is that there should be a radical revolution, psychological

revolution, because no politics, no government, no Lenin, Marx, nobody is going to solve any of our problems - the human problems from which every misery comes, from the human being who is functioning, living, operating, acting on thought. And when you have an insight into thought then you also have an insight into the nature and the beauty of love; and then action from that.

There is a nice story of a preacher, a teacher - perhaps some of you have heard it from me, if you have please forgive me for repeating it - there was a teacher and his disciples. Every morning he used to talk to the disciples, give a sermon. And one morning he gets on the rostrum, on the pedestal, and was just about to begin when a bird comes in and sits on the window sill and begins to sing. And the preacher stops talking and listens to the bird, the beauty of the sound, the blue sky and the quietness of the song. And the bird flies away. So he turns to his disciples and says, "The morning sermon is over".

# **BROCKWOOD PARK 3RD PUBLIC TALK 3RD SEPTEMBER 1977**

May we go on with what we were talking about last Sunday?

Please let me remind you, if I may once again, this is not an entertainment, or an intellectual affair, but we are concerned with the whole existence of man. Whether a human being can ever be free from his travail, with his efforts, with his anxieties, violence and the brutality, and if there is an end to sorrow. That is what we are going to talk over together this morning: whether there is an ending to sorrow and the whole complex problem of what is death. Because we have already dealt with, or gone into pretty thoroughly the question of fear, pleasure, and also to find out what love is.

And before we go into this question of suffering I think we should be able to think together over this problem - think in the sense that both of us together should be free from our prejudices, from our convictions, from our beliefs, and investigate together, if that is possible, if you are willing, to go into this enormous problem of what is suffering. Why human beings throughout the ages have maintained and sustained, and put up with suffering. And whether there is an ending to all that. Because as we said, when there is suffering there is no love: and without love there is no compassion, no clarity. And out of that clarity and compassion comes the skill that is not cultivating the importance of the self. So if we may, we are going together, freely, to investigate this question of suffering.

And one must also be free of all ideologies. Ideologies are dangerous illusions, whether they are political, social, or religious, or personal. Every form of ideology either ends up in

totalitarianism, or a religious conditioning, like the Catholic, the Protestant, the Hindu, the Buddhist and so on, and therefore it becomes a much greater burden. So to really go into this enormous question of suffering, and love, and death, one must be free from all ideologies. I wonder if you will be free for this morning at least, to be free completely of your convictions, be free completely, wholly of any ideal, ideology - what should be, what must be - and your personal convictions. You may have experienced a great deal and perhaps those experiences have led you, or brought about certain definite conclusions, images. But to enquire into this question one must be utterly free of all this, otherwise it leads us to illusion. And I hope we see that clearly and we can proceed from there to enquire why human beings throughout the world suffer and have tolerated this suffering, and whether it is at all possible to end all suffering. Obviously there is biological, physiological suffering, but that suffering distorts the mind if one is not very, very careful. So we are talking about psychological suffering of mankind.

In investigating suffering we are investigating into the suffering of man, because each one of us is the essence of all humanity. I hope that at least one is clear on that point, that you are psychologically, inwardly, deeply like the rest of mankind. They suffer, they go through a great deal of anxiety, uncertainty, confusion, violence, a great sense of grief, loss, loneliness, as all of us do. So there is no division psychologically between us all. We are the world, psychologically, and the world is us. That is not a conviction, that is not a conclusion, that is not an intellectual theory but an actuality, to be felt, to be realized and to live it.

So in investigating this question of sorrow we are going to

investigate not only your personal limited sorrow but also the sorrow of mankind. So please in investigating this don't let us reduce it to a personal thing, because when you see the enormous suffering of mankind, in the understanding of the enormity of it, the wholeness of it, then our own part has a role in it. So it is not a selfish enquiry: how am I, or you to be free of sorrow. If you make it personal, limited then we will not understand the full significance of the enormity of sorrow.

In opposition to sorrow there is happiness, like in our consciousness there is the good and the bad. In our consciousness there is sorrow and a sense of happiness. Now we are enquiring not as an opposite to happiness, but sorrow itself. I hope we are somewhat clear on this point. Because the opposites contain each other: if the good is the outcome of the bad, then the good contains the bad. And if sorrow is the opposite of happiness, gladness, enjoyment and so on, all the rest of it, then the enquiry into sorrow has its root in happiness. So we are enquiring into sorrow per se, for itself, not as an opposite to something else. May we go on with this?

Now if I may, we are thinking together. Not that you must accept or reject what the speaker is saying, but rather together being free of our particular idiosyncracies, tendencies, conclusions, together investigate. Then it is fun, then it is a movement together. But if you hold on to your particular belief, or prejudice or this or that then there is no movement of being together. Because the speaker, if he may point out a little bit, has no beliefs, no conclusions, no theories, no ideologies, so one is free to enquire, to look, to observe. In observing sorrow it is important to understand

how one observes. I think this is very, very important. The nature and the movement of observation - how you look at your sorrow. If you are looking at it as though it were different from you then there is a division between you and that which you call sorrow. But is that sorrow different from you? Is the observer of sorrow different from sorrow itself, or the observer is sorrow? It is not he is free from sorrow and then looks at sorrow, or identifies with sorrow, but is not sorrow in the field of the observer, he is sorrow. So the observer becomes the observed. The experiencer is the experienced. The thinker is the thought. There is no division between the observer who says "I am sorrow" and divides himself and then tries to do something about sorrow - run away from it, seek comfort, suppress it and all the various means of transcending sorrow. Whereas if the observer is the observed, which is a fact, like when you are angry that anger is not different from you. You are that anger. So you eliminate altogether the division that brings about conflict. You understand? This is really very important to understand, if one may insist on this. Because we are traditionally brought up, educated, to think the observer is something totally different from the observed. He is the analyser therefore he can analyse. But the analyser is the analysed. So in this perception there is no division between the observer and the observed, between the thinker and the thought. There is no thought without the thinker. If there is no thinker there is no thought. They are one.

So we are investigating together into this question, not something opposed to pleasure - pain, grief - pleasure opposed to sorrow, but we are investigating sorrow itself. That is, the observer is observed, so he is observing, he is not dictating what sorrow is,

he is not telling what sorrow should be, or not be, he is just observing without any choice, without any movement of thought.

So we are observing the nature and the movement of sorrow. There are various kinds of sorrow - the man that has no work, the man that will always remain poor, the man who will never enjoy clean clothes, fresh bath, as it happens among the poor. There are various kinds of sorrow such as ignorance, the sorrow you see when children are maltreated, the sorrow when animals are killed, the vivisection and all the rest of it. There is sorrow of war, which affects the whole of mankind. There is sorrow when someone whom you like or love dies. There is the sorrow of failure. There is the sorrow of the desire to fulfil and the failure and frustration of that. So there are multiple kinds of sorrow. Right? Do we deal with all the multiple expressions of sorrow, or deal with the root of sorrow? You understand my question? Do we take each expression of sorrow - and there are multiple varieties of sorrow, or go to the very root of sorrow? Because if we took the multiple expressions of sorrow there will be no end. But whereas you may trim them, diminish them but they will always remain outside. But if you could look at the multiple branches of sorrow and through that observation go into the very root of sorrow - from the outside go inside - then we can examine what is the root, the cause. And is there a cause for sorrow? And what is sorrow? You understand? May we go on? Please don't be mesmerized by my seriousness, or by my voice, or the way I look. Because to me, personally, it is a very, very serious matter because if I do not end sorrow there is no love in our hearts. You may pity others, you may be troubled by the slaughter that is going on, not only human beings but whales

and baby seals and all the rest of the horrors that human beings perpetrate. So it is very important to find out for yourself through examination, through talking over together whether there can be an end to this enormous weight of mankind.

So please we are journeying together into this question. As we said, it is very important to learn how to observe: to learn. That is, not to memorize, because that becomes mechanical, but to learn to observe, not to accumulate - the art of observation, which is to observe without any distortion. And there is distortion only when there is fear, when you say, I must get rid of sorrow. Or when you seek comfort because you are suffering and you hope there will be an end to suffering, and that hope gives you a certain sense of comfort. All these factors distort the enquiry into this great question. It requires a peculiar discipline of its own, so the mind is capable of looking at itself. As we talked, whether thought is aware of itself, your consciousness, aware of its own content. If it is aware of itself then it can move greatly, but if you impose on consciousness its content, saying these are its content and learn about the content then that becomes mechanical. That doesn't lead anywhere.

So we are enquiring into this question of what is sorrow, and whether there is an end to sorrow. What is sorrow? Why does one suffer? Is it that one has lost something that one had? Or there is suffering because you have been promised a reward and that reward has not been given? Because we are traditionally educated through reward and punishment. And we are asking: is there sorrow because we have no rewards, heavenly or earthly rewards? Does one suffer because of self pity? Because you have not the



things that somebody else has? You are not so bright, clever, intelligent, nice looking as the other, therefore through comparison is there suffering? Please follow all this. Do you suffer because through comparison, measurement, you suffer? Do you suffer because through limitation you have not been able to achieve that which you are trying to imitate? Is there suffering because you are trying to conform to a pattern and never reaching that pattern fully, completely? So one asks very deeply what is suffering, and why does one suffer?

And also one must be very careful in examination whether the word sorrow itself weighs down on man? The word itself. We have praised sorrow. We have romanticized about sorrow. We have made sorrow into something that is essential in order to find reality. You must go through suffering to find something, to find love, pity, compassion. So we seek through suffering a reward. And does the word suffering, sorrow, does it bring about the feeling of sorrow? Please examine all this as we are going along. Or independent of the word and the stimulation of that word, the reaction of that word, is there sorrow by itself? This is not an intellectual exercise, but in examination you have to ask all these questions. If you are asking it intellectually then you won't go very far. But if it is a matter of tremendous crisis in one's life, as it is, when there is sorrow it is a challenge, and all your energy is brought into being. But we dissipate that energy by running away, comfort, explanations, karma, this that, ten different explanations. So as this is a challenge - which is, what is sorrow? Is there an ending to sorrow? It is a challenge. And either you respond completely to it - and you can only do that when you have no fear,

when you are not caught up in the machinery of pleasure, when you are not escaping from it, seeking comfort, but responding to it with all your energy - then that response is the expression of your totality of your energy. Right? Because sorrow is a tremendous challenge.

In the understanding of the cause of sorrow does sorrow disappear? I may say to myself, I am full of self-pity, and if I can end self-pity there will be no sorrow. So I work at getting rid of it because I see how silly it is, and I try to suppress it and I worry about it like a dog does with a bone. And thereby intellectually I think I am free from sorrow. But the uncovering, the cause of sorrow is not the ending of sorrow. The searching of the cause of sorrow is a wastage of energy; sorrow is there, demanding your tremendous attention. It is a challenge asking you to act. But instead of that we say, let me look at the cause, let me find out, is it this, that or the other? I may be mistaken, let me talk it over with others, or read some book which will tell me what the real cause is. But all this is moving away from the actual act, actual response to that challenge. You understand? So we are asking: what is the root of sorrow? If our mind, which is the movement of thought, is looking into its memory and responding according to that memory, which is according to that previous knowledge, then you are acting not to the challenge, but you are responding from the memory of the past. I wonder if you see this? Please stay with this for a few minutes and you will see the importance of this.

I am in sorrow, my son, my wife or the social conditions, the poverty, the brutality of man, brings about a great sorrow in me. And it wants a response, a complete response from me as a human

being who represents the totality of humanity - and I mean the totality of humanity. And thought responds to the challenge - thought - and says, I must find out how to respond to it. I have had sorrow before and I know all the meaning, the suffering and the pain, the anxiety, the loneliness of sorrow, and the remembrance of that, and according to that remembrance I respond. Therefore I am not responding, acting. I am responding from a memory. I wonder if you see that. Therefore it is not actual response. May we go on a little bit? Please, do this. I hope you are doing this, actually seeing the fact that any response to that challenge from memory is no response at all, it is a mere reaction. It is not action, it is a reaction. If you once see that then the question is: what is the root of it all, not the cause? There is a difference between causation, when there is a cause there is an effect - right? And the effect becomes the cause - right? There is the cause, from the cause there is an effect, which is the action, that effect becomes the cause for the next action. So it is a chain - cause, effect and that effect becomes the cause to the next effect, and so on. So when the mind is caught in this limited chain, and it is always limited, then your response to that challenge will be very limited. I wonder if you see all this? May I go on? Do you understand a little bit? I hope I am making this clear. If I am not making it clear I will go over it again ten times in different ways because it is very important, because to act to that challenge without a time interval - the time interval is the response of memory. Are you doing it?

You know what sorrow is - all of us know it, every human being in the world knows what sorrow is. So you know it very well. You may not actually have had any sorrow, but you see

others round you and the enormity of sorrow of mankind - the global sorrow of mankind. And if you respond to that according to your conditioning, according to your past memory, then you are then caught in an action that is always time-binding. The challenge and response demands no time interval. I wonder if you see this. Therefore there is instant action. So that is what we are enquiring into. That is, what is the root of sorrow? We are not trying to find out the cause but the very substance, the very nature, the very movement of sorrow.

As we said, fear is time. Fear, we said, is the movement of thought, thought as measure. So thought is the response of memory, experience, knowledge, and that thought is limited and so it is a movement in time. So if there is no time there is no fear. You understand this? I am afraid I might die; that is, I might in the future, I am living now but I might die. So that is a time interval. But if there was no time interval at all there is no fear. I wonder if you see this? So in the same way, is the root of sorrow time - time being the movement of thought, time is thought? And if there is no thought at all when you respond to that challenge, is there suffering? I wonder if you see? Please, again, let's forget science fiction, and also forget, put away for the time being, your ideas about time, sorrow, fear and all the rest of it, your conclusions, what you have read about sorrow, and reincarnation - everything, forget all that, and begin again as though you know nothing about sorrow, as though you really - though you suffer - have no answer to it. Then we can begin together. But you are so conditioned to put sorrow on somebody else. Christianity has done that beautifully. Go to church and you see all the suffering in that figure. The

Christians have given all their suffering over to somebody. And they think by that they have understood the whole circus of sorrow. And in India and the Asiatic countries they have also another form of evasion - karma - I won't go into all that business. So here we are not doing that. Here we are trying to face the actual movement at the moment of sorrow, and to be completely choicelessly aware of that thing.

We are asking: is time, which is thought, is that the fundamental issue that makes sorrow flower? So we are asking: is thought responsible for suffering? Not only the suffering of others, the brutality of others, the total ignorance of this whole movement of the self, is that the movement of thought - thought being the past? There is no new thought, there is no free thought, there is only thought, which is the response of knowledge as experience, stored up in the brain as memory, and that responds. Now if that is the fact, if that is true: that is, sorrow is the outcome of time and thought; if that is a fact, not a supposition then you are responding to sorrow without the 'me'. Aren't you? The 'me' is put together by thought - my name, my form, how I look, my qualities, my reactions, all the things that are required, it is all put together by thought surely? So that thought is me. Thought is me. So time is me, the self, the ego, the personality, all that is the movement of time as me. When there is no time - you understand - when you respond to this challenge of suffering and there is no me, is there suffering? I wonder if you see this?

Isn't all sorrow based on me? The individual, the personality, the ego, the self says, "I suffer", "I am lonely", "I am anxious", "I have lost my son and I put all my energy, love into that one basket

and now he is gone, and I am lonely" - you follow - this whole movement, this whole structure is me, is thought. And thought says, I am not only me but I am a superior me. There is something far superior than this thought which is still the movement of thought.

So there is an ending to sorrow when there is no me. Right? Now we will come back to it a little later if time allows.

Now we are going to talk over together the question of what is death. Again, please, if I may point out, one doesn't know what it means. Right? You can begin with that. You may have speculated about it, you may have read about it, you may have had your own conclusions about it but actually you have never realized what death is - obviously not. So when you are looking at this question of death don't bring in your secondhand knowledge - because all of us are secondhand human beings, or third-hand, or umpteenth-hand. So can we look at this problem as though we did not know a thing about it? Then you can find out. But if you come to it with a great deal of knowledge, then you are informing death what it is! Which is so absurd. But whereas if one comes to it totally not knowing then you begin to enquire quite differently. Right? You begin with uncertainty and therefore when there is uncertainty you end up with complete certainty. But we are certain first and end up in doubt. So we are starting not knowing whether it is a shoddy little affair called death - one has seen a thousand deaths. One has known the death of someone very close to you; or the death of millions through atomic bombs - Hiroshima and all the rest of this horror man has perpetuated on other human beings in the name of peace, in the name of ideologies - they are all ideologies. So doubt,

put away every form of ideology because they are dangerous illusions, political, social and so on or the capitalist.

So, without any ideology, without any conclusion, not knowing, we are going together to find out. Which is: what is death? What is the thing that dies? What is the thing that terminates? And also in enquiring one sees, if there is something that is continuous then it becomes mechanical. If there is an ending to everything there is a new beginning. I wonder if you see this. So we are enquiring without fear. And if you are afraid then you cannot possibly find out what this immense thing called death is. It must be the most extraordinary thing.

To find out what is death we must also enquire into not what is after death, but what is before death. Surely that is much more important isn't it? We never do that. We never enquire what is living. You follow? Death is coming but what is living? Is this living, this enormous suffering, fear, anxiety, sorrow and all the rest of it, is that living? And because we cling to that we are afraid of the other. Right? So before we ask what is death, we must also ask what is living, because if you don't know what is living you won't know what is death. They must go together apparently. If one can find out what is living, what is the full meaning of living, the totality of living, the wholeness of living because then the brain is capable of understanding the wholeness of death. But we are enquiring into the meaning of death, without enquiring into the meaning of life. You understand?

Now when one asks what is the meaning of life, you immediately have conclusions. You say, it is this, some ideology. Right? You give it a significance according to your conditioning. If

you are an idealist - I hope you are not - if you are an idealist you give the ideological significance according to your conditioning, according to your conclusions, according to what you have read and so on. So is living a conclusion, an ideology? You follow? Come on sirs. I hope you are doing this actually, not theoretically because then you will see if you are not giving significance to life, if you are not saying life is this and this and this, or something else, an ideal, then you are free - you see what happens when you are free of ideologies, then you are free of systems - political, religious, social, the social ideology and so on. So before we enquire into the meaning of what is death, we are asking what is living. Is what we are living, living? Our constant struggle with each other? Trying to understand each other? Trying to understand the speaker? You understand? He has said this and what does he mean? Is that living? Is it living according to a book? According to some psychologist?

So if you banish all that totally then we will begin with 'what is'. 'What is', is that our living has become a tremendous torture, a tremendous battle between human beings, man, woman, neighbour, whether he is close or very far. It is a conflict in which there is occasional freedom to look at the blue sky, to see something lovely and enjoy it and be happy for a while. But the cloud of struggle begins soon. And all this we call living - going to the church, doing mass, the mass there, and the traditional repetition, a meaningless repetition, accepting some ideologies - you follow? This is what we call living. And we are so committed to this. Right? We accept this. We are not discontented completely with all that. So discontentment has its significance. Real discontentment, not I



want to play the guitar and I must play it until midnight, it doesn't matter whether you sleep or not - that is not discontent - all that childish stuff. Discontent is a flame and one suppresses it by childish acts, by momentary satisfactions, but discontent when you let it flow, arise, keep it, it burns away everything that is not true.

So can one live a life that is whole, not fragmented, a life in which thought doesn't divide the living, the family, the office. You follow? The church, the god, this and that - it is all divided, broken up? The word whole means healthy, sane and holy, the meaning of that word itself. And we have lost all that. And when death comes we are appalled by it, we are shocked by it. And when it comes, it generally comes for others, not for oneself, when it comes your mind is incapable of meeting it because you have not lived a total life. You understand? I wonder if you understand all this? A life that is whole, complete, true.

In this you also have to enquire: what is beauty? You are interested in all this? Aren't you tired? As I was saying yesterday, I dig the hole and you are all watching! I am digging into the whole structure of human consciousness and if you are not co-operating, enquiring, looking then you will say, "I am not tired" - at the end of an hour - it must be an hour isn't it - obviously you must be terribly worn out because you are not used to this kind of thinking, looking, observing. We lead such superficial lives. So the mind has looked into itself, into its consciousness and has found out, sees the way it lives daily. And if it has not understood very deeply the whole way of living, which is totally different, you understand, the ending of all tradition, of all habits, all memories, all that, how can you understand what death is? Death comes and with that you cannot

argue, say, "Wait a few weeks more" - it is there. And can the mind meet it? That is, can the mind meet the end of everything while you are living, while you have vitality, the energy, full of life, because then you are not wasted in conflicts and worries and all the rest of that stuff, you are full of energy, clarity? And death means the ending of ending of all that you know, all your attachments, of all your bank accounts, of your this and that, completely end it. That is death. And can the mind, while living, meet such a state? You understand? Then you will understand the full meaning of what death is. If we cling to the idea of me, I must continue - the 'me' is put together by thought, so you are saying me and my consciousness in which there is the higher consciousness, the supreme consciousness - it is all put together by thought. And thought lives in the known. You understand? Thought is the outcome of the known so if there is not freedom from the known you cannot possibly find out what death is, which is the ending of everything. Both the physical organism with all its ingrained habits and so on, the identification with the body, with the name, with all the memories it has acquired - you cannot carry it over when you go to death. You must end it. As you cannot carry all your money, so in the same way you have to end everything you know. That means there is absolute aloneness - not loneliness but aloneness in the sense there is nothing else but that state of mind that is completely whole. Aloneness means all one.

So if you go as far as that, not intellectually but actually, which means no ideologies, political, socialistic - apparently these political ideologies end up in some form of totalitarianism - and when there is no ideology, when there is nothing left to which you

are attached, nothing, then that is death. But we are so frightened of this. We say, there must be some kind of continuity.

I don't think there is time to go into this question of what there is, if there is a continuity or not. Human beings want that continuity. What is the point of my living this whole life, fifty years, sixty or whatever it is, in which I have accumulated a lot of knowledge, a lot of experience, I have changed myself - this thing which thought has created, is that all when it ends? Is that the end of everything? So then thought says there must be something more. You follow sirs? Thought says there is something much more. So it has all kinds of comforting ideas. But when thought recognizes its own limitation, not imposed limitation, when thought itself is aware of its own time-binding quality, then thought has its right place, where knowledge has its right place - technology and so on and so on. But it has no place at all in the psychological world. When the psyche is totally non-existent, empty, that is death. Then there is a totally different - I mustn't promise! You are all ready for a reward. I just stopped myself in time! No, you don't see the importance of this. You know our minds are overcrowded, full with all kinds of knowledge and information, both psychologically as well as physiologically. It is good to have physiological and biological knowledge, the outside, the world of technology and so on, but thought has no place in the psychological world. It has no place anywhere else. But thought is always seeking - because it functions in fragmentation - it is always seeking an end. I wonder if you see this? It is always seeking a fragmentary end, something to gain, by doing this I will get that. Therefore when you have the promise of a reward you forget the means. There is only the means,

not the end. Right. That is enough.

## **BROCKWOOD PARK 4TH PUBLIC TALK 4TH SEPTEMBER 1977**

We have been talking over together last Saturday, Sunday, and yesterday, and during the discussions, questions and answers and so on, many of our human problems. Our consciousness, which is ourselves, is so filled with other people's ideas, with our own concepts and conclusions, with our fears, anxieties, pleasure, occasional flash of joy and sorrow, and a great many ideas. That is our consciousness, that is what we are. And if one may point out as we have been doing during the last fifty years and more, that ideas do not bring about a radical change in human consciousness. Idea - the root meaning of that word is to observe. What we do is to observe and make an abstraction of what we have seen into an idea, and live according to that idea. That has been the pattern of our existence.

We have been talking about the radical change in human consciousness, whether it is at all possible, and if it is not possible we are everlastingly living in a prison of our own ideas, our own concepts within a field where there is every kind of confusion, uncertainty, instability. And we seem to think if we move from one corner of that field to another, we think that we have greatly changed, but it is still in the same field. I think very few of us realize that fact: that as long as we live within that area of what we call our consciousness, however little change, or however great change within that field, there is no fundamental human transformation.

And meditation - that is what we are going to discuss this

morning - we are going to talk over together this question of meditation. I think one should be very clear about certain things: ideations, or ideologies however clever, however thought out, ultimately bring about dangerous illusions, whether they are the ideologies of the right or centre or the extreme left, they all either end up in great bureaucracies controlling man, or concentration camps, or the destruction of moulding man according to a particular concept. This is what is happening throughout the world. And the intellectuals have led us up to this point, right throughout the world. They have accepted with a great delight and a great energy the whole ideological concept of Marxism, Maoism, and so on. And they have all led to a great deal of confusion, misery, concentration camps and all the rest of it - whether to the right or the left, or the centre.

And we have also been prisoners of religious ideas, ideologies, the Catholic, the Hindu, the Buddhists and so on. Or the traditional acceptance of the gurus with their modern modifications of the ancient traditions, with their ideologies. And they are also becoming prisoners of those ideologies.

So if one observes all this carefully, impersonally, objectively, one must put away all ideologies. And then if you have no ideologies how do we act? That is one of the problems which we more or less talked about some time ago. Actions based on ideologies are immoral because you are then conforming to a particular pattern. Is morality, ethics, the acceptance of authority and following certain laid down policies of ideologies and so on; or is morality something totally free from all ideologies? And we are going to talk over together this morning this question which

unfortunately has been brought to this country and the various western countries by so-called gurus, with their ideas of meditation.

So can we talk over together this morning this question? That is, we are both of us thinking together, investigating together. There is no authority here though the speaker sits on a platform, it doesn't give him any authority. Please let's be quite sure of that. Because if there is authority there is no freedom. And without freedom there is no compassion, there is no clarity, there is no skill in action - which we have talked about a great deal. So we are on the same level, at the same time, with the same intensity, investigating this. When we are at the same level, at the same time, with the same intensity, that is love. And without love we cannot possibly understand this very complex problem of what is meditation - not how to meditate, that is too absurd, but what is the meaning and the significance of meditation? So we are both of us freely enquiring into this - not that you have learnt something from somebody - how to meditate, which may be like practising on a piano all the time.

So in enquiring into this very complex problem one must ask for oneself whether the content of consciousness, which is what we are, with all our conflicts, struggles, confusions, misery and occasional happiness, whether that consciousness can become aware of itself and empty itself? That is one problem in meditation.

The other is the question of time, which is: is there psychological progress? That is, is there psychological evolution? That's one point. And the other is space: whether there is space in which there is no direction, in which there is no centre. We are going to enquire into all this. And we are also going to enquire

what is beauty? Because otherwise without beauty there is no love. And also we are going to enquire if there is anything sacred, holy. This is the whole movement of our investigation. Which is, whether consciousness with all its content, which makes up our consciousness, whether it can be totally, completely emptied? And the question of time: which is the psychological time which gives us the idea that we shall gradually progress, evolve, become better. The whole concept of that.

And is the flowering of goodness, is it a matter of time? And is goodness the opposite of that which is not good? And we also have to enquire into the question of space. I am repeating the three things so that we know the whole thing that we are talking about. And whether there is beauty - beauty not of things, of ideas, of structure, but beauty in itself - fundamentally is there anything that is essentially beautiful and therefore good? And our enquiry also must come into: is there ultimately in our life, daily life, anything that is holy, sacred? This is the meaning of meditation. And any system, any method, which promises a reward is not meditation, obviously. If you do this, you will get that. That is, our centuries of conditioning: reward and punishment, hell and heaven. If you do the right thing, if you believe in what the church says, you will reach heaven; if you don't, down you go! And all the rest of that business right throughout the world. Our conditioning is based on this reward and punishment. And meditation is not seeking an end. It is not trying to grope after a purpose, a goal, an end. Because if you have a motive then the motive dictates what the end is. And enquiry, like all good scientists, first-class top scientists, they have no motive, they enquire. In the enquiry they find out. So one must



understand this desire to reach a goal, a purpose, an end. And where there is desire, which we have gone into very carefully, the nature of desire which is perception, contact, sensation, then desire with all its images - then desire in meditation brings about illusion. Obviously.

Now can we proceed really together? I mean together - not I talk and you listen but together freely, without any distortions, without any conclusions, begin, not knowing what meditation is. And in the process of this enquiry into the things that we are going to talk about, consciousness and so on, that very enquiry becomes meditation. You understand? Not that you must meditate, nor how to meditate and the problem of meditation, but in the process of enquiry that very movement is meditation. Is this clear? Can we proceed from there? I don't know if you are interested, or if you are at all serious about this question of meditation, because it is very important to find out because out of this comes immense silence. Not cultivated silence, not the silence between two thoughts, between two noises but a silence that is unimaginable. So the brain becomes extraordinarily quiet when in the process of enquiry, and that is why when there is silence there is great perception. And when in this silence there is emptiness, that emptiness is the summation of all energy. This is the problem of meditation. And if you are not interested in it I can't help it. If you are not interested in it then you will carry on your daily monotonous, bourgeois, intellectual, or amusing life.

So let's begin by enquiring together. I am insisting - we are insisting on that word together, because we have made this monstrous, brutal world together, this immoral world together. And

so in the enquiry of all this there may be, and there will be, total transformation of ourselves and therefore a different society, a different social order and so on, differing governments, everything will come out of this - if you know what it is to meditate.

So we are going to examine together this question of consciousness and its content. In examination of this it is very important to find out whether you are examining it, or in observing consciousness becomes aware of itself. You see the difference? I hope this is clear. That is, you can observe the movement of your consciousness, which is your desires, your hurts, your ambitions, your greeds and all the rest of it, the content of our consciousness, you can observe it from the outside as it were; or consciousness becomes aware of itself. This is the problem. Whether you become aware of your consciousness; Or - please go into this with me a little bit - or consciousness is lighted up and you observe? Do you understand? This is only possible when thought realizes that what it has created, which is its consciousness, when thought realizes it is only observing itself, not you, which thought has put together, observing consciousness. I don't know how to put it - you understand this a little bit?

Nobody has to tell you that you are hungry. There is hunger. In the same way is it possible for thought to become aware of itself; for consciousness to be aware itself, not that you are examining consciousness? Is this somewhat clear or not? Because this is very important at the beginning of our examination. I want to examine consciousness. So I begin to analyse the various aspects, the various contents of my consciousness. I am greedy, I am angry, there is hatred, there is jealousy, there is happiness, there is

pleasure, there are a great many hurts from childhood, flowering or controlled. I can examine this. Or there is observation and therefore consciousness begins to reveal itself. Do you see the difference? I observe the tree, the tree tells me all its story if I know how to observe. So in the same way I must learn how to observe - observe only, not tell consciousness what it should do. Right? Am I making it somewhat clear?

That is, if I want to examine consciousness I separate myself from consciousness and then examine it as an analyst. Whereas if there is only observation - only observation - then consciousness begins to reveal its content, its story. I don't have to tell the story about consciousness; consciousness tells its story. This is simple. I won't elaborate that. So that is what we are doing: we are observing only, and so consciousness begins to show itself, not only the superficial consciousness but the deeper layers of consciousness, the whole content of consciousness. This is an art to be learnt - not memorized, not to say, "Well, I have heard this I am going to store it up in my brain and I am going to learn about it." Then that is merely a mechanical process, which has no meaning whatsoever. Whereas if you see the importance of sheer, absolute motionless observation, then the thing flowers - consciousness opens up its doors, as it were. So observation implies seeing the totality of consciousness. I wonder if you see?

Am I talking to myself? I hope not! One can have a dialogue with oneself. We did the other day. I can have a dialogue about the whole question of meditation with myself. But that is entirely different from having a dialogue with each other. That is what we are doing - although there are so many people here, we are actually

a dialogue. There is only one person here and he or she and I are talking about this. I am telling him or her, to observe is the most important thing in life - not tell the observation how to observe, but to learn the art of observing without any distortion, without any motive, without any purpose, just to observe. In that there is tremendous beauty because then there is no distortion. You see things clearly as they are. But if make an abstraction of it into an idea, and then through that idea observe then it is a distortion.

Right?

So we are merely freely without any distorting factor entering into our observation, observing consciousness. So consciousness begins to reveal its own totality. There is nothing hidden. Which is, the content, which is our hurt, our greed, our envy, our happiness, our beliefs, our ideologies, all that makes up consciousness, the past traditions, the present, scientific or factual traditions and so on and so on and so on - all that is our consciousness. To observe it without any movement of thought, because thought has put all the content of our consciousness - thought has built it. When thought comes and says, "This is right, this is wrong, this shouldn't be that", you are still within the field of consciousness and you are not going beyond it. So one has to understand very clearly the place of thought. Thought has its own place in the field of knowledge, technology and all the rest of it. But thought has no place whatsoever in the psychological structure of man. When it does then confusion begins, then contradiction and all the struggles, the images about you and another - all the rest of it follows. So the art, as we said the meaning of 'art' means to put everything in its right place, not the painter, not the sculptor or the poet, but in our daily

life to put everything in its right place, that is art. So can you observe your consciousness and does it reveal its content - not bit by bit, but the totality of its movement? Then only is it possible to go beyond it. Not through analysis which we talked about, because analysis implies the analyser and the analysed, the division, the problem of time and division, and when you analyse each analysis must be totally complete. If there is not complete analysis then the imperfection of that analysis is carried over to the next analysis, so imperfection grows more and more. You understand? You practise on the piano and you practise the wrong note all the time. Right? So that is our enquiry.

And in enquiring can you observe without any movement of the eye? Because the eye has an effect on the brain. You can observe it for yourself. When you keep your eyeballs completely still observation becomes very clear because the brain is quietened. You can experiment with this. This is not a trick for something further. It is like going to a guru and learning a few tricks. There is a lovely story I must tell you about. A young man goes to a guru, a teacher, and says, "Please tell me what truth is. I have searched everywhere and nobody seems able to tell me, please tell me what truth is." And the guru says, "Stay with me. Be with me." And so the pupil, the disciple, stays with him for about fifteen years watching him - you know, all the rest of it. At the end of fifteen years he says, "Good Lord I have learnt nothing." And so goes to the guru and says, "I am so sorry you have taught me nothing. I haven't found truth. I am going to leave you and go to that guru, to the other one." And so after five years he comes back and says "At last I have learnt." And the guru says, "What have you learnt?"

"You see that river, I can walk across it without a boat, without anything, I can walk on it, I can tread on the water." And the guru says, "You can do that for twopence if you take that little boat." I think you should bear that story in mind when you approach any guru.

So can you observe without any movement of thought interfering with your observation? It is only possible when the observer realizes that which he is observing is one - the observer is the observed. Anger is not different from me, I am anger, I am jealousy. So there is no division between the observer and the observed. That is the basic reality one must capture. And to observe without the observer. Just to observe, then you will see the whole of consciousness, the whole of it begins to reveal itself without your making an effort. Which means in that total observation there is the emptying or going beyond all the things that thought has put together, which is our consciousness. The reality which thought has made is not truth - it is a reality of thought. We must go on.

Then to enquire into this problem of time - not scientific fiction, but time as psychologically a movement towards an object, towards an idea, towards an ideology. That is, one is greedy - I am taking that - or violent. And one says to oneself, I will take time to get over it, or to modify it, or to change it, or to get rid of it, or to go beyond it. That will take time. We are talking about that time, not the chronological time by the watch or by the sun; but this whole conditioning of our mind which says, I will take time to achieve that which is essential, that which is beautiful, that which is good. We are questioning that time. Is there psychological time

at all; or thought has invented that time? You are following? Please examine it. Look at it without any distortion, this question, this challenge. You know when you are challenged, unless you respond with all your energy it is not a challenge at all, you just pass it by. But if you respond to that challenge with all your energy, as we are doing now, whether there is a psychological time at all, all your energy is responding; all your energy is not responding if you are trying to withhold something, say, I must have a little time. "I was looking forward to meeting you the day after tomorrow. Oh my god, if there is no time I am lost. I love you, and all the rest of it, and if I don't meet you in a week's time, what is going to happen?" You follow? You are following all this? This is the psychological time, which is hope.

Are you also please working together? We are working together. I am not working by myself. I can go and do this in my room - that is not important. But we are sharing this thing together, moving together. So we are asking: as there is chronological time, that is, it takes time to learn a language, it takes time to learn to drive a car, it takes time to learn mathematics, it takes time to learn certain specialities, to become a specialist. That same idea, that same thought says, it will take time for me to evolve, to be good, or to become chief executive of some blasted business. So is there such time? Please this is very important because you are going to shatter altogether the idea of tomorrow - psychologically. Then it is a tremendous shock. If you understand there is no psychological tomorrow then what will you do with that which is? You understand the problem. If there is no time, then how is violence to end? Our conditioning is, to use time as a means of getting rid

slowly or quickly, or whatever it is of violence. But if there is no time at all then what takes place when there is violence? Will there be violence? You understand my question? If one's whole outlook is, psychologically that there is no time at all, then is there a me who is violent? You follow? The 'me' is put together through time. The 'me' is violence, is time. But if there is no time at all as 'me', which is the process of tomorrow, then there is nothing, there is no violence. I wonder if you see this? You see, is love a matter of time? Is love a thing to be remembered - or having remembrance, and the pleasure of that remembrance which you call love, which is time? Right? So is love a matter of time, remembrance? If it is a matter of time, which is thought, then it obviously is not love. "I will love you everlastingly" - which is of course nonsense. But we take vows in church, you know all that nonsense.

So do we in our examination see very clearly that psychologically there is no time at all? If there is no time at all there is no past or future, but only something else totally different. I wonder if you see this? You see we are conditioned to time. We say, psychologically there must be evolution for me to become something other than what I am. And when you deny, when you see the truth of the fact that time is an invention of thought because thought itself has brought this time, then there is an ending of the past and the future. Do you understand what I am saying? There is only the sense of timeless movement now. I wonder if you see this. It is really extraordinary if you understand this. After all love is that, isn't it? Love is at the same level, at the same time, at the same intensity, at that moment that is love - not the remembrance, or the future - that state of mind that is really completely without time,



which is love. Then see what happens in our relationship, see what happens in our relationship with another. You perhaps have that extraordinary sense of love which is not of time, which is not of thought, which is not a remembrance of pleasure or pain; and what is the relationship between you, who have that, and another who hasn't got that? You understand the problem? You have no image, because image is the movement of time, about another, because time has built that, thought has built this image step by step about another; and the other has made an image about you step by step, which is a movement of time. And you have no time at all, and therefore you have this extraordinary sense of love which is not of time, then what is your relationship with another? Do you understand? Work it out! Think it out, go into it and you will see.

Then what is the relationship between human beings? When you have that extraordinary quality of love, then in that quality there is supreme intelligence. Right? I wonder if you see this. That intelligence is going to act in that relationship, not you will act in that relationship. I wonder if you see. I must get on. You can discover this. It is really a marvellous thing to go into a great deal because it totally alters all relationship. Because if there is no alteration fundamentally in our relationship there is no alteration in society because we have built this monstrous society. So that is the whole nature of time: the man that is hoping, that hope is born out of despair; that despair is the past and the hope is the future; and so he is caught in psychological time and there is no answer to that question at all.

So then, the next thing is space - space. One wonders what is space. Do you ever wonder what is space? Not some science writer

about space, or who has intellectually thought and laid down in words what space is, but what is space? Can there be space without order? Can there be space in disorder? All right, let's begin with that. We are enquiring together, please bear with me if I repeat it over and over again that we are examining moving, sharing this thing together.

We are asking: is there space when there is disorder in a room? Just take the physical fact when you throw your clothes all over the place, and you know, messy, is there space? And that space can only come when you have put everything in its right place. Right? So outwardly. Now inwardly, our minds are so confused, our whole life is self-contradiction, disorder, caught in various habits, drugs, smoking, drink, sex, habits. Obviously where there is habit there is disorder, because habit is mechanical. So we are going to find out what is order. Is order something dictated by thought? Because thought itself is a movement of disorder because it is limited. Right? I wonder if you see this. We think we can bring about order socially by great careful thought, which is the ideological movement. Right? Our society whether in the west or the east is in disorder, is confused, is contradictory - you sell arms to some people and they hope to have peace. The world is all so totally mad - and we are also mad, somewhat. The world is mad because we have made it mad.

So what is disorder, and what is order? We are saying, disorder comes outwardly when thought is a movement in action, thought which is limited, fragmentary and divides the whole of life into fragments. You have seen that. Thought does that. Are we aware of this? Please come on. That is, you are a business man, then if you

are not a business man, you are an artist, if you are not an artist, you are a doctor, a professor, or merely a gardener - you follow, all our life is divided, divided, divided. That is disorder. Where there is division there is disorder, and thought has brought about this division - class, nationality, heaven and hell - you know all the rest of it. Thought has done this. So where there is movement of thought, which is time-binding, which is fragmentary in itself, therefore limited in itself, wherever it acts there must be total disorder. I wonder if you see this? No, don't agree with me please, it is not a question of agreeing with me. Do you see this in your life?

So if that is true then what is order in relation to action? You understand? All our action now is based on thought, on conclusions, on memory. And we are saying, as long as thought, which is limited, which has created ideologies and acts according to that ideology, there must be total disorder. We are saying that, which is a fact, if you observe it in daily life. Then what is action in which there is no movement of thought - you understand? Is this all becoming too abstract? It is not. To me it is boiling. It is not an abstraction, not an intellectual amusement either.

Is there an action which is not born out of the movement of thought, out of certain ideologies which have been put together by thought, or by memories, which again is the response of thought - is there an action totally free from thought? Such action then would be complete, whole, total. You understand? Not fragmentary, not contradictory, it will be the whole of action in which there is no regret, no sense of "I wish I hadn't done that", or "I will do that". Right? This is what we are enquiring into. Disorder comes about

when there is the movement of thought, and thought itself is fragmentary and when it acts everything must be fragmentary. If one sees that very clearly then one asks, what is action without thought. Action means the doing now, not tomorrow, or having done, doesn't it? The meaning of that word is active, present acting, now. And, as we said, love is not of time. Right? Compassion is beyond intellect, beyond memory, it is a state of mind, and that love, that compassion acts because that compassion, love is supremely intelligent. So intelligence then acts. Are you getting some of this? Or is it just words?

So we can go into this enormously. It is like digging into the bottomless pit and there is always water so we can go deeper and deeper and deeper. So then we are saying: order is space, this kind of order, which is action of intelligence, which is neither yours nor mine, it is intelligence born out of love and compassion. Now space implies a mind that is not occupied. But our minds are occupied all day long about something or other. So there is no space, or an interval between two thoughts, every thought is associated with another thought. Look at it, please look at it. So that there is no gap when your whole mind is crowded, chattering, opinions, judgements - I am right, I am left, I am this, that.

So order of the kind we have talked about brings enormous space. Space means silence. Right? And out of silence comes this extraordinary sense of emptiness. Don't be frightened by that word empty because when there is emptiness then things can happen. You understand? Like a womb of a woman bears a child, it is empty. Do you understand all this?

So then we go on to the next thing - beauty. What is beauty?

Does it lie in a picture, in a museum, or in the poem of Keats?  
Does it lie in the line of the mountains against the sky, or in a sheet of water reflecting the heavens, the beauty of the clouds? Or the line of an architect, a building? We are asking what is beauty? You understand? Come on sirs, go into yourself, find out. The form, that has a certain beauty. We are enquiring into what is beauty, not the imagination that creates beauty, not the word that creates the beauty, not a beautiful idea, but what is beauty when you see something extraordinarily alive and beautiful like a mountain, a clear sky, a view, at that moment when you see it totally you are absent, aren't you. I wonder if you realize this. Because of its immensity, its extraordinary stability, its extraordinary sense of - you know - firmness and the line of it, that magnificence drives away the 'me' for the moment. And you say, "How extraordinary". Please listen carefully - which is the outer glory has driven away the petty little 'me'. Right? Like a boy, a child given a toy and he is absorbed by that toy. Right? And he will play with it for an hour and break it up, and when you take away the toy he is back to himself, naughty, crying, mischievous and all the rest of it. So the same thing has happened, the great mountains have driven away the petty little 'me', and you see it for the moment. That is, when the 'me' is absent totally there is beauty. Get it? Come on sirs. Not in the drum, not in the folk songs, not in the latest songs, on television they have it, I have forgotten - rock, that's it. You are carried away by all that but you never find out for yourself what is beauty because without beauty there is no love - not the beauty of a form, a face, curly hair, tall, short, black, but the beauty that comes when there is no 'me'. The 'me' that has been put together by

thought, the 'me' that is the movement of time. And that is beauty. We can go into it much more deeply because then your relationship to nature changes completely; then earth becomes precious - you understand - every tree, every leaf, everything is part of that beauty. But man is destroying everything.

So then we are asking: is there anything sacred, holy?

Obviously the things that thought has put together in a church - in a church, not the building, which is also the result of thought - everything that thought has put together in the religious sense, or in the psychological sense, and investing sacredness in an image, in an idea, is that sacred at all? If it is sacred then it has no division - you are not a Christian then, nor a Hindu, Buddhist, Muslim and all the rest of the divisions. So that which thought has put together is of time, is fragmentary, is not whole, therefore it is not holy.

Though you worship the image on a cross that is not holy, that is put together by thought - or the image that the Hindus have put together, or the Buddhists and so on. So what then is sacred?

Because without finding that out, not being told, not wanting that sacredness because that gives an enormous vitality, enormous strength to life, without that, life becomes very shoddy, empty, meaningless. So one has to go into this question and find out. And you can only find out when thought has discovered - please listen - when thought has discovered for itself its right place, therefore without effort, without will, there is this immense sense of silence - silence of the mind without any movement of thought. It is only when the mind is absolutely free and silent then you discover that which is beyond all words, which is timeless. And all this is meditation. How can you meditate when you are angry, when your

life is based on violence, when in yourself there is contradiction?

So one has to put order there first. The very process of putting order is part of meditation - not to have conflict between two human beings, man, woman, never to have conflict, and to find out how to live without conflict, that is part of meditation. Then out of that comes the enormity of what is true meditation. Finito!

## **BROCKWOOD PARK 2ND PUBLIC TALK 28TH AUGUST 1977**

May we continue with what we were talking about yesterday? We were saying yesterday morning, if I remember correctly, that we have developed extraordinary skills, capacities, in almost every direction, in every field of our existence. And these skills, these extraordinary capacities have brought about a great deal of confusion, have exaggerated the importance of the self, the 'me', and perhaps divided people a great deal - those who know, and those who don't know. And without clarity, as we were saying, these skills will be disastrous because unless the mind is very clear, objective, and that clarity can only come about, as we were saying yesterday, through compassion. Compassion, clarity, and skill. Where there is compassion there is clarity and out of that clarity there is intelligence. And that intelligence is not personal - yours or mine. That intelligence will use the skill without giving importance to the self, the 'me'. That is what we were saying, more or less, yesterday.

And also we were talking about desire. And I think it is very important to understand this factor of desire in our daily life, which is part of our consciousness. As we were saying yesterday - I hope you're not bored by the repetition of what we said yesterday - in our consciousness one of the major factors is this desire, amongst other factors equally important, such as fear, pleasure, so-called love and a great deal of sorrow. And we were talking yesterday about desire, because it is desire that creates illusion, it creates and holds on to various forms of images, conclusions, and concepts.



And as most people have read a great deal about all these mysterious factors of occultism and mysterious miracles and so on, they have created a great many images to which the mind clings, and therefore it creates illusions. So it is very important, I think, to understand the movement of desire, which is the structure of desire. And most religions throughout the world have said, suppress desire, control it, transform it for other higher, nobler ends. And that brings about a great deal of conflict in oneself. That, again, is fairly obvious.

Now, if I may point out, as we did yesterday, we are exploring the whole thing together, you and the speaker are investigating into this whole problem of consciousness and its content - its content makes up the consciousness - and whether it is possible to radically transform deeply, fundamentally, the whole content of our consciousness. That is what we are concerned with during all these talks and so on - discussions and dialogues. And, we were saying, one of the factors is desire of our consciousness. The desire may be for nobler ends, or for physical ends, or some projected ideological concepts. And these projections, these future states will inevitably bring about conflict, because then there is 'what is' and 'what should be' or 'what might be', or imitating or conforming to a certain pattern and therefore there is conflict between 'what is' and 'what should be'. And it is important, I think, to understand this conflict which is brought about by desire.

We said that desire has its root, its beginning, in perception, seeing, contact, then sensation, desire and the desire which creates images. This is the whole process, movement of desire. It is fairly simple to understand this. I think most of us know this. But one of

the factors of conflict is the achievement, or the fulfilment of desire, therefore there is constant struggle. The whole question of meditation is involved in this too: the desire to achieve some state through conformity, through pattern, through method - the whole structure is based on desire to be something, or to become something.

Are we all together? I hope so. We are not talking to ourselves. We are together taking a journey into the whole field of consciousness, which is very complex, and needs very careful, hesitant, investigation. And if you are not serious, if you are not concerned with it, then I think you had better go and play golf.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Just a minute sir, I haven't finished. Questions much later. We will have questions and dialogues on Tuesday. So if you can have patience until then, or if there is time at the end of the talk we can go into it.

We are investigating into the movement of thought, of desire, of fear, anxiety, greed, violence and the pursuit of pleasure and to find out what love is, and whether there is a possibility of ending sorrow altogether, because this is the content of our consciousness. And, as we were saying, we human beings have created the society in which we live - immoral, divisions, racial, communal, national, religious, the various divisions which gurus have brought about throughout the world, native gurus and foreign gurus, the priests and so on. This is the whole content of our consciousness. To observe it without choice, to become aware of the whole nature of consciousness without any effort, persuasion, without seeking reward or avoiding punishment, just to observe it in our daily life.

And that can only be observed very carefully in relationship between human beings because that is the mirror in which you can see yourself. Yourself being a human being which represents the world's humanity. That again is simple. That is you, as a human being, suffer, go through a great deal of trouble, anxiety, pain, uncertainty, insecurity, which is the nature of all human beings throughout the world. So you in essence are the world, and the world is you. This is not a theory, this is not an ideal, but an actual fact.

So we are together exploring it. So it is your responsibility if you are serious to go into this. No guru, no system can help you to understand yourself. Without understanding yourself there is no *raison d'être* to continue, to act, to find out what is right action, what is truth and so on. So in investigating our consciousness we are investigating the human consciousness, not only yours, because you are the world and therefore when you observe your own consciousness you are observing the consciousness of mankind. So it is not something personal, selfish and so on.

One of the factors in that is desire. Desire is perception, contact, sensation and the thought which creates the image, and the pursuit of that image is the desire to fulfil, and the frustrations and the bitterness and all the rest of it following from that. Now can there be an observation, sensation and not ending in desire, just to observe? Which means one has to understand a great deal of the nature of thought, because it is thought that gives it a continuity, it is thought that creates the image out of that sensation and the pursuit of that image. That is fairly simple. May I go on? We are all together in this, I hope.

So thought is the response of memory, experience, knowledge stored up in the brain, so thought is never new, it is always old. That again is obvious. Thought therefore is limited. It has created innumerable problems and thought has also created the extraordinary technological world, marvellous things it has done. And as thought is limited because it is the outcome of the past, which is time, therefore thought is time-binding, therefore limited. Thought then tries to pretend it can perceive the immeasurable, the timeless, the something beyond itself, therefore it projects all kinds of images. This is obviously so.

So can one observe this whole movement of desire without creating the image and pursuing that image and getting involved in frustration, in the hope of fulfilment and all that - just to observe the whole movement of desire, to become aware of it? I hope we are doing it as we are talking over together.

Then also there is the question of fear. We are discussing, we are talking over together this question of compassion, clarity, and skill. To come upon this extraordinary quality of compassion which brings about clarity, from which comes skill, one has to understand the nature of the self, the 'me'. Right? It is the 'me' that is the distorting factor in life. It is the factor that divides me and you, we and they, and all the rest of it. In investigating our consciousness we are investigating also at the same time the nature and the structure of the 'me'. Right? I think that is clear.

So to know oneself fundamentally, basically, not according to any philosopher, psychologist or the latest ones, or the ancient ones, we have to abandon all those authorities and observe actually what we are. Which means you have no authority to tell you what

to do - right? If there is an authority to tell you what to do then there is all the conflicts, struggles to achieve what we have learnt from others. All right? So we wipe away every form of psychological authority so the mind is free to observe itself, to observe its own consciousness. The content makes up our consciousness. And one of the contents is desire and the other is fear - fear not only physiologically but psychologically. When we understand the psychological fears then we can deal intelligently with the physiological fears. Not the other way round. Though it is psychosomatic one has to understand the psychological fears.

Now may we together go into it? That is, can you observe your fear - this is not group therapy, this is not confession, I am not your guru, thank god! But we can together examine this fear, which seems to be part of our daily life - and whether one can be psychologically free and not be caught up in the illusion that you are free. That illusion comes about when you say to yourself "I must be free from fear", which is the movement of desire. Therefore, having understood the nature of desire and its movement, its images, its conflicts, the whole business of desire, then we can look at fear in ourselves, and not deceive ourselves that we are psychologically free from fear.

To go into the whole question of fear, not a particular form of fear - you may be afraid of your wife or your husband, or the girlfriend, or the boyfriend, or society, it doesn't matter, a dozen forms of fear - but to go to the very root of fear, which would be much simpler, quicker than taking the various branches of fear and trimming them. But we can go together into the very root of fear. To observe the various branches of fear which one has and not say,

I must prune them one by one, but rather by observing the totality of fear then come to the root of it. I hope I am making myself clear, am I? That is, one may have the fear of attachment, fear that comes about through attachment - attachment to an idea, to an experience, to an image, or to a person, to something or other psychologically - and try to be free from that attachment, therefore from that particular form of fear. Or one may be afraid psychologically of not becoming something, not being something. The word - if I may here go off a little bit - the word 'mantra', you know the word mantra? - most of you know it. You are all familiar with transcendental rubbish. You are probably very familiar with it. And the word they use is mantra. The root meaning of that Sanskrit word means - I have talked to many scholars about that word and they have given me this meaning - which is: reflect on not being, meditate on not being or becoming, and wipe away all self-centred activity. That is the real meaning of that word mantra. You understand? Not for \$150 or something or other, but to be free from self-centred action and reflect, think about, observe, meditate on not becoming, being. It is a tremendous thing this - not to be sold for \$5 - right? So that is a deviation, sorry!

So we are saying: is it possible, psychologically, to be free of fear, all fear? We took attachment - shall we examine one by one, each fear, or shall we go to the very root of it? You can only go to the root of it when you observe the totality, the various forms of fear - observe, become aware of them, not try to do something about them. Right? I wonder if I am conveying it. To observe the whole tree of fear, with all the branches, with all the various qualities, divisions of fear, by observing the whole of the tree go to

the very root of it. You understand? That is what we are going to do, not take one fear after another, but go to the very centre of fear. Will you do it together? We are going to do it together.

That is, can you observe not only your particular form of fear, but also various other forms with one glance, just to look - fear of darkness, fear of attachment, fear, being attached, the fear of losing, fear of darkness, fear of domination, the thousand fears one has? So by observing all that, you come to the root of it - right? What is the root of fear, psychologically? Is it not time? I am putting it, examining it, it may not be right, but we will go into it. Is it not, the root of fear, time - the tomorrow, what might happen tomorrow, or in the future? Or what might happen if one doesn't do certain things. So time as the past, time what might happen now, or time in the future. So is not the root of fear time? And time is movement of thought - right? That is, one has been hurt in the past psychologically, and one is afraid that one might be hurt again in the future; so there is resistance, building a wall around oneself not to be hurt, and fear of being hurt. That means it is the whole movement of time as thought, time as measure. Right? Is this fairly clear? I am sorry I must go on. If it is not clear, sorry.

So we are saying: the root of fear is the movement of time, which is thought as measure. And can you observe, be aware of this movement, not control it, suppress fear, or escape from it, just to observe it? To be aware of this total movement. Right? Then when one is aware of this total movement of thought as time and measure - I have been, I shall be, I hope to be - to be choicelessly aware of this fact and remain with it, not move away from actually what is. Which is, what actually is, is the movement of thought,

which says "I have been hurt in the past and I hope I shall not be hurt in the future". And that very process of thinking is fear. I am only taking that as an example. So where there is fear obviously there is no affection, there is no love. And we are concerned, as we said, with the understanding of compassion, clarity and skill. The skill that does not cultivate, exaggerate, give importance to the 'me' for status, position and all the rest of it, which is what is actually happening in the world when a man is highly skilled, he has a tremendous importance in society, therefore the importance of himself.

And also part of this consciousness is the pursuit of this one enormous desire for pleasure. Again all religions have said, do not pursue pleasure, sexual or any other kind of pleasure because you have given your life over to Jesus, or Krishna, or to somebody or other, therefore suppress desire, suppress fear, suppress any form of pleasure. You know this. Every religion has talked about it endlessly. We are saying: on the contrary don't suppress anything, don't avoid anything, don't analyse your fear. Just to observe. Because analysis is a waste of time because in that is involved, who is the analyser and what is the analysed. Is the analyser different from the analysed? Obviously not. Right? I want to get on with it.

So as most human beings, all of us are caught in this pursuit of pleasure, and when that pleasure is not given there is hatred, you know all the things that come from it - violence, hatred, anger, bitterness, you know. So one must understand this pursuit by human beings throughout the world and this enormous urge for pleasure.



What is the function of the brain? The function is to register, like a computer, to register. And it has registered a pleasure, and thought gives it the energy, the drive to pursue that pleasure. You are following this? One has had pleasure of various kinds yesterday, suppose. And it is registered. Then thought comes and picks it up and says, there must be more. And thought then pursues the more. The more then becomes pleasure because the continuity of pleasure is given vitality, drive by thought, thinking about it, today or tomorrow, later on. So that is the movement of pleasure. Right? Having registered and thought pursuing that which has happened yesterday and gives to it continuity. Now the question is: is it possible to register only what is absolutely necessary and nothing else. You understand? Does it mean anything, this?

One is hurt at school, college, university, later on in the family and so on, one is hurt. What is hurt is the image that one has about oneself. Right? And that image is hurt and thought then builds round that image not to be hurt further - which is simple. Now is it possible not to register the hurt at all? You understand my question? Am I talking to myself? This is very important, I think, to understand because we are registering so many things unnecessarily and so building up the self, the 'me'. I am hurt, I am not what I should be, I must achieve what I think should be and so on and so on and so on. This whole registration is a form of giving importance to the self. Right? Now we are asking: is it possible to register only what is absolutely necessary? What is absolutely necessary? Not all the things the psyche builds up, which are memories. Right? I wonder if you see it. We are all travelling together? Oh, good - some of us at least.

So what is not necessary? And what is necessary? You understand my question? What is necessary to register and what is not necessary to register? Because the brain is occupied with this, all the time registering, therefore there is no tranquility, quietness to the brain, because whereas if there is a clarity of what is to be registered and what is not to be registered the brain is quieter, therefore that is part of meditation - not all the silly stuff that is talked about.

Now what is necessary to register? Are the things that one registers psychologically necessary at all? You understand my question? Anything that you psychologically hold is unnecessary - by holding those things, registering those things, the brain holding on to them gives it a certain security, and that security is the 'me', because it has gathered all the psychological hurts, imprints, you know, all the rest of it - I don't have to repeat them over and over again. So we are saying: to register anything psychologically and hold them is absolutely unnecessary - your beliefs, your dogmas, your experiences, your wishes, your desires, all that is totally unnecessary. So when the brain is only registering what is necessary, then what is that that is necessary? Food, clothes, and shelter - nothing else! You understand? This is a tremendous investigation into oneself, therefore it means the brain is no longer the accumulating factor of the 'me'. Therefore the brain is quieter, rested, because it needs considerable tranquillity but it has sought that tranquillity, that security in the 'me' which is the accumulation of all the past registrations, which are just memories, therefore worthless - like collecting a lot of dead ash, and giving tremendous importance to it. Are we going together?

So we are asking: to register what is absolutely. It is a marvellous thing if you can go into it and do it because then there is real freedom - freedom from all the accumulated knowledge, tradition, superstition, experience, which has all built up this enormous structure to which thought clings as the 'me'. When the 'me' is not then compassion comes into being, and that compassion brings clarity. With that clarity there is skill. When the 'me' is not the skill has tremendous importance. Then that skill will organize a totally different kind of political structure. Because we have tried Communism and that has failed; we have tried every form of government - when we say every form, the world has, not only England, but the world has, Communism, Socialism, various forms of sharing the earth and so on and so on. But they have not tackled it from this end, which is having compassion, clarity and skill, then organization has quite a different meaning and vitality. It is a living thing then, not patterns set by some politicians. I wonder if you are getting all this?

So: that is what we are talking about. We are talking about the fact that our consciousness with all its content has to be observed, to be totally, choicelessly aware of it, which is ourselves. And you can become extraordinarily aware of it fully in relationship, between human beings, man, woman, boy and girl, husband and wife and all the rest of it. That is possible only when there is no creation of images about another. When the man doesn't create an image about his wife, the girl, or the girl doesn't create an image about the man. The image is the registering factor. I don't know if you see this? Do you see this? Between husband and wife, or a boy and a girl there is not only sexual registration and the pursuit of

that pleasure, that experience, but also the registration of hurts, the registration of insults, the nagging, the pleasure, you know all that goes on in relationship. And this is the registration which is the image. Do you understand? Now when there is this image between the man and the woman there is no relationship at all; it is a relationship of registration, you register and I register and the registrations are the images. Now if we don't register at all anything psychological then relationship between man and woman is completely different - naturally. I wonder if you see this. Are you doing it as we are talking? Or is it just verbal acceptance because some of you may think it is very logical, reasonable, sane, or others might think it is much too difficult, sorry I can't pursue all this, I would rather go and sing in a camp, or whatever you do. But we are talking about this very seriously because it affects all human relationships. And where there is image as registration, and it is that registration of the image that brings about jealousy, anxiety, hatred, irritation and all that between human beings, and that denies love. Right?

Now love, for most of us, is something - you know what it is, I don't have to explain it. It is biological and also it becomes psychological. I am attached to my wife, without a wife you feel lonely, you lose all comfort. So the more you register, the more attached you are and the more attached you are the greater the fear of losing. And facing that which is loneliness, the emptiness in that loneliness and trying to run away from the loneliness through various forms of entertainment, religious and otherwise. So we are saying where there is registration, unnecessary registration, there is no love. And if we want to understand the nature of compassion

one has to go into this question of what is love and whether there is such a thing as love without any form of attachment, with all its complications, with all its pleasure and so on and so on, and fears. And next Saturday and Sunday we will talk about sorrow, death and meditation. Now you can bully me!

Q: A man takes a wife out of loneliness.

K: I did not say that. Just listen sir. I said that when one becomes aware of oneself there is this factor of loneliness, which is entirely different from being alone. Alone - the word alone means all one. Whereas loneliness is complete isolation from everything, don't you feel this?

Q: Yes I do sir.

K: Not only you sir, all human beings go through this sense of complete isolation in which there is no relationship with anything - you know. You are completely lost. And most of us never remain with it, understand it, go into it, but run away from it. That is, to look at loneliness and not move away from it. You know when you have great pleasure you don't want to move away from it, do you. You use everything to hold it. You live with it. In the same way live so completely with that loneliness without a movement away from it. Then out of that, living with something which you don't understand, which has got tremendous meaning in one's life, then that begins to flower, come out like a beautiful flower and wither away. But if you run away from it or try to force yourself to understand it, go into it, you are destroying the flower. Whereas if you remain with it completely it is like a thing that flowers and withers away. You understand this?

Q: No I don't. All I can see is: why is my life a mess? It is a

mess because I don't want to marry.

K: I didn't say sir, marry, or not marry.

Q: Well you say stay with your loneliness. It seems to me to stay in the rotten position I am in now.

K: No,no. If one is neurotic and you know you are neurotic - most people don't know that they are neurotic - but if you are aware that you are neurotic and not act from neuroticism, you will end it. Surely this is simple enough.

Q: How do I stop acting out of neuroticism when I am neurotic? I could put away myself and say I will not act any more.

K: No sir, we are not saying that. We are saying - please listen sir - that as we said there is an art of listening, which is to listen not to the speaker only but to listen to yourself, to listen to the birds, to the movement of the wind amongst the leaves and so on. Just to listen. You know your own opinions, you know your own thoughts, but you have to put them aside to find out what the other fellow is saying. If you are not capable that is part of neuroticism. But I am sure, though most of us are perhaps neurotic, we can at moments, at least for this morning, put away our own thoughts, our own importance, our own opinions and just listen to find out what the other fellow is saying. That is all. The other fellow is saying simply, that to be aware of oneself, and if one is aware you discover that you are neurotic, that you have peculiarities, you have this and that - you know. You hold on to opinions and experiences, all the importance - just to be aware of it. And in that awareness the neuroticism comes out, flowers, withers away - if you give it an opportunity. But if you say, "No, I am neurotic, I must not act, I must lock myself up", then you are giving importance more and

more to the neuroticism. Full stop.

Isn't that enough for this morning?

Q: No.

K: Wait a minute sir. You say no - why? Look sir, we have this morning gone into something that demands your total attention, that you have to go into yourself very, very deeply, and if you have done it, you say at the end of an hour, "That is enough".

## **SAANEN 6TH PUBLIC TALK 21ST JULY 1977.**

I would like to talk this morning about, if I may, observing holistically - to observe, to see or to listen to the whole total content of something. We look at things partially according to our pleasure, or according to our conditioning, or according to some idealistic point of view. So we are always looking at things fragmentarily. The politician is only concerned with politics, the economists and so on, the scientists, the businessman, all throughout life, it seems to one, that one never takes or observes the whole movement of life - not broken up - like a full river with a great volume of water behind it. It is water right from the beginning to the end. It may get polluted but given sufficient space between two pollutions it can clean itself. So in the same way can one treat one's life holistically, move totally from the beginning to the end without any fragmentation, without any deviation, without any delusion? I would like to talk about that.

First of all it is important to understand, I think, how the mind creates illusions of self-importance, of various types of comforting, safe, at least for the time being, illusions that give one security, and these bring about a great deal of illusions. That is, to look at something with a preconceived idea or belief, so we never really see it actually. And these illusions are created by desire, by satisfaction, by wanting comfort. And satisfaction is entirely different from ecstasy. Ecstasy, as we said the other day, is a state of being, or not being, which is outside of oneself. That is really ecstasy in which there is no experiencing. The moment there is an experiencing it is the self, it is the past memories that recollect,



remember, that translate an experience according to the past demands, or past conditioning. So ecstasy never creates illusions. You cannot hold on to it because it is outside of oneself. There is no question of remembering it. There is no question of wanting it, because when one wants it there is the desire to satisfy and that creates illusion. Right? And most of us are caught in some kind of illusion - the illusion of being, or not being, the illusion of power, position and so on, the whole category from the projection of the centre, which is the 'me'. That invariably creates illusion. As we said, illusion means to observe, to see sensuously with a definite conclusion, prejudice, or idea. That invariably creates illusions. That is clear. And an illusory mind, or a mind that is caught in illusions, has no order. Right?

Order can only come about holistically. Right? Please see the importance of this. We need order; even in a very small room you put things in their place otherwise it becomes terribly disorderly, ugly and rather dirty - as most rooms are - sorry! And we think order is following a certain pattern, following a certain conclusion, following a certain order which you have already established in the past and keep on in that routine. I think order is something entirely different. Order can only come about when there is clarity. Clarity brings order, not the other way round. If you put it the other way round, which is, try to seek order then that becomes mechanistic, naturally, repetition, a conformity to a pattern which you have established for yourself in the room or outside the room, or inside yourself.

Order, as we said, can only come about through clarity - clarity to observe without any distortion. We went into it the other day

very carefully, so we won't go into it again, if you don't mind. Order implies harmony in daily life. Harmony is not an idea because we are already prisoners of ideas. We are caught in the prison of ideas and therefore there is no harmony in that. Harmony implies clarity, which is to see things holistically, to see, to observe life as a total unitary movement. Right? Can we do this? You understand my question? Can one observe life, or observe one's living, which is life, as a total whole movement of life - not I am a businessman and I am different at home, or I am an artist and I can do the most absurd things, eccentricism, you know all that follows? This breaking or fragmenting life into various categories - the elite and the non-elite, the worker and the non worker, the intellectual and the romantic, the emotional, which is our whole way of living. Now can we see how important it is to see this life as a total movement in which everything is included, in which there is no breaking down, as the good and the bad, and heaven and hell? Right? It is only possible - no, I will put it this way: can one observe what it means to see holistically? Can one see holistically anything? Right? When you observe your friend, or your wife or your girl, or your boy, husband, can you observe, see holistically in that relationship? Right? Are you following all this? Right? Is that possible?

It is possible only when there is no accumulated remembrances which become the image. Right? In any relationship there is accumulated remembrances, incidents, which definitely leave a mark on the brain, and therefore you always look at somebody, your wife and so on, fragmentarily. Now can we, being serious, wanting to find a different way of living in our daily life, to look at

another in a relationship, intimate or not intimate, as a whole? Please do it now as we are talking. You are married, you have got girls and you have got boys, you have got a husband, wife and all the rest of it, uncle, aunt, whatever it is, can you look at another as a whole? Which means not having any remembrances or conclusions about another. Therefore to observe holistically implies freedom. Right? We are getting on.

We think freedom is from something else. Right? To be free implies, generally as it is understood, I am free from my sorrow, from my anxiety, from my work - or whatever it is. Which is really a reaction, isn't it? Therefore it is not freedom at all. When a man says, "I am free from smoking" - I hope you don't smoke, any of you because it is very bad for one's health, that's up to you - when one says, "I am free from smoking", that is a response from what has been, moving away from what has been. But we are talking of freedom which is not from something, which means to observe holistically. Right? Get it?

So we are going to talk about something which demands your careful attention. That is, to observe freely, holistically, means there is no fragmentation or direction in observation. Right? There is no freedom when there is direction; when there is direction there is distortion. It is only when there is complete freedom that you can observe holistically. And therefore in that observation there is no satisfaction, and therefore there is no illusion. Get it? Step by step we are going into it.

So, can one observe life as a total movement, non-fragmented, but holistic, flowing continuously - 'continuously' not in the sense of time. Right? When one uses the word 'continuous' it implies

time. Right? But there is a continuity which is not of time. I am going to go into that a little bit. Are you as excited about it as I am? I am getting into it.

When one talks about continuity it is of time because a thing that has been and then will be. The relationship is between the past and the future as a continuity, without breaking up. Right? That is what we generally understand by the word 'continuity', which is of time. Right? Time is movement, from here to there; time implies distance, to be covered through days, or months, or years, or as an idea to be achieved. All that implies a movement. Right? Time implies thought, of course, so thought is movement in time, or, thought is the movement of time. Right? Therefore it is a movement of measure. Right? This is reasonable, sane. But is there a continuity, if we can use that word which isn't perhaps quite right, but we will use it for the moment - is there a continuity which is not a series of incidents related to the past and therefore the cause becomes the effect, and the effect becomes the cause, which is continuity. Right? Now we are asking is there a state of being in which there is a coming to an end of everything. I am discovering something, I want to talk about death, you will see in a minute.

We think life is a movement in time and to be measured, and this movement ends with death. That is what we call continuity. There is, I think - not, I think - one observes a movement which is not of time, which is not a remembrance of something, going through the present, modified and continues. There is a state of mind which is dying to everything that is happening - coming in and flowing out. You understand? Not retaining, flowing out.

There is never any retention but always flowing out. Right? That has its own sense of beauty, and, if I may use the word in quotes, 'continuity' - which is not of time.

Now, are we working this out together? Otherwise it has no meaning, there is no fun in my talking about it. There is fun only when we can communicate with each other, and each of us are doing it together. It is like playing cricket, or football, or any game - together we have to do this. Not I do it and tell you, and then you copy it, or try to find out what it means. But if we do it together it is all the time active. Right?

So, we are asking: is there a way of living which is only from moment to moment, without any retention, which is memory and so on? How shall I put this? I want to communicate therefore I must find the words - because communication - listen to this - communication implies compassion, clarity and the skill, which is verbal skill to communicate. If there is compassion and clarity, skill will inevitably come about - not the other way round. I want to tell you something very deep and I must have the skill to tell you, the words, the means of communication; but that communication remains only verbal when there is no compassion and clarity. Intellectually one can cleverly argue this out, logically, sanely, objectively, but it remains at a very, very superficial level; but when there is communication with compassion, clarity, skill is easy. I don't know if you follow all this?

So I want to communicate - the speaker wants to communicate with you whether it is possible to live a life which is totally holistic. Right? Not fragmented - therefore no you and me. Right? No we and they, my country, your country, my god - all that is

gone. Right? Are you doing it? As we are talking, are we together doing it? As I said, we are playing a tremendous game. If you don't take your part in it you are out of the game. If one of the football players doesn't play properly he goes out. So this is a game in which life is involved. Right? Our whole life, therefore you have to partake in this game. So we are asking together if it is possible to live a life that is holistic, without any fragmentation. And that fragmentation exists when there is a desire to satisfy, which creates illusion, therefore you are not playing the game. You are out of the game. If you say, "I have come here to understand you, the speaker", then you are out of the game. You are here not to understand me; you are understanding the whole of human existence, which is you. You are the representative of all humanity, therefore you have to take part holistically in the game. Right? Is that possible? I say it is possible only when you see exactly 'what is', without any distortion. If you are angry, see it as it is, not try to suppress and all the rest of it. When you are jealous, anxious, suffering, anything, to observe holistically. And that is possible only when you live with suffering completely - not to go beyond it, not to seek comfort, not to escape from it, when you completely, totally live with something then there is no distortion. Right? And out of that observation holistically comes clarity. Right? Do it. Please do it as we are talking.

And for us life, as we said, is a movement in time. I was born so many years ago, I am going on until I die. There is this constant movement of remembrances, registration, retention, action, and, from that action learning, storing it up and so on. And we are saying that movement is of time; and that movement is brought

about by thought which is time. And thought being limited, fragmented, thought can never see holistically, though we have cultivated it religiously through education and so on and so on. Thought becomes an extraordinary thing in our life. Therefore thought is always fragmentary. Why? Because it is born out of memory, out of knowledge, out of experience, stored up in the brain, so whatever is stored up in the brain is the past, therefore it is limited, therefore it is fragmentary, not holistic. That is clear - right?

And also we said, order in life is essential, because the moment you have order you are clear. Right? When there is clarity there is order. So we are going to examine together this problem of death. Together. You know every religion, from the ancient of days, has tried to find out if there is something beyond death. The ancient Egyptians - if you have read something of it - thought, or lived in a way that living is part of death - so you carried on with your slaves, with your cattle as you die. To go over the other side is to live what you have lived in the past. You have read about it, you know the whole Egyptian attitude, the ancient Egyptians. And that was a continuity. Right? And the Hindus - the word 'Hindu' was invented by the British during their colonization - the word 'Hindu' never existed, Hinduism never existed. It was only invented by the British when they were big and in power. The ancient people of India - we will put it that way - geographically speaking, in those days there was no geography, they were human beings - they said life must have a continuity because what is the point of achieving a moral character, having so much experience in life, having suffered so much, if it merely ends in death, what is the point of it?

Therefore, they said, there must be a future for this. And that future is the content of consciousness with its content. And that consciousness modified with its content went on, which is called... I won't name it even! Because it is much better not to name these things, you can observe them better.

And also the Christians have different kinds of desires, fulfilments, as the resurrection and so on and so on. We want to find the truth of it - right? The truth of it, not what you think or I think, not what the professionals think, the priests and the psychologists and all the rest of it. And also there have appeared in a great many articles in America and Europe, that people who have died - 'died' in quotes - come back in daily life and remember that extraordinary state after death - light, beauty, whatever it is. One questions whether they are really dead, because if you are really dead, which means oxygen not going to the brain, and therefore the brain deteriorating after five minutes, or three minutes, I have forgotten exactly, therefore when there is real death there is no coming back. And therefore there is no recollection of something after you die. You know there have been articles about this. So I want to clear the field.

I want to find out the truth of this extraordinary state, together. Please this is a very serious game that we are playing, it is beyond chess, beyond football, beyond everything. It is a game - we are playing a game with delight, enjoying the game, and therefore a mind that is eager to find out; not saying, "I must find out because I would like a next life, I am frightened of death, therefore please tell me if there is something more." That is not playing the game. So we are together trying to find out the truth of these things. Because



death must be the most extraordinary experience, much greater than so-called love, much greater than any desire, any idea, any conclusion, because it may be the end of everything - the end of every form of relationship, every form of recollection, of remembrance, accumulation. It might be total annihilation. Right? Complete ending of everything. One must find out what is the truth of this matter.

To find out the truth, to come upon it, every form of identification must end - right - every form of fear, and the desire for comfort. It is that desire for comfort that may create illusion, and therefore one is caught in that illusion and says, "Yes, there is a marvellous state after death." So we are learning how to observe the way of observation which is holistic - which means there is no fear, there is no desire for comfort, there is no illusion, and therefore the mind is completely free to look. Are you doing this? Which means you have no attachment - which is enormously difficult, because I am attached to my wife, house, ideas, conclusions, and therefore I am frightened to let go, I am frightened to be completely alone. We explained that word 'alone' means all one. So no attachment of any kind to anything, to ideas, to persons, to a future hope - please if you are playing the game this is very, very serious - to your son, to your daughter, to your wife, to your husband - no attachment, which doesn't mean that you become callous. When there is attachment there is illusion, and when there is illusion there is no clarity. And when there is no clarity there is no freedom and therefore no order.

So the mind must have no identification with the name, with the form, or with any person, idea, conclusion - is that possible? And,

as we said, that does not deny love: on the contrary, when you are attached to a person there is no love; there is dependence, there is the fear of loneliness, to be left alone in the world where everything is so terribly insecure, both psychologically as well as outwardly. Therefore there is a desire to be attached to something.

As you are listening, if you want to find out what is the truth of death, what is the meaning, the real depth of that extraordinary thing that must happen in life, there must be freedom. And there is no freedom when there is attachment, when there is fear, when there is a desire for comfort. Can you put all that aside? Can you? Otherwise don't play the game. You can't play the game. I hope you have, because we are trying to find out together the truth of this extraordinary thing called death. And also the truth of what is before death. You understand? Not the truth after death, but also the truth before death. What is the truth before death? If that is not clear the other can't be clear. So we must look very closely, carefully and freely at what is before death, which we call living. Therefore, what is the truth of our living - which means what are you, or who are you? You understand? What are you, which you call living? We are trying to see the truth of that. I don't have to tell you, do I? You know it very well. A heavily conditioned mind through education, environment, through culture, through religious sanctions, beliefs and dogmas, rituals, my country, your country; the constant battle, wanting to be happy and being unhappy, depressed and elated, going through anxiety, uncertainty, hate, envy and the pursuit of pleasure, fear. Right? Afraid to be alone, fear of loneliness, old age, disease - this is the truth of our life, our daily life. Right? And can such a mind, which hasn't put order in

this life, order in the sense of that which comes through clarity and compassion, can such a mind which is so utterly fragmented, disorderly, frightened, find out the truth about something else? You follow what I am getting at?

So one must first put order in one's house. The house is burning and some of us are not aware of it at all. It is actually burning. If you read everyday a newspaper, what is happening in every country - so your house and the house of humanity is burning. And you aren't doing anything about it. Because we are all concerned with our own immediate security. Right? And when you seek security, for god's sake, you are bringing about total insecurity.

So during the last six talks, or whatever we have been through, we have tried to bring about clarity. Out of that clarity and compassion comes intelligence. Intelligence is compassion, is clarity, the awakening of that. And that awakening in the midst of this misery can come about, when you live with it completely. Do you understand? When you live with your suffering, with your sorrow, with your agony, with your person, live it completely, not escape from it at all in any direction. Then out of that comes an extraordinary sense of clarity, which we have talked about considerably.

So during these days have you, together, brought about this intelligence in life or death? If you have, and I hope for the sake of humanity and the world that you have - one wants to cry because human beings are so damn stupid - then you can find out the truth of death - not partially dying, partially awake, partially dead, as most human beings are, but the total ending, which is the brain not having enough oxygen can only last (I don't know exactly) three or

five minutes, and after that it cannot function. That is death, through disease, accident, old age, or through senility. Now what is the truth of it all? Some of us may have seen what is before death, and in seeing it very, very clearly, and out of that clarity comes compassion and therefore the awakening of intelligence, and with that intelligence we are going to look. Do you understand?

Otherwise you can't see the logic of it. If your house is not in complete order and therefore complete clarity and compassion, how can you find anything beyond it? So what is the truth of death? That is, complete ending. There may be something, or there may not be. Right? Because that is a hope and therefore hope creates distortion and therefore illusion. So we are cutting that out. Can you stand all this?

So the ending: one can only find out the truth of it when there is an ending. Right? Right? Then there is an ending to everything that you have. Can you do it? Ending to your attachment, not giving it a day, but ending it completely now. That is what death means. Can you? So ending, complete ending - when there is complete ending something new is born. You understand? I wonder if you do?

You know fear is a burden, a terrible burden, and when you remove that burden completely there is something new that takes place. Right? But we are afraid of ending, ending at the end of one's life. We are saying end it now. You have understood? End it; end your vanity, because without ending there is no beginning. Right? And we are caught in this continuity, never ending. So when there is total complete holistic ending there is something totally new beginning, of which you cannot possibly imagine. It is a totally different dimension - my saying it has no value. But as we

are together playing the game of trying to find out what is the truth of this extraordinary thing called death, to end one's attachment - to one's fears, to one's vanities, conclusions, neuroticisms - to end it. Can you do it? Will you do it? Are you doing it? Not bit by bit - one day attachment, next day fear, third day vanity, fourth day anxiety and so on - to end the whole thing now. That is, to end the content of consciousness, which is our consciousness. The content makes consciousness. The content is fear, attachment, greed, envy, my country, your country, my god - content. To end all that, not through will - through will you can never do anything, in the psychological sense. Then if you do it by will there is conflict. Right? And through conflict there is no understanding of the depth and truth of anything. If you and your wife, or your husband are in conflict you don't understand the relationship. It is only when there is no conflict then you can look at each other, then you can feel each other, trust each other - you follow? Then a totally different state exists in relationship.

So to find out the truth of what death is, there must be the ending of this content of one's consciousness. Therefore you will never ask: "Who am I?" Or "What am I?" You are your consciousness with its content. And when there is an ending to that consciousness with its content there is something entirely different, which is not imagined. You know, human beings have sought immortality in their action, one writes a book and in that book there is the immortality of the writer; a great painter does a sketch, a painting, and that painting becomes the immortality of that human being. All that must end, and which no artist is willing to do.

So as human beings, and each human being is a representative of the whole of humanity - I wish you could feel that, understand the depth of such a statement - you are the world, and the world is you, and when there is change in that consciousness you bring about a change in the human consciousness. So death is the ending of this consciousness as we know it. Right sirs.

See you on Sunday.

## **SAANEN 3RD PUBLIC TALK 14TH JULY 1977.**

Shall we go on with what we were talking about the day before yesterday? We were talking about authority and the dangers of an authoritarian outlook on life, which not only perverts perception, clarity but also breeds fear. And we went into it comparatively deeply. And where there is psychological authority the awakening of intelligence is not possible. We went into that quite clearly.

This morning, if one may, we will go into something that requires equal attention, that all of us think over together, the speaker is not only responsible for what he is saying but also those of you who are willing to listen seriously, it is your responsibility also, to share, to partake in thinking over together this thing that we are going to discuss this morning. We have been talking about security: security in the things of thought, the things thought has created, the security in authority; and also I would like to go into this question of finding safety, comfort, security in skill - skill in action. Please listen to it, because there is a great deal involved in this.

When one has a skill in action it gives a certain sense of well being, security. And that skill born of knowledge must invariably in its action become mechanical. Right? I hope we are sharing this together. Skill in action is what man has sought because it gives him a certain position in society, certain prestige and power - power to go to the moon, live under the sea and so on - skill, skill, which is born of accumulated technological knowledge. And if one lives in that field all the time, as one does in modern society, with all its economic demands, that knowledge becomes not only

additive - you add more to that knowledge - but also invariably it becomes a repetitive mechanical process that gradually gathers its own stimulation, its own activity, its own arrogance, and power. In that power one seeks a great deal of security - one has security. I do not know but this must be obvious to all of us. And the world at the present time is demanding more and more skill - whether you are an engineer, technological expert, a scientist, a psychotherapist, etc., etc., etc. But there is great danger, is there not, in seeking this absolute skill? That skill is born out of accumulated knowledge, but in that skill there is no clarity.

Please listen: I am going to investigate something totally new this morning. And I hope you will have the kindness and the seriousness to listen, not agreeing or disagreeing but thinking over together - thinking together logically, sanely, rationally and with a certain sense of humility.

When skill becomes all important in life, because that is the means of livelihood, and when one is totally educated for that purpose - all our universities, colleges, and schools are directed for that purpose - and that skill invariably breeds a certain sense of power, arrogance and self-importance. Right? What is the relationship of skill to clarity? And what is the relationship of clarity to compassion? These are the main things which we are going to discuss.

We have talked very often about the art of listening, the art of seeing, the art of learning. The art of listening is to listen so that naturally everything is put in its right place. The meaning of that word 'art' means that: to put things where they belong. And the art of seeing is to observe without any distortion, obviously. If there is



any distortion there is no observation. If we mistake a bird for a snake then you can't see clearly. In the same way to see clearly, to have great clarity in perception, there must be no distortion - distortion brought about by any form of motive, purpose, a direction. Right? May we go on? We are meeting each other, thinking together? And the art of learning is not only the acquisition of knowledge, which is necessary, necessary for skilful action, but also there is learning without accumulation. Right? This is a little more difficult. There are two types of learning: acquiring and gathering through experience, through books, through education a great deal of knowledge, and that knowledge is used skilfully - that is one form of learning; then there is the other form, which is never to accumulate, which means - please listen to this - which means never to register anything but that which is absolutely necessary. Right? Are we meeting each other? That is, when you learn any form of knowledge the brain is registering, accumulating knowledge, storing it up and acting from that storage of knowledge skilfully, or unskilfully. But there is another form of learning which is to become so totally aware that you only register what is absolutely necessary, and nothing else. You understand this? So then the mind is not cluttered up all the time with knowledge, movement. I wonder if you are following all this? We will go into this.

There are these three essential things in the awakening of intelligence: which is, the art of listening, to communicate not only verbally but non-verbally exactly what you mean, and you listen without distortion: that is the art of listening. The art of seeing is to observe clearly without a direction, without motive, without any

form of desire, but merely to observe. Right? And then there is the art of learning, accumulating knowledge which means registering all the things that are necessary for skilful action, and non-registering of any psychological responses, any psychological reactions so that the brain is employing itself where function, skill are necessary through knowledge and the brain is free not to register. Right? I wonder if you understand this? This is very arduous to be so totally aware so that you only register what is necessary and not, absolutely not register anything which is not necessary. Someone insults you, someone flatters you, someone calls you this or that, no registration. Right? This gives tremendous clarity - not only with regard to skill, which is the outcome of knowledge - why am I getting so... it is very exciting, you don't know what it means. I was thinking about this yesterday, I wanted to talk about it the day before yesterday but it slipped. To register and not to register so there is no psychological building up of the 'me', the structure of the self. The structure of the self arises only when there is registration of everything that is not necessary. That is, giving importance to one's name, form, one's experience, one's opinions, conclusions, all that is the gathering up of the energy of the self - which is always distorting. Right? Shall we go on? Please, I can go on but you must keep together with me. We are taking the journey together, I am not walking ahead of you, or walking behind you. We are all moving together.

So where there is the art of learning, where there is putting everything in its right place and therefore to listen without any conclusion, without any opinion - which are all distorting factors. And in that listening one discovers the false and the true, without

any effort because when there is actual attention given to listening that very attention excludes everything that is not absolutely factual. Right? And in the art of seeing, when one observes with one's conclusions, opinions, dogmas, beliefs you cannot possibly see very clearly - obviously. And the art of learning: learning to act in life skilfully, but any other form of registering distorts, gives importance to skill and therefore it becomes mechanical. I hope you understand this - right? You see this?

So the art of listening, the art of seeing, the art of learning gives extraordinary clarity, and therefore that clarity can communicate verbally. Right? So there is the skill in action, and if there is no clarity it breeds self importance, whether that self importance is identified with a group or with oneself, or with a nation. And that self importance denies clarity, naturally. So skill, clarity and compassion. You cannot have clarity without compassion. And because we have no compassion skill has become more important. Right?

It is very important to understand this because when you listen to all this seriously, with attention, and therefore sharing together in our thinking, logically and so on, when you have this compassion, clarity and skill, then you become the teacher, because then you have the teaching, not mine, the teaching. And so it becomes extraordinarily important for a person who listens. And this clarity is denied when there is any form of fear. Right? And most human beings have a great deal of fear which denies compassion. Right? Fear of various kinds, fear of growing old, fear of losing your husband, wife, losing your girl, boy and so on, fear of not being successful - you know, various forms of fear. I hope

you are aware of your own fears. You may not be aware of them sitting here, at this present moment, but if you are serious you don't have to invite fear, it is there. So you can look at the fear now? Right? You don't have to say, "Well, I am not afraid at this moment and I can't recall my fears" - which is absurd because you are a living human being now and in that state your fears, though they may be dormant, they are still there - consciously or unconsciously.

So fear in any form, both physiological as well as psychological, distorts clarity and therefore a person that is afraid in any form has no compassion. We will go into the whole question of compassion later, much later. But let's take all this together.

So as I said, the art of seeing, the art of observing very clearly, and that is only possible when you don't want to get rid of fear because then that becomes a distorting factor; or you are unconscious of your fears, which is also a distorting factor. Right? So to be aware of the fear, the many fears which have a common root - right? Agreed to this? Oh, come on! It is like a tree: a tree has many, many branches and many leaves. And fear also has many branches, many leaves, many expressions of fear which breed their own flowering and their own fruit, which is action. Right? So one must go to the very root of fear, not take various forms of fears but the root of fear. Is that clear?

Look: one may be afraid of darkness, one may be afraid of losing one's wife, or husband, one may be afraid of having no money, one may be afraid of some past pain and not wanting it again, one may be afraid of a dozen things. And analytically one can go through them one by one - right? And this is such a waste of time, isn't it? Whereas it would be much simpler and more direct if

you go to the root of fear. Right? I don't think many of us realize, or are aware deeply of the nature of fear, what it does to human beings. Because when there is fear there are many kinds of neurotic actions. Fear of being lonely - you know most of you are lonely; and so you seek companionship escaping from loneliness. So companionship becomes very important, and if you have no companionship fear arises. Or out of that loneliness you build a wall around yourself, you resist, you escape and out of that escape, resistance, suppression, grows every form of neurotic action. So it is very important to understand the nature and the structure of fear, because it will not give clarity. And if there is no clarity there is no awakening of intelligence, which is the meaning that we have gathered together here, to see if we cannot awaken that intelligence which is neither yours nor mine, it is intelligence. And that intelligence has its own action, which is non mechanistic, and therefore without cause. Oh, I wonder if you understand all this? Right? Somebody, yes?

So it is very important to understand, to be free totally, completely of fear. Right? Is that what we are prepared to do? Is that what we are thinking together? We see the importance and the urgency of being completely, consciously as well as unconsciously, to wipe fear away? One can deal with conscious fears comparatively easily. Right? But it is much more difficult to be free of fears of which you know naught of, fears that are hidden. Right? Do you understand this? Shall I go on? How are you going to examine the deep rooted fears? Is it possible to examine them? Psychologists say it is possible through analysis, through dreams, through careful psychoanalytical therapy. That is, one must go into

this question of analysis altogether so that the mind is free from the analytical process, because analysis doesn't clear up the mind.

Right? There is no clarity in analysis because the more you analyse the more there is. And it might take you the whole of your life - at the end of it you have nothing! Right?

So we are going to think together and to find out the truth - the truth, not yours or mine, but the truth of analysis. Right? Can we go together? First of all in analysis there is the observer and the observed. Right? The analyser and the analysed. Which is, the analyser says, "I am going to analyse my reactions" - right? "My dreams, my desires, my fears". But is the analyser different from the fear? You understand? Different from the thing which he is going to analyse? You must be very clear on this. We are asking: is the analyser different from the analysed? If you say they are different, which most people do, then you are caught in everlasting conflict. Right? That is, the analyser, being different, he can examine his responses and jealousies, anger, violence, and in that examination, in that analysis, the examiner thinks he is separate. Right? And this separation will inevitably divide, and therefore there must be conflict. Right? Where there is division there must be conflict, whether the division is between two nations or division between man and woman - not that the woman is the same as the man, obviously biologically they are not - but the ideas, the accumulated responses of each, the images they have of each, they divide, and therefore there is conflict in all the relationships. Right? Can we go on?

So: when there is analysis and the analyser is different there must be inevitably conflict. And most unfortunately, we are

educated to have conflict, it is the way of our life. If we have no conflict we say, "What is wrong with me?" And to have conflict is the essence of neuroticism, as violence. And in analysis time is necessary. Right? It might take days, months, years, if you have the energy, the capacity, the money then you can go on analysing yourself endlessly - it becomes quite fun! Then you have somebody to go to, to tell them all about your troubles and pay fifty dollars, or whatever you pay. That is such a waste of time. So in analysis time is implied. That is, postponement of the immediate solution of the problem. Analysis implies conflict, analysis implies time, analysis implies no ending to any problem. That is a fact. So when you see the truth of this, or see the fact, you will never analyse. Right? Then what will you do? If you have been educated as most people are to analyse; it is necessary to analyse technologically - medicine and so on - but psychologically analysis, not only breeds time, division, but also each analysis must be complete, mustn't it? Otherwise the incompleteness of analysis is brought over from yesterday, and with the incomplete analysis you examine the new fact. Right? So there is always a colouring from the past of the present. Right? If you see this very, very clearly - and I hope you do, I am making it as clear as possible, one could talk about it endlessly but there is no time for that - then what will you do if you don't analyse? If you see analysis is a false process in spite of all the big names and all the rest of it, if you yourself see actually the truth that analysis doesn't lead anywhere, then what will you do?

Now we are going to take fear. Most of us are accustomed to analyse fear, the cause and the effect. Right? What has made one

afraid? One seeks the cause. Right? That is a process of analysis. It may be a hundred causes, or it may be a single cause. And the cause, with its effect, the effect becomes the cause for the next fear - right? So there is causation, effect, and the effect becomes the cause. So when you are seeking a cause you are caught up in this chain. Are you following all this? And therefore there is no release from this chain, which is part of analysis. Are we following this? Clear?

So one asks: if there is no analysis then what will happen to my fear? What will happen to the fear that one has? The fears may be a dozen but the root of fear, we are concerned with the root, not with the branches - if you can pull out the root it is finished. The whole tree is dead. Right? So what is the root of fear? Can one find that out through analysis? Obviously not. Because as I have explained the reasons, the logic of not being able to see the root of fear if you are caught up with analysis. Right? So what is the root of fear? Is it time - time being chronological, there is the watch, time by the watch, twenty four hours, sunset to sunrise, that is one form of time? There is the other which is psychological time. Right? Are you following this? That is the tomorrow: psychologically I will solve my problems the day after tomorrow. Right? So is fear the result of time? I have had pain yesterday or last week, and that pain is registered in the brain, which is unnecessary, and that pain being registered then there is the fear of that pain happening again a week later. When there is no registration of that pain then there is no fear, which is time. You understand that? Oh, come on! Are we meeting each other somewhere? Am I explaining clearly?

There is fear when there is measurement. Right? When one



measures oneself with somebody there is fear. I am not as intelligent as you are and I would like to be as intelligent as you are, and I am afraid I may not be. All that is a movement of time, isn't it? Which is measurement, which is comparison. So measurement, time, comparison, imitation breeds fear. Are you following? And all that, which is time, measurement, comparison, is the movement of thought. Right? So thought is the very root of fear. Please see the logic, the reasoning of this. It is not just a haphazard statement. We are thinking together, examining together, taking the journey together to find out. And we see analysis is not the solution; finding the cause is not the solution; and time is not the solution, time being measurement, comparison, and time is the movement of thought. So the problem then is not how to be free of fear, or how to suppress fear, but to understand the whole movement of thought. Right? See how far we have gone away from the demand to be free of fear? We are entering into something much greater, much more comprehensive. If there is understanding of the whole movement of thought it must be holistic, whole. And fear arises only when there is the 'me', which is the small, not the whole. I wonder if you understand all this?

So the art of learning, the art of seeing, the art of listening - in that art there is no movement of thought. Right? I am just listening to you, why should I interfere with my thoughts. I am seeing, observing, in that observation there is no movement of thought. Right? I just observe. I observe the mountain, the tree, the river, the people, without any projection of my background and so on, which is the movement of thought. Right? And thought is necessary to accumulate knowledge to function skilfully, but otherwise thought

has no place whatsoever. And this brings tremendous clarity, doesn't it? I hope you have clarity - have you? Clarity means there is no centre from which you are functioning. Right? A centre which is put together by thought as the 'me', mine, they and we - right? And where there is a centre there must be a circumference, and where there is a circumference there is resistance, there is division, and that is one of the causes, the fundamental causes of fear. Right? 'Causes' in quotes.

So when we consider fear we are considering the whole movement of thought, which breeds fear. And clarity is only possible when thought is completely in abeyance. Right? That is, when thought has its right place, which is to act in the field of knowledge and not enter into any other field. You understand sirs? Therefore in that there is total elimination of all opinion, judgement, evaluation. There is only listening, seeing and learning. And without that clarity skill becomes the most destructive thing in life, which is what is happening in the world. You can go to the moon and put the flag of your country up there, which is not clarity. You can kill each other through wars, by the extraordinary development of technology, which is the movement of thought. You can divide yourselves into races, communes, and so on and so on, which are all divisions created by thought.

So thought is fragmentary. Right? I wonder if you see all this. So whatever it does must be fragmented. Right? Do you see this? I wonder if you do? Thought is a fragment. Thought is limited. Thought is conditioned. Thought is narrow, because thought is based on experience, memory, knowledge, which is the past, which is time-binding. Right? So that which is time-binding is necessarily

limited, therefore thought is fragmented. Right? Right sirs? So thought can never understand that which is whole. Thought can never understand that which is immeasurable, which is timeless. The timeless, the immeasurable one can imagine, thought can put up all kinds of imaginary future structures, but it is still limited. So god put together by thought is limited. Right? No, I am afraid those of you who believe in god won't see this, because your god is the result of your thought, of your fears, of your desire to be secure. And you may say, "Has not god created all nature?" - talk to the scientists and they will tell you about it, the biologists and the theoretical physicists and so on. So thought, whatever - please see the truth of this and clarity will come like sun out of the clouds - that thought is the word, and the word is never the thing, the word is the description of the thing but the thing is not the description. Right? So fear then becomes completely useless, it has no meaning. Then you have to find out whether thought can ever remain in its field? You understand? And not move out of that field. That is, to register, because that is the function of the brain, to register so that it can be secure, so that it can be safe. Right? It is safe, secure in the field of knowledge because that is the function of the brain accumulating knowledge so as to be secure in that field, because you can't live without security - food, clothes and shelter one must have, not for the few but for the whole. And that is only possible when thought only operates there; and when it does not register in any other direction there is then no nationality, there is no you and me. I don't know if you see this. There is no division because when there is no registration the mind is free to look. Right? The mind is free to observe. And when there is that

clarity skill never becomes mechanical. You understand sirs?  
Because there is functioning always from that clarity. Whatever the skill be it is functioning, acting from that clarity which is born out of compassion. Right?

So one has to enquire very deeply into what is compassion. Can we go into it now? You understand, we have talked very clearly about clarity and skill, and the dangers of skill without clarity - skill then becomes a means of self aggrandizement, the aggrandizement of a nation, of a group - you know, the whole process of it. So we are saying there are three things one must understand very, very carefully - understand in the sense of not intellectually, not verbally but actually see the quality of it. There are three things, which are compassion, clarity and skill. Right? And when there is compassion there is no division between clarity and skill. Right? It is one movement. I wonder if you see this? And because we are caught up in skill we don't see the total movement. So what is the nature and the structure of compassion? To understand it one must go into the whole question of pleasure, love, suffering, death. You can't just say, "I have compassion". The mind that says, "I am compassionate", is not compassionate. You understand? I wonder if you do. When the mind says, "I am intelligent", it is no longer intelligent because it is conscious of itself. Right? When it is conscious of itself there is no intelligence.

So one must go into this question: what is the depth and the meaning and the significance and the beauty of compassion? And to do that we must enquire not only, as we did, into fear, but also into pleasure. Is love pleasure? Is love desire? Is love of another a remembrance? Is love of another an image? All these are involved

when we think over together this question of compassion. And we can only go into it when we go together, not the speaker goes into it and you just listen, when we go together into it, because a human being is not alone, he is the essence of all human beings. And that is a fact, that is a reality. It is not my invention, my wanting to identify myself with the whole. The absolute fact is you, as a human being, living through millenia after millenia, you are the representative of the whole of mankind, mankind that has suffered, agonized, shed tears, killed, and been killed, jealous, angry, anxious, seeking pleasure, caught in fear - you are all that. Therefore you are the entire humanity. And when there is a total revolution in this consciousness, that revolution affects the consciousness of mankind. That is a fact. And that is why it is so urgently important that each one of us who listens, and you are good enough to listen, serious enough to take the journey together, when you fundamentally, deeply do that, when consciousness changes its content, you affect the whole of mankind.

So when we meet next time, next Sunday, we will go into the question of what is compassion. Right sirs.

# **BROCKWOOD PARK 2ND PUBLIC DIALOGUE**

## **1ST SEPTEMBER 1977**

What shall we do this morning? Discussions are not possible with a large crowd like this, nor dialogues, but perhaps we can start with questions and answers and see where it goes. May we do that?

Right.

No questions? Yes sir.

Q: When one is totally attentive there is no thought, but when there is thought one is seeing inattentively. Could we discuss about how this inattention comes about?

K: The gentleman would like to discuss, to talk over together, the question of when there is complete attention there is no movement of thought; but thought arises when there is inattention, when there is no attention. So could one go into this question? Are there any others?

Q: Could we talk about education and responsibility?

Q: Do you think sir that the unconditional freedom of the human mind is dependent upon the ending of suffering and slaughtering of animals?

K: We have answered that question the other day sir. You are raising the same question again.

Q: Forbearance and children.

K: Education and responsibility - what shall we talk over together? When there is complete attention, a total, not commitment, not concentration, but complete attention there is no arising of thought. Is that so? Then also in that question was asked: when there is inattention, when there is no attention thought arises,

how is one, or is it possible to maintain total attention all the time? Isn't that the question sir? And education and responsibility. So what shall we discuss?

Q: The first question sir.

K: The first question.

Q: Could you include in that something to do with the flowering of good?

K: Would you also discuss the nature of the flowering of goodness.

Perhaps we can include all these three questions in talking over together what is attention and that which is not attention. Shall we begin with that? Am I going to have a dialogue with myself, or will you join in with me? You know having a dialogue with myself may be very amusing to you. I once saw a hole that had to be dug for an electric conduit and there were about eight people sitting all around and two men were working. The others were smoking, talking, drinking and having a good time watching the others dig! So it appears to me that it will be the same when I am having a dialogue with myself. So in answering this question: what is attention, what is the nature of thought that ceases when there is complete attention, and when there is no attention thought arises. That is what we are going to talk over together.

First of all, if one may ask, has one gone into this question of what is awareness, what is it to be aware, otherwise we will not be able to understand, totally, completely the full significance of attention. So I think we ought to talk over together the question of what is awareness. Don't you think? I don't want to have a dialogue with myself, please.

Q: How does the concept of awareness come about actually?

K: What is the concept of awareness, how does it arise, what is the necessity of awareness? Right sir?

Q: No sir, what I mean is that the concept of awareness is unawareness, and it seems that in trying to be aware there is a concept of awareness that gets in the way.

K: That is what we are saying, the same.

Q: You have to find out where the concept of awareness is, why should we make concepts of things?

K: Wait a minute. I understand what you are saying. Which is: why do we make concepts? Why do we make out of a statement, which may be factual, a concept of it, an idea of it, a conclusion of it? Shall we deal with that first and go on into it?

Someone makes a statement that politicians are generally crooked. And we make an image of politicians, or draw a conclusion from it, but you never take the word and its whole significance without making an abstraction of it. You understand? We make abstractions of truth, of a fact, but we never look at the fact but make an abstraction and then act according to that abstraction. That is fairly simple. So we will go into it.

What is the concept of awareness - concept, that is, is there an idea of awareness, or are you aware? There is a difference. The idea of being aware: or be aware. Let's go into it a little more. The word 'aware' means to be sensitive, to be alive, to things about you - to nature, to people, to colour, to the trees, to the environment, to the social structure, the whole thing, to be aware outwardly of all that is happening outside and to be aware of what is happening inside - to be sensitive, to know, to observe what is happening



inside, and also what is happening outside, environmentally, economically socially and so on and so on. Now if one is not aware what is happening outwardly and one begins to be aware inwardly then one becomes rather neurotic. But if one begins to be aware of what is exactly happening in the world, as much as possible, and then from there move inwardly, then you have a balance, then there is a possibility of not deceiving oneself. So we will begin by being aware of what is happening outwardly and then move, like an ebb on the tide that comes in and then goes out, comes in and goes out, there is constant movement, out, in, in and out, so that there is no deception.

Why are we governed? Why is there a government? Why is there social difference - the poor and the rich, the various classes, racial differences, national differences, religious differences, all that is going on outwardly - wars, violence and every kind of brutal activity going on? And governments exist to rule, obviously. Without some kind of order there must be disorder - politically, religiously and all the rest of it. So let's find out what is order and what is disorder. Right? Can we begin with that? Because that is what is happening, outwardly there is tremendous disorder. Right?

Q: Could you just clear up one point? You said that one must be aware outwardly first otherwise there may be deception within. Why is this so?

K: The gentleman asks if one is not aware outwardly what is happening and begin to be aware inwardly - I said there might be a possibility of deception, of not being able to see clearly what is happening inside because what is happening outside you can observe, see, hear, know, and you can judge. And inwardly if you

know what is happening outside and from there move inwardly you have then a criteria - I wonder if I am making it clear? This is fairly simple I think. Sir look: how am I to study myself? How am I to know myself? Which is: myself is a very complex structure, very complex movement, how am I to know myself so that I don't deceive myself? I can only know myself in my relationship to others. Right? In my relationship to others I may withdraw from others because I don't want to be hurt. Or in my relationship I may discover that I am very jealous, that I am dependent, that I am attached, that I am really quite callous. So relationship acts as a mirror in which one knows oneself. It is the same thing outwardly - the outer is a reflection of myself, because the society, the government, all the things we have created are created by humanity, by human beings. That is all fairly obvious.

So in beginning to find out what is awareness we must go into the question of what is order and what is disorder. Right? We see outwardly there is a great deal of disorder, confusion and uncertainty. Right? Shall we go on? Now what has brought about this uncertainty, this order outwardly? I know there is this disorder outwardly, who is responsible for all this? Are we? Be quite clear please. Don't be hesitant. Be quite clear whether we are responsible for the disorder outwardly, or it is some divine disorder out of which divine order will come. So if we feel responsible for the outward disorder then is that disorder an expression of our own disorder?

Q: We are generally confused therefore we throw out confusion.

K: Quite. So as we are generally confused we throw out - the gentleman suggests - confusion. So I have learnt, observed this

disorder outwardly is created by my disorder inwardly. So as long as human beings have no order in themselves there will be disorder always. And governments try to control that disorder outwardly. The extreme form is this totalitarianism where Marxism, Lenin, Maoism - you know - is to say we know what order is, you don't, we are going to tell you what it is. Right? And suppress you, or concentration camps, psychiatric hospitals and all the rest of it follow.

So if the world is in disorder because we are in disorder, each one of us, then are we aware of our disorder? Or is it a concept of disorder? You understand? Are we aware that we are in disorder? Or there is an idea which has been suggested that we are in disorder therefore I accept that idea? The acceptance of an idea is an abstraction, an abstraction of 'what is'. The abstraction is to move away from 'what is' - and most of us live in ideas, move away from facts. So what is it we are doing now? Are we accepting a concept of disorder, or are we aware that we are ourselves in disorder? You understand the difference between the two? It is clear. Now which is it? Aware of disorder in ourselves because somebody else has suggested it? And without somebody suggesting it, or having a concept of order, do you become aware per se, for itself? I wonder? This is simple. Shall we go on from there?

So am I aware of my disorder?

Q: One is aware but one becomes very fearful, even suicide and all the rest of it.

K: Yes sir, we are coming to that slowly. We will go slowly, if you don't mind, step by step - not jump to any conclusions. Are we

aware, am I aware, I and you, aware that we are in ourselves in disorder? (Baby crying) That is disorder!

Q: Sir I feel there would be order if that young lady could be very quiet with her mother.

K: Yes sir. I am not responsible.

So: are we in ourselves aware that we are in disorder? And what do we mean by disorder - not what is order, but what do we mean by disorder? Come on sirs.

Q: May I come in on this point. It is very difficult, we can only be aware of our disorder at this particular moment but thought comes and goes. May I ask you: I have found how difficult it is to be actually aware of it.

K: Yes sir. To be actually at every moment to be aware of this disorder. That is why - please if we are serious, talking seriously together - we are asking each other what does it mean to be in disorder?

Q: To be in contradiction with oneself, within oneself.

K: Yes, that means contradiction. Why are we in contradiction?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Look into yourselves please, please look into yourself, watch it.

Q: One half thinks one thing and another bit thinks another.

K: So there is contradiction. You think one thing, do another. Say one thing and do something else and so on. There is contradiction, opposing desires, opposing demands, opposing movements in all of us, duality. Right? Are you clear on this? May we go on? Duality. How does this duality arise? I am having a conversation with myself.

Q: My conditioning.

K: Yes. Is it my conditioning? Is it our conditioning?

Q: Dissatisfaction.

K: Sir look.

Q: The struggle between the inner self and what we have been conditioned to accept.

K: So we have been conditioned to accept, and not to accept, to obey and not to obey, to follow and the urge to be independent. So that is there is constant dualistic action going on, whether it is conditioned, or not conditioned. So we are asking: how does this duality arise?

Q: Because we compare 'what is' with 'what should be'.

K: Are you doing that? Or is that an idea?

Q: I am doing that.

K: Good. I am not trying to be sarcastic sir. We are talking factually, not theoretically, not in abstractions, not in hypothetical anythings, but dealing with facts. Then we can go very far if we deal with facts. But if you go into abstractions you are lost.

So we are asking: why does this contradiction arise, basically, - I know education, culture and all the rest of it, but go beyond that, much more fundamentally, deeply. Why does this contradiction arise, between heaven and hell, god and the devil - you follow? - the whole social, moral structure?

Q: We are brought up to it, rewarded for being good, and punished for being bad.

K: Yes sir, reward and punishment.

Q: So therefore one is acting out of fear.

K: I am asking sir - we know that - we are asking a much more

fundamental thing: why does this contradiction, division, exist fundamentally? Go into it much deeper. Fear is involved in it but go much further than that.

Q: Due to lack of awareness from without.

Q: Sir, we call ourselves human beings but we have a lot of animal instincts.

K: Yes. The animal instincts are based on reward and punishment - but it is only domesticated animals that have this reward and punishment conditioning. But generally, I believe, they have told me also, that wild animals don't have regard to reward and punishment, they kill to eat, that's all. That is not reward or punishment. Let's leave that for the moment.

Shall I talk to myself? No? You are not following what I am asking you. Please just go into it. Fundamentally why does this contradiction exist?

Q: Thought arises?

K: Don't guess sir. Let's go into it.

Q: I think it is trial and error.

K: Trial and error - no, no.

Q: Sir, can that question really be answered?

K: I am going to answer it. I am not conceited. I have enquired into this - for fifty two years I have talked about this blasted thing.

Q: Sir, is it not inherent in human consciousness?

K: Is it inherent in human consciousness. If it is inherent, inborn, then you can't do anything about it.

Q: An inherent conditioning.

K: Inherent conditioning. It may be that. I want to go into it.

Q: Is it because we want to be in harmony and we deceive

ourselves.

K: We deceive ourselves.

Q: Mainly because I want two things.

K: Man, woman, light and shadow, courage and cowardice - you know, you can multiply, but why does this dualistic activity go on in us? You can explain - conditioning, instinct, inherent, we have been taught and so on and so on, and so on and so on

Q: We are operating all the time from self-centred activity.

K: Yes sir, self-centred activity and therefore there is division. I am asking you, why does this division exist? I won't ask anymore.

Q: There is a nerve and we don't listen to it, we try to be what we are not.

K: Don't you want to find out?

Q: I think there is a lot of influence from a lot of groups of people.

Q: Is it that we are too ready with intellectual answers?

K: That's right sir - just verbal answers, too quickly. If you don't mind go into it seriously and find out. Why is there this dualistic action, 'what is' and 'what should be' - right? The ideal and the fact - that is good enough. 'What is' and 'what should be'. Look into that. Just take that. And why is there this division between 'what is' and 'what should be', the ideal?

Q: Escaping from the fact.

Q: Because we think we know what should be.

K: I am asking, my lady, why is there this division?

Q: Because we want to impress others.

K: You see how you make me have a dialogue with myself - which I don't want. I am asking a very simple question. I am asking

myself, and therefore I am asking you: why is there this division between 'what is' and 'what should be'?

Q: We do not listen.

Q: If I am living totally in the present, totally in the now, I don't have those thought, I don't have thoughts, I am totally aware.

K: No, sir. Please you are not answering my question.

Q: When I ask myself that question I don't like what I find.

K: Let's begin with that, I don't like 'what is' and I would like 'what should be'. The pleasure of 'what should be' is greater than 'what is'. Right? Take a simple thing like that, begin with that. That is, sir, I have no hope in this life, but I have a hope later on, next life and so on. So what is the process of this division?

Q: Surely the evolution of consciousness, imagination, always on the move, never ever satisfied.

K: Is it sir that we are incapable of looking at 'what is'? We would rather run away from 'what is' into 'what should be', hoping somehow, by some miracle, by some effort of will to change 'what is' into 'what should be'. Take that simple fact and begin with that. That is, I am angry and I should not be angry. If I knew what to do with anger, how to deal with anger and go beyond it there is no need for 'what should be', which is 'don't be angry'. You understand my question? If you can tell me what to do with 'what is', then I won't escape to 'what should be' because I don't know what to do with 'what is', I hope by inventing an ideal I can somehow through the ideal change 'what is'. This is what is happening - no? Will you start from there?

Q: If we remain with 'what is' is there anything to do at all?

K: I am coming to that. Let's look into it first. Because I am



incapable I don't know what to do, my brain has been so conditioned that I am always living in the future - 'what should be'. But I am essentially living in the past. But I hope by living in the future I can alter the present. Right? Now if you were to tell me what I am to do with 'what is' then the future doesn't matter to me. Right? I wonder if you understand this.

It is not a question of accepting 'what is', but remaining with 'what is'. Right?

Q: I see there is a lot more implied than you are actually bringing out in this. I am denied, the 'me' is denied when you say that.

K: I don't want to go into the 'me' yet. It is very complex. Just begin with the simple. Which is: I am greedy, that is a fact. The abstraction of the fact is non-greedy. So it means I have moved away from 'what is'. And by moving away I hope to understand 'what is'. Now I can only understand something if I can look at 'what is' and not run away from it, not try to change into something else. So can I, with your help, can I remain, look, observe, see 'what is' - nothing else? You understand my question? You have understood my question? Please teach me.

Q: The problem there is you see we don't want 'what is'.

K: Then escape.

Q: That is what we are all doing.

K: Do it, but know that you are escaping.

Q: That doesn't change it.

K: Know that you are escaping. Therefore you haven't solved a thing. But be aware that you are escaping, that you are running away, avoiding.

Q: The point is that it is worth seeing that as soon as one tries to see 'what is', one doesn't do that. I see that I am jealous - at least I do not see it yet but the feeling is there, that it is worth challenging perhaps.

K: Sir, so please help me to understand how to deal with 'what is' - then my problem is solved, you understand? Then I won't fight duality, there won't be duality. So please teach me, help me to understand and go beyond it, not remain in it - go beyond 'what is'.

Q: Sir we have the concept between 'what is' and 'what should be' and that is part of 'what is'.

K: No, sir, please sir. Of course in a sense it is but please.

Q: You want to learn about something, that is your greed, and to learn about anything you have to be attentive.

K: That is what I am coming to sir. Slowly, sir, slowly, piano, piano. Please help me to understand 'what is'. How am I to look at 'what is'? Right? If I know how to look at it then I can begin to unravel it and then it is finished. Right? Now please help me to learn the art of observation of 'what is'.

Q: Look at it without thought.

K: Oh madam, how am I to look at it without thought? I don't know.

Q: Be aware.

K: You see you are not doing this. Do it, please, then you won't answer so quickly.

Q: To look at 'what is' is very difficult.

K: I said what is the art of looking? Please if you give five minutes, two minutes attention to this marvellous thing you'll learn something. What is the art of looking?

Q: I said it is acceptance.

K: No sir, it is not acceptance. Just to look.

Q: Watch your thoughts.

K: Oh no. I am asking you - I give up! I had better have a conversation with myself.

I want to look at 'what is' - there must be a great deal involved in it because we have looked. I know I am greedy but it doesn't do anything. Greed is a feeling. I have looked at that feeling named greed. The word is not the thing. But we may be mistaking the word for the thing. This is not intellectual; it is very simple. I may be caught in words but not with facts. The fact is I am greedy. The word - it is very complex that is why you should go into this very deeply - the word may incite that feeling. Can the mind be free of the word and look? You follow what I am saying? So I must first learn whether the word has become important to me in my life. Am I a slave to words, knowing that the word is not the thing? So the word becomes important when the fact is not real, actual to us. I would rather look at a picture of a mountain than go and look at a mountain. Right? To look at a mountain I have to go a great distance, climb, look, observe, feel. But by looking at a picture of a mountain - it is a picture, it is a symbol, it is not reality. So are we caught in words? If you are caught in words then you are moving away from the fact. So does the word create the feeling of greed, or is there a greed without the word? Examination requires tremendous discipline, not suppression, the very enquiry and the pursuit in that enquiry has its own discipline. So I have to find out very carefully whether the word has created the feeling, or the feeling exists without the word. The word is greed, I have named

it. I have named it because I have had that feeling before. So I am registering the present feeling by a past incident of the same kind. So the present has been absorbed into the past. Are you interested in all this?

So I realize what I am doing. I am aware of what is happening. What is happening is that the word has become extraordinarily important to me. So then is there a freedom from the word - communist, socialist, etc.etc., greed, envy, nationality and so on - is there a freedom from the word? The word is the past. Right? The feeling is the present recognized by the word as the past, so I am living all the time in the past. So the past is me, the past is time, so time is me. Look what I am discovering - come on! Time is me. So the 'me' says, I must not be angry because my conditioning has said don't be angry, don't be greedy. So the past is telling the present what it should do. So there is a contradiction. So I am finding out why there is contradiction. There is contradiction because fundamentally, very deeply, the past is dictating the present, what it should do. Which is, the 'me', which is the past with all its memories, experiences, knowledge, and the thing that it has put together by thought, the 'me', which is the past, which is time, the past is dictating what should happen.

Now can I observe the fact - please listen - the fact of greed without the past? Can there be observation of greed without naming it, without getting caught in the word and understand whether the word has created the feeling, and if the word has created the feeling then the word is me, which is the past, so the 'me' is telling me, "Don't be greedy". So I am asking myself whether it is possible to look at 'what is' without the 'me', which is

the observer. Right? Can I observe greed, the feeling and its fulfilment and action without the observer, which is the past? Get it?

Q: How?

K: Don't say, how to do it. You will do it as we learn going along, it's like learning to drive a car. You learn day by day, looking, looking, looking. Or in one moment you can learn the whole thing, but that is much more difficult and I won't go into that.

So are you doing now what is being said? That is, 'what is' can only be observed when there is no me. Right? Can you observe without the observer? Go on sirs.

Q: Only if it is possible to look at it and not want an answer.

K: I am going to show you in a minute. Wait a minute. I am asking then how you then observe? No, observe. Observe the tent, observe the colour round you, the shirts and the dresses - how do you observe it? What is observation? You observe through the eye, don't you? Now you can observe without moving the eye? Because if you move the eye the whole operation of the brain comes into being. I won't go into this because you will turn it into some kind of mystical, nonsensical thing, mysterious and you know, occult and all the rest of that. There is something mysterious in the world, hidden things which you cannot possibly find unless you have laid the foundation of righteousness - to live correctly, truthfully without conflict, then you have all kinds of powers. But if you start seeking powers of various kinds then you are lost, you become somewhat neurotic.

So can you observe, as you do with your eyes, to look without

any distortion? The moment there is distortion the brain is in operation. Golly, I have got it! You understand? Now look at something without moving your eyes. How still the brain becomes. Have you noticed it? The moment you look all around there is then taking all that in - I won't go into that. Anyhow, how do you observe all this? You observe it not only with your eyes but you observe with all your care, if you are interested you observe with care. Which means you observe with affection - care means affection - right? No? So is there an observation of the fact, not the idea, but the fact, with care, with affection? Is there an observation of violence with care and with affection? Therefore there is no - you follow? Oh, you don't see all this - it is so simple once you capture this. Awareness implies care, affection. So you approach 'what is' with care, with affection, therefore where there is affection there is no judgement. Right? There is no condemnation therefore you are free of the opposite. I wonder if you get this.

Q: We have to love.

K: Ah, not we have to love. That is not an action of will. If there is to be an understanding of 'what is', and 'what is ' may be violence, greed, brutality, cruelty or joy - awareness implies great care in looking. When you have a baby don't - the mother cares infinitely with affection, gets up at two, three or four o'clock in the morning, half a dozen times, watching, watching, watching. So in the same way where there is awareness there is care, there is affection. Can there be observation, awareness of violence with care, to look at it with a great deal of care? See all its operation, what is implied, how it affects humanity - you follow - the whole of it, what is happening in the world, what is happening inside, to

look at it with infinite care and affection. Then there is no duality. The mother doesn't say my baby is not so beautiful as the other baby. It is her baby. Later on she might wish it.

So awareness implies observing the fact, not the idea of the fact, but the fact of 'what is'. And in that awareness there is infinite care, watching, affection - you know. Then there is no duality. Duality exists because we don't know what to do with 'what is'. When I know what to do with it, duality is non-existent. When I know, for example, that I am greedy I go into it very, very carefully. Is it the word that has incited the feeling? Or does the feeling exist without the word? I must find out that first. That is, I see a shirt, material of a shirt and there is perception, contact, sensation, the desire to have it, cut properly - you follow - the image begins. So that is greed. Now is there greed without the object? Oh, you people don't know what all this is.

Q: Maybe when you observe violence there is an immediate reaction to it and you become violent yourself.

K: Yes. So when you observe violence there is an immediate reaction to it, and that reaction may be another form of violence. Now watch it! That is, you say something to me which I don't like and I become angry. It is a tremendous question sir, this, if you go into it. That is, not to register what you have said, either in the way of flattery or in the way of insult. If you don't register there is no reaction. This requires a discipline of a totally different kind, watching - watch yourself so completely that you only register, as we discussed the other day, what is absolutely essential, nothing psychologically. To understand that and to go into it, to watch it, is its own discipline - you understand? Not imposed. There is its own

- it says, look, look carefully, don't move - you follow? - that itself is - right?

So we said duality exists in all of us, which is self contradiction in various forms because we do not know what kind of action should take place with 'what is'. If I know it there is no duality. In India and all over the world, they have been preaching non-violence, especially in India, it started from there, probably with Tolstoy and much earlier. And people who talk a great deal about non-violence are very violent people because that is a fact. They are suppressing it, they are holding it, they are controlling it but they talk about it. But if you really understand violence, the whole of it, the word and so on and so on then there is no opposite at all. So this is awareness. You understand? I have to watch the word violent and I see that violence, confusion exists because I have contributed to it, I am responsible for it. And to eliminate violence I must understand the whole nature of violence - anger, imitation, conformity, accepting authority and so on and so on. Right?

Now when there is awareness you can move to something else, which is: what is the difference between awareness and concentration? We learn at school to concentrate. I want to look out of the window and the teacher says, "Look, look at your book", so there is immediately contradiction. I want to see out of the window, what is happening out there, and the teacher tells me, "Look at your book" - so there is conflict. If I have a good teacher he says, "First look at what is happening out there. Look at it with all your attention." You understand? "Look with great care at the tree, the bird sitting on it, the leaves moving in the wind." From that he learns attention - you follow - learns awareness and so on.



So one has to find out for oneself what is awareness, what is concentration, and what is attention. We have talked about attention, whether it can be maintained, sustained all the time. Or if there is inattention, there is no attention? That is one problem. Then the other is: what is concentration? Why do we give such tremendous importance to concentration? Go on sirs, I don't want to have a dialogue with myself.

Q: Concentration is to do with attention.

K: No, no. You have to learn about it. What is concentration? Why do all of you who meditate under the tree or in your room, try to concentrate? Don't you?

Q: You achieve something.

K: Sir, are we talking about the same thing? Are you talking about concentration?

Q: You achieve something.

K: I am asking what is concentration, why do we give such importance to concentration?

Q: It suppresses the chattering mind.

K: To suppress the chattering mind. See what you are doing. That means conflict, doesn't it? Your mind is chattering and you suppress it, so there is duality, there is conflict, there is struggle. But you never ask why is your mind chattering. Not how to stop it. Why is your mind chattering? This is all so childish sirs. Why is one's mind chattering? Is it habit? Is it laziness? Is it comforting? Think it out sirs. Is it laziness that the mind has got into the habit and therefore it keeps on chattering, chattering, chattering? Is it your conditioning? Is it because it is afraid very profoundly that if it doesn't chatter what will happen? You understand? That is, most

of our minds are occupied, whether in the kitchen, whether in the office, whether in the family, whether in bed or cooking, all the time occupied with something or other - why?

Q: Does it really matter if the mind is chattering?

K: Oh yes it does. Wait, wait, I'll show it to you why it matters if you don't mind listening for a minute. It matters really because it is a wastage of energy. It is like all the time working, working. Please answer this: why is the mind occupied with something? First watch yourself, don't immediately answer; that becomes verbal and meaningless, but if you say now why is my mind occupied? Why is the mind occupied?

Q: Because the mind is not free.

K: No, no. Is it afraid that if it is not occupied what would happen?

Q: It would have no existence if it were not occupied.

K: That is just it sir. Because it has no existence, so it says I exist because I am chattering. Oh you don't see all this.

So I am asking you why is it that your mind is occupied? If it was not occupied it is empty isn't it? And you are frightened of that, aren't you? So fear is dictating that you should be occupied with something so as to escape from fear and chatter and chatter - is that it?

Q: To avoid what can't be controlled.

K: To avoid it. So your mind is occupied, and you know what it is when the mind is occupied it is useless - right? Isn't it? It may be thinking of god and saying god, god, or whatever it does, and read books about god, and never look at anything else - it is an utterly meaningless and useless mind. So a mind that is occupied is not

only useless but it has no vitality. Right? And it has no - I won't go into all this, it is too difficult. We are so afraid of being empty. You understand? Of being nothing. So occupation implies a mind that is wasting its energy. And to avoid all that chattering you concentrate on something: you say, "I won't chatter and I'll look at this picture" - or this poem, at this face and look. But you are not looking because it is occupied. Right? Whereas to look there must be no occupation, which means you look without concentration. Concentration then becomes an occupation - I must concentrate. I must not allow any thought to come in etc.etc. So you are building a wall round yourself in order to concentrate, which becomes a conflict. Right?

So awareness we have gone into. Concentration - we can go much more deeply into it but we haven't time, there is a great deal involved in it, because you know when you concentrate you are bringing about greater importance to the self, unconsciously. I may give my concentration in the office, or in the factory, or in the garden or whatever it is, that concentration becomes very important to me. Haven't you noticed it? Because through that concentration I am going to get something - a reward. So this is the question of concentration.

Attention is something entirely different from awareness in which there is no choice, concentration which is focussing all your energy on a particular thing, thereby becoming a specialist - specialist as a gardener, professor, or whatever you like, which gives you tremendous importance to oneself. Now we said attention has nothing whatsoever to do with either, because in attention there is no centre from which you are observing. You are

attending. Right? Now look: I am saying something; now give your whole attention, attention, your nerves, your body, everything, listen with such tremendous attention and you will see there is no centre as me who is listening. You are just listening. So where there is attention there is no me. Obviously. There is no centre and therefore there is no periphery, there is no distance from the centre to an end, there is only a space in which there is complete attention, without border. So what is then not attention? Because most of us attend very seriously for a couple of seconds and then seeing what it does we want to maintain it, practise attention, go to various schools where you learn to be attentive, or follow some guru who will tell you how to be attentive, practise and all the rest which is all nonsense.

To attend: which means to give your whole attention, whole attention in observing, which means keeping your eyes absolutely still and looking. Will you all do some of all this? Or am I talking vainly, as usual? Look sirs: this is very important what we are talking about because responsibility becomes then extraordinarily important, relationship. That lady asks what is the relationship between education and responsibility. If I have a child and I am responsible for it unfortunately, and how am I to educate it? It becomes - you follow - a tremendous problem. Send it to an ordinary school where he is turned out to be like the rest of the world? You follow? And all the rest of it. What is your responsibility as a mother, a father, a parent? What is your responsibility? You are tremendously responsible when they are two or three years old, watching over them, careful. After five or six send them off to school and you have wiped your hands off

them. This is not an educational meeting - we can go into that another time.

So conflict ends with the understanding of 'what is'. Right? You understand now? If I have learnt a great deal about 'what is' there is no necessity for the opposite - right?