

When you speak of a path to truth,  
it implies that truth,  
this living reality, is not in the present,  
but somewhere in the distance,  
somewhere in the future.  
Now to me, truth is fulfillment,  
and to fulfillment there can be no path.  
So it seems, to me at least,  
that the first illusion in which you are caught  
is this desire for assurance,  
this desire for certainty,  
this inquiry after a path, a way,  
a mode of living whereby you can attain  
the desired goal,  
which is truth.

Your conviction that truth exists only in the  
distant future implies imitation.  
When you inquire what truth is,  
you are really asking to be told the path which  
leads to truth.  
Then you want to know which system to follow,  
which mode, which discipline,  
to help you on the way to truth.

But to me there is no path to truth;  
truth is not to be understood through any system,  
through any path.  
A path implies a goal, a static end,  
and therefore a conditioning of the mind and  
the heart  
by that end, which necessarily demands discipline,  
control, acquisitiveness.

This discipline, this control, becomes a  
burden;  
it robs you of freedom and conditions your  
action in daily life.  
Inquiry after truth implies a goal,  
a static end, which you are seeking.  
And that you are seeking a goal shows that  
your mind  
is searching for assurance, certainty.  
To attain this certainty, mind desires a path,  
a system, a method which it can follow,  
and this assurance you think to find by

**conditioning mind  
and heart through self-discipline,  
self-control, suppression.**

**But truth is a reality that cannot be understood  
by following any path.  
Truth is not a conditioning, a shaping of the mind  
and heart, but a constant fulfillment,  
a fulfillment in action.**

**That you inquire after truth implies that you  
believe in a path to truth,  
and this is the first illusion  
in which you are caught.**

**To be aware is to watch your bodily activity,  
the way you walk,  
the way you sit, the movements  
of your hands:  
it is to hear the words you use,  
to observe all your thoughts,  
all your emotions, all your reactions.  
It includes awareness of the unconscious,  
with its traditions, its instinctual knowledge,  
and the immense sorrow it has accumulated—  
not only personal sorrow,  
but the sorrow of man.  
You have to be aware of all that;  
and you cannot be aware of it if you are  
merely judging, evaluating, saying,  
"This is good and that is bad, this I will keep  
and that I will reject,"  
all of which only makes the mind dull, insensitive.**

**From awareness comes attention.  
Attention flows from awareness when  
in that awareness there is no choice,  
no personal choosing, no experiencing...  
but merely observing.  
And, to observe, you must have in the mind a  
great deal of space.  
A mind that is caught in ambition, greed, envy,  
in the pursuit of pleasure and self-fulfillment,  
with its inevitable sorrow, pain, despair,**

**anguish—such a mind has no space in which to  
observe, to attend.  
It is crowded with its own desires, going round  
and round in its own backwaters of reaction.  
You cannot attend if your mind is not highly sensitive,  
sharp, reasonable, logical, sane, healthy,  
without the slightest shadow of neuroticism.  
The mind has to explore every corner of itself,  
leaving no spot uncovered,  
because if there is a single dark corner of one's mind  
which one is afraid to explore,  
from that springs illusion...**

**It is only in the state of attention that you can be a light unto yourself,  
and then every action of your daily life springs from that light—  
every action—whether you are doing your job, cooking,  
going for a walk, mending clothes, or what you will.  
This whole process is meditation...**

So what is the correct action in which there is no will, no choice, no desire - Now is it possible to see, to observe, to be aware of the beautiful and the ugly things of life and not say "I must have" or "I must not have"?. Have you ever just observed anything? Is there an action in which there is no motive no cause-the self does not enter into it at all? Of course there is. There is when the self is not which means no identifying process takes place.... Effortless observation....choiceless observation.... There is the perceiving of a beautiful lake with all the colour and the glory and the beauty of it, that's enough. Not the cultivating of memory, which is developed through the identification process. Right ?

You want more and more and more and more and "the more" means that the past sensation has not been sufficient...A mind which is seeking the 'more' is never conscious of 'what is' because it is always living in the 'more'-in what it would like to be, never in 'what is'. ... meditation is actually seeing 'what is'... when no identification.... not identified by thought....There are only sensation. So we are asking is there a holistic awareness of all the senses, therefore there is never asking for the 'more'. I wonder if you follow all this ?. Are we together in this even partially?. and where there is this total-fully aware-of all the senses, awareness of it-not you are aware of it... the awareness of the senses in themselves-then there is no centre - in which there is awareness of the wholeness. If you consider it, you will see that to suppress the senses...is contradictory, conflicting, sorrowful.... To understand the truth you must have complete sensitivity. Do you understand Sirs? Reality demands your whole being; you must come to it with your body, mind, and heart as a total human being....Insight is complete total attention...

I wonder if you know what it means to be aware of something? Most of us are not aware because we have become so accustomed to condemning, judging,

evaluating, identifying, choosing. Choice obviously prevents awareness because choice is always made as a result of conflict. To be aware....just to see it, to be aware of it all without any sense of judgement....

Just be aware, that is all what you have to do, without condemning, without forcing, without trying to change what you are aware of.....if you are aware choicelessly, the whole field of consciousness begins to unfold..... So you begin with the outer and move inwardly. Then you will find, when you move inwardly that the inward and the outward are not two different things, that the outward awareness is not different from the inward awareness, and that they are both the same.

Be alert to all your thoughts and feelings, don't let one feeling or thought slip by without being aware of it and absorbing all its content. Absorbing is not the word, but seeing the whole content of the thought-feeling. It is like entering a room and seeing the whole content of the room at once, its atmosphere and its spaces. To see and be aware of one's thoughts makes one intensively sensitive, pliable, and alert. Don't condemn or judge, but be very alert. To see "what is," is really quite arduous.

- "happy is the man who is nothing" : Letters to a young friend (Nandini Mehta, Bombay)

"the need to observe thought, see it arise, see it disappear, to pursue it till it ends."

- (this expressions was commonly used by K in his public talks in the late 1940's and 1950's. Ref. KFT CDROM-1933-1986)

To observe 'what is', the mind must be free of all comparison of the ideal, of the opposite. Then you will see that what actually 'is', is far more important than what 'should be'....

What we call living is conflict and we see what that conflict is. When we understand that conflict- 'what is' is the truth and it is the observation of the truth that frees the mind. There is also much sorrow in our life and we do not know how to end it. The ending of sorrow is the beginning of wisdom. Without knowing what sorrow is and understanding its nature and structure, we shall not know what love is, because for us love is sorrow, pain, pleasure, jealousy. When a husband says to his wife that he loves her and at the same time is ambitious, has that love any meaning? Can an ambitious man love? Can a competitive man love? And yet we talk about love, about tenderness, about ending war, when we are competitive, ambitious, seeking our own personal position, advancement and so on. All this brings sorrow. Can sorrow end? It can only come to an end when you understand yourself, which is actually 'what is'. Then you understand why you have sorrow, whether that sorrow is self-pity, or the fear of being alone, or the emptiness of your own life, or the sorrow that comes about when you depend on another. And all this is part of our living. When we understand all this we come to a much greater problem, which is death. Please bear in mind that we are not talking about reincarnation, about what happens after death. We are not talking about that, or giving hope to those people who are afraid of death.

- You Are the World

So meditation is a mind seeing actually 'what is'.....

...let us keep in mind that we want to examine 'what is', to observe and be aware of exactly 'what is' the actual, without giving it any slant, without giving it an interpretation. It needs an extraordinarily astute mind, an extraordinarily pliable heart, to be aware of and to follow 'what is'; ...

...'what is' is not static, it is a movement. And to keep with the movement of 'what is' you need to have a very clear mind, you need to have an unprejudiced (not a distorted) mind...

So we are asking is there a holistic awareness of all the senses, therefore there is never asking for the 'more'. I wonder if you follow all this ?. Are we together in this even partially? And where there is this total - fully aware - of all the senses, awareness of it - not you are aware of it... the awareness of the senses in themselves - then there is no centre - in which there is awareness of the wholeness. If you consider it, you will see that to suppress the senses... is contradictory, conflicting, sorrowful.... To understand the truth you must have complete sensitivity. Do you understand Sirs? Reality demands your whole being; you must come to it with your body, mind, and heart as a total human being..... Insight is complete total attention....

When this is a fact not an idea, then dualism and division between observer and observed comes to an end. The observer is the observed - they are not separate states. The observer and the observed are a joint phenomenon and when you experience that directly then you will find that the thing which you have dreaded as emptiness which makes you seek escape into various forms of sensation including religion - ceases and you are able to face it and be it.

Watch what is happening inside you, do not think, but just watch, do not move your eye-balls, just keep them very, very quiet, because there is nothing to see now, you have seen all the things around you, now you are seeing what is happening inside your mind, and to see what is happening inside your mind, you have to be very quiet inside. And when you do this, do you know what happens to you? You become very sensitive, you become very alert to things outside and inside. Then you find out that the outside is the inside, then you find out that the observer is the observed.

As long as there is the thinker and the thought, there must be duality. As long as there is a seeker who is seeking, there must be duality. As long as there is an experiencer and the thing to be experienced, there must be duality. So duality exists when there is the observer and the observed. That is, as long as there is a centre, the censor, the observer, the thinker, the seeker, the experiencer as the centre, there must be the opposite.

Liberation is not an end. Liberation is from moment to moment in the understanding of 'what is'-when the mind is free, not made free.

Are not the thinker and his thought an inseparable phenomenon? Why do we separate the thought from the thinker? Is it not one of the cunning tricks of the mind so that the thinker can change his garb according to circumstances, yet remain the same? Outwardly there is the appearance of change but inwardly the thinker continues to be as he is. The craving for continuity, for permanency, creates this division between the thinker and his thoughts. When the thinker and

his thought become inseparable then only is duality transcended. Only then is there the true religious experience. Only when the thinker ceases is there Reality. This inseparable unity of the thinker and his thought is to be experienced but not to be speculated upon. This experience is liberation; in it there is inexpressible joy.

We do not know the workings of our own mind—the mind as it is, not as it should be or as we would like it to be. The mind is the only instrument we have, the instrument with which we think, we act, in which we have our being. If we do not understand that mind in operation as it is functioning in each one of us, any problem that we are confronted with will become more complex and more destructive. So it seems to me, to understand one's mind is the first essential function of all education. What is our mind, yours and mine?—not according to someone else. If you do not follow my description of the mind, but actually, while listening to me, observe your own mind in operation, then perhaps it would be profitable and worthwhile to go into the whole question of thought. What is our mind? It is the result, is it not, of climate, of centuries of tradition, the so-called culture, the social and economic influences, the environment, the ideas, the dogmas that society imprints on the mind through religion, through so-called knowledge and superficial information. Please observe your own mind, and not merely follow the description that I am giving because the description has very little significance. If we can watch the operations of our mind, then perhaps we shall be able to deal with the problems of life as they concern us. The mind is divided into the conscious and the unconscious. If we do not like to use these two words, we might use the terms, superficial and hidden—the superficial parts of the mind and the deeper layers of the mind. The whole of the conscious as well as the unconscious, the superficial as well as the hidden, the total process of our thinking—only part of which we are conscious of, and the rest, which is the major part, we are not conscious of—is what we call consciousness. This consciousness is time, is the result of centuries of man's endeavor.

We are made to believe in certain ideas from childhood, we are conditioned by dogmas, by beliefs, by theories. Each one of us is conditioned by various influences, and from that conditioning, from those limited and unconscious influences, our thoughts spring and take the form of a Communist, a Hindu, a Muslim, or a scientist. Thought obviously springs from the background of memory, of tradition, and it is with this background of both the conscious as well as the unconscious, the superficial as well as the deeper layers of the mind, that we meet life. Life is always in movement, never static. But, our minds are static. Our minds are conditioned, held, tethered to dogma, to belief, to experience, to knowledge. With this tethered mind, with this mind that is so conditioned, so heavily held, we meet life, which is in constant movement. Life, with its many complex and swiftly changing problems, is never still, and it requires a fresh approach every day, every minute. So, when we meet this life, there is a constant struggle between the mind that is conditioned and static, and life that is in constant movement. That is what is happening, is it not?

There is not only a conflict between life and the conditioned mind, but such a mind, meeting life, creates more problems. We acquire superficial knowledge, new ways of conquering nature, science. But the mind that has acquired knowledge still remains in the conditioned state, bound to a particular form of belief. So, our problem is not how to meet life, but how can the mind, with all its conditioning, with its dogmas, beliefs, free itself? It is only the free mind that can meet life, not the mind that is tethered to any system, to any belief, to any particular knowledge. So is it not important, if we would not create more problems, if we would put an end to misery, sorrow, to understand the workings of our own minds

Do we know what we mean by the self? By that, I mean the idea, the memory, the conclusion, the experience, the various forms of nameable and unnameable intentions, the conscious endeavor to be or not to be, the accumulated memory of the unconscious, the racial, the group, the individual, the clan, and the whole of it all, whether it is projected outwardly in action or projected spiritually as virtue; the striving after all this is the self. In it is included

the competition, the desire to be. The whole process of that is the self; and we know actually when we are faced with it that it is an evil thing. I am using the word 'evil' intentionally, because the self is dividing: the self is self-enclosing: its activities, however noble, are separative and isolating. We know all this. We also know those extraordinary moments when the self is not there, in which there is no sense of endeavor, of effort, and which happens when there is love.

So, to understand the innumerable problems that each one of us has, is it not essential that there be self-knowledge? And that is one of the most difficult things, self-awareness-which does not mean an isolation, a withdrawal. Obviously, to know oneself is essential; but to know oneself does not imply a withdrawal from relationship. And it would be a mistake, surely, to think that one can know oneself significantly, completely, fully, through isolation, through exclusion, or by going to some psychologist, or to some priest; or that one can learn self-knowledge through a book. Self-knowledge is obviously a process, not an end in itself; and to know oneself, one must be aware of oneself in action, which is relationship. You discover yourself, not in isolation, not in withdrawal, but in relationship-in relationship to society, to your wife, your husband, your brother, to man; but to discover how you react, what your responses are, requires an extraordinary alertness of mind, a keenness of perception.

What is the relationship between yourself and the misery, the confusion, in and around you? Surely this confusion, this misery, did not come into being by itself. You and I have created it, not a capitalist nor a communist nor a fascist society, but you and I have created it in our relationship with each other. What you are within has been projected without, onto the world; what you are, what you think and what you feel, what you do in your everyday existence, is projected outwardly, and that constitutes the world. If we are miserable, confused, chaotic within, by projection that becomes the world, that becomes society, because the relationship between yourself and myself, between myself and another is society-society is the product of our relationship -and if our relationship is confused, egocentric, narrow, limited, national, we project that and bring chaos into the world. What you are, the world is. So your problem is the world's problem. Surely, this is a simple and basic fact, is it not? In our relationship with the one or the many we seem somehow to overlook this point all the time. We want to bring about alteration through a system or through a revolution in ideas or values based on a system, forgetting that it is you and I who create society, who bring about confusion or order by the way in which we live. So we must begin near, that is, we must concern ourselves with our daily existence, with our daily thoughts and feelings and actions which are revealed in the manner of earning our livelihood and in our relationship with ideas or beliefs.

A total, an enriching revolution cannot take place unless you and I understand ourselves as a total process. You and I are not isolated individuals but are the result of the whole human struggle with its illusions, fancies, pursuits, ignorance, strife, conflict, and misery. One cannot begin to alter the condition of the world without understanding oneself. If you see that, there is immediately within you a complete revolution, is there not? Then no guru is necessary because knowledge of oneself is from moment to moment, it is not the accumulation of hearsay, nor is it contained in the precepts of religious teachers. Because you are discovering yourself in relationship with another from moment to moment, relationship has a completely different meaning. Relationship then is a revelation, a constant process of the discovery of oneself, and from this self-discovery, action takes place. So, self-knowledge can come only through relationship, not through isolation. Relationship is action, and self-knowledge is the result of awareness in action.

The transformation of the world is brought about by the transformation of oneself, because the self is the product and a part of the total process of human existence. To transform oneself, self-knowledge is essential; without knowing what you are, there is no basis for right thought, and without knowing yourself, there cannot be transformation.

There is no essential difference between the old and the young, for both are slaves to their own desires and gratifications. Maturity is not a matter of age; it comes with understanding. The ardent spirit of inquiry is perhaps easier for the young, because those who are older have

been battered about by life, conflicts have worn them out and death in different forms awaits them. This does not mean that they are incapable of purposive inquiry, but only that it is more difficult for them. Many adults are immature and rather childish, and this is a contributing cause of the confusion and misery in the world. It is the older people who are responsible for the prevailing economic and moral crisis; and one of our unfortunate weaknesses is that we want someone else to act for us and change the course of our lives. We wait for others to revolt and build anew, and we remain inactive until we are assured of the outcome. It is security and success that most of us are after; and a mind that is seeking security, that craves success, is not intelligent, and is therefore incapable of integrated action. There can be integrated action only if one is aware of one's own conditioning, of one's racial, national, political, and religious prejudices; that is, only if one realizes that the ways of the self are ever separative. Life is a well of deep waters. One can come to it with small buckets and draw only a little water, or one can come with large vessels, drawing plentiful waters that will nourish and sustain. While one is young is the time to investigate, to experiment with everything. The school should help its young people to discover their vocations and responsibilities, and not merely cram their minds with facts and technical knowledge. It should be the soil in which they can grow without fear, happily and integrally.

The more we think over a problem, the more we investigate, analyze, and discuss it, the more complex it becomes. So is it possible to look at the problem comprehensively, wholly? How is this possible? Because that, it seems to me, is our major difficulty. Our problems are being multiplied-there is imminent danger of war, there is every kind of disturbance in our relationships-and how can we understand all that comprehensively, as a whole? Obviously it can be solved only when we can look at it as a whole-not in compartments, not divided. When is that possible? Surely it is only possible when the process of thinking-which has its source in the 'me', the self, in the background of tradition, of conditioning, of prejudice, of hope, of despair-has come to an end. Can we understand this self, not by analyzing, but by seeing the thing as it is, being aware of it as a fact and not as a theory?-not seeking to dissolve the self in order to achieve a result but seeing the activity of the self, the 'me', constantly in action. Can we look at it, without any movement to destroy or to encourage? That is the problem, is it not? If, in each one of us, the center of the 'me' is non-existent, with its desire for power, position, authority, continuance, self-preservation, surely our problems will come to an end!

The self is a problem that thought cannot resolve. There must be an awareness which is not of thought. To be aware, without condemnation or justification, of the activities of the self-just to be aware-is sufficient. If you are aware in order to find out how to resolve the problem, in order to transform it, in order to produce a result, then it is still within the field of the self, of the 'me'. So long as we are seeking a result, whether through analysis, through awareness, through constant examination of every thought, we are still within the field of thought, which is within the field of the 'me', of the 'I', of the ego, or what you will.

As long as the activity of the mind exists, surely there can be no love. When there is love, we shall have no social problems.

Truth is a pathless land'. Man cannot come to it through any organization, through any creed, through any dogma, priest or ritual, not through any philosophic knowledge or psychological technique. He has to find it through the mirror of relationship, through the understanding of the contents of his own mind, through observation and not through intellectual analysis or introspective dissection. Man has built in himself images as a fence of security - religious, political, personal. These manifest as symbols, ideas, beliefs. The burden of these images dominates man's thinking, his relationships, and his daily life. These images are the causes of our problems for they divide man from man. His perception of life is shaped by the concepts already established in his mind. The content of his consciousness is his entire existence. This content is common to all humanity. The individuality is the name, the form and superficial culture he acquires from tradition and environment. The uniqueness of man does not lie in the superficial but in complete freedom from the content of his consciousness, which is common to all mankind. So he is not an individual.



Freedom is not a reaction; freedom is not a choice. It is man's pretense that because he has choice he is free. Freedom is pure observation without direction, without fear of punishment and reward. Freedom is without motive; freedom is not at the end of the evolution of man but lies in the first step of his existence. In observation one begins to discover the lack of freedom. Freedom is found in the choiceless awareness of our daily existence and activity.

Thought is time. Thought is born of experience and knowledge, which are inseparable from time and the past. Time is the psychological enemy of man. Our action is based on knowledge and therefore time, so man is always a slave to the past. Thought is ever-limited and so we live in constant conflict and struggle. There is no psychological evolution.

When man becomes aware of the movement of his own thoughts, he will see the division between the thinker and thought, the observer and the observed, the experiencer and the experience. He will discover that this division is an illusion. Then only is there pure observation which is insight without any shadow of the past or of time. This timeless insight brings about a deep, radical mutation in the mind.

Total negation is the essence of the positive. When there is negation of all those things that thought has brought about psychologically, only then is there love, which is compassion and intelligence

We do not really enjoy anything. We look at it, we are superficially amused or excited by it, we have a sensation which we call joy. But enjoyment is something far deeper, which must be understood and gone into. When we are young, we enjoy and take delight in things-in games, in clothes, in reading a book or writing a poem or painting a picture, or in pushing each other about. As we grow older, although we still want to enjoy things, the best has gone out of us; we prefer other kinds of sensations-passion, lust, power, position.

As we grow older, the things of life lose their meaning; our minds become dull, insensitive, and so, we try to enjoy, we try to force ourselves to look at pictures, to look at trees, to look at little children playing. We read some sacred book or other and try to find its meaning, its depth, its significance. But, it is all an effort, a travail, something to struggle with. I think it is very important to understand this thing called joy, the enjoyment of things. When you see something very beautiful, you want to possess it, you want to hold onto it, you want to call it your own-it is my tree, my bird, my house, my husband, my wife. We want to hold it, and in that very process of holding, the thing that you once enjoyed is gone because in the very holding there is dependence, there is fear, there is exclusion, and so the thing that gave joy, a sense of inward beauty, is lost, and life becomes enclosed. To know real joy, one must go much deeper.

What is it that most of us are seeking? What is it that each one of us wants? Especially in this restless world, where everybody is trying to find some kind of peace, some kind of happiness, a refuge, surely it is important to find out, isn't it, what it is that we are trying to seek, what it is that we are trying to discover? Probably most of us are seeking some kind of happiness, some kind of peace; in a world that is ridden with turmoil, wars, contention, strife, we want a refuge where there can be some peace. I think that is what most of us want. So we pursue, go from one leader to another, from one religious organization to another, from one teacher to another. Now, is it that we are seeking happiness or is it that we are seeking gratification of some kind from which we hope to derive happiness? There is a difference between happiness and gratification. Can you seek happiness? Perhaps you can find gratification but surely you cannot find happiness. Happiness is derivative; it is a by-product of something else. So, before we give our minds and hearts to something which demands a great deal of earnestness, attention, thought, care, we must find out, must we not, what it is that we are seeking; whether it is happiness, or gratification? I am afraid most of us are seeking gratification. We

want to be gratified, we want to find a sense of fullness at the end of our search. After all, if one is seeking peace one can find it very easily. One can devote oneself blindly to some kind of cause, to an idea, and take shelter there. Surely that does not solve the problem. Mere isolation in an enclosing idea is not a release from conflict. So we must find, must we not, what it is-inwardly, as well as outwardly-that each one of us wants? If we are clear on that matter, then we don't have to go anywhere, to any teacher, to any church, to any organization. Therefore our difficulty is, to be clear in ourselves regarding our intention, is it not? Can we be clear? And does this clarity come through searching, through trying to find out what others say, from the highest teacher to the ordinary preacher in a church around the corner? Have you got to go to somebody to find out? Yet that is what we are doing, is it not? We read innumerable books, we attend many meetings and discuss, we join various organizations trying thereby to find a remedy to the conflict, to the miseries in our lives. Or, if we don't do all that, we think we have found; that is, we say that a particular organization, a particular teacher, a particular book satisfies us; we have found everything we want in that; and we remain in that, crystallized and enclosed. Do we not seek, through all this confusion, something permanent, something lasting, something which we call real, God, truth, what you like-the name doesn't matter, the word is not the thing, surely. So don't let us be caught in words. Leave that to the professional lecturers. There is a search for something permanent, is there not, in most of us? -something we can cling to, something which will give us assurance, a hope, a lasting enthusiasm, a lasting certainty, because in ourselves we are so uncertain. We do not know ourselves. We know a lot about facts, what the books have said; but we do not know for ourselves, we do not have a direct experience. And what is it that we call permanent? What is it that we are seeking, which will, or which we hope will give us permanency? Are we not seeking lasting happiness, lasting gratification, lasting certainty? We want something that will endure everlastingly, which will gratify us. If we strip ourselves of all the words and phrases, and actually look at it, this is what we want. We want permanent pleasure

We may move from one refinement to another, from one subtlety to another, from one enjoyment to another, but at the center of it all there is the 'me', the 'me' that is enjoying, that wants more happiness, the 'me' that searches, looks for, longs for happiness, the 'me' that struggles, the 'me' that becomes more and more 'refined,' but never likes to come to an end. It is only when the 'me' in all its subtle forms comes to an end that there is a state of bliss which cannot be sought after, an ecstasy, a real joy, without pain, without corruption. Now, in all our joy, all our happiness, is corruption; because behind it there is pain, behind it there is fear. When the mind goes beyond the thought of the 'me', the experiencer, the observer, the thinker, then there is a possibility of happiness which is incorruptible. That happiness cannot be made permanent, in the sense in which we use that word. But, our mind is seeking permanent happiness, something that will last, that will continue. That very desire for continuity is corruption. But when the mind is free from the 'me', there is a happiness, from moment to moment, which comes without your seeking, in which there is no gathering, no storing up, no putting by of happiness. It is not something which you can hold on to.

There is the desire for security. And one can understand this desire to be secure when you meet a wild animal, a snake; or you watch when you cross the road. But there is no other form of security. Really, if you look at it, there is no other form. You would like to have security with your wife, children, neighbor, your relations-if you have relations-but you don't have it. You may have your mother, you may have your father, but you are not related, you are completely isolated-we will go into that. There is no security, psychological security, at any time, at any level, with anybody-this is the most difficult thing to realize. There is no psychological security with another because he is a human being, and so are you; he is free, and so are you. But we want security in our relationships, through marriage, through vows-you know the tricks we play upon ourselves and upon others. This is an obvious fact; it does not need great analysis

We never come into contact with this insecurity. We are afraid of being completely insecure. It requires a great deal of intelligence to understand that insecurity. When one feels completely

insecure, one runs away. Or, not finding security in anything, one becomes unbalanced, ready to commit suicide, to go to a mental hospital, or one becomes a most devout religious person-which are all the same, forms of imbalance. To realize-not intellectually, not verbally, not as a determined, willed attitude-the fact that there is no security requires an extraordinarily simple, clear, harmonious living.

We are endlessly seeking, and we never ask why we are seeking. The obvious answer is that we are dissatisfied, unhappy, unfortunate, lonely, unloved, fearful. We need something to cling to, we need somebody to protect us-the father, the mother, and so on-and so we are seeking. When we are seeking, we are always finding. Unfortunately, we will always find when we are seeking. So the first thing is not to seek. You understand? You all have been told that you must seek, experiment with truth, find out truth, go after it, pursue it, chase it, and that you must discipline, control yourself. And then somebody comes along and says, "Don't do all that. Don't seek at all." Naturally, your reaction is either to ask him to go away or you turn your back, or you find out for yourself why he says such a thing-not accept, not deny, but question. And what are you seeking? Inquire about yourself. You are seeking; you are saying that you are missing something in this life inwardly-not at the level of technique or having a petty job or more money. What is it that we are seeking? We are seeking because in us there is such deep dissatisfaction with our family, with society, with culture, with our own selves, and we want to satisfy, to go beyond this gnawing discontent that is destroying. And why are we discontented? I know discontent can very easily be satisfied. Give a young man who has been discontented-a communist or a revolutionary-a good job, and he forgets all about it. Give him a nice house, a nice car, a nice garden, a good position, and you will see that discontent disappears. If he can achieve an ideological success, that discontent disappears too. But you never ask why you are discontented- not the people who have jobs, and who want better jobs. We must understand the root cause of discontent before we can examine the whole structure and the meaning of pleasure and, therefore, of sorrow.

Not to seek any form of psychological security, any form of gratification, requires investigation, constant watchfulness to see how the mind operates, and surely that is meditation, is it not? Meditation is not the practice of a formula or the repetition of certain words, which is all silly, immature. Without knowing the whole process of the mind, conscious as well as unconscious, any form of meditation is really a hindrance, an escape, a childish activity; it is a form of self-hypnosis. But to be aware of the process of thinking, to go into it carefully step by step with full consciousness and discover for oneself the ways of the self-that is meditation. It is only through self-knowledge that the mind can be free to discover what is truth, what is God, what is death, what is this thing that we call living.

Why is one lazy? Probably you are not eating rightly, you have worked too much, walked too much, talked too much, done so many things; and naturally the body, when it gets up in the morning, is lazy. Because you have not spent an intelligent day, the body is tired the next day. And it's no good disciplining the body. Whereas if you are attentive at the moment of your talking, when you are in your office-if you are completely attentive even for five minutes, that is enough. When you are eating, be attentive and do not eat fast, nor stuff yourself with all kinds of food. Then you will see that your body becomes, of itself, intelligent. You don't have to force it to be intelligent; it becomes intelligent, and that intelligence will tell it to get up or not to get up. So you begin to discover that one can live a life of going to the office and all the rest of it without this constant battle, because one has not wasted energy, but is using it totally all the time-and that is meditation.

You understand? Meditation is not what is done all the world over: repetition of words, sitting in a certain posture, breathing in a certain way, repeating some sloka or mantra over and over again. Naturally that makes the mind stupid, dull; and out of that stupidity, dullness, the mind becomes silent and you think you have got silence. That kind of meditation is merely self-hypnosis. It is not meditation at all. It is the most destructive way of meditating. But there is meditation which demands that you attend-attend to what you are saying to your wife, to your husband, to your children, how you talk to your servants if you have any, how you talk to your

boss-be attentive at that moment, do not concentrate. Because concentration is something which is very ugly. Every schoolboy can do it because he is forced to do it. And you think that by forcing yourself to concentrate, you will get some peace. You won't. You will not have what you call "peace of mind"-you will have a piece of mind, which is not peace of mind. Concentration is an exclusion. When you want to concentrate on something, you are excluding, you are resisting, you are putting away things which you don't want. Whereas if you are attentive, then you can look at every thought, every movement; then there is no such thing as distraction, and then you can meditate

Then such meditation is a marvelous thing because it brings clarity. Meditation is clarity. Meditation then is silence, and that very silence is the disciplining process of life, not your disciplining yourself in order to achieve silence. But when you are attentive to every word, to every gesture, to all the things you are saying, feeling, to your motives, not correcting them, then out of that comes silence, and from that silence there is discipline. Then in that there is no effort; there is a movement which is not of time at all. And such a human being is a joyous person; he does not create enmity, he does not bring unhappiness.

Truth is something that cannot be given to you. You have to find it out for yourself. And to find it out for yourself, you must be a law to yourself, you must be a guide to yourself, not the political man that is going to save the world, not the communist, not the leader, not the priest, not the sannyasi, not the books; you have to live, you have to be a law to yourself. And therefore no authority-which means completely standing alone, not outwardly, but inwardly completely alone, which means no fear. And when the mind has understood the nature of fear, the nature of death, and that extraordinary thing called love, then it has understood, not verbalized, not thought about, but actually lived. Then out of that understanding comes a mind that is active, but completely still. This whole process of understanding life, of freeing oneself from all the battles, not in some future, but immediately, giving your whole attention to it-all that is meditation: not sitting in some corner and holding your nose and repeating some silly words, mesmerizing yourself, that is not meditation at all, that is self-hypnosis. But to understand life, to be free from sorrow-actually, not verbally, not theoretically, but actually-to be free of fear and of death brings about a mind that is completely still. And all that is meditation.

Meditation is self-knowledge and without self-knowledge there is no meditation. If you are not aware of all your responses all the time, if you are not fully conscious, fully cognizant of your daily activities, merely to lock yourself in a room and sit down in front of a picture of your guru, of your Master, to meditate, is an escape, because without self-knowledge there is no right thinking and, without right thinking, what you do has no meaning, however noble your intentions are. Thus prayer has no significance without self-knowledge but when there is self-knowledge there is right thinking and hence right action.

Meditation, then, is emptying the mind of the past, not as an idea, not as an ideology which you are going to practice day after day-to empty the mind of the past. Because the man or the entity who empties the mind of the past is the result of the past. But to understand this whole structure of the mind, which is the result of the past, and to empty the mind of the past demands a deep awareness. To be aware of your conditioning, your way of talking, your gestures, the callousness, the brutality, the violence, just to be aware of it without condemning it-then out of that awareness comes a state of mind which is completely quiet. To understand this quietness, the silence of the mind, you must understand sorrow, because most of us live in sorrow; whether we are aware of it or not, we have never put an end to sorrow; it is like our shadow, it is with us night and day.

In sorrow there is a great deal of self-pity, concern with one's own loneliness, emptiness; and when one becomes aware of that emptiness, loneliness, there is self-pity, and that self-pity we call sorrow. So as long as there is sorrow, conscious or unconscious, within the mind, there is

no quietness of the mind, there is no stillness of the mind. The stillness of the mind comes where there is beauty and love; you cannot separate beauty from love. Beauty is not an ornament, nor good taste. It does not lie in the line of the hills, nor in architecture. There is beauty when you know what love is, and you cannot possibly know what love is when there is not intelligence, austerity, and order. And nobody can give this to you, no saint, no god, no mahatma-nobody! No authority in the world can give it to you. You as a human being have to understand this whole structure-the structure and the nature of your life of every day, what you do, what you think, what your motives are, how you behave, how you are caught in your own conclusions, in your own conditioning. It must begin there, in daily life, and if you cannot alter that totally, completely, bring about a total mutation in yourself, you will never know that still mind. And it is only the still mind that can find out: it is only the still mind that knows what truth is. Because that still mind has no imagination; it does not project its desires; it is a still mind-and it is only then that there is the bliss of something that cannot be put into words.

Krishnamurti: When you are eating, eat. When you are going for a walk, walk. Don't say, "I must be doing something else." When you are reading, give your attention completely to that, whether it is a detective novel, a magazine, the Bible, or what you will. The complete attention is a complete action, and therefore there is no "I must be doing something else." What is important is not what we are doing but whether we can give total attention.

Krishnamurti: I am not advocating anything. But you know, the cup is useful only when it is empty. With most of us, the mind is clouded, cluttered up with so many things-pleasant and unpleasant experiences, knowledge, patterns or formulas of behavior, and so on. It is never empty. And creation can take place only in the mind that is totally empty. I don't know if you have ever noticed what sometimes happens when you have a problem, either mathematical or psychological. You think about it a great deal, you worry over it like a dog chewing on a bone, but you can't find an answer. Then you let it alone, you go away from it, you take a walk; and suddenly, out of that emptiness, comes the answer. Now, how does this take place? Your mind has been very active within its own limitations about that problem, but you have not found the answer, so you have put the problem aside. Then your mind becomes somewhat quiet, somewhat still, empty; and in that stillness, that emptiness, the problem is resolved. Similarly, when one dies each minute to the inward environment, to the inward commitments, to the inward memories, to the inward securities and agonies, there is then an emptiness in which alone a new thing can take place.

And it is only a very still mind, not a disciplined mind, that has understood and therefore is free. It is only that still mind that can know what is creation. Because the word God has been spoiled. But to find out that something which is beyond time, you must have a very still mind. And that still mind is not a dead mind but is tremendously active; anything that is moving at the highest speed and is active is always quiet. It is only the dull mind that worries about that is anxious, fearful. Such a mind can never be still. And it is only a mind that is still that is a religious mind. And it is only the religious mind that can find out, or be in that state of creation. And it is only such a mind that can bring about peace in the world. And that peace is your responsibility, the responsibility of each one of us, not the politician, not the soldier, not the lawyer, not the businessman, not the communist, socialist, nobody. It is your responsibility, how you live, how you live your daily life. If you want peace in the world, you have to live peacefully, not hating each other, not being envious, not seeking power, not pursuing competition. Because out of that freedom from these, you have love. It is only a mind that is capable of loving that will know what it is to live peacefully.

It is a stupid person that wants to continue-no man who understood the rich feelings of life would want continuity. When you understand life, you will find the unknown, for life is the unknown, and death and life are one. There is no division between life and death: it is the foolish and the ignorant who make the division, those who are concerned with their body and with their petty continuity. Such people use the theory of reincarnation as a means of covering up their fear, as a guarantee of their stupid little continuity. It is obvious that thought continues; but surely, a man who is seeking truth is not concerned with thought, for thought

does not lead to truth. The theory of the 'me' continuing through reincarnation towards truth is a false idea, it is untrue. The 'me' is a bundle of memories, which is time, and the mere continuation of time does not lead you to the eternal, which is beyond time. The fear of death ceases only when the unknown enters your heart. Life is the unknown, as death is the unknown, as truth is the unknown.

Life is the unknown, sir; but we cling to one small expression of that life, and that which we cling to is merely memory, which is an incomplete thought; therefore, that which we cling to is unreal, it has no validity. The mind clings to that empty thing called memory, and memory is the mind, the self, at whatever level you like to fix it. So, mind, which is in the field of the known, can never invite the unknown. It is only when there is the unknown, a state of complete uncertainty, that there comes the cessation of fear and with it the perception of reality

Therefore, we mean, do we not, a supersensory continuity, a psychological continuity, a thought continuity, a continuity of character, which is termed the soul, or what you will. We want to know if thought continues. That is, I have meditated, I have practiced so many things, I have not finished writing my book, I have not completed my career, I am weak and need time to grow strong, I want to continue my pleasure, and so on-and I am afraid that death will put an end to all that. So, death is a form of frustration, is it not? I am doing something, and I don't want to end it; I want continuity in order to fulfill myself. Now, is there fulfillment through continuity? Obviously, there is fulfillment of a sort through continuity. If I am writing a book, I don't want to die until I have finished it; I want time to develop a certain character, and so on.

One of the most difficult things to understand, it seems to me, is this problem of change. We see that there is progress in different forms, so-called evolution, but is there a fundamental change in progress? I do not know if this problem has struck you at all, or whether you have ever thought about it, but perhaps it will be worthwhile to go into the question this morning. We see that there is progress in the obvious sense of that word; there are new inventions, better cars, better planes, better refrigerators, the superficial peace of a progressive society, and so on. But does that progress bring about a radical change in man, in you and me? It does superficially alter the conduct of our life, but can it ever fundamentally transform our thinking? And how is this fundamental transformation to be brought about? I think it is a problem worth considering. There is progress in self-improvement-I can be better tomorrow, more kind, more generous, less envious, less ambitious. But does self-improvement bring about a complete change in one's thinking? Or is there no change at all, but only progress? Progress implies time, does it not? I am this today, and I shall be something better tomorrow. That is, in self-improvement or self-denial or self-abnegation, there is progression, the gradualism of moving towards a better life, which means superficially adjusting to environment, conforming to an improved pattern, being conditioned in a nobler way, and so on. We see that process taking place all the time. And you must have wondered, as I have, whether progress does bring about a fundamental revolution. To me, the important thing is not progress but revolution. Please don't be horrified by that word revolution, as most people are in a very progressive society like this. But it seems to me that unless we understand the extraordinary necessity of bringing about not just a social amelioration but a radical change in our outlook, mere progress is progress in sorrow; it may effect the pacification, the calming of sorrow, but not the cessation of sorrow, which is always latent. After all, progress in the sense of getting better over a period of time is really the process of the self, the 'me', the ego. There is progress in self-improvement, obviously, which is the determined effort to be good, to be more this or less that, and so on. As there is improvement in refrigerators and airplanes, so also there is improvement in the self, but that improvement, that progress, does not free the mind from sorrow.

So, if we want to understand the problem of sorrow and perhaps put an end to it, then we cannot possibly think in terms of progress because a man who thinks in terms of progress, of time, saying that he will be happy tomorrow, is living in sorrow. And to understand this

problem, one must go into the whole question of consciousness, must one not? Is this too difficult a subject? I'll go on and we'll see. If I really want to understand sorrow and the ending of sorrow, I must find out, not only what are the implications of progress, but also what that entity is who wants to improve himself, and I must also know the motive with which he seeks to improve. All this is consciousness. There is the superficial consciousness of everyday activity: the job, the family, the constant adjustment to social environment, either happily, easily, or contradictorily, with a neurosis. And there is also the deeper level of consciousness, which is the vast social inheritance of man through centuries. We are trying to discover for ourselves what is consciousness, and whether it is possible for the mind to be free of sorrow-not to change the pattern of sorrow, not to decorate the prison of sorrow, but to be completely free from the seed, the root of sorrow. In inquiring into that, we shall see the difference between progress and the psychological revolution which is essential if there is to be freedom from sorrow.

We are not trying to alter the conduct of our consciousness; we are not trying to do something about it; we are just looking at it. Surely, if we are at all observant, slightly aware of anything, we know the superficial consciousness. We can see that on the surface our mind is active, occupied in adjustment, in a job, earning a livelihood, in expressing certain tendencies, gifts, talents, or acquiring certain technical knowledge; and most of us are satisfied to live on that surface

Now, can we go below that and see the motive of this superficial adjustment? Again, if you are a little aware of this whole process, you know that this adjustment to opinion, to values, this acceptance of authority and so on, is motivated by self-perpetuation, self-protection. If you can go still below that, you will find there is this vast undercurrent of racial, national, and group instincts, all the accumulations of human struggle, knowledge, endeavor, the dogmas and traditions of the Hindu, the Buddhist, or the Christian, the residue of so-called education through centuries-all of which has conditioned the mind to a certain inherited pattern. And if you can go deeper still, there is the primal desire to be, to succeed, to become, which expresses itself on the surface in various forms of social activity and creates deep-rooted anxieties, fears. Put very succinctly, the whole of that is our consciousness. In other words, our thinking is based on this fundamental urge to be, to become, and on top of that lie the many layers of tradition, of culture, of education, and the superficial conditioning of a given society-all forcing us to conform to a pattern that enables us to survive. There are many details and subtleties, but in essence that is our consciousness.

Now, can we go below that and see the motive of this superficial adjustment? Again, if you are a little aware of this whole process, you know that this adjustment to opinion, to values, this acceptance of authority and so on, is motivated by self-perpetuation, self-protection. If you can go still below that, you will find there is this vast undercurrent of racial, national, and group instincts, all the accumulations of human struggle, knowledge, endeavor, the dogmas and traditions of the Hindu, the Buddhist, or the Christian, the residue of so-called education through centuries-all of which has conditioned the mind to a certain inherited pattern. And if you can go deeper still, there is the primal desire to be, to succeed, to become, which expresses itself on the surface in various forms of social activity and creates deep-rooted anxieties, fears. Put very succinctly, the whole of that is our consciousness. In other words, our thinking is based on this fundamental urge to be, to become, and on top of that lie the many layers of tradition, of culture, of education, and the superficial conditioning of a given society-all forcing us to conform to a pattern that enables us to survive. There are many details and subtleties, but in essence that is our consciousness.

Now, any progress within that consciousness is self-improvement, and self-improvement is progress in sorrow, not the cessation of sorrow. This is quite obvious if you look at it. And if the mind is concerned with being free of all sorrow, then what is the mind to do? I do not know if you have thought about this problem, but please think about it now. We suffer, don't we? We suffer, not only from physical illness, disease, but also from loneliness, from the poverty of our being; we suffer because we are not loved. When we love somebody and there

is no loving in return, there is sorrow. In every direction, to think is to be full of sorrow: therefore, it seems better not to think, so we accept a belief and stagnate in that belief, which we call religion. Now, if the mind sees that there is no ending of sorrow through self-improvement through progress, which is fairly obvious, then what is the mind to do? Can the mind go beyond this consciousness, beyond these various urges and contradictory desires? And is going beyond a matter of time? Please follow this, not merely verbally, but actually. If it is a matter of time, then you are back again in the other thing, which is progress. Do you see that? Within the framework of consciousness, any movement in any direction is self-improvement and therefore the continuance of sorrow. Sorrow may be controlled, disciplined, subjugated, rationalized, superrefined, but the potential quality of sorrow is still there; and to be free from sorrow there must be freedom from this potentiality, from this seed of the 'I', the self, from the whole process of becoming. To go beyond, there must be the cessation of this process.

But if you say, "How am I to go beyond?" then the 'how' becomes the method, the practice, which is still progress, therefore there is no going beyond but only the refinement of consciousness in sorrow. I hope you are getting this. The mind thinks in terms of progress, of improvement, of time; and is it possible for such a mind, seeing that so-called progress is progress in sorrow, to come to an end-not in time, not tomorrow, but immediately? Otherwise you are back again in the whole routine, in the old wheel of sorrow. If the problem is stated clearly and clearly understood, then you will find the absolute answer.

Now, to go beyond, to transcend all that, requires tremendous attention. This total attention, in which there is no choice, no sense of becoming, of changing, altering, wholly frees the mind from the process of self-consciousness; there is then no experiencer who is accumulating, and it is only then that the mind can be truly said to be free from sorrow. It is accumulation that is the cause of sorrow. We do not die to everything from day to day; we do not die to the innumerable traditions, to the family, to our own experiences, to our own desire to hurt another. One has to die to all that from moment to moment, to that vast accumulative memory, and only then the mind is free from the self, which is the entity of accumulation.

We know loneliness, don't we, the fear, the misery, the antagonism, the real fright of a mind that is aware of its own loneliness. We all know that. Don't we? That state of loneliness is not foreign to any one of us. You may have all the riches, all the pleasures, you may have great capacity and bliss, but within, there is always the lurking shadow of loneliness. The rich man, the poor man who is struggling, the man who is writing, creating, the worshiper-they all know this loneliness. When it is in that state, what does the mind do? The mind turns on the radio, picks up a book, runs away from what is into something which is not. Sirs, do follow what I am saying-not the words, but the application, the observation of your own loneliness. When the mind is aware of its loneliness, it runs away, escapes. The escape, whether into religious contemplation or going to a cinema, is exactly the same; it is still an escape from what is. The man who escapes through drinking is no more immoral than the one who escapes by the worship of God; they are both the same, both are escaping. When you observe the fact that you are lonely, if there is no escape and therefore no struggle into the opposite, then generally, the mind tends to condemn it according to the frame of its knowledge, but if there is no condemnation, then the whole attitude of the mind towards the thing it has called lonely has undergone a complete change, has it not?

After all, loneliness is a state of isolation, because the mind encloses itself and cuts itself away from every relationship, from everything. In that state the mind knows loneliness, and if, without condemning it, the mind be aware and not create the escape, then surely that loneliness undergoes a transformation. The transformation might then be called "aleness"-it does not matter what word you use. In that aleness there is no fear. The mind that feels lonely because it has isolated itself through various activities is afraid of that loneliness. But if there is awareness in which there is no choice-which means no condemnation-then the mind is no longer lonely, but it is in a state of aleness in which there is no corruption, in which there is no process of self-enclosure. One must be alone, there must be that aleness, in that sense. Loneliness is a state of frustration, aleness is not, and aleness is not the opposite



of loneliness. Surely, sirs, we must be alone, alone from all influences, from all compulsions, from all demands, longings, hopes, so that the mind is no longer in the action of frustration. That aloneness is essential, it is a religious thing. But the mind cannot come to it without understanding the whole problem of loneliness. Most of us are lonely, all our activities are the activities of frustration. The happy man is not a lonely man. Happiness is alone, and the action of aloneness is entirely different from the activities of loneliness.

Are we not aware of a state of emptiness in us, a state of despair, of loneliness, the complete sense of not being able to depend on anything, not having anybody to look up to? Don't we know a moment of extraordinary loneliness, of extraordinary sorrow, without reason, a sense of despair at the height of thought, at the height of love; don't we know this loneliness? And is this loneliness not pushing us always to be somebody, to be well-thought-of? Can I live with that loneliness, not run away from it, not try to fulfill through some action? Can I live with it and not try to transform it, not try to shape and control it? If the mind can, then perhaps it will go beyond that loneliness, beyond that despair, which does not mean into hope, into a state of devotion, but on the contrary. If I can understand and live in that loneliness-not run away from it, but live in that strange loneliness which comes when I am bored, when I am afraid, when I am apprehensive, not for any cause or with cause-when I know this sense of loneliness, is it possible for the mind to live with it, without trying to push it away?

Now, if the mind can stay in that very extraordinary sense of being cut off from everything, from all ideas, from all crutches, from all dependencies, then is it not possible for such a mind to go beyond, not theoretically, but actually? It is only when it can fully experience that state of loneliness, that state of emptiness, that state of nondependency, then only is it possible—that action is not the action through the narrow funnel of the 'me'.

The more you are conscious of yourself, the more isolated you are, and self-consciousness is the process of isolation. But aloneness is not isolation. There is aloneness only when loneliness comes to an end. Aloneness is a state in which all influence has completely ceased, both the influence from outside and the inner influence of memory; and only when the mind is in that state of aloneness can it know the incorruptible. But to come to that, we must understand loneliness, this process of isolation, which is the self and its activity. So, the understanding of the self is the beginning of the cessation of isolation, and therefore of loneliness.

Then, if we go still more deeply into it, the problem arises of whether that which we call loneliness is an actuality or merely a word. Is loneliness an actuality or merely a word which covers something that may not be what we think it is? Is not loneliness a thought, the result of thinking? That is, thinking is verbalization based on memory, and do we not, with that verbalization, with that thought, with that memory, look at the state which we call "lonely?" So, the very giving of a name to that state may be the cause of fear which prevents us from looking at it more closely; and if we do not give it a name, which is fabricated by the mind, then is that state lonely?

Can this emptiness, this void, be filled? If not, can we run away from it, escape from it? If we have experienced and found one escape to be of no value, are not all other escapes therefore of no value? It does not matter whether you fill the emptiness with this or with that. So-called meditation is also an escape. It does not matter much that you change your way of escape. How then will you find what to do about this loneliness? You can only find what to do when you have stopped escaping. Is that not so? When you are willing to face what is—which means you must not turn on the radio, which means you must turn your back to civilization—then that loneliness comes to an end, because it is completely transformed. It is no longer loneliness.

Questioner: What is the difference between awareness and introspection? And who is aware in awareness? Krishnamurti: Let us first examine what we mean by introspection. We mean by introspection looking within oneself, examining oneself. Why does one examine oneself? In order to improve, in order to change, in order to modify. You introspect in order to become

something, otherwise you would not indulge in introspection. You would not examine yourself if there were not the desire to modify, change, to become something other than what you are. That is the obvious reason for introspection. I am angry and I introspect, examine myself, in order to get rid of anger or to modify or change anger. Where there is introspection, which is the desire to modify or change the responses, the reactions of the self, there is always an end in view; when that end is not achieved there is moodiness, depression. Therefore introspection invariably goes with depression.

I don't know if you have noticed that when you introspect, when you look into yourself in order to change yourself, there is always a wave of depression. There is always a moody wave which you have to battle against; you have to examine yourself again in order to overcome that mood and so on. Introspection is a process in which there is no release because it is a process of transforming what is into something which it is not. Obviously that is exactly what is taking place when we introspect, when we indulge in that peculiar action. In that action, there is always an accumulative process, the 'I' examining something in order to change it. So there is always a dualistic conflict and therefore a process of frustration. There is never a release; and realizing that frustration, there is depression. Awareness is entirely different. Awareness is observation without condemnation. Awareness brings understanding, because there is no condemnation or identification but silent observation. If I want to understand something, I must observe, I must not criticize, I must not condemn, I must not pursue it as pleasure or avoid it as non-pleasure. There must merely be the silent observation of a fact. There is no end in view but awareness of everything as it arises. That observation and the understanding of that observation cease when there is condemnation, identification, or justification.

Questioner: It is now a well-established fact that many of our diseases are psychosomatic, brought on by deep inner frustrations and conflicts of which we are often unaware. Must we now run to psychiatrists as we used to run to physicians, or is there a way for man to free himself from this inner turmoil? Krishnamurti: Which raises the question: What is the position of the psychoanalysts? And what is the position of those of us who have some form of disease or illness? Is the disease brought on by our emotional disturbances, or is it without emotional significance? Most of us are disturbed. Most of us are confused, in turmoil, even the very prosperous who have refrigerators, cars, and all the rest of it; and as we do not know how to deal with the disturbance, inevitably it reacts on the physical and produces an illness, which is fairly obvious. And the question is: Must we run to psychiatrists to help us to remove our disturbances and thereby regain health, or is it possible for us to find out for ourselves how not to be disturbed, how not to have turmoil, anxieties, fears?

Now, can you and I be free of all this turmoil and confusion? Do you understand? What is confusion? Confusion exists only when there is the fact plus what I think about the fact: my opinion about the fact, my disregard of the fact, my evasion of the fact, my evaluation of the fact, and so on. If I can look at the fact without the additive quality, then there is no confusion. If I recognize the fact that a certain road leads to Ventura, there is no confusion. Confusion arises only when I think or insist that the road leads somewhere else-and that is actually the state that most of us are in.

"Attention is not the same as concentration. Concentration is exclusion; attention, which is total awareness, excludes nothing. It seems to me that most of us are not aware, not only of what we are talking about but of our environment, the clouds, the movement of water. Perhaps it is because we are so concerned with ourselves, with our own petty little problems, our own ideas, our own pleasures, pursuits and ambitions that we are not objectively aware. And yet we talk a great deal about awareness. Once in India I was travelling in a car. There was a chauffeur driving and I was sitting beside him. There were three gentlemen behind discussing awareness, and unfortunately at that moment the

driver was looking somewhere else and he ran over a goat, and the three gentlemen were still discussing awareness-totally unaware that they had run over a goat. When this lack of attention was pointed out to those gentlemen who were trying to be aware it was a great surprise to them"

Awareness is not a commitment to something. Awareness is an observation, both outer and inner, in which direction has stopped. You are aware, but the thing of which you are aware is not being encouraged or nourished. Awareness is not concentration on something. It is not an action of the will choosing what it will be aware of, and analysing it to bring about a certain result. When awareness is deliberately focused on a particular object, as a conflict, that is the action of will which is concentration. When you concentrate - that is, put all your energy and thought within your chosen frontiers, whether reading a book or watching your anger - then, in this exclusion, the thing you are concentrating upon is strengthened, nourished. So here we have to understand the nature of awareness: We have to understand what we are talking about when we use the word awareness. Now, you can either be aware of a particular thing, or be aware of that particular as part of the total. The particular by itself has very little meaning, but when you see the total, then that particular has a relationship to the whole. Only in this relationship does the particular have its right meaning; it doesn't become all-important, it is not exaggerated. So the real question is: does one see the total process of life or is one concentrated on the particular, thus missing the whole field of life? To be aware of the whole field is to see also the particular, but, at the same time, to understand its relationship to the whole. If you are angry and are concerned with ending that anger, then you focus your attention on the anger and the whole escapes you and the anger is strengthened. But anger is interrelated to the whole. So when we separate the particular from the whole, the particular breeds its own problems

The duality of thinker and thought

As you watch anything - a tree, your wife, your children, your neighbor, the stars of a night, the light on the water, the bird in the sky, anything - there is always the observer, the censor, the thinker, the experiencer, the seeker, and the thing he is observing; the observer and the observed; the thinker and the thought. So, there is always a division. It is this division that is time.

That division is the very essence of conflict. And when there is conflict, there is contradiction. There is "the observer and the observed"—that is a contradiction; there is a separation. And hence where there is contradiction, there is conflict. And when there is conflict, there is always the urgency to get beyond it, to conquer it, to overcome it, to escape from it, to do something about it, and all that activity involves time.... As long as there is this division, time will go on, and time is sorrow.

And a man who will understand the end of sorrow must understand this, must find, must go beyond this duality between the thinker and the thought, the experiencer and the experienced. That is, when there is a division between the observer and the observed, there is time, and therefore there is no ending of sorrow. Then, what is one to do? You understand the question? I see, within myself, the observer is always watching, judging, censoring, accepting, rejecting, disciplining, controlling, shaping. That observer, that thinker, is the result of thought, obviously. Thought is first; not the observer, not the thinker. If there was no thinking at all, there would be no observer, no thinker; then there would only be complete, total attention.

Is there a difference between the observer and the observed? We are so conditioned, so heavily burdened with the past, with all our knowledge, information how can the mind be spontaneous? Can the mind observe its activity without prejudice, which means without images?

When there is a division between the observer and the observed there is conflict but when the observer is the observed there is no control, no suppression. The self comes to an end. Duality comes to an end. Conflict comes to an end.

This is the greatest meditation to come upon this extraordinary thing for the mind to discover for itself the observer is the observed

'Meditation is a movement in and of the unknown ... it is that energy that thought-matter cannot touch. Thought is perversion for it is the product of yesterday ... Everything put together by thought is within the area of noise, and thought can in no way make itself still ... thought itself must be still for silence to be. Silence is always now as thought is not. Thought, always being old, cannot possibly enter into that silence which is always new. The new becomes the old when thought touches it ... Love can only be when thought is still. This stillness can in no way be manufactured by thought ... this stillness can never be touched by thought. Thought is always old, but love is not ... the flowering of goodness is not in the soil of thought'

. to look at myself without any formula--can one do that? Otherwise you can't learn about yourself obviously. If I say, I am jealous, the very verbalization of that fact, or of that feeling, has already conditioned it. Right? Therefore I cannot see anything further in it. . . .[1]

Now the question is: can the mind be free of this egocentric activity? Right? That is really the question, not whether it is so or not. Which means can the mind stand alone, uninfluenced? Alone, being alone does not mean isolation. Sir, look: when one rejects completely all the absurdities of nationality, the absurdities of propaganda, of religious propaganda, rejects conclusions of any kind, actually, not theoretically, completely put aside, has understood very deeply

the question of pleasure and fear, and division--the `me' and the `not me'--is there any form of the self at all?

To me it seems to be fairly clear that to observe there must be freedom. Not only the outward phenomenon, but also to observe what is going on within ourselves, to observe without any prejudice, without taking any side, but to examine very closely, freely, the whole process of our thinking and our activity, our pleasures, fears, and all the things that we have built around ourselves, not only outwardly but in ourselves as a form of resistance, compulsive demands, escapes and so on. If we could do that consistently, with full intention, to discover for ourselves a way of living that is not contradictory, then perhaps these talks will be worthwhile. Otherwise it will be another lecture, another entertainment, pleasurable or rather absurd, logical or illogical and so on. So if we could completely give ourselves to the examination, to observe intimately what is going on, both outwardly and inwardly.

Now the difficulty in this lies, it seems to me, the capacity to observe, to see things as they are, not as we would like them to be, or what they should be, but actually what is going on. To so observe has its own discipline, not the discipline of imitation, or compulsion, or conformity but that very observation brings its own discipline, not imposed, not conforming to any particular pattern, which implies suppression, but to observe. After all when you do observe something very closely, or listen to somebody very fully, that very listening and seeing, in that is implied attention. And where there is attention there is discipline, without being disciplined.

If that is clear, the next point is, in observing there is always the observer. The observer who, with his prejudices, with his conditionings, with his fears and guilts and all the rest of it, he is the observer, the censor, and through his eyes he looks, and therefore he is really not looking at all, he is merely coming to conclusions based upon his past experiences and knowledge. The past experiences, conclusions and knowledge prevent actually seeing. And when there is such an observer and what he observes is something different, or something which he has to conquer, or change and so on; whereas if the observer is the observed--I think this is really a radical thing to understand, really the most important thing to understand if we are going to discuss anything seriously: that in us there is this division, this contradiction, the observer and the many fragments which he observes. The many fragments make up the `me', the ego, the personality, whatever you like to call it, the many fragments. And one of the fragments becomes the observer, or the censor, and that fragment looks over the various other fragments. Please do this as we are talking, not agreeing or disagreeing, but observe this fact that is going on within oneself; it becomes terribly interesting and rather fun if you go at it very, very seriously.

We are made up of many fragments, each contradicting the other. Both linguistically, factually and theoretically. Contradictory desires, contradictory

pursuits, ambitions that deny affection, love and so on--one is aware of these fragments. And who is the observer who decides what he should do, what he should think, what he should become? Surely one of the fragments. He becomes the analyzer, he assumes the authority. One fragment, among the many other fragments, assumes the censorship, and he becomes the actor, the doer, compelling other fragments to conform and therefore brings about contradiction. I don't know if we see this very clearly? Then what is one to do, knowing most of us are made up of these many fragments, which fragment is to act? Or are all the fragments to act? You are following? Or action by any one of the fragments brings about contradiction, conflict and therefore confusion. Right? Are we communicating with each other? Communication being thinking together. Not only verbally, but understanding together, going together, creating together. One fragment believes in god, or doesn't believe in god, and another fragment wants a security, not only physical but psychological security. One fragment is afraid, another fragment tries to dominate that fear. Seeing this extraordinary contradiction in ourselves, what is one to do? The fragments cannot be integrated, which implies there is an integrator. Right? That is, the integrator becomes another fragment. So it is not integration, it is not one fragment which assumes a superior position as the higher self, or the most intellectual thing and dominates the rest. Or one fragment which feels greatly emotional and tries to function along emotional lines. So seeing this very clearly, what is the action that will be total, that will not be contradictory? And who is it that is seeing the whole fragments? Is it another fragment that says, 'I observe all the many other fragments'? Are we moving together? Or there is only observation without the observer. Can we go along? You understand my question?

Is there an observation, the seeing, without the 'me' as the observer seeing? And therefore creating a duality, a division. That's really our problem, isn't it, basically? We have divided the world, the geographical world, as the British, the French, the Indian, the American, Russian and so on, and inwardly we have divided psychologically the world, those who believe and those who do not believe, my country, your country, my god, your god and all the rest of it. And this division has brought about wars. And a man who would live completely at peace, not only with himself but with the world, has to understand this division, this separation. And can thought bring about this complete, total observation? I don't know if we are going together in this?

Who is responsible for this division? The Catholic, the Protestant, the Communist, the Socialist, the Muslim, the Hindu? You follow? This division that is going on within, outwardly and inwardly - who is responsible? The Pope? The Archbishop? The politicians? Who is it? Is it thought? The intellect? Can thought observe without division? You follow? We observe--or thought observes--all the many factors of these divisions; and is it not thought itself that has brought about this division, the intellect? And the intellect is one of the divisions, one of the fragmentations and that intellect has become extraordinarily important, which is thought. Right? For us thought is the most extraordinarily important thing, the

intellect. And we hope to solve all the problems of our life through thought, don't we? By thinking over a problem, trying to suppress it or give free reigns to it. Thought is the factor, is the instrument, which is always observing. Right?

Now that is, thought is one of the fragments. You don't live by thought, you have your feelings, your appetites, your pleasures. So if thought breeds contradiction, as yours and mine, as heaven and hell and all the rest of it, then how shall we observe, see, without the fragment which we call thought? I do not know if you have ever put this question to yourself. Thought is after all the response of the past, memories. Thought is never free, and with that thought, with that instrument, we are always looking at life, always responding to every challenge with thought. Now can we observe with eyes, with a mind that is not shaped by thought? That is, can we observe without any conclusion, without any prejudice, without being committed to any particular theory or action? Which means to observe with eyes that have learnt about these many factors, fragments, which make up the 'me'. That is, as long as there is no self-knowing, as long as I do not know myself completely and thoroughly, I must function in fragments. And how to observe myself, how to learn about myself, without the censor intervening in observation. Are we getting together?

Look, I want to learn about myself because I see how extraordinarily important it is if I am at all to understand the world, action and a new way of living altogether. I have to understand myself--not according to some philosopher, psychologist however learned. I want to learn about myself as actually what I am, without any distortion, without suppressing anything, what I am both consciously as well as unconsciously. I want to know myself completely. Now how shall I learn? How shall I learn about what I am? To learn there must be a certain passion, a great deal of curiosity, without any assumption, taking things for granted, to look at myself without any formula. Can one do that? Otherwise you can't learn about yourself, obviously. If I say, 'I am jealous,' the very verbalization of that fact, or of that feeling, has already conditioned it. Right? Therefore I cannot see anything further in it. So there must be a learning about the usage of words, not to be caught in words, and the realization that the word, the description, is not the described or the thing.

So to look, to learn about oneself there must be freedom from all conclusion. I am ugly, I don't want to look at myself. I don't know what I shall find in myself. I am afraid to look at myself. You know all the things that we have come up with. So, can one observe without any sense of condemnation? Because if there is condemnation it is one of the fragments that has gathered, that has been conditioned by a particular society or culture in which it lives. If you are a Catholic you are conditioned--2,000 years of propaganda has conditioned your mind, and with that mind you observe. And in that observation there is already condemnation, justification, therefore you don't learn. Right? The act of learning implies there must be freedom from the past. Obviously.

Now we are learning together here and is one free from the culture that has conditioned the mind? Being born as a Hindu or a Muslim, of centuries of propaganda--don't do this, do this, believe in this, don't believe in that--has conditioned the mind. And such a mind says, 'I am going to learn about myself.' It doesn't realize that it is conditioned, and a conditioned mind cannot possibly learn. Therefore it must be free of its conditioning I don't know if you are following all this? Are you? You know what that implies when you say, 'Yes, we are'? Not to be an Englishman, or a Frenchman, not to belong to any religion, not to have any prejudice, not to come to any conclusion, which means freedom. And it is only such a mind that can learn about itself. Therefore one has to be aware of one's conditioning? Then the problem arises: who is to be aware of the conditioning? You follow? There is only conditioning, not, to be aware of the conditioning. I don't know if you see this? The moment I am aware of my conditioning there is a duality, isn't there? I who am aware of my particular conditioning and hence the one who is aware wants to change his conditioning, break it down, be free from it. Therefore that creates conflict. Right? All division is bound to create conflict. Right? Sir, look, the Catholic and the Protestant, you have got a very good example. Any division is bound to bring about contradiction, conflict and strife. If I say, 'I will be aware of my conditioning,' there is immediately a contradiction, a separation. So to be aware of one's conditioning. You see? I am going to be aware of my conditioning, is one thing. And the other is to be aware of it. Non-verbally, because the word is not the thing, and therefore the actual perception of it. Can you do this? Not that this a group therapy, or analysis--for god's sake none of all that stuff--but actually is one aware of this conditioning? To be aware that I am a Hindu. Awareness implies looking, being aware, without any choice. The moment you have choice it is a fragmentation.

So can you observe yourself without any image of yourself? The image of yourself is the conditioning. Right? And to observe without any image, which means I don't know what I am, I am going to find out. In that there is no assumption, conclusion, therefore the mind is free to observe, to learn. Right? But in learning the moment there is an accumulation you have stopped learning. Look sir, suppose I have observed myself and I see I am this, as a fact, and from that observation I have learnt something about myself. Having learnt about myself is the past. Right? With that past knowledge I am going to observe, therefore I cease to observe. It is only the past that is observing. Right? So can I, can the mind observe without accumulating? You understand the problem? Just look at the problem first, not what to do. When you understand the problem very clearly action follows naturally. I observe myself and through that observation I have learnt something. After having learnt, I further observe. Having learnt more, I go on to observe, therefore the observer becomes the analyzer. Right? Right? Please do see this. Let's go along. The observer, the analyzer, is the result of many things he has learnt about himself, and with the eyes of the past, as the analyzer, as the person who has accumulated knowledge, he examines, he



looks, he learns. So the past is always trying to learn of what is going on in the present. Is this clear?

So can there be a learning, that is, watching, observing, without any sense of accumulation, so that the mind is always fresh to learn? It is only such a mind that is a free mind. So can the mind be free of thought in observing, in learning? Because you see one wants to learn, naturally, seeing the transient nature of our life, the exhaustion of pleasure revived by thought, given continuity to pleasure by thought, seeing how everything comes to an end, one wants to find out if there is anything which is beyond, which is transcendental, which is something other than this daily routine, daily boredom, daily occupation, daily worry. After all that is what religions promise: seek god, love god. But to learn if there is anything that is beyond thought, beyond the intellect, beyond the routine, one must be free of all beliefs, mustn't one? Which doesn't mean you become an atheist. The atheists and the believers are both the same.

I want to find out seriously if there is something which is beyond 'what is', which means the mind must be totally free of any fear otherwise fear will project something that will give it a comfort. So I must learn all about fear, the mind must be enquiring into this whole terrible problem of fear. If the mind wants to find out anything that is beyond the imagination, the myth, the symbol, man has projected as god, the mind must be free of all that to find out. And it cannot possibly find out if there is any form of fear. And we are frightened human beings. So can the mind learn the whole nature of fear, not only the conscious fears but the deep-rooted fears of which most of us are unaware?

So from that arises the question: how are the unconscious fears to be revealed, to be exposed? Are you following all this? Is it to be exposed through analysis, which means the analyzer, which means a fragment who is going to analyze. Or through dreams discover all the fears, and that is a perilous road, to find out through dreams what we are because dreams are merely the continuation of what we are during the daily life, waking hours. No? Is all this too much in one morning?

Audience: No.

K: Good. So how is the mind, which has divided in itself as the conscious and the unconscious, which again is a division, therefore contradiction, how is the mind to be aware of this whole structure and nature of consciousness? The me? You follow? Without division. And there are hidden parts in the mind, deep down in the darkest corners of our minds, all kinds of things going on. Nothing extraordinary, it is as silly as the conscious mind, the things of the conscious mind. So how is all that to be exposed? Not through analysis obviously. Right? It you really see that, the impossibility, the danger, the falseness of analysis--I hope there aren't any analysts here, bad luck if there are- -if you really see that, your mind then is free to observe without analysis. I don't know if you see that.

Look sir, let's be very simple about this. Analysis implies time. Right? Analysis implies the analyzer who is different from the thing analyzed. And is the analyzer different from the thing he wants to analyze? Surely they are both the same only he, a fragment, has assumed the part, the knowledge, the assumption that he is different and he is going to analyze. And each analysis must be complete. Right? Otherwise you carry over the misunderstandings of your analysis to the next analysis. Time, division as the analyzer, each analysis must be complete, finished each time, which are all impossible. If you see the truth of that, the actual fact of it, then you are free of it, aren't you? Are you? If you are free of it then you have quite a different mind that is going to observe. You see the difference? If there is the freedom from the false--and analysis is the false--then my mind is free from the burden of that which has been false, therefore it is free to look.

Now can the mind look at the totality of consciousness without any division as the observer watching the whole structure of consciousness? I don't know if you are following all this?. Is this all becoming rather complex? If it is complex, life is complex. And to learn about oneself you have to face this extraordinarily complex entity called the `me'. You have to learn about it, and that's what we are doing, we are getting educated about ourselves.

So, can the mind observe the totality of itself? Look, we are human beings--at least supposed to be--only we have divided ourselves into various nationalities, religious beliefs, and so on. When you observe, that is, when you go beyond all nationalities and religious beliefs, we are aggressive, brutal, violent, pleasure-seeking people, frightened and so on, and we have to learn all about that, which is ourselves. And to learn about ourselves we see analysis has no answer at all. On the contrary analysis prevents action, denies action. So can the mind observe the totality of itself, look at itself without any division? Then there is no need for analysis or for the hidden things to be exposed, you see the whole thing. Therefore in that observation you may discover fear. Fear and pleasure are the two principal things in us, driving forces, demanding more and more and more pleasure, and warding off fear. Right? Now what do you do with pleasure? You want more of it, surely--both physical, psychological pleasures. And in looking at pleasure very closely, one asks oneself: what is it? what is pleasure? Please sirs, do discuss with me. Come together. What is pleasure to you? Physical sensation, psychological factors

Sir, do you know what it means to live in the present? To ignore the past. Can I ignore the past? When all my life is the past. No? I am the past. No? The past. All thought is the past. No? Because thought is the response of memory. Memory is knowledge, experience, which is all the past. Can the mind ignore all that? Because the mind is the past. All the brain cells are the result of the past. And you say, `Ignore it and live in the present'. Do you know what it means to live in the present? Which means to have no time at all, to be free of time. Not so that you will miss the bus--I don't mean that. If you forget time you won't be able to

get home. We mean by freedom from time implies freedom from the whole structure of the 'me', which is time, which is the past. And one has to learn about all that. You can't say, I'll be free, or ignore it.

The mind is silent only with the abundance of energy, when there is that attention in which all contradiction of the pulling of desire in different directions, has ceased. **The struggle of desire to be silent does not make for silence.** Silence is not to be bought through any form of compulsion; it is not the reward of suppression or even sublimation. But the mind that is not silent is never free; and it is only to the silent mind that the heavens are opened. The bliss which the mind seeks is not found through its seeking, nor does it lie in faith. Only the silent mind can receive that blessing which is not of church or belief. For the mind to be silent, all its contradictory corners must come together and be fused in the flame of understanding. The silent mind is not a reflective mind. To reflect, there must be the watcher and the watched, The experiencer heavy with the past. In the silent mind there is no centre from which to become, to be, or to think. All desire is contradiction, for every centre of desire is opposed to another centre. The silence of the total mind is meditation.

We see contradiction in us and about us; because we are in contradiction, there is lack of peace in us and therefore outside us. There is in us a constant state of denial and assertion - what we *want* to be and what we are. The state of contradiction creates conflict and this conflict does not bring about peace - which is a simple, obvious fact. This inward contradiction should not be translated into some kind of philosophical dualism, because that is a very easy escape. That is by saying that contradiction is a state of dualism we think we have solved it - which is obviously a mere convention, a contributory escape from actuality. Now what do we mean by conflict, by contradiction? Why is there a contradiction in me? - this constant struggle to be something apart from what I am. I am this, and I want to be that. This contradiction in us is a fact, not a metaphysical dualism. Metaphysics has no significance in understanding what *is*. We may discuss, say, dualism, what it is, if it exists, and so on; but of what value is it if we don't know that there is contradiction in us, opposing desires, opposing interests, opposing pursuits? I want to be good and I am not able to be. This contradiction, this opposition in us, must be understood because it creates conflict; and in conflict, in struggle, we cannot create individually. Let us be clear on the state we are in. There is contradiction, so there must be struggle; and struggle is destruction, waste. In that state we can produce nothing but antagonism, strife, more bitterness and sorrow. If we can understand this fully and hence be free of contradiction, then there can be inward peace, which will bring understanding of each other.

The problem is this. Seeing that conflict is destructive, wasteful, why is it that in each of us there is contradiction? To understand that, we must go a little further. Why is there the sense of opposing desires? I do not know if we are aware of it in ourselves - this contradiction, this sense of wanting and not wanting, remembering something and trying to forget it in order to find something new. Just watch it. It is very simple and very normal. It is not something extraordinary.

The fact is, there is contradiction. Then why does this contradiction arise? What do we mean by contradiction? Does it not imply an impermanent state which is being opposed by another impermanent state? I think I have a permanent desire, I posit in myself a permanent desire and another desire arises which contradicts it; this contradiction brings about conflict, which is waste. That is to say there is a constant denial of one desire by another desire, one pursuit overcoming another pursuit. Now, is there such a thing as a permanent desire? Surely, *all* desire is impermanent - not metaphysically, but actually. I want a job. That is I look to a certain job as a means of happiness; and when I get it, I am dissatisfied. I want to become the manager, then the owner, and so on and on, not only in this world, but in the so-called spiritual world - the teacher becoming the principal, the priest becoming the bishop, the pupil becoming the master.

This constant becoming, arriving at one state after another, brings about contradiction, does it not? Therefore, why not look at life not as one permanent desire but as a series of fleeting desires always in opposition to each other? Hence the mind need not be in a state of contradiction. If I regard life not as a permanent desire but as a series of temporary desires which are constantly changing, then there is no contradiction.

Contradiction arises only when the mind has a fixed point of desire; that is when the mind does not regard *all* desire as moving, transient, but seizes upon one desire and makes that into a permanency - only then, when other desires arise, is there contradiction. But all desires are in constant movement, there is no fixation of desire. There is no fixed point in desire; but the mind establishes a fixed point because it treats everything as a means to arrive, to gain; and there must be contradiction, conflict, as long as one is arriving. You want to arrive, you want to succeed, you want to find an ultimate God or truth which will be your permanent satisfaction. Therefore you are not seeking truth, you are not seeking God. You are seeking lasting gratification, and that gratification you clothe with an idea, a respectable-sounding word such as God, truth; but actually we are all seeking gratification, and we place that gratification, that satisfaction, at the highest point, calling it God, and the lowest point is drink. So long as the mind is seeking gratification, there is not much difference between God and drink. Socially, drink may be bad; but the inward desire for gratification, for gain, is even more harmful, is it not? If you really want to find truth, you must be extremely honest, not merely at the verbal level but altogether; you must be extraordinarily clear, and you cannot be clear if you are unwilling to face facts.

Now what brings about contradiction in each one of us? Surely it is the desire to become something, is it not? We all want to become something: to become successful in the world and, inwardly, to achieve a result. So long as we think in terms of time, in terms of achievement, in terms of position, there must be contradiction. After all, the mind is the product of time. Thought is based on yesterday, on the past; and so long as thought is functioning within the field of time, thinking in terms of the future, of becoming, gaining, achieving, there must be contradiction, because then we are incapable of facing exactly what *is*. Only in realizing, in understanding, in being choicelessly aware of what is, is there a possibility of freedom from that disintegrating factor which is contradiction.

Therefore it is essential, is it not?, to understand the whole process of our thinking, for it is there that we find contradiction. Thought itself has become a contradiction because we have not understood the total process of ourselves; and that understanding is possible only when we are fully aware of our thought, not as an observer operating upon his thought, but integrally and without choice - which is extremely arduous. Then only is there the dissolution of that contradiction which is so detrimental, so painful.

So long as we are trying to achieve a psychological result, so long as we want inward security, there must be a contradiction in our life. I do not think that most of us are aware of this contradiction; or, if we are, we do not see its real significance. On the contrary, contradiction gives us an impetus to live; the very element of friction makes us feel that we are alive. The effort, the struggle of contradiction, gives us a sense of vitality. That is why we love wars, that is why we enjoy the battle of frustrations. So long as there is the desire to achieve a result, which is the desire to be psychologically secure, there must be a contradiction; and where there is contradiction, there cannot be a quiet mind. Quietness of mind is essential to understand the whole significance of life. Thought can never be tranquil; thought, which is the product of time, can never find that which is timeless, can never know that which is beyond time. The very nature of our thinking is a contradiction, because we are always thinking in terms of the past or of the future; therefore we are never fully cognizant, fully aware of the present.

To be fully aware of the present is an extraordinarily difficult task because the mind is incapable of facing a fact directly without deception. Thought is the product of the past and therefore it can only think in terms of the past or of the future; it cannot be completely aware of a fact in the present. So long as thought, which is the product of the past, tries to eliminate contradiction and all the problems that it creates, it is merely pursuing a result, trying to achieve an end, and such thinking only creates more contradiction and hence conflict, misery and confusion in us and, therefore, about us.

To be free of contradiction, one must be aware of the present without choice. How can there be choice when you are confronted with a fact? Surely the understanding of the fact is made impossible so long as thought is trying to operate upon the fact in terms of becoming, changing, altering. Therefore self-knowledge is the beginning of understanding; without self-knowledge, contradiction and conflict will continue. To know the whole process, the totality of oneself, does not require any expert, any authority. The pursuit of authority only breeds fear. No expert, no specialist, can show us how to understand the process of the self.

One has to study it for oneself. You and I can help each other by talking about it, but none can unfold it for us, no specialist, no teacher, can explore it for us. We can be aware of it only in our relationship - in our relationship to things, to property, to people and to ideas. In relationship we shall discover that contradiction arises when action is approximating itself to an idea. The idea is merely the crystallization of thought as a symbol, and the effort to live up to the symbol brings about a contradiction.

Thus, so long as there is a pattern of thought, contradiction will continue; to put an end to the pattern, and so to contradiction, there must be self-knowledge. This understanding of the self is not a process reserved for the few. The self is to be understood in our everyday speech, in the way we think and feel, in the way we look at another. If we can be aware of every thought, of every feeling, from moment to moment, then we shall see that in relationship the ways of the self are understood. Then only is there a possibility of that tranquillity of mind in which alone the ultimate reality can come into being

Meditation is a movement in and of the unknown ... it is that energy that thought-matter cannot touch. Thought is perversion for it is the product of yesterday ... Everything put together by thought is within the area of noise, and thought can in no way make itself still ... thought itself must be still for silence to be. Silence is always now as thought is not. Thought, always being old, cannot possibly enter into that silence which is always new. The new becomes the old when thought touches it ... Love can only be when thought is still. This stillness can in no way be manufactured by thought ... this stillness can never be touched by thought. Thought is always old, but love is not ... the flowering of goodness is not in the soil of thought'

“Meditation is never control of the body. There is no actual division between the organism and the mind. The brain, the nervous system, and the thing we call the mind are all one, indivisible. It is the natural act of meditation that brings about the harmonious movement of the whole. To divide the body from the mind and to control the body with intellectual decisions is to bring about contradiction, from which arise various forms of struggle, conflict and resistance. Every decision to control only breeds resistance, even the determination to be aware. Meditation is the understanding of the division brought about by decision. Freedom is not the act of decision but the act of perception. The seeing *is* the doing. It is not a determination to see and then to act. After all, will is desire with all its contradictions. When one desire assumes authority over another, that desire becomes will. In this, there is inevitable division. And meditation is the understanding of desire, not the overcoming of one desire by another. Desire is the movement of sensation, which becomes pleasure and fear. This is sustained by the constant dwelling of thought upon one or the other. Meditation is really a complete emptying of the mind.”

“Meditation is never control of the body. There is no actual division between the organism and the mind. The brain, the nervous system, and the thing we call the mind are all one, indivisible. It is the natural act of meditation that brings about the harmonious movement of the whole. To divide the body from the mind and to control the body with intellectual decisions is to bring about contradiction, from which arise various forms of struggle, conflict and resistance. Every decision to control only breeds resistance, even the determination to be aware. Meditation is the understanding of the division brought about by decision. Freedom is not the act of decision but the act of perception. The seeing *is* the doing. It is not a determination to see and then to act. After all, will is desire with all its

contradictions. When one desire assumes authority over another, that desire becomes will. In this, there is inevitable division. And meditation is the understanding of desire, not the overcoming of one desire by another. Desire is the movement of sensation, which becomes pleasure and fear. This is sustained by the constant dwelling of thought upon one or the other. Meditation is really a complete emptying of the mind.”

Not being anything is the beginning of freedom. So if you are capable of feeling, of going into this you will find, as you become aware, that you are not free, that you are bound to very many different things, and that at the same time the mind hopes to be free. And you can see that the two are contradictory. So the mind has to investigate why it clings to anything. All this implies hard work. It is much more arduous than going to an office, than any physical labor, than all the sciences put together. Because the humble, intelligent mind is concerned with itself without being self-centered; therefore it has to be extraordinarily alert, aware, and that means real hard work every day, every hour, every minute.... This demands insistent work because freedom does not come easily. Everything impedes — your wife, your husband, your son, your neighbor, your Gods, your religions, your tradition. All these impede you, but you have created them because you want security. And the mind that is seeking security can never find it. If you have watched a little in the world, you know there is no such thing as security. The wife dies, the husband dies, the son runs away — something happens. Life is not static, though we would like to make it so. No relationship is static because all life is movement. That is a thing to be grasped, the truth to be seen, felt, not something to be argued about. Then you will see, as you begin to investigate, that it is really a process of meditation. But do not be mesmerized by that word. To be aware of every thought, to know from what source it springs and what is its intention — that is meditation. And to know the whole content of one thought reveals the whole process of the mind.

If you find it difficult to be aware, then experiment with writing down every thought and feeling that arises throughout the day; write down your reactions of jealousy, envy, vanity, sensuality, the intentions behind your words, and so on. Spend some time before breakfast in writing them down—which may necessitate going to bed earlier and putting aside some social affair. If you write these things down whenever you can, and in the evening before sleeping look over all that you have written during the day, study and examine it without judgment, without condemnation, you will begin to discover the hidden causes of your thoughts and feelings, desires and words....

Now, the important thing in this is to study with free intelligence what you have written down, and in studying it you will become aware of your own state. In the flame of self-awareness, of self-knowledge, the causes of conflict are discovered and consumed. You should continue to write down your thoughts and feelings, intentions and reactions, not once or twice, but for a considerable number of days until you are able to be aware of them instantly....

Meditation is not only constant self-awareness, but constant abandonment of the self. Out of right thinking there is meditation, from which there comes the tranquility of wisdom; and in that serenity the highest is realized.

Writing down what one thinks and feels, one's desires and reactions, brings about an inward awareness, the cooperation of the unconscious with the conscious, and this in turn leads to integration and understanding.

Is truth something final, absolute, fixed? We would like it to be absolute because then we could take shelter in it. We would like it to be permanent because then we could hold on to it, find happiness in it. But is truth absolute, continuous, to be experienced over and over again? The repetition of experience is the mere cultivation of memory, is it not? In moments of quietness, I may experience a certain truth, but if I cling to that experience through memory and make it absolute, fixed — is that truth? Is truth the continuation, the cultivation of memory? Or, is truth to be found only when the mind is utterly still? When the mind is not caught in memories, not cultivating memory as the centre of recognition, but is aware of everything I am saying, everything I am doing in my relationships, in my activities, seeing the truth of everything as it is from moment to moment — surely, that is the way of meditation, is it not? There is comprehension only when the mind is still, and the mind cannot be still as long as it is ignorant of itself. That ignorance is not dispelled through any form of discipline, through pursuing any authority, ancient or modern. Belief only creates resistance, isolation, and where there is isolation, there is no possibility of tranquillity. Tranquillity comes only when I understand the whole process of myself — the various entities in conflict with each other which compose the "me." As that is an arduous task, we turn to others to learn various tricks which we call meditation. The tricks of the mind are not meditation. Meditation is the beginning of self-knowledge, and without meditation, there is no self-knowledge.

The mind is silent only with the abundance of energy, when there is that attention in which all contradiction of the pulling of desire in different directions, has ceased. **The struggle of desire to be silent does not make for silence.** Silence is not to be bought through any form of compulsion; it is not the reward of suppression or even sublimation. But the mind that is not silent is never free; and it is only to the silent mind that the heavens are opened. The bliss which the mind seeks is not found through its seeking, nor does it lie in faith. Only the silent mind can receive that blessing which is not of church or belief. For the mind to be silent, all its contradictory corners must come together and be fused in the flame of understanding. The silent mind is not a reflective mind. To reflect, there must be the watcher and the watched, The experiencer heavy with the past. In the silent mind there is no centre from which to become, to be, or to think. All desire is contradiction, for every centre of desire is opposed to another centre. The silence of the total mind is meditation

Freedom is not a reaction; freedom is not a choice. It is man's pretence that because he has choice he is free. Freedom is pure observation without direction, without fear of punishment and reward. Freedom is without motive; freedom is not at the end of the evolution of man but lies in the first step of his existence. In



observation one begins to discover the lack of freedom. Freedom is found in the choiceless awareness of our daily existence and activity. Thought is time. Thought is born of experience and knowledge which are inseparable from time and the past. Time is the psychological enemy of man. Our action is based on knowledge and therefore time, so man is always a slave to the past. Thought is ever-limited and so we live in constant conflict and struggle. There is no psychological evolution.

When man becomes aware of the movement of his own thoughts he will see the division between the thinker and thought, the observer and the observed, the experiencer and the experience. He will discover that this division is an illusion. Then only is there pure observation which is insight without any shadow of the past or of time. This timeless insight brings about a deep radical mutation in the mind.

Total negation is the essence of the positive. When there is negation of all those things that thought has brought about psychologically, only then is there love, which is compassion and intelligence."

We see contradiction in us and about us; because we are in contradiction, there is lack of peace in us and therefore outside us. There is in us a constant state of denial and assertion - what we *want* to be and what we are. The state of contradiction creates conflict and this conflict does not bring about peace - which is a simple, obvious fact. This inward contradiction should not be translated into some kind of philosophical dualism, because that is a very easy escape. That is by saying that contradiction is a state of dualism we think we have solved it - which is obviously a mere convention, a contributory escape from actuality. Now what do we mean by conflict, by contradiction? Why is there a contradiction in me? - this constant struggle to be something apart from what I am. I am this, and I want to be that. This contradiction in us is a fact, not a metaphysical dualism. Metaphysics has no significance in understanding what *is*. We may discuss, say, dualism, what it is, if it exists, and so on; but of what value is it if we don't know that there is contradiction in us, opposing desires, opposing interests, opposing pursuits? I want to be good and I am not able to be. This contradiction, this opposition in us, must be understood because it creates conflict; and in conflict, in struggle, we cannot create individually. Let us be clear on the state we are in. There is contradiction, so there must be struggle; and struggle is destruction, waste. In that state we can produce nothing but antagonism, strife, more bitterness and sorrow. If we can understand this fully and hence be free of contradiction, then there can be inward peace, which will bring understanding of each other.

The problem is this. Seeing that conflict is destructive, wasteful, why is it that in each of us there is contradiction? To understand that, we must go a little further. Why is there the sense of opposing desires? I do not know if we are aware of it in ourselves - this contradiction, this sense of wanting and not wanting, remembering something and trying to forget it in order to find something new. Just watch it. It is very simple and very normal. It is not something extraordinary. The fact is, there is contradiction. Then why does this contradiction arise?

What do we mean by contradiction? Does it not imply an impermanent state which is being opposed by another impermanent state? I think I have a permanent desire, I posit in myself a permanent desire and another desire arises which contradicts it; this contradiction brings about conflict, which is waste. That is to say there is a constant denial of one desire by another desire, one pursuit overcoming another pursuit. Now, is there such a thing as a permanent desire? Surely, *all* desire is impermanent - not metaphysically, but actually. I want a job. That is I look to a certain job as a means of happiness; and when I get it, I am dissatisfied. I want to become the manager, then the owner, and so on and on, not only in this world, but in the so-called spiritual world - the teacher becoming the principal, the priest becoming the bishop, the pupil becoming the master. This constant becoming, arriving at one state after another, brings about contradiction, does it not? Therefore, why not look at life not as one permanent desire but as a series of fleeting desires always in opposition to each other? Hence the mind need not be in a state of contradiction. If I regard life not as a permanent desire but as a series of temporary desires which are constantly changing, then there is no contradiction.

Contradiction arises only when the mind has a fixed point of desire; that is when the mind does not regard *all* desire as moving, transient, but seizes upon one desire and makes that into a permanency - only then, when other desires arise, is there contradiction. But all desires are in constant movement, there is no fixation of desire. There is no fixed point in desire; but the mind establishes a fixed point because it treats everything as a means to arrive, to gain; and there must be contradiction, conflict, as long as one is arriving. You want to arrive, you want to succeed, you want to find an ultimate God or truth which will be your permanent satisfaction. Therefore you are not seeking truth, you are not seeking God. You are seeking lasting gratification, and that gratification you clothe with an idea, a respectable-sounding word such as God, truth; but actually we are all seeking gratification, and we place that gratification, that satisfaction, at the highest point, calling it God, and the lowest point is drink. So long as the mind is seeking gratification, there is not much difference between God and drink.

Socially, drink may be bad; but the inward desire for gratification, for gain, is even more harmful, is it not? If you really want to find truth, you must be extremely honest, not merely at the verbal level but altogether; you must be extraordinarily clear, and you cannot be clear if you are unwilling to face facts.

Now what brings about contradiction in each one of us? Surely it is the desire to become something, is it not? We all want to become something: to become successful in the world and, inwardly, to achieve a result. So long as we think in terms of time, in terms of achievement, in terms of position, there must be contradiction. After all, the mind is the product of time. Thought is based on yesterday, on the past; and so long as thought is functioning within the field of time, thinking in terms of the future, of becoming, gaining, achieving, there must be contradiction, because then we are incapable of facing exactly what *is*. Only in realizing, in understanding, in being choicelessly aware of what is, is there a possibility of freedom from that disintegrating factor which is contradiction.

Therefore it is essential, is it not?, to understand the whole process of our thinking, for it is there that we find contradiction. Thought itself has become a contradiction because we have not understood the total process of ourselves; and that understanding is possible only when we are fully aware of our thought, not as an observer operating upon his thought, but integrally and without choice - which is extremely arduous. Then only is there the dissolution of that contradiction which is so detrimental, so painful.

So long as we are trying to achieve a psychological result, so long as we want inward security, there must be a contradiction in our life. I do not think that most of us are aware of this contradiction; or, if we are, we do not see its real significance. On the contrary, contradiction gives us an impetus to live; the very element of friction makes us feel that we are alive. The effort, the struggle of contradiction, gives us a sense of vitality. That is why we love wars, that is why we enjoy the battle of frustrations. So long as there is the desire to achieve a result, which is the desire to be psychologically secure, there must be a contradiction; and where there is contradiction, there cannot be a quiet mind. Quietness of mind is essential to understand the whole significance of life. Thought can never be tranquil; thought, which is the product of time, can never find that which is timeless, can never know that which is beyond time. The very nature of our thinking is a contradiction, because we are always thinking in terms of the past or of the future; therefore we are never fully cognizant, fully aware of the present.

To be fully aware of the present is an extraordinarily difficult task because the mind is incapable of facing a fact directly without deception. Thought is the product of the past and therefore it can only think in terms of the past or of the future; it cannot be completely aware of a fact in the present. So long as thought, which is the product of the past, tries to eliminate contradiction and all the problems that it creates, it is merely pursuing a result, trying to achieve an end, and such thinking only creates more contradiction and hence conflict, misery and confusion in us and, therefore, about us.

To be free of contradiction, one must be aware of the present without choice. How can there be choice when you are confronted with a fact? Surely the understanding of the fact is made impossible so long as thought is trying to operate upon the fact in terms of becoming, changing, altering. Therefore self-knowledge is the beginning of understanding; without self-knowledge, contradiction and conflict will continue. To know the whole process, the totality of oneself, does not require any expert, any authority. The pursuit of authority only breeds fear. No expert, no specialist, can show us how to understand the process of the self. One has to study it for oneself. You and I can help each other by talking about it, but none can unfold it for us, no specialist, no teacher, can explore it for us. We can be aware of it only in our relationship - in our relationship to things, to property, to people and to ideas. In relationship we shall discover that contradiction arises when action is approximating itself to an idea. The idea is merely the crystallization of thought as a symbol, and the effort to live up to the symbol brings about a contradiction.

Thus, so long as there is a pattern of thought, contradiction will continue; to put an end to the pattern, and so to contradiction, there must be self-knowledge. This understanding of the self is not a process reserved for the few. The self is to be understood in our everyday speech, in the way we think and feel, in the way we look at another. If we can be aware of every thought, of every feeling, from moment to moment, then we shall see that in relationship the ways of the self are understood. Then only is there a possibility of that tranquillity of mind in which alone the ultimate reality can come into being.

Obviously, the mind can be made still by the repetition of a word, of a chant, of a prayer. The mind can be drugged, put to sleep; it can be put to sleep pleasantly or violently, and during this sleep there may be dreams. But a mind that is made quiet by discipline, by ritual, by repetition, can never be alert, sensitive and free. This bludgeoning of the mind, subtly or crudely, is not meditation. It is pleasant to chant and to listen to one who can do it well; but sensation lives only on further sensation, and sensation leads to illusion. Most of us like to live on illusions, there is pleasure in finding deeper and wider illusions; but it is fear of losing our illusions that makes us deny or cover up the real, the actual. It is not that we are incapable of understanding the actual; what makes us fearful is that we reject the actual and cling to the illusion. Getting caught deeper and deeper in illusion is not meditation, nor is decorating the cage which holds us. Awareness, without any choice, of the ways of the mind, which is the breeder of illusion, is the beginning of meditation.

What are we seeking?

What is it that most of us are seeking? What is it that each one of us wants? Surely it is important to find out. Probably most of us are seeking some kind of happiness, some kind of peace; in a world that is ridden with turmoil, wars, contention, strife, we want a refuge where there can be some peace. I think that is what most of us want. So we pursue, go from one leader to another, from one religious organization to another, from one teacher to another.

Now, is it that we are seeking happiness or is it that we are seeking gratification of some kind from which we hope to derive happiness? There is a difference between happiness and gratification. Can you seek happiness? Perhaps you can find gratification but surely you cannot find happiness? Happiness is derivative: it is a by-product of something else. So, before we give our minds and hearts to something which demands a great deal of earnestness, attention, thought, care, we must find out, must we not?, what it is that we are seeking; whether it is happiness, or gratification. I am afraid most of us are seeking gratification. We want to be gratified, we want to find a sense of fullness at the end of our search.

After all, if one is seeking peace one can find it very easily. One can devote oneself blindly to some kind of cause, to an idea, and take shelter there. Surely that does not solve the problem. Mere isolation in an enclosing idea is not a release from conflict. So we must find, must we not?, what it is, inwardly, as well as outwardly, that each one of us wants. If we are clear on that matter, then we don't have to go anywhere, to any teacher, to any church, to any organization.

But our difficulty is, to be clear in ourselves regarding our intention. Can we be clear? and does that clarity come through searching, through trying to find out what others say, from the highest teacher to the ordinary preacher in a church round the corner? Have you got to go to somebody to find out? Yet that is what we are doing, is it not? We read innumerable books, we attend many meetings and discuss, we join various organizations - trying thereby to find a remedy to the conflict, to the miseries in our lives. or, if we don't do all that, we think we have found: that is, we say that a particular organization, a particular teacher, a particular book satisfies us: we have found everything we want in that: and we remain in that, crystallized and enclosed.

Do we not seek, through all this confusion, something permanent, something lasting, something which we call real? - god, truth, what you like - the name doesn't matter, the word is not the thing, surely. So don't let us be caught in words. Leave that to the professional lecturers. There is a search for something permanent, is there not? in most of us - something we can cling to, something which will give us assurance, a hope, a lasting enthusiasm, a lasting certainty, because in ourselves, we know a lot about facts, what the books have said; but we do not know for ourselves, we do not have a direct experience.

And what is it that we call permanent? What is it that we are seeking, which will, or which we hope will give us permanency? are we not seeking lasting happiness, lasting gratification, lasting certainty? We want something that will endure everlastingly, which will gratify us. If we strip ourselves of all the words and phrases, and actually look at it, this is what we want. We want permanent pleasure, permanent gratification - which we call truth, god or what you will.

Very well, we want pleasure. Perhaps that may be putting it very crudely, but that is actually what we want - knowledge that will give us pleasure, experiences that will give us pleasure, a gratification that will not wither away by tomorrow. And we have experimented with various gratifications, and they have all faded away; and we hope now to find permanent gratification in reality, in god. Surely, that is what we are all seeking - the clever ones and the stupid ones, the theorist and the factual person who is striving after something. And is there permanent gratification? is there something which will endure?

Now, if you seek permanent gratification, surely you must understand, must you not? The thing you are seeking. When you say, 'I am seeking permanent happiness' - god, or truth, or what you like - must you not also understand the thing that is searching, the searcher, the seeker? Because there may be no such thing as permanent security, permanent happiness. Truth may be something entirely different; and I think it is utterly different from what you can see, conceive, formulate. Therefore, before we seek something permanent, it is not obviously necessary to understand the seeker? Is the seeker different from the things he seeks? When you say, 'I am seeking happiness', is the seeker different from the object of his search? Is the thinker different from the thought? Are they

not a joint phenomenon, rather than a separate process? Therefore it is essential, is it not?, to understand the seeker, before you try to find out what he is seeking.

So we have come to the point when we ask ourselves, really earnestly and profoundly, if peace, happiness, reality, god, or what you will, can be given to us by someone else. Can this incessant search, this longing, give us that extraordinary sense of reality, that creative being, which comes when we really understand ourselves? Does self-knowledge come through search, through following someone else, through belonging to any particular organization, through reading books, and so on? After all, that is the main issue, is it not?, that so long as I do not understand myself, I have no basis for thought, all my search will be in vain. I can escape into illusions, I can run away from contention, strife, struggle; I can worship another; I can look for my salvation through somebody else. But so long as I am ignorant of myself, so long as I am unaware of the total process of myself, I have no basis for thought, for affection, for action.

But that is the last thing we want: to know ourselves. Yet that is the only foundation on which we can build. Before we can build, before we can transform, before we can condemn or destroy, we must know that which we are. If we are petty, jealous, vain, greedy - that is what we create about us, that is the society in which we live.

It seems to me that before we set out on a journey to find reality, to find god, before we can act, before we can have any relationship with another, which is society, it is essential that we begin to understand ourselves first. I consider the earnest person to be one who is completely concerned with this, first, and not with how to arrive at a particular goal, because, if you and I do not understand ourselves, how can we, in action, bring about a transformation in society, in relationship, in anything that we do? and it does not mean, obviously, that self-knowledge is opposed to, or isolated from, relationship. It does not mean, obviously, emphasis on the individual, the me, as opposed to the mass, as opposed to another.

Now without knowing yourself, without knowing your own way of thinking and why you think certain things, without knowing the background of your conditioning and why you have certain beliefs about art and religion, about your country and your neighbour and about yourself, how can you think truly about anything? without knowing the substance of your thought and whence it comes - surely your search is utterly futile, your action has no meaning?

Before we can find out what the end-purpose of life is, what it all means - wars, national antagonisms, conflicts, the whole mess - we must begin with ourselves, must we not? it sounds so simple, but it is extremely difficult. To follow oneself, to see how one's thought operates, one has to be extra-ordinarily alert, so that as one begins to be more and more alert to intricacies of one's own thinking and

responses and feelings, one begins to have greater awareness, not only of oneself but of another with whom one is in relationship. To know oneself, is to study oneself in action, which is relationship. The difficulty is that we are so impatient; we want to get on, we want to reach an end, and so we have neither the time nor the occasion to give ourselves the opportunity to study, to observe. Alternatively we have committed ourselves to various activities/to earning a livelihood, to rearing children/or have taken on certain responsibilities of various organisations; we have so committed ourselves in different ways that we have hardly any time for self reflection, to observe, to study. So really the responsibility of the reaction depends on oneself, not on another. The pursuit, all over the world, of gurus and their systems, reading the latest books on this and that, and so on, seems to me so utterly empty, so utterly futile, for you may wander all over the earth but you have to come back to yourself. And, as most of us are totally unaware of ourselves, it is extremely difficult to begin to see clearly the process of our thinking and feeling and acting.

The more you know yourself, the more clarity there is. Self knowledge has no end/you don't come to an achievement, you don't come to a conclusion. It is an endless river. As one studies it, as one goes into it more and more, one finds peace. Only when the mind is tranquil/ through self knowledge and not through imposed self discipline/only then, in that tranquility, in that silence, can reality come into being. It is only then that there can be bliss, that there can be creative action. And it seems to me that without this understanding, without this experience, merely to read books, to attend talks, to do propaganda, is so infantile that just an activity without much meaning; where as if one is able to understand oneself, and thereby bring about creative happiness, that experiencing of something that is not of the mind, then perhaps there can be a transformation in the immediate relationship about us and so in the world in which we live.

And I do not think any analyst can solve this problem. He may temporarily help you to conform to a certain pattern of society which he calls normal existence, but the problem is much deeper than that, and no one can solve it except yourself. You and I have made this society; it is the result of our actions, of our thoughts, of our very being, and as long as we are merely trying to reform the product without understanding the entity that has produced it, we shall have more diseases, more chaos, more delinquency. The understanding of the self brings about wisdom and right action.

The duality of thinker and thought

As you watch anything—a tree, your wife, your children, your neighbor, the stars of a night, the light on the water, the bird in the sky, anything—there is always the observer—the censor, the thinker the experiencer, the seeker—and the thing he is observing; the observer and the observed; the thinker and the thought. So, there is always a division. It is this division that is time. That division is the very essence of conflict. And when there is conflict, there is contradiction. There is “the observer and the observed”—that is a contradiction; there is a

separation. And hence where there is contradiction, there is conflict. And when there is conflict, there is always the urgency to get beyond it, to conquer it, to overcome it, to escape from it, to do something about it, and all that activity involves time.... As long as there is this division, time will go on, and time is sorrow.

And a man who will understand the end of sorrow must understand this, must find, must go beyond this duality between the thinker and the thought, the experiencer and the experienced. That is, when there is a division between the observer and the observed, there is time, and therefore there is no ending of sorrow. Then, what is one to do? You understand the question? I see, within myself, the observer is always watching, judging, censoring, accepting, rejecting, disciplining, controlling, shaping. That observer, that thinker, is the result of thought, obviously. Thought is first; not the observer, not the thinker. If there was no thinking at all, there would be no observer, no thinker; then there would only be complete, total attention

We are so conditioned, so heavily burdened with the past, with all our knowledge, information how can the mind be spontaneous? Can the mind observe its activity without prejudice, which means without images?

When there is a division between the observer and the observed there is conflict but when the observer is the observed there is no control, no suppression. The self comes to an end. Duality comes to an end. Conflict comes to an end.

This is the greatest meditation to come upon this extraordinary thing for the mind to discover for itself the observer is the observed.>>

Krishnamurti: Now why do you ask this question? Why are you asking me to tell you the meaning of life, the purpose of life? What do we mean by life? Does life have a meaning, a purpose? Is not living in itself its own purpose, its own meaning? Why do we want more? Because we are so dissatisfied with our life, our life is so empty, so tawdry, so monotonous, doing the same thing over and over again, we want something more, something beyond that which we are doing. Since our everyday life is so empty, so dull, so meaningless, so boring, so intolerably stupid, we say life must have a fuller meaning and that is why you ask this question. Surely a man who is living richly, a man who sees things as they are and is content with what he has, is not confused; he is clear, therefore he does not ask what is the purpose of life. For him the very living is the beginning and the end. Our difficulty is that, since our life is empty, we want to find a purpose to life and strive for it. Such a purpose of life can only be mere intellection, without any reality; when the purpose of life is pursued by a stupid, dull mind, by an empty heart, that purpose will also be empty. Therefore our purpose is how to make our life rich, not with money and all the rest of it but inwardly rich-which is not something cryptic. When you say that the purpose of life is to be happy, the purpose of life is to find God, surely that desire to find God is an escape from life and your God is merely a thing that is known. You can only



make your way towards an object which you know; if you build a staircase to the thing that you call God, surely that is not God. Reality can be understood only in living, not in escape. When you seek a purpose of life, you are really escaping and not understanding what life is. Life is relationship, life is action in relationship; when I do not understand relationship, or when relationship is confused, then I seek a fuller meaning. Why are our lives so empty? Why are we so lonely, frustrated? Because we have never looked into ourselves and understood ourselves. We never admit to ourselves that this life is all we know and that it should therefore be understood fully and completely. We prefer to run away from ourselves and that is why we seek the purpose of life away from relationship. If we begin to understand action, which is our relationship with people, with property, with beliefs and ideas, then we will find that relationship itself brings its own reward. You do not have to seek. It is like seeking love. Can you find love by seeking it? Love cannot be cultivated. You will find love only in relationship, not outside relationship, and it is because we have no love that we want a purpose of life. When there is love, which is its own eternity, then there is no search for God, because love is God. It is because our minds are full of technicalities and superstitious mutterings that our lives are so empty and that is why we seek a purpose beyond ourselves. To find life's purpose we must go through the door of ourselves; consciously or unconsciously we avoid facing things as they are in themselves and so we want God to open for us a door which is beyond. This question about the purpose of life is put only by those who do not love. Love can be found only in action, which is relationship.