



Jiddu Krishnamurti

Network Of Thought

Table Of Content

- Saanen -	3
Chapter 1 1st Public Talk	3
Chapter 2 2nd Public Talk	12
Chapter 3 3rd Public Talk.....	22
Chapter 4 4th Public Talk.....	30
Chapter 5 5th Public Talk.....	39
Chapter 6 6th Public Talk.....	49
Chapter 7 7th Public Talk.....	57
- Amsterdam -	66
Chapter 8 1st Public Talk	66
Chapter 9 2nd Public Talk	79
- Longer, Unedited Versions -	88
Saanen 1st Public Talk	88
Saanen 2nd Public Talk	101
Saanen 3rd Public Talk.....	114
Saanen 4th Public Talk.....	125
Saanen 5th Public Talk.....	138
Saanen 6th Public Talk.....	150
Saanen 7th Public Talk.....	161
Amsterdam 1st Public Talk	174
Amsterdam 2nd Public Talk.....	190

- Saanen -

Chapter 1 1st Public Talk

Saanen 12th July 1981

I see some of my old friends are here - and I am glad to see you. As we are going to have seven talks we should go into what I am going to say very carefully, covering the whole field of life, so please be patient those of you who have heard the speaker before, please be tolerant if the speaker repeats himself, for repetition has a certain value.

Prejudice has something in common with ideals, beliefs and faiths. We must be able to think together; but our prejudices, our ideals and so on, limit the capacity and the energy required to think, to observe and examine together so as to discover for ourselves what lies behind all the confusion, misery, terror, destruction and tremendous violence in the world. To understand, not only the mere outward facts that are taking place, but also the depth and the significance of all this, we must be able to observe together - not you observing one way and the speaker another, but together observe the same thing. That observation, that examination, is prevented if we cling to our prejudices, to our particular experiences and our particular comprehension. Thinking together is tremendously important because we have to face a world that is rapidly disintegrating, degenerating, a world in which there is no sense of morality, where nothing is sacred, where no one respects another. To understand all this, not only superficially, casually, we have to enter into the depths of it, into what lies behind it. We have to enquire why it is that after all these millions of years of evolution, man, you and the whole world, have become so violent, callous, destructive, enduring wars and the atomic bomb. The technological world is evolving more and more; perhaps that may be one of the factors causing man to become like this. So, please let us think together, not according to my way or your way, but simply using the capacity to think.

Thought is the common factor of all mankind. There is no Eastern thought, or Western thought; there is only the common capacity to think, whether one is

utterly poor or most sophisticated, living in an affluent society. Whether a surgeon, a carpenter, a labourer in the field, or a great poet, thought is the common factor of all of us. We do not seem to realize that thought is the common factor that binds us all. You think according to your capacity, to your energy, your experience and knowledge; another thinks differently according to his experience and conditioning. We are all caught in this network of thought. This is a fact, indisputable and actual.

We have been 'programmed' biologically, physically and also 'programmed' mentally, intellectually. We must be aware of having been programmed, like a computer. Computers are programmed by experts to produce the results that they want. And these computers will outstrip man in thought. These computers can gather experience, and from that experience learn, accumulate knowledge, according to their programme. Gradually they are going to outstrip all our thinking in accuracy and with greater speed. Of course they cannot compose as Beethoven, or as Keats, but they will outstrip our thinking.

So, then, what is man? He has been programmed to be Catholic, protestant, to be Italian or British and so on. For centuries he has been programmed - to believe, to have faith, to follow certain rituals, certain dogmas; programmed to be nationalistic and to go to war. So his brain has become as a computer but not so capable because his thought is limited, whereas the computer, although being also limited, is able to think much more rapidly than the human being and can outstrip him.

These are facts, this is what actually is going on. Then what becomes of man? Then what is man? If the robots and the computer can do almost all that the human being can do, then what is the future society of man? When cars can be built by the robot and the computer - probably much better - then what is going to become of man as a social entity? These and many other problems are facing us. You cannot any more think as Christians, Buddhists, Hindus and Muslims. We are facing a tremendous crisis; a crisis which the politicians can

never solve because they are programmed to think in a particular way - nor can the scientists understand or solve the crisis; nor yet the business world, the world of money. The turning point, the perceptive decision, the challenge, is not in politics, in religion, in the scientific world, it is in our consciousness. One has to understand the consciousness of mankind, which has brought us to this point. One has to be very serious about this matter because we are really facing something very dangerous in the world - where there is the proliferation of the atomic bomb which some lunatic will turn on. We all must be aware of all this.

One has to be very very serious, not flippant, not casual but concerned, to understand this behaviour and how human thought has brought us all to this point. We must be able to penetrate very carefully, hesitantly, with deep observation, to understand together what is happening both out there and inwardly. The inward psychological activity always overcomes the outer, however many regulations, sanctions, decisions you may have outwardly, all these are shattered by our psychological desires, fears and anxieties, by the longing for security. Unless we understand that, whatever outward semblance of order we may have, inward disorder always overcomes that which is outwardly conforming, disciplined, regularized. There may be carefully constructed institutions - political, religious, economic - but whatever the construction of these may be, unless our inward consciousness is in total order, inward disorder will always overcome the outer. We have seen this historically, it is happening now in front of our eyes. This is a fact.

The turning point is in our consciousness. Our consciousness is a very complicated affair. Volumes have been written about it, both in the East and in the West. We are not aware of our own consciousness; to examine that consciousness in all its complexity one has to be free to look to be choicelessly aware of its movement. It is not that the speaker is directing you to look or to listen to all the inward movement of consciousness in a particular way. Consciousness is common to all mankind. Throughout the world man suffers inwardly as well as outwardly there is anxiety, uncertainty, utter despair

of loneliness; there is insecurity, jealousy, greed, envy and suffering. Human consciousness is one whole; it is not your consciousness or mine. This is logical, sane, rational: wherever you go, in whatever climate you live, whether you are affluent or degradingly poor, whether you believe in god, or in some other entity, belief and faith are common to all mankind - the images and symbols may be totally different in various localities but they stem from something common to all mankind. This is not a mere verbal statement. If you take it as a verbal statement, as an idea, as a concept, then you will not see the deep significance involved in it. The significance is that your consciousness is the consciousness of all humanity because you suffer, you are anxious, you are lonely, insecure, confused, exactly like others, though they live ten thousand miles away. The realization of it, the feeling of it - the feeling in your guts - is totally different from the mere verbal acceptance. When you realize that you are the rest of mankind, it brings a tremendous energy, you have broken through the narrow groove of individuality the narrow circle of me and you, we and they. We are examining together this very complex consciousness of man, not the European man, not the Asiatic man or the Middle East man, but this extraordinary movement in time that has been going on in consciousness for millions of years.

Please do not accept what the speaker is saying; if you do it will have no meaning. If you do not begin to doubt, begin to question, be sceptical to enquire, if you hold on to your own particular belief, faith, experience or the accumulated knowledge, then you will reduce it all to some kind of pettiness with very little meaning. If you do that you will not be facing the tremendous issue that is facing man.

We have to see what our actual consciousness is. Thought and all the things that thought has put together, is part of our consciousness - the culture in which we live, the aesthetic values, the economic pressures, the national inheritance. If you are a surgeon or a carpenter, if you specialize in a particular profession, that group consciousness is part of your consciousness. If you live in a particular country with its particular tradition and religious culture, that

particular group-consciousness has become part of your consciousness. These are facts. If you are a carpenter you have to have certain skills, understand the nature of wood and the tools of the trade, so you gradually belong to a group that has cultivated these special skills and that has its own consciousness - similarly the scientist, the archeologist, just as the animals have their own particular consciousness as a group. If you are a housewife you have your own particular group consciousness, like all the other housewives. Permissiveness has spread throughout the world; it began in the far West and has spread right through the world. That is a group-conscious movement. See the significance of it; go into it for yourself, see what is involved in it.

Our consciousness includes, in the much deeper consciousness, our fears. Man has lived with fear for generation after generation. He has lived with pleasure, with envy, with all the travail of loneliness, depression and confusion; and with great sorrow, with what he calls love and the everlasting fear of death. All this is his consciousness which is common to all mankind. Realize what it means: it means that you are no longer an individual. This is very hard to accept because we have been programmed, as is the computer, to think we are individuals. We have been programmed religiously to think that we have souls separate from all the others. Being programmed our brain works in the same pattern century after century.

If one understands the nature of our consciousness, then the particular endeavour of the 'me' that suffers has become something global, then a totally different activity will take place. That is the crisis we are in. We have been programmed; being programmed we can learn - occasionally have an insight - and our brain repeats itself over and over again. Just see the actual fact of that: one is a Christian, or a Buddhist or a Hindu; one is against Communism, one is a Communist or a Democrat, repeat, repeat, repeat. And in this state of repetition there is an occasional breakthrough.

So, how shall a human being - who is actually the rest of mankind - how shall he face this crisis, this turning point? How will you as a human being, who has evolved through millennia upon millennia, thinking as an individual - which is actually an illusion - face a turning point, see what actually is and in that very perception move totally in another direction?

Let us understand together what it means to look - to look at the actuality of thought. You all think, that is why you are here. You all think and thought expresses itself in words, or through a gesture, through a look, through some bodily movement. Words being common to each one of us, we understand through those words the significance of what is being said. Yet thought is common to all mankind - it is a most extraordinary thing if you have discovered that, for then you see that thought is not your thought, it is thought. We have to learn how to see things as they actually are - not as you are programmed to look. See the difference. Can we be free of being programmed and look? If you look as a Christian, a Democrat, a Communist, a Socialist or a Catholic or a protestant - which are all so many prejudices - then you will not be able to understand the enormity of the danger, the crisis, that we are facing. If you belong to a certain group, or follow a certain guru, or are committed to a certain form of action, then, because you have been programmed, you will be incapable of looking at things as they actually are. It is only if you do not belong to any organization, to any group, to any particular religion or nationality, that you can really observe. If you have accumulated a great deal of knowledge from books and from experience, your mind has already been filled, your brain is crowded with experience, with your particular tendencies and so on - all that is going to prevent you from looking. Can we be free of all that to look at what is actually happening in the world? - at the terror and the terrible religious sectarian divisions, one guru opposed to another idiotic guru, the vanity behind all that, the power, the position, the wealth of these gurus, it is appalling. Can you look at yourself - not as a separate human being but as a human being who is actually the rest of mankind? To have such a feeling means that you have tremendous love for human beings.

When you are able to see clearly, without any distortion, then you begin to enquire into the nature of consciousness, including the much deeper layers of consciousness. You have to enquire into the whole movement of thought, because it is thought that is responsible for all the content of consciousness, whether it is the deep or the superficial layers. If you had no thought there would be no fear, no sense of pleasure, no time; thought is responsible. Thought is responsible for the beauty of a great cathedral, but thought is also responsible for all the nonsense that takes place inside the cathedral. All the achievements of the great painters, poets, composers, are the activity of thought: the composer; inwardly hearing the marvellous sound, commits it onto paper. That is the movement of thought. Thought is responsible for all the gods in the world, all the saviours, all the gurus; for all the obedience and devotion; the whole is the result of thought which seeks gratification and escape from loneliness. Thought is the common factor of all mankind. The poorest villager in India thinks as the chief executive thinks, as the religious leader thinks. That is a common everyday fact. That is the ground on which all human beings stand. You cannot escape from that.

Thought has done marvellous things to help man but it has also brought about great destruction and terror in the world. We have to understand the nature and the movement of thought; why you think in a certain way; why you cling to certain forms of thought; why you hold on to certain experiences; why thought has never understood the nature of death. We have to examine the very structure of thought - not your thought because it is fairly obvious what your thought is, for you have been programmed. But if you enquire seriously into what thinking is, then you enter into quite a different dimension - not the dimension of your own particular little problem. You must understand the tremendous movement of thought, the nature of thinking - not as a philosopher, not as a religious man, not as a member of a particular profession, or a housewife - the enormous vitality of thinking.

Thought is responsible for all the cruelty, the wars, the war machines and the brutality of war, the killing, the terror, the throwing of bombs, the taking of

hostages in the name of a cause, or without a cause. Thought is also responsible for the cathedrals, the beauty of their structure, the lovely poems; it is also responsible for all the technological development, the computer with its extraordinary capacity to learn and go beyond man-s thought. What is thinking? It is a response, a reaction, of memory. If you had no memory you would not be able to think. Memory is stored in the brain as knowledge, the result of experience. This is how our brain operates. First, experience; that experience may have been from the beginning of man, which we have inherited, that experience gives knowledge which is stored up in the brain; from knowledge there is memory and from that memory thought. Prom thought you act. Prom that action you learn more. So you repeat the cycle. Experience, knowledge, memory, thought, action; from that action learn more and repeat. This is how we are programmed. We are always doing this: having remembered pain, in the future avoid pain by not doing the thing that will cause pain, which becomes knowledge, and repeat that. Sexual pleasure, repeat that. This is the movement of thought. See the beauty of it, how mechanically thought operates. Thought says to itself: `I am free to operate.' Yet thought is never free because it is based on knowledge and knowledge is obviously always limited. Knowledge must also be always limited because it is part of time. I will learn more and to learn more I must have time. I do not know Russian but I will learn it. It may take me six months or a year or a lifetime. Knowledge is the movement of time. Time, knowledge, thought and action; in this cycle we live. Thought is limited, so whatever action thought generates must be limited and such limitation must create conflict, must be divisive.

If I say that I am a Hindu, that I am Indian, I am limited and that limitation brings about not only corruption but conflict because another says, `I am a Christian' or `I am a Buddhist', so there is conflict between us. Our life from birth to death is a series of struggles and conflicts from which we are always trying to escape, which again causes more conflict. We live and die in this perpetual and endless conflict. We never seek out the root of that conflict, which is thought, because thought is limited. Please do not ask, `How am I to

stop thought?' - that is not the point. The point is to understand the nature of thought, to look at it.

Chapter 2 2nd Public Talk

Saanen 14th July 1981

We were saying that human consciousness is similar in all human beings. Our consciousness, whether we live in the East or West, is made up of many layers of fears, anxieties, pleasures, sorrows and every form of faith. Occasionally, perhaps, in that consciousness there is also love, compassion, and from that compassion a totally different kind of intelligence. And always there is the fear of ending, death. Human beings throughout the world from time immemorial have tried to find out if there is something sacred, beyond all thought, something incorruptible and timeless.

There are the various group consciousnesses; the businessmen with their consciousness, the scientists with theirs and the carpenter with his, these are of the content of consciousness and are the product of thought. Thought has created wonderful things; from the extraordinary technology of computers, to telecommunication, to robots, surgery and medicine. Thought has invented religions; all the religious organizations throughout the world are put together by thought.

Thought has invented the computer. You must understand the complexity and the future of the computer; it is going to outstrip man in his thought; it is going to change the structure of society and the structure of government. This is not some fantastic conclusion of the speaker, or some fantasy, it is something that is actually going on now, of which you may not be aware. The computer has a mechanical intelligence; it can learn and invent. The computer is going to make human labour practically unnecessary - perhaps two hours work a day. These are all changes that are coming. You may not like it, you may revolt against it, but it is coming.

Thought has invented the computer, but human thought is limited and the mechanical intelligence of the computer is going beyond that of man. It is

going to totally revolutionize our lives. So what will a human being be then? These are facts, not some specialized conclusions of the speaker.

When we consider what the capacity of the computer is, then we have to ask ourselves: what is a human being to do? The computer is going to take over most of the activities of the brain. And what happens to the brain then? When a human being's occupation is taken over by the computer, by the robot, what becomes of the human? We human beings have been 'programmed' biologically, intellectually, emotionally, psychologically, through millions of years, and we repeat the pattern of the programme over and over again. We have stopped learning: and we must enquire if the human brain, which has been programmed for so many centuries, is capable of learning and immediately transforming itself into a totally different dimension. If we are not capable of that, the computer, which is much more capable, rapid and accurate, is going to take over the activities of the brain. This is not something casual, this is a very very serious, desperately serious matter. The computer can invent a new religion. It could be programmed by an expert Hindu scholar, by a Catholic, by a protestant or a Muslim, and it would turn out a marvellous structure for a new religion! And we, if we are not aware of what is happening, we will follow that new structure which has been turned out by the computer. See the seriousness of all this, please.

Our consciousness has been programmed for thousands and thousands of years to think of ourselves as individuals, as separate entities struggling, in conflict from the moment we are born until we die. We are programmed to that. We have accepted that. We have never challenged it; we have never asked if it is possible to live a life absolutely without conflict. Never having asked it we will never learn about it. We repeat. It is an innate part of our existence to be in conflict - nature is in conflict: that is our argument - and we consider that progress is only through conflict. Religious organizations throughout history have maintained the idea of individual salvation. We are questioning very seriously whether there is an individual consciousness; whether you, as a

human being, have a separate consciousness from the rest of mankind. You have to answer this, not just play with it.

Having been brought up, programmed, conditioned, to be individuals, then our consciousness is all this activity of thought. Fear and the pursuit of pleasure are the movement of thought. The suffering, anxiety, uncertainty and the deep regrets, wounds, the burden of centuries of sorrow, are all part of thought. Thought is responsible for what we call love, which has become sensual pleasure, something to be desired.

As we said, and we will repeat it over and over again until we are quite sure of it, we are thinking together, the speaker is not telling you what to think. He is not making propaganda - it is a horrible thing, propaganda. He is not telling you how to act, what to believe, but together, we are investigating the catastrophe that is taking place in the world outside of us, the utter ruthlessness and violence, and also inwardly in each human being the extraordinary conflict that is going on. Together we are examining. It is not - if one may point out - that you are merely listening to some ideas or conclusions; we are not talking about ideas, conclusions or beliefs. We are looking at this world that human beings have produced, for which all of us are responsible. We must be clear in our understanding - at whatever level that understanding be, whether it is intellectual understanding, which is merely verbal, or the understanding of deep significance so that that understanding acts - that we have come to a point where we have to make a decision, not by the exercise of will, but the decision that will naturally come when we begin to understand the whole nature and structure of the world, both externally and internally. That perception will bring about a decision, an action.

Thought has created the problems which surround us and our brains are trained, educated, conditioned, to the solving of problems. Thought has created the problems, like the division between nationalities. Thought has created the division and the conflict between various economic structures; thought has created the various religions and the divisions between them and

therefore there is conflict. The brain is trained to attempt to solve these conflicts which thought has created. It is essential that we understand deeply the nature of our thinking and the nature of our reactions which arise from our thinking. Thought dominates our lives, whatever we do; whatever action takes place, thought is behind that action. In every activity, whether it is sensual or intellectual, or biological, thought is operating all the time. Biologically, through centuries, the brain has been programmed, conditioned - the body acts in its own way, the action of breathing, the beat of the heart and so on - so, if you are a Catholic, a Hindu, or a Buddhist, you repeat that conditioning over and over again. Thought is a movement in time and space. Thought is memory, the remembrance of past things. Thought is the activity of knowledge, knowledge which has been gathered together through millions of years and stored as memory in the brain. If you observe the activity of your thinking you will see that experience and knowledge are the basis of your life. Knowledge is never complete, it must always go together with ignorance. We think knowledge is going to solve all our problems, whether the knowledge of the priest, the guru, the scientist, the philosopher, or the latest psychiatrist. But we have never questioned whether knowledge in itself can solve any of our problems - except perhaps technological problems.

Knowledge comes through time. To learn a language you need time. To learn a skill or to drive a car efficiently takes time. The same movement of time is brought over to the psychological field; there too we say, 'I must have time to learn about myself.' 'I must have time in order to change myself from 'what I am' to 'what I should be.' Bringing over the activity of the external world into the psychological world means that time is a great factor in our life - tomorrow, the past and the present. Time is thought. Time is required in the acquisition of knowledge through experience, both externally in the world and inwardly. That is the way we have been programmed.

Being so programmed we consider time is necessary to bring about a deep, fundamental change in the human structure. We employ time as thought - 'I am this, I shall be that.' You would also say in the technical world: 'I do not

know how to construct a computer but I will learn., Time, knowledge, memory, thought, they are a single unit; they are not separate activities but a single movement. Thought, the outcome of knowledge, must everlastingly be incomplete and therefore limited, because knowledge is incomplete. Whatever is limited must bring about conflict. Nationality is limited. Religious belief is limited. An experience which you have had, or which you are longing for, is limited. Every experience must be limited.

Questioner: Why?

Krishnamurti: Because there are more experiences. I may have an experience sexually, or the experience of the possession of wealth, the experience of giving everything up and going into a monastery - those experiences are all limited.

Thought, being limited, creates problems - national, economic and religious divisions; then thought says, 'I must solve them.' So thought is always functioning in the resolution of problems. And the computer, a mechanism which has been programmed, can outstrip all of us because it has no problems; it evolves, learns, moves.

Our consciousness has been programmed as an individual consciousness. We are questioning whether that consciousness, which we have accepted as individual, is actually individual at all. Do not say: 'What will happen if I am not an individual?' Something totally different may happen. You may have an individual training in a particular trade, in a particular profession, you may be a surgeon, a doctor, an engineer, but that does not make you an individual. You may have a different name, a different form - that does not make individuality; nor the acceptance that the brain through time has affirmed: 'I am an individual, it is my desire to fulfil, to become through struggle.' That so-called individual consciousness, which is yours, is the consciousness of all humanity.

If your consciousness, which you have accepted as separate, is not separate, then what is the nature of your consciousness? part of it is the

sensory responses. Those sensory responses are naturally, necessarily, programmed to defend yourself, through hunger to seek food, to breathe, unconsciously. Biologically you are programmed. Then the content of your consciousness includes the many hurts and wounds that you have received from childhood, the many forms of guilt; it includes the various ideas, imaginary certainties; the many experiences, both sensory and psychological; there is always the basis, the root, of fear in its many forms. With fear naturally goes hatred. Where there is fear there must be violence, aggression, the tremendous urge to succeed, both in the physical and the psychological world. In the content of consciousness there is the constant pursuit of pleasure; the pleasure of possession, of domination, the pleasure of money which gives power, the pleasure of a philosopher with his immense knowledge, the guru with his circus. pleasure again has innumerable forms. There is also pain, anxiety, the deep sense of abiding loneliness and sorrow, not only the so-called personal sorrow but also the enormous sorrow brought about through wars, through neglect, through this endless conquering of one group of people by another. In that consciousness there is the racial and group content; ultimately there is death.

This is our consciousness - beliefs, certainties and uncertainties, anxiety, loneliness and endless misery. These are the facts. And we say this consciousness is mine! Is that so? Go to the Far East, or the Near East, America, Europe, anywhere where human beings are; they suffer, they are anxious, lonely, depressed, melancholic, struggling and in conflict - they are just the same as you. So, is your consciousness different from that of another? I know it is very difficult for people to accept - you may logically accept it, intellectually you may say, 'Yes, that is so, maybe.' But to feel this total human sense that you are the rest of mankind requires a great deal of sensitivity. It is not a problem to be solved. It is not that you must accept that you are not an individual, that you must endeavour to feel this global human entity. If you do, you have made it into a problem which the brain is only too ready to try to solve! But if you really look at it with your mind, your heart, your whole being

totally aware of this fact, then you have broken the programme. It is naturally broken. But if you say, `I will break it,` then you are again back into the same pattern. To the speaker this is utter reality, not something verbally accepted because it is pleasant; it is something that is actual. You may have logically, reasonably and sanely examined and found that it is so; but the brain which has been programmed to the sense of individuality is going to revolt against it (which you are doing now). The brain is unwilling to learn. Whereas the computer will learn because it has nothing to lose. But here you are frightened of losing something.

Can the brain learn? That is the whole point; so now we have to go into this question of what learning is. Learning for most of us is a process of acquiring knowledge. I do not know the Russian language but I will learn it. I will learn day after day, memorizing, holding on to certain words, phrases and the meanings, syntax and grammar. If I apply myself I can learn almost any language within a certain time. To us, learning is essentially the accumulation of knowledge or skill. Our brains are conditioned to this pattern. Accumulate knowledge and from that act. When I learn a language, there knowledge is necessary. But if I am learning psychologically about the content of my mind, of my consciousness, does learning there imply examining each layer of it and accumulating knowledge about it and from that knowledge acting - following the same pattern as learning a language? If the brain repeats that pattern when I am learning about the content of my consciousness, it means that I need time to accumulate knowledge about myself, my consciousness. Then I determine what the problems are and the brain is ready to solve them - it has been trained to solve problems. It is repeating this endless pattern and that is what I call learning. Is there a learning which is not this? Is there a different action of learning, which is not the accumulation of knowledge? You understand the difference?

Let me put it differently: from experience we acquire knowledge, from knowledge memory; the response of memory is thought, then from thought action, from that action you learn more, so the cycle is repeated. That is the

pattern of our life. That form of learning will never solve our problems because it is repetition. We acquire more knowledge which may lead to better action; but that action is limited and this we keep repeating. The activity from that knowledge will not solve our human problems at all. We have not solved them, it is so obvious. After millions of years we have not solved our problems: we are cutting each other's throats, we are competing with each other, we hate each other, we want to be successful, the whole pattern is repeated from the time man began and we are still at it. Do what you will along this pattern and no human problem will be solved, whether it be political, religious or economic, because it is thought that is operating.

Now, is there another form of learning; learning, not in the context of knowledge, but a different form, a non-accumulative perception-action? To find out we have to enquire whether it is possible to observe the content of our consciousness and to observe the world without a single prejudice. Is that possible? Do not say it is not possible, just ask the question. See whether, when you have a prejudice, you can observe clearly. You cannot, obviously. If you have a certain conclusion, a certain set of beliefs, concepts, ideals, and you want to see clearly what the world is, all those conclusions, ideals, prejudices and so on will actually prevent it. It is not a question of how to get rid of your prejudices but of seeing clearly, intelligently, that any form of prejudice, however noble or ignoble will actually prevent perception. When you see that, prejudices go. What is important is not the prejudice but the demand to see clearly.

If I want to be a good surgeon I cannot do so with ideals or prejudices about surgeons; I must actually perform surgery. Can you see that a new form of action, a new form of non-accumulative knowledge, is possible which will break the pattern, break the programme, so that you are acting totally differently?

The way we have lived, over millions of years, has been the repetition of the same process of acquiring knowledge and acting from that knowledge.

That knowledge and action is limited. That limitation creates problems and the brain has become accustomed to solving the problems which knowledge has repeatedly created. The brain is caught in that pattern and we are saying that that pattern will never, in any circumstance, solve our human problems. Obviously we have not solved them up till now. There must be a different, a totally different, movement, which is a non-accumulative perception-action. To have non-accumulative perception is to have no prejudice. It is to have absolutely no ideals, no concepts, no faith - because all those have destroyed man, they have not solved his problems. So: have you a prejudice? Have you a prejudice which has something in common with an ideal? Of course. Ideals are to be accomplished in the future, and knowledge becomes tremendously important in the realizing of ideals. So, can you observe without accumulation, without the destructive nature of prejudice, ideals, faith, belief and your own conclusions and experiences? There is group consciousness, national consciousness, linguistic consciousness, professional consciousness, racial consciousness, and there is fear, anxiety, sorrow, loneliness, the pursuit of pleasure, love and finally death. If you keep acting in that circle, you maintain the human consciousness of the world. just see the truth of this. You are part of that consciousness and you sustain it by saying, 'I am an individual. My prejudices are important. My ideals are essential' - repeating the same thing over and over again. Now the maintenance, the sustenance and the nourishment, of that consciousness takes place when you are repeating that pattern. But when you break away from that consciousness, you are introducing a totally new factor in the whole of that consciousness.

Now, if we understand the nature of our own consciousness, if we see how it is operating in this endless cycle of knowledge, action and division - a consciousness which has been sustained for millennia - if we see the truth that all this is a form of prejudice and break away from it, we introduce a new factor into the old. It means that you, as a human being who is of the consciousness of the rest of mankind, can move away from the old pattern of obedience and acceptance. That is the real turning point in your life. Man cannot go on

repeating the old pattern, it has lost its meaning, - in the psychological world it has totally lost its meaning. If you fulfil yourself, who cares? If you become a saint, what does it matter? Whereas, if you totally move away from that you affect the whole consciousness of mankind.

Chapter 3 3rd Public Talk

Saanen 16th July 1981

I would like to repeat that we are not trying to convince you of anything - that must be clearly understood. We are not trying to persuade you to accept a particular point of view. We are not trying to impress you about anything; nor are we doing any propaganda. We are not talking about personalities, or who is right and who is wrong, but rather trying to think out, to observe, together, what the world is and what we are, what we have made of the world and what we have made of ourselves. We are trying together to examine both the inward and the outward man.

To observe clearly one must be free to look - obviously. If one clings to one's particular experiences, judgements and prejudices, then it is not possible to think clearly. The world crisis which is right in front of us demands, urges, that we think together so that we can solve the human problem together, not according to any particular person, philosopher, or particular guru. We are trying to observe together. It is important to bear in mind all the time that the speaker is merely pointing out something which we are examining together. It is not something one-sided but rather that we are co-operating in examining, in taking a journey together and so acting together.

It is very important to understand that our consciousness is not our individual consciousness. Our consciousness is not only that of the specialized group, nationality and so on, but it is also all the human travail, conflict, misery, confusion and sorrow. We are examining together that human consciousness, which is our consciousness, not yours or mine, but ours.

One of the factors that is demanded in this examination is the capacity of intelligence. Intelligence is the capacity to discern, to understand, to distinguish; it is also the capacity to observe, to put together all that we have gathered and to act from that. That gathering, that discernment, that observation, can be prejudiced; and intelligence is denied when there is

prejudice. If you follow another, intelligence is denied; the following of another, however noble, denies your own perception, denies your own observation - you are merely following somebody who will tell you what to do, what to think. If you do that, then intelligence does not exist; because in that there is no observation and therefore no intelligence. Intelligence demands doubting, questioning, not being impressed by others, by their enthusiasm, by their energy. Intelligence demands that there be impersonal observation. Intelligence is not only the capacity to understand that which is rationally, verbally explained but also implies that we gather as much information as possible, yet knowing that that information can never be complete, about anybody or anything. Where there is intelligence there is hesitation, observation and the clarity of rational impersonal thinking. The comprehension of the whole of man, of all his complexities, all his physical responses, his emotional reactions, his intellectual capacities, his affection and his travail, the perceiving of all that at one glance, in one act, is supreme intelligence. Intelligence has not, so far, been able to transcend conflict. We are going together to see if it is possible for the brain to be free from conflict. We live with conflict from the time we are born and will continue to do so until we die. There is the constant struggle to be, to become something spiritually, so-called, or psychologically; to become successful in the world; to fulfil - all that is the movement of becoming: I am this now but I will reach the ultimate destination, the highest principle, whether that principle be called god, Brahman, or any other name. The constant struggle whether to become, or to be, is the same. But when one is trying to become, in various directions, then you are denying being. When you try to be you are becoming also. See this movement of the mind, of thought: I think; am, and being dissatisfied, discontented, with what I am, I try to fulfil myself in something; I drive towards a particular goal; it may be painful, but the end is thought to be pleasurable. There is this constant struggle to be and to become.

We are all trying to become; physically, we want a better house, a better position with more power, higher status. Biologically, if we are not well we seek

co become well. psychologically, the whole inward process of thought, of consciousness, the whole drive, inwardly, is from the recognition that one is actually nothing, and by becoming, to move away from that. psychologically, inwardly, there is always the escape from `what is`, always the running away from that which I am, from that with which I am dissatisfied to something which will satisfy me. Whether that satisfaction is conceived as deep contentment, happiness, or enlightenment, which is a projection of thought, or as acquiring greater knowledge, it is still the process of becoming - I am, I shall be. That process involves time. The brain is `programmed' to this. All our culture, all our religious sanctions, everything says: `become'. It is a phenomenon to be seen all over the world. Not only in this Western world but in the East, everyone is trying to become, or to be, or to avoid. Now: is this the cause of conflict, inwardly and outwardly? Inwardly there is this imitation, competition, conformity with the ideal; outwardly there is this competition between so-called individuals of one group against another group, nation against nation. Inwardly and outwardly there is always this drive to become and to be something.

We are asking: is this the basic cause of our conflict? Is man doomed - as long as he lives on this marvellous earth - to perpetual conflict? One can rationalize this conflict, say nature is in conflict, the tree struggling to reach the sun is in conflict, and that that is part of our nature, because, through conflict, through competition, we have evolved, we have grown into this marvellous human being that we are - this is not being said sarcastically. Our brain is programmed to conflict. We have a problem which we have never been able to resolve. You may neurotically escape into some phantasy and in that phantasy be totally content, or you may imagine that you have inwardly achieved something and be totally content with that: an intelligent mind must question all this, it must exercise doubt, scepticism. Why have human beings, for millions of years, from the beginning of man up to the present time, lived in conflict? We have accepted it, we have tolerated it, we have said it is part of our nature to compete, to be aggressive, to imitate, to conform; we have said that it is part of the everlasting pattern of life.

Why is man, who is so highly sophisticated in one direction, so utterly unintelligent in other directions? Does conflict end through knowledge - knowledge about oneself, or about the world, knowledge about matter, learning more about society so as to have better organizations and better institutions, acquiring more and more knowledge? Will that solve our human conflict? Or is it that freedom from conflict has nothing whatsoever to do with knowledge?

We have a great deal of knowledge about the world, about matter and the universe; we have also a great deal of historical knowledge about ourselves: will that knowledge free the human being from conflict? Or has freedom from conflict nothing to do with analysis, with discovering the various causes and factors of conflict? Will analytical discovery of the cause, or many causes, free the brain from conflict - the conflict which we have while we are awake during the daytime and the conflict carried on while we are asleep? We can examine and interpret dreams, we can go into the whole question of why human beings dream at all; will that solve conflict? Will the analytical mind analysing very clearly, rationally, sanely into the cause of conflict, end conflict? In analysis the analyser tries to analyse conflict, and in doing so separates himself from conflict - will that solve it? Or is it that freedom has nothing whatsoever to do with any of these processes? If you follow somebody who says: 'I will show you the way; I am free from conflict and I will show you the way' - will that help you? This has been the part of the priest, the part of the guru, the part of the so-called enlightened man - 'Follow me, I will show you; or, 'I will point out the goal to you.' History shows this through millennia upon millennia, and yet man has not been able to solve his deep-rooted conflict.

Let us find out together - not agree, not as an intellectual verbal concept - if there is a perception, an action, that will end conflict, not gradually, but immediately. What are the implications of that? The brain being programmed to conflict is caught in that pattern. We are asking if that pattern can be broken immediately, not gradually. You may think you can break it through drugs, through alcohol, through sex, through different forms of discipline, through

handing oneself over to something - man has tried a thousand different ways to escape from this terror of conflict. Now, we are asking: is it possible for a conditioned brain to break that conditioning immediately? This may be a theoretical, non-actual, question. You may say it is impossible, it is just a theory, it is just a wish, a desire, to be free of this conflict. But if you examine the matter rationally, logically, with intelligence, you see that time will not solve this conditioning. The first thing to realize is that there is no psychological tomorrow. If you see actually, not verbally, but deeply in your heart, in your mind, in the very very depths of your being, you will realize that time will not solve this problem. And that means that you have already broken the pattern, you have begun to see cracks in the pattern we have accepted of time as a means of unravelling, breaking up, this programmed brain. Once you see for yourself, clearly, absolutely, irrevocably, that time is not a freeing factor then already you begin to see cracks in the enclosure of the brain. Philosophers and scientists have said: time is a factor of growth, biologically, linguistically, technologically, but they have never enquired into the nature of psychological time. Any enquiry into psychological time implies the whole complex of psychological becoming - I am this, but I will be that; I am unhappy, unfulfilled, desperately lonely but tomorrow will be different. To perceive that time is the factor of conflict then that very perception is action; decision has taken place - YOU do not have to decide - the very perception is the action and decision.

There are multiple forms of conflict, there are thousands of opinions so there are thousands of forms of conflict. But we are not talking about the many forms of conflict but about conflict itself. We are not talking about your particular conflict - I don,t get on with my wife, or in my business, or this or that - but the conflict of the human brain in its existence. Is there a perception - not born of memory, not born of knowledge - that sees the whole nature and structure of conflict; a perception of that whole? Is there such perception at all - not analytical perception, not intellectual observation of the various types of conflict, not an emotional response to conflict? Is there a perception not of remembrance, which is time, which is thought? Is there a perception which is

not of time or thought, which can see the whole nature of conflict, and with that very perception bring about the ending of conflict? Thought is time. Thought is experience, knowledge, put together in the brain as memory. It is the result of time - 'I didn't know a week ago but I know now.' The multiplication of knowledge, the expansion of knowledge, the depth of knowledge, is of time. So thought is time - any psychological movement is time. If I want to go from here to Montreux, if I want to learn a language, if I want to meet somebody at a distant place, time is required. And that same outer process is carried on inwardly - 'I am not, I will be'. So thought is time. Thought and time are indivisible.

And we are asking the question: is there a perception which is not of time and thought - a perception that is entirely out of the pattern to which the brain has been accustomed? Is there such a thing that perhaps alone is going to solve the problem? We have not solved the problem in a million years of conflict; we are continuing the same pattern. We must find, intelligently, hesitantly, with care, if there is a way, if there is a perception which covers the whole of conflict, a perception which breaks the pattern. The speaker has put this question forward. Now how shall we meet this together? He may be wrong, irrational, but after you have listened to him very carefully, it is your responsibility as well as the speaker's, to see if it is so, if it is possible. Do not say: 'Well it is not possible because I have not done it; it is not within my sphere; I have not thought enough about it; or, I do not want to think about it at all because I am satisfied with my conflict and because I am quite certain one day humanity will be free of conflict.' That is all just an escape from the problem. So are we together being aware of all the complexities of conflict, not denying it. It is there, it is there as actually as pain in the body. Are we aware without any choice that it is so and at the same time ask the question as to whether there is a different approach altogether?

Now, can we observe - it does not matter what it is - without the naming, without the remembrance? Look at your friend, or your wife, or whomever it is, observe that person without the words 'my wife' or 'my friend' or 'we belong to

the same group' - without any of that - observe so that you are not observing through remembrance. Have you ever directly tried it? Look at the person without naming, without time and remembrance and also look at yourself - at the image that you have built about yourself, the image that you have built about the other; look as though you were looking for the first time - as you might at a rose for the first time. Learn to look; learn to observe this quality which comes without all the operation of thought. Do not say it is not possible. If you go to a professor, not knowing his subject but wanting to learn from him (I am not your professor), you go to listen. You do not say: 'I know something about it,' or 'You are wrong,' or 'You are right,' or 'I don't like your attitude.' You listen, you find out. As you begin to listen sensitively, with awareness, you begin to discover whether it is a phoney professor using a lot of words, or a professor who has really gone into the depths of his subject. Now, can we together so listen and observe, without the word, without remembrance, without all the movement of thought? Which means, complete attention; attention, not from a centre but attention which has no centre. If you have a centre from which you are attending, that is merely a form of concentration. But if you are attending and there is no centre, it means that you are giving complete attention; in that attention there is no time.

Many of you, fortunately or unfortunately, have heard the speaker for many years and one sees that this breaking of the 'programme' of the brain has not come about. You repeatedly listen to that statement year after year and it has not come about. Is it because you want to attain, to become, to have that state in which the pattern of the brain has been broken? You have listened, and it has not come about, and you are hoping that it will come about - which is another form of striving to become. So you are still in conflict. So you brush it all aside and say you will not come here any more because you have not got what you want - 'I want that but have not got it.' That wanting is the desire to be something and is a cause of conflict. That desire comes from the 'programmed' brain. We are saying: to break that programme, that pattern, observe without the movement of thought. It sounds very simple, but see the

logic of it, the reason, the sanity, of it, not because the speaker says so, but because it is sane. Obviously one must exercise the capacity to be logical, rational and yet know its limitation; because rational, logical thinking is still part of thought. Knowing that thought is limited, be aware of that limitation and do not push it further because it will still be limited however far you go, whereas if you observe a rose, a flower, without the word, without naming the colour, but just look at it, then that look brings about great sensitivity, breaks down this sense of heaviness of the brain, and gives extraordinary vitality. There is a totally different kind of energy when there is pure perception, which is not related to thought and time.

Chapter 4 4th Public Talk

Saanen 19th July 1981

Order is necessary in our everyday activity; order in our action and order in our relationship with each other. One has to understand that the very quality of order is totally different from that of discipline. Order comes through directly learning about ourselves - not according to some philosopher or some psychologist. We discover order for ourselves when we are free from all sense of compulsion, from all sense of determined effort to obtain order along a particular path. That order comes very naturally. In that order there is righteousness. It is order, not according to some pattern, and not only in the outward world, which has become so utterly chaotic, but inwardly within ourselves where we are not clear, where we are confused and uncertain. Learning about ourselves is part of order. If you follow another, however erudite, you will not be able to understand yourself.

To find out what order is we must begin to understand the nature of our relationships. Our life is a movement in relationship; however much one may think one lives alone, one is always related to something or other, either to the past or to some projected image in the future. So, life is a movement in relationship and in that relationship there is disorder. We must examine closely why we live in such disorder in our relationships with each other - however intimate or superficial.

The speaker is not trying to persuade you to think in a particular direction, or put any kind of persuasive, subtle pressure on you. On the contrary, we are together thinking over our human problems and discovering what our relationship with each other is and whether in that relationship we can bring about order. To understand the full meaning of relationship with each other, however close, however distant, we must begin to understand why the brain creates images. We have images about ourselves and images about others. Why is it that each one has a peculiar image and identifies himself with that

image? Is the image necessary, does it give one a sense of security? Does not the image bring about the separation of human beings?

We have to look closely at our relationship with wife, husband or friend; look very closely, not trying to avoid it, not trying to brush it aside. We must together examine and find out why human beings throughout the world have this extraordinary machinery that creates images, symbols, patterns. Is it because in those patterns, symbols and images, great security is found?

If you observe you will see that you have an image about yourself, either an image of conceit which is arrogant, or the contrary to that. Or you have accumulated a great deal of experience, acquired a great deal of knowledge, which in itself creates the image, the image of the expert. Why do we have images about ourselves? Those images separate people. If you have an image of yourself as Swiss or British or French and so on, that image not only distorts your observation of humanity but it also separates you from others. And wherever there is separation, division, there must be conflict - as there is conflict going on all over the world, the Arab against the Israeli, the Muslim against the Hindu, one Christian church against another. National division and economic division, all result from images, concepts, ideas and the brain clings to these images - why? Is it because of our education, because of our culture in which the individual is most important and where the collective society is something totally different from the individual? That is part of our culture, part of our religious training and of our daily education. When one has an image about oneself as being British or American, that image gives one a certain security. That is fairly obvious. Having created the image about oneself that image becomes semi-permanent; behind that image, or in that image, one tries to find security, safety, a form of resistance. When one is related to another, however delicately, however subtly, psychically or physically, there is a response based on an image. If one is married or related intimately with somebody, an image is formed in one's daily life; whether one is acquainted for a week or ten years, the image is slowly formed about the other person step by step; every reaction is remembered, adding to the image and stored

up in the brain so that the relationship - it may be physical, sexual, or psychical - is actually between two images, one's own and the other's.

The speaker is not saying something extravagant, or exotic, or fantastic, he is merely pointing out that these images exist. These images exist and one can never know another completely. If one is married or one has a girl friend, one can never know her completely; one thinks one knows her because having lived with that person one has accumulated memories of various incidents various irritations and all the occurrences which happen in daily life; and she also has experienced her reactions and their. images are established in her brain. Those images play an extraordinarily important part in one's life. Apparently very few of us are free from any form of image. The freedom from images is real freedom. In that freedom there is no division brought about by images. If one is a Hindu, born in India with all the conditioning to which one is subject, the conditioning of the race, or of a particular group with its superstitions, with its religious beliefs, dogmas, rituals - the whole structure of that society - one lives with that complex of images, which is one's conditioning. And however much one may talk about brotherhood, unity, wholeness, it is merely empty words having no actual daily meaning. But if one frees oneself from all that imposition, all the conditioning of all that superstitious nonsense, then one is breaking down the image. And also in one's relationship, if one is married or lives with somebody, is it possible not to create an image at all - not to record an incident which may be pleasurable or painful, in that particular relationship, not to record either the insult or the flattery, the encouragement or discouragement?

Is it possible not to record at all? Because if the brain is constantly recording everything that is happening, psychologically, then it is never free to be quiet, it can never be tranquil, peaceful. If the machinery of the brain is operating all the time it wears itself out. This is obvious. It is what happens in our relationships with each other - whatever the relationship is - and if there is constant recording of everything then the brain slowly begins to wither away and that is essentially old age.

So in investigating we come upon this question: is it possible in our relationships with all their reactions and subtleties, with all their essential responses, is there a possibility of not remembering? This remembering and recording is going on all the time. We are asking whether it is possible not to record psychologically, but only to record that which is absolutely necessary? In certain directions it is necessary to record. For example, one must record all that which is necessary to learn mathematics. If I am to be an engineer I must record all the mathematics related to structures and so on. If I am to be a physicist I must record that which has already been established in that subject. To learn to drive a car I must record. But is it necessary in our relationships to record, psychologically, inwardly, at all? The remembrance of incidents past, is that love? When I say to my wife, 'I love you,' is that from a remembrance of all the things we have been through together - the incidents, the travail, the struggles, which are recorded, stored in the brain - is that remembrance actual love?

So is it possible to be free and not to record psychologically at all? It is only possible when there is complete attention. When there is complete attention there is no recording.

I do not know why we want explanations, or why it is that our brains are not swift enough to capture, to have an insight into, the whole thing immediately. Why is it that we cannot see this thing, the truth of all this, and let that truth operate and therefore cleanse the slate and have a brain that is not recording at all psychologically? But most human beings are rather sluggish, they rather like to live in their old patterns, in their particular habits of thought; anything new they reject because they think it is much better to live with the known rather than with the unknown. In the known there is safety - at least they think there is safety, security - so they keep on repeating, working and struggling within that field of the known. Can we observe without the whole process and machinery of memory operating?

What is love? This is a very complex question; all of us feel we love something or other, abstract love, love of a nation, love of a person, love of god, love of gardening, love of overeating. We have abused the word love so greatly that we have to find out basically what love is. Love is not an idea. Love of god is an idea, love of a symbol is still an idea. When you go to the church and kneel down and pray, you are really worshipping, or praying to, something which thought has created. So, see what is happening, thought has created it - actually this is a fact - and you worship that which thought has created; which means you are worshipping, in a very subtle way, yourself. This may seem a sacrilegious statement, but it is a fact. That is what is happening throughout the world. Thought creates the symbol with all the attributes of that symbol, romantic or logical and sane; having created it you love it, you become totally intolerant of any other thing. All the gurus, all the priests, all the religious structures, are based on that. See the tragedy of it. Thought creates the flag, the symbol of a particular country, then you fight for it, you kill each other for it; your nation will destroy the earth in competition with another nation, and so the flag becomes a symbol of your love. We have lived for millions of years that way and we are still extraordinarily destructive, violent, brutal, cynical human beings.

When we say we love another, in that love there is desire, the pleasurable projections of the various activities of thought. One has to find out whether love is desire, whether love is pleasure, whether in love there is fear; for where there is fear there must be hatred, jealousy, anxiety, possessiveness, domination. There is beauty in relationship and the whole cosmos is a movement in relationship. Cosmos is order and when one has order in oneself one has order in one's relationships and therefore the possibility of order in our society. If one enquires into the nature of relationship one finds it is absolutely necessary to have order, and out of that order comes love. What is beauty? You see the fresh snow on the mountains this morning, clean, a lovely sight. You see those solitary trees standing black against that white. Looking at the world about us you see the marvellous machinery, the extraordinary computer

with its special beauty; you see the beauty of a face, the beauty of a painting, beauty of a poem - you seem to recognize beauty out there. In the museums or when you go to a concert and listen to Beethoven, or Mozart, there is great beauty - but always out there. In the hills, in the valleys with their running waters, and the flight of birds and the singing of a blackbird in the early morning, there is beauty. But is beauty only out there? Or is beauty something that only exists when the 'me' is not? When you look at those mountains on a sunny morning, sparkling clear against the blue sky, their very majesty drives away all the accumulated memories of yourself - for a moment. There the outward beauty, the outward magnificence, the majesty and the strength of the mountains, wipes away all your problems - if only for a second. You have forgotten yourself. When there is total absence of yourself beauty is. But we are not free of ourselves; we are selfish people, concerned with ourselves, with our importance or with our problems, with our agonies, sorrows and loneliness. Out of desperate loneliness we want identification with something or other and we cling to an idea, to a belief, to a person, especially to a person. In dependency all our problems arise. Where there is psychological dependency, fear begins. When you are tied to something corruption begins.

Desire is the most urgent and vital drive in our life. We are talking about desire itself, not desire for a particular thing. All religions have said that if you want to serve god you must subjugate desire, destroy desire, control desire. All the religions have said: substitute for desire an image that thought has created - the image that the Christians have, that the Hindus have and so on. Substitute an image for the actual. The actual is desire - the burning of it and they think that one can overcome that desire by substituting something else for it. Or, surrender yourself to that which you think is the master, the saviour, the guru - which again is the activity of thought. This has been the pattern of all religious thinking. One has to understand the whole movement of desire; for obviously it is not love, nor yet compassion. Without love and compassion, meditation is utterly meaningless. Love and compassion have their own intelligence which is not the intelligence of cunning thought.

So it is important to understand the nature of desire, why it has played such an extraordinarily important part in our life; how it distorts clarity, how it prevents the extraordinary quality of love. It is important that we understand and do not suppress, do not try to control it or direct it in a particular direction, which you think may give you peace.

Please bear in mind that the speaker is not trying to impress you or guide and help you. But together we are walking a very subtle, complex path. We have to listen to each other to find out the truth about desire. When one understands the significance, the meaning, the fullness, the truth of desire, then desire has quite a different value or drive in one's life.

When one observes desire, is one observing it as an outsider looking at desire? Or is one observing desire as it arises? Not desire as something separate from oneself, one is desire. You see the difference? Either one observes desire, which one has when one sees something in the shop window which pleases one, and one has the desire to buy it so that the object is different from 'me', or else the desire is 'me', so there is a perception of desire without the observer watching desire.

One can look at a tree. 'Tree' is the word by which one recognizes that which is standing in the field. But one knows that the word 'tree' is not the tree. Similarly one's wife is not the word. But one has made the word one's wife. I do not know if you see all the subtleties of this. One must very clearly understand, from the beginning, that the word is not the thing. The word 'desire' is not the feeling of it - the extraordinary feeling there is behind that reaction. So one must be very watchful that one is not caught in the word. Also the brain must be active enough to see that the object may create desire - desire which is separate from the object. Is one aware that the word is not the thing and that desire is not separate from the observer who is watching desire? Is one aware that the object may create desire but the desire is independent of the object?

How does desire flower? Why is there such extraordinary energy behind it? If we do not understand deeply the nature of desire we will always be in conflict with each other. One may desire one thing and one's wife may desire another and the children may desire something different. So we are always at loggerheads with each other. And this battle, this struggle, is called love, relationship.

We are asking: what is the source of desire? We must be very truthful in this, very honest, for desire is very very deceptive, very subtle, unless we understand the root of it. For all of us sensory responses are important - sight, touch, taste, smell, hearing. And a particular sensory response may for some of us be more important than the other responses. If we are artistic we see things in a special way. If we are trained as an engineer then the sensory responses are different. so we never observe totally, with all the sensory responses. We each respond somewhat specially, divided. Is it possible to respond totally with all one's senses? See the importance of that. If one responds totally with all one's senses there is the elimination of the centralized observer. But when one responds to a particular thing in a special way then the division begins. Find out when you leave this tent, when you look at the flowing waters of the river, the light sparkling on the swiftness of the waters, find out if you can look at it with all your senses. Do not ask me how, for that becomes mechanical. But educate yourself in the understanding of total sensory response.

When you see something, the seeing brings about a response. You see a green shirt, or a green dress, the seeing awakens the response. Then contact takes place. Then from contact thought creates the image of you in that shirt or dress, then the desire arises. Or you see a car in the road, it has nice lines, it is highly polished and there is plenty of power behind it. Then you go around it, examine the engine. Then thought creates the image of you getting into the car and starting the engine, putting your foot down and driving it. So does desire begin and the source of desire is thought creating the image, up to that point there is no desire. There are the sensory responses, which are normal,

but then thought creates the image and from that moment desire begins. Now, is it possible for thought not to arise and create the image? This is learning about desire, which in itself is discipline. Learning about desire is discipline, not the controlling of it. If you really learn about something it is finished. But if you say you must control desire, then you are in a totally different field altogether. When you see the whole of this movement you will find that thought with its image will not interfere; you will only see, have the sensation and what is wrong with that? We are all so crazy about desire, we want to fulfil ourselves through desire. But we do not see what havoc it creates in the world - the desire for individual security, for individual attainment, success, power, prestige. We do not feel that we are totally responsible for everything we do. If one understands desire, the nature of it, then what place has it? Has it any place where there is love? Is love then something so extraordinarily outside of human existence that it has actually no value at all? Or, is it that we are not seeing the beauty and the depth, the greatness and sacredness of the actuality of it; is it that we have not the energy, the time to study, to educate ourselves, to understand what it is? Without love and compassion with its intelligence, meditation has very little meaning. Without that perfume that which is eternal can never be found. And that is why it is important to put the 'house' of our life, of our being, of our struggles, into complete order.

Chapter 5 5th Public Talk

Saanen 21st July 1981

We have to consider together whether the brain, which is now only operating partially, has the capacity to function wholly, completely. Now we are only using a part of it, which one can observe for oneself. One can see that specialization, which may be necessary, brings about the functioning of only a part of the brain. If one is a scientist, specializing in that subject, naturally only one part of the brain is functioning; if one is a mathematician it is the same. In the modern world one has to specialize, and we are asking whether, even so, it is possible to allow the brain to operate wholly, completely.

And another question we are asking is: what is going to happen to humanity, to all of us, when the computer out-thinks man in accuracy and rapidity - as the computer experts are saying it will? With the development of the robot, man will only have, perhaps, two hours of work a day. This may be going to happen within the foreseeable future. Then what will man do? Is he going to be absorbed in the field of entertainment? That is already taking place: sports are becoming more important; there is the watching of television; and there are the varieties of religious entertainment. Or is he going to turn inwardly, which is not an entertainment but something which demands great capacity of observation, examination and non-personal perception? These are the two possibilities. The basic content of our human consciousness is the pursuit of pleasure and the avoidance of fear. Is humanity increasingly going to follow entertainment? One hopes these Gatherings are not a form of entertainment.

Now, can the brain be totally free so as to function wholly? - because any specialization, any following of a certain path, a certain groove or pattern, inevitably implies that the brain is functioning partially and therefore with limited energy. We live in a society of specialization - engineers, physicists, surgeons, carpenters and the specializations of particular beliefs, dogmas and rituals. Certain specializations are necessary, such as that of the surgeon or

carpenter, but in spite of that can the brain function completely, wholly, and therefore have tremendous energy? This is, I think, a very serious question into which we have to enquire together.

If one observes one's own activity one finds that the brain functions very partially, fragmentarily, with the result that one's energy becomes less and less as one grows older. Biologically, physically, when one is young one is full of vitality; but as one is educated, and then follows a livelihood that needs specialization, the activity of the brain becomes narrowed down, limited and its energy becomes less and less.

Though the brain may have to have a certain form of specialization - not necessarily religious specialization because that is superstition - as a surgeon for example, can it also operate wholly? It can only operate wholly, with all the tremendous vitality of a million years behind it, when it is completely free. Specialization, which is now necessary for a livelihood may not be necessary if the computer takes over. It will not take over surgery, obviously. It will not take over the feeling of beauty, as when looking at the evening stars, but it may take over other functions altogether.

Can the human brain be totally free, without any form of attachment - attachment to certain beliefs, experiences and so on? If the brain cannot be totally free it will deteriorate. When the brain is occupied with problems, with specialization, with a livelihood, it is in limited activity. But when the computer takes over, this activity will become less and less and therefore it will gradually deteriorate. This is not something in the future, it is actually happening now if one observes one's own mental activity.

Can your consciousness, with its basic content of fear, the pursuit of pleasure with all the implications of grief, pain and sorrow, being hurt inwardly and so on, become totally free? We may have other forms of consciousness, group consciousness, racial consciousness, national consciousness, the consciousness of the Catholic group, the Hindu group and so on but basically the content of our consciousness is fear, the pursuit of pleasure, with the

resultant pain, sorrow and ultimately death. These comprise the central content of our consciousness. We are together observing the whole phenomenon of human existence, which is our existence. We are mankind, because our consciousness, whether as a Christian living in the Western world, or as a Muslim in the Middle East, or a Buddhist in the Asiatic world, is basically fear, the pursuit of pleasure and the never ending burden of pain, hurts, sorrow. One's consciousness is not personal to oneself. This is very difficult to accept because we have been so conditioned, so educated, that we resist the actual fact that we are not individuals at all, we are the whole of mankind. This is not a romantic idea, it is not a philosophical concept, it is absolutely not an ideal; examined closely, it is a fact. So we have to find out whether the brain can be free from the content of its consciousness. Sirs, why do you listen to the speaker? Is it that in listening to the speaker you are listening to yourself? Is that what is taking place? The speaker is only pointing something out, acting as a mirror in which you see yourself, see the actuality of your own consciousness; it is not the description which the speaker is pointing out, which becomes merely an idea if you do no more than follow it. But if through the description, you yourself actually perceive your own state of mind, your own consciousness, then listening to the speaker has a certain importance. And if at the end of these talks you say to yourself: 'I have not changed; why? It is your fault. You have spoken for fifty years perhaps, and I have not changed', is it the fault of the speaker? Or you say: 'I have not been able to apply it; naturally it is the fault of the speaker'. Then you become cynical and do all kinds of absurd things. So please bear in mind that you are listening not so much to the speaker as looking at your own consciousness through the description in words - which is the consciousness of all humanity. The Western world may believe in certain religious symbols and certain rituals; the Eastern world does likewise, but behind it all there is the same fear, the same pursuit of pleasure, the same burden of greed, pain, of being hurt and wanting to achieve - all of which is common to the whole of humanity.

So, in listening we are learning about ourselves, not just following the description. We are actually learning to look at ourselves and therefore bringing about a total freedom in which the whole of the brain can operate. After all, meditation, love and compassion are the operation of the whole of the brain. When there is the operation of the whole there is integral order. When there is integral, inward order, there is total freedom. It is only then that there can be something which is timelessly sacred. That is not a reward; that is not something to be achieved; that which is eternally timeless, sacred, comes about only when the brain is totally free to function in wholeness.

The content of our consciousness is put together by all the activities of thought; can that content ever be freed so that there is a totally different dimension altogether? So let us observe the whole movement of pleasure. There is not only biological, including sexual, pleasure, there is also pleasure in possessions, pleasure in having money, pleasure in achieving something that you have been working towards; there is pleasure in power, political or religious, in power over a person; there is pleasure in the acquisition of knowledge, and in the expression of that knowledge as a professor, as a writer, as a poet; there is the gratification that comes about through leading a very strict, moral and ascetic life, the pleasure of achieving something inwardly which is not common to ordinary man. This has been the pattern of our existence for millions of years. The brain has been conditioned to it and therefore has become limited. Anything that is conditioned must be limited and therefore the brain, when it is pursuing the many forms of pleasure, must inevitably become small, limited, narrow. And probably, unconsciously realizing this, one seeks different forms of entertainment, a release through sex, through different kinds of fulfilment. Please observe it in yourself, in your own activity in daily life. If you observe, you will see that one's brain is occupied all day with something or other, chattering, talking endlessly, going on like a machine that never stops. And in this way the brain is gradually wearing itself out - and it is going to become inactive if the computer takes its place.

So, why are human beings caught in this perpetual pursuit of pleasure - why? Is it because they are so utterly lonely? Are they escaping from that sense of isolation? Is it that they have been, from childhood, conditioned to this? Is it because thought creates the image of Pleasure and then pursues it? Is thought the source of pleasure? For example, one has had some kind of pleasure, eating very tasty food, or sexual pleasure, or the pleasure of being flattered and the brain registers that pleasure. The incidents which have brought about pleasure have been recorded in the brain, and the remembrance of these incidents of yesterday, or last week, is the movement of thought. Thought is the movement of pleasure; the brain has registered incidents, pleasurable and exciting, worth remembering, and thought projects them into the future and pursues them. So the question then is: why does thought carry on the memory of an incident that is over and finished? Is not that part of our occupation? A man who wants money, power, position, is perpetually occupied with it. Perhaps, the brain is similarly occupied with the remembrance of something of a week ago which gave great pleasure, being held in the brain, which thought projects as future pleasure and pursues. The repetition of pleasure is the movement of thought and therefore limited; therefore the brain can never function wholly, it can only function partially.

Now the next question that arises is: if this is the pattern of thought, how can thought be stopped, or rather, how can the brain stop registering the incident of yesterday which gave delight? That is the obvious question, but why does one put it? Why? Is it because one wants to escape from the movement of pleasure, and that that very escape is yet another form of pleasure? Whereas if you see the fact that the incident which gave great delight, pleasure, excitement, is over, that it is no longer a living thing, but something which happened a week ago - it was a living thing then but it is not so now - can you not finish with it, end it, not carry it over? It is not how to end it or now to stop it. It is just to see factually how the brain, how thought, is operating. If one is aware of that, then thought itself will come to an end. The registering of pleasure is ended, finished.

Fear is the common state of all mankind, whether you live in a small house or in a palace, whether you have no work or plenty of work, whether you have tremendous knowledge about everything on earth or are ignorant, or whether you are a priest or the highest representative of god, or whatever, there is still this deep rooted fear which is common to all mankind. That is a common ground on which all humanity stands. There is no question about it. It is an absolute, irrevocable fact, it cannot be contradicted. As long as the brain is caught in this pattern of fear its operation is limited and therefore can never function wholly. So it is necessary, if humanity is to survive completely as human beings and not as machines, to find out for oneself whether it is possible to be totally free from fear.

We are concerned with fear itself, not with the expressions of fear. What is fear? When there is fear, is there at that very moment a recognition as fear? Is that fear describable at the moment the reaction is taking place? Or does the description come after? 'After' is time. Suppose one is afraid: either one is afraid of something, afraid of something that one has done in the past which one does not want another to know, or something has happened in the past which again awakens fear, or is there a fear by itself without an object? At the second when there is fear does one call it fear? Or does that happen only afterwards? Surely it is after it has happened. Which means that previous incidents of fear which have been held in the brain are remembered immediately after the reaction takes place; the memory says 'That is fear'. At the immediacy of the reaction one does not call it fear. It is only after it has happened that one names it as fear. The naming of it as fear is from the remembrance of other incidents that have arisen which have been named fear. One remembers those fears of the past and the new reaction arises which one immediately identifies with the word fear. That is simple enough. So there is always the memory operating on the present.

So; is fear time? - the fear of something which happened a week ago, which has caused that feeling which we have named as fear and the future

implication that it must not happen again; yet it might happen again, therefore one is afraid of it. So one asks oneself: is it time that is the root of fear?

So what is time? Time by the watch is very simple. The sun rises at a certain time and sets at a certain time - yesterday, today and tomorrow. That is a natural sequence of time. There is also psychological, inward time. The incident which happened last week, which has given pleasure, or which awakened the sense of fear, is remembered and projected into the future - I may lose my position, I may lose my money, I may lose my wife - time. So is fear part of psychological time? It looks like it. And what is psychological time? Not only does physical time need space, but psychological time needs space also - yesterday, last week, modified today, tomorrow. There is space and time. That is simple. So, is fear the movement of time? And is not the movement of time, psychologically, the movement of thought? So thought is time and time is fear - obviously. One has had pain sitting with the dentist. It is stored, remembered, projected; one hopes not to have that pain again - thought is moving. So fear is a movement of thought in space and time. If one sees that, not as an idea, but as an actuality (which means one has to give to that fear complete attention at the moment it arises) then it is not registered. Do this and you will find out for yourself. When you give complete attention to an insult, there is no insult. Or if somebody comes along and says, 'What a marvellous person you are' and you pay attention it is like water off a duck's back. The movement of fear is thought in time and space. That is a fact. It is not something described by the speaker. If you have observed it for yourself, then it is an absolute fact, you cannot escape from it. You cannot escape from a fact, it is always there. You may try to avoid it, you may try to suppress it, try every kind of escape, but it is always there. If you give complete attention to the fact that fear is the movement of thought, then fear is not, psychologically. The content of our consciousness is the movement of thought in time and space. Whether that thought is very limited, or wide and extensive, it is still a movement in time and space.

Thought has created many different forms of power in ourselves, psychologically, but they are all limited. When there is freedom from limitation there is an astonishing sense of power, not mechanical power but a tremendous sense of energy. It has nothing to do with thought and therefore that power, that energy cannot be misused. But if thought says, 'I will use it', then that power, that energy, is dissipated.

Another factor which exists in our consciousness is sorrow, grief, pain and the wounds and hurts that remain in most human beings from childhood. That psychological hurt, the pain of it, is remembered, it is held on to; grief arises from it; sorrow is involved in it. There is the global sorrow of mankind which has faced thousands and thousands of wars, for which millions of people have cried. The war machine is still with us, directed by politicians, reinforced by our nationalism, by our feeling that we are separate from the rest, 'we' and 'they', 'you' and 'me'. It is a global sorrow which the politicians are building, building, building. We are ready for another war and when we prepare for something there must be some kind of explosion somewhere - it may not be in the Middle East, it may happen here. As long as we are preparing for something we are going to get it - it is like preparing food. But we are so stupid that all this goes on - including terrorism.

We are asking whether this whole pattern of being hurt, knowing loneliness and pain, resisting, withdrawing, isolating ourselves, which causes further pain, can come to an end; whether the grief, the sorrow of losing some precious belief that we have held, or the disillusionment that comes when we lose somebody we have followed, for whom we have struggled, surrendered ourselves, can also come to an end? Is it possible ever to be free of all this? It is possible if we apply ourselves, not just endlessly talk about it. As it is we realize that we are hurt psychologically from childhood, we see all the consequences of that hurt, which we resist, from which we withdraw, not wanting to be hurt any more. We encourage isolation and therefore build a wall round ourselves. In our relationships we are doing the same thing.

The consequences of being hurt from childhood are pain, resistance, withdrawal, isolation, deeper and deeper fear. And as the speaker has said, there is the global sorrow of mankind; human beings have been tortured through wars, tortured under dictatorships, totalitarianism, tortured in different parts of the world. And there is the sorrow of my brother, son, wife, running away, or dying; the sorrow of separation, the sorrow that comes about when one is deeply interested in something and the other is not. In all this sorrow there is no compassion, there is no love. The ending of sorrow brings love - not pleasure, not desire, but love. Where there is love there is compassion with which comes intelligence, which has nothing whatever to do with the 'intelligence' of thought.

We have to look very closely at ourselves as humanity, at why we have borne all these things all our lives, at why we have never ended this condition. Is it part indolence, part habit? We generally say: 'It is part of our habit, part of our conditioning. What am I to do about it? How am I to uncondition myself? I cannot find the answer; I will go to the guru next door' - or further away, or the priest, or this or that. We never say: 'Let us look at ourselves closely and see if we can break through it, like any other habit.' The habit of smoking can be broken, or that of drugs and alcohol. But we say: 'What does it matter. I am getting old anyhow, the body is destroying itself, so what does little more pleasure matter?' So do we carry on. We do not feel utterly responsible for all the things we do. We either blame it on the environment, on society, on our parents, on past hereditary; we find some excuse but never apply ourselves. If we really have the urge, the immediate urge, to find out why we are hurt, it can be done. We are hurt because we have built an image about ourselves. That is a fact. When one says, 'I am hurt', it is the image that one has about oneself that is hurt. Somebody comes along and puts his heavy boot on that image and one gets hurt. One gets hurt through comparison: 'I am this but somebody else is better'. As long as one has an image about oneself one is going to get hurt. That is a fact and if one does not pay attention to that fact, but retains an image of oneself of any kind somebody is going to put a pin into it and one is

going to get hurt. If one has an image about oneself as addressing large audiences and being famous, having gained a reputation which one wants to maintain, then someone is going to hurt it - somebody else with a bigger audience. If one gives complete attention to the image one has about oneself - attention, not concentration but attention - then one will see that the image has no meaning and it disappears.

Chapter 6 6th Public Talk

Saanen 23rd July 1981

I think we ought to talk over together, going into it rather deeply, the implication of sorrow, so as to find out for ourselves whether sorrow and love can exist together. And also what is our relationship to the sorrow of mankind? - not only to our own personal daily grief, hurt, pain, and the sorrow that comes with death. Mankind has suffered thousands of wars; there seems to be no end to wars. We have left it to the politicians, all over the world, to bring about peace, but what they are doing, if you have understood them, will never bring peace. We are all preparing for war. The preparations are going to have some kind of blow up somewhere in the world. We human beings have never been able to live in peace with each other. We talk about it a great deal. The religions have preached peace - Peace on earth and goodwill - but apparently it has never been possible to have peace on earth, on the earth on which we live, which is not the British earth or the French earth, it is our earth. We have never been able to resolve the problem of killing each other.

Probably we have violence in our hearts. We have never been free from a sense of antagonism, a sense of retaliation, never free from our fears, sorrows, wounds and the pain of daily existence; we never have peace and comfort, we are always in travail. That is part of our life, part of our daily suffering. Man has tried many many ways to be free of this suffering without love; he has suppressed it, escaped from it, identified himself with something greater, handed himself over to some ideal, or belief or faith. Apparently this sorrow can never end; we have become accustomed to it, we put up with it, we tolerate it and we never ask ourselves seriously, with a great sense of awareness, whether it is possible to end it.

We should also talk over together the immense implications of death. Death is part of life, though we generally postpone or avoid even talking about it. It is there and we ought to go into it. And we should also enquire whether love - not the remembrance of pleasure which has nothing to do with love and

compassion - whether love with its own peculiar all-comprehending intelligence can exist in our life.

First of all: do we, as human beings, want to be really free from sorrow? Have we ever actually gone into it, faced it and understood all the movement of it, the implications involved in it? Why is it that we human beings - who are so extraordinarily clever in the technological world - have never resolved the problem of sorrow? It is important to talk this question over together, and find out for ourselves whether sorrow can really end.

We all suffer in various ways. There is the sorrow for death of someone, there is the sorrow of great poverty - which the East knows very well - and the great sorrow of ignorance - 'ignorance' not in the sense of book knowledge but the ignorance of not knowing oneself totally, the whole complex activity of the self. If we do not understand that very deeply then there remains the sorrow of that ignorance. There is the sorrow of never being able to realize something fundamentally, deeply - though we are very clever at achieving technological success and other successes in this world. We have never been able to understand pain, not only physical pain, but the deep psychological pain, however learned or not very erudite we may be. There is the sorrow of constant struggle, the conflict from the moment we are born until we die. There is the personal sorrow of not being beautiful outwardly or inwardly. There is the sorrow of attachment with its fear, with its corruption. There is the sorrow of not being loved and craving to be loved. There is the sorrow of never realizing something beyond thought, something which is eternal. And ultimately there is the sorrow of death.

We have described various forms of sorrow. The basic factor of sorrow is self-centred activity. We are all so concerned with ourselves, with our endless problems, with old age, with not being able to have a deep inward yet global outlook. We all have images of ourselves and of others. The brain is always active in day dreaming, being occupied with something or other, or creating pictures and ideas from the imagination. From childhood one gradually builds

the structure of the image which is `me'. Each one of us is doing this constantly; it is that image, which is `me', that gets hurt. When the `me' is hurt there is resistance, the building of a wall round oneself so as not to be hurt any more; and this creates more fear and isolation, the feeling of having no relationship, the encouraging of loneliness which also brings about sorrow.

After having described the various forms of sorrow, can we look at it without verbalization, without running away from it into intellectual adaptation to some form of religious or intellectual conclusion? Can we look at it completely, not moving away from it, but staying with it? Suppose I have a son who is deaf or blind; I am responsible, and it gives sorrow knowing that he can never look at the beautiful sky, never hear the running waters. There is this sorrow: remain with it, do not move away from it. Or suppose I have great sorrow for the death of someone with whom I have lived for many years. Then there is this sorrow which is the essence of isolation; we feel totally isolated, completely alone. Now, remain completely with that feeling, not verbalizing it, not rationalizing it, or escaping from it, or trying to transcend it - all of which is the movement that thought brings about. When there is that sorrow and thought does not enter into it at all - which means that you are completely sorrow, not trying to overcome sorrow, but totally sorrow - then there is the disappearance of it. It is only when there is the fragmentation of thought that there is travail.

When there is sorrow, remain with it without a single movement of thought so that there is the wholeness of it. The wholeness of sorrow is not that I am in sorrow, I am sorrow - and then there is no fragmentation involved in it. When there is that totality of sorrow, no movement away from it, then there is the withering away of it.

Without ending sorrow how can there be love? Strangely we have associated sorrow and love. I love my son and when he dies I am full of sorrow - sorrow we associate with love. Now we are asking: when there is suffering can love exist at all? But is love desire? Is love pleasure - so that when that desire, that pleasure, is denied, there is suffering? We say that suffering as

jealousy, attachment, possession, is all part of love. That is our conditioning, that is how we are educated, that is part of our inheritance, tradition. Now, love and sorrow cannot possibly go together. That is not a dogmatic statement, or a rhetorical assertion. When one looks into the depth of sorrow and understands the movement of it in which is involved pleasure, desire, attachment, and the consequences of that attachment, which bring about corruption when one is aware without any choice, without any movement, aware of the whole nature of sorrow, then can love exist with sorrow? Or is love something entirely different? We ought to be clear that devotion to a person, to a symbol, to the family, is not love. If I am devoted to you for various reasons, there is a motive behind that devotion. Love has no motive. If there is a motive it is not love, obviously. If you give me pleasure, sexually, or various forms of comfort, then there is dependency; the motive is my dependence on you because you give me something in return; and as we live together I call that love. Is it? So one questions the whole thing and asks oneself: where there is motive can love exist?

Where there is ambition, whether in the physical world, or in the psychological world - ambition to be on top of everything, to be a great success, to have power, religiously, or physically - can love exist? Obviously not. We recognise that it cannot exist and yet we go on. Look what happens to the brain when we play such tricks. I am ambitious, I want to be spiritually next to god, specially on his right hand; I want to achieve illumination - you know, all that deception; you cannot achieve illumination; you cannot possibly achieve that which is beyond time. Competitiveness, conformity, jealousy, fearfulness, hate, all that is going on, psychologically, inwardly. We are either conscious of it, or we deliberately avoid it. Yet I say to my wife or father, whoever it is, 'I love you.' What happens when there is such deep contradiction in my life, in my relationship? How can that contradiction have any sense of deep integrity? And yet that is what we are doing until we die, can one live in this world without ambition, without competitiveness? Look at what is happening in the outward world. There is competition between various

nations; the politicians are competing with each other, economically, technologically, in building up the instruments of war; and so we are destroying ourselves. We allow this to go on because we are also inwardly competitive.

As we pointed out, if a few really understand what we have been talking about for the last fifty years, and are really deeply involved and have brought about the end of fear, sorrow and so on, then that will affect the whole of the consciousness of mankind. Perhaps you are doubtful whether it will affect the consciousness of mankind? Hitler and his kind have affected the consciousness of mankind - Napoleon, the Caesars, the butchers of the world have affected mankind. Also the good People have affected mankind - I do not mean respectable people. The good are those who live life wholly, not fragmented. The great teachers of the world have affected human consciousness. But if there was a group of people who had understood what we have been talking about - not verbally but actually living life with great integrity - then it would affect the whole consciousness of man. This is not a theory. This is an actual fact. If you understand that simple fact you will see that it goes right through; television, newspapers, everything, is affecting the consciousness of man. So love cannot exist where there is a motive, where there is attachment, where there is ambition and competitiveness, love is not desire and pleasure. Just feel that, see it.

We are going into all this so as to bring about order in our life - order in our `house', which has no order. There is so much disorder in our life and without establishing an order that is whole, integral, meditation has no meaning whatsoever. If one's `house' is not in order one may sit in meditation, hoping that through that meditation one will bring about order; but what happens when one is living in disorder and one meditates? One has fanciful dreams, illusions and all kinds of nonsensical results. But a sane, intelligent, logical man, must first establish order in daily life, then he can go into the depths of meditation, into the meaning and the beauty of it, the greatness of it, the worth of it.

Whether we are very young, middle aged or old, death is part of our life, just as love, pain, suspicion, arrogance, are all part of life. But we do not see death as part of our life; we want to postpone it, or put it as far away from us as possible, so we have a time interval between life and death. What is death? This question is again rather complex.

The Christian concept of death and suffering and the Asiatic conclusion about reincarnation are just beliefs and like all beliefs they have no substance. So put those aside and let us go into it together. It may be unpleasant; you may not want to face it. You are living now, healthily, having pleasure, fear, anxiety and tomorrow there is hope and you do not want to be concerned with the ending of all this. But if we are intelligent, sane, rational, we have to face not only the living and all the implications of the living, but also the implications of dying. We must know both. That is the wholeness of life in which there is no division. So what is death apart from the physical ending of an organism that has lived wrongly, addicted to drink, to drugs and over indulgence or asceticism and denial? The body goes through this constant battle between the opposites, it has not a balanced harmonious life, but one of extremes. Also the body goes through great stress imposed by thought. Thought dictates and the body is controlled thereby; and thought being limited brings about disharmony. It causes us to live in disharmony physically, forcing, controlling, subjugating, driving the body - this is what we are all doing including fasting for political or religious reasons, which is violence. The body may endure all this for many years, reaching old age and not getting senile. But the body will inevitably come to an end, the organism will die; is that what death is? Is the coming to an end of the organism, either through some disease, old age or accident, what we are concerned about? Is it that thought identifies itself with the body, with the name, with the form, with all the memories, and says, 'Death must be avoided'? Is it that we are afraid of the coming to an end of a body that has been looked after, cared for? Perhaps we are not afraid of that especially, perhaps slyly anxious about it, but that is not of great importance. What is far more important for us is the ending of the relationships that we

have had, the pleasures that we have had, the memories, pleasant and unpleasant, all of which make up what we call living - the daily living, going to the office, the factory, doing some skilful job, having a family, being attached to the family, with all the memories of that family, my son, my daughter, my wife, my husband, in the family unit - which is fast disappearing. There is the feeling of being related to somebody, though in that relationship there may be great pain and anxiety; the feeling of being at home with somebody; or not at home with anybody. Is that what we are afraid of? - the ending of my relationships, my attachments, the ending of something I have known, something to which I have clung, something in which I have specialized all my life, - am I afraid of the ending of all that? That is the ending of all that is `me' - the family, the name, the home, the tradition, the inheritance, the cultural education and racial inheritance, all that is `me', the `me' that is struggling or that is happy. Is that what we are afraid of? - the ending of `me', which is the ending, psychologically, of the life which I am leading, the life which I know with its pain and sorrow. Is that what we are afraid of? If we are afraid of that and have not resolved that fear, still death inevitably comes, then what happens to that consciousness, which is not your consciousness but the consciousness of mankind, the consciousness of the vast whole of humanity? As long as I am afraid as an individual with my limited consciousness, it is that that I am afraid of. It is that of which I am scared. One realizes that it is not a fact that one's consciousness is totally separate from that of everybody else - one sees that separateness is an illusion, it is illogical, unhealthy. So one realizes, perhaps in one's heart, in one's feeling, that one is the whole of mankind - not an individual consciousness, which has no meaning. And one has lived this kind of life, which is pain, sorrow, anxiety, and if one's brain has not transformed some of all that, one's life is only a further confusion to the wholeness. But if one realizes that one's consciousness is the consciousness of mankind, and that for the human consciousness one is totally responsible, then freedom from the limitation of that consciousness becomes extraordinarily important. When there is that freedom then one is contributing to the breaking down of

the limitation of that consciousness. Then death has a totally different meaning.

One has lived a so-called individual life, concerned about oneself and one's problems. Those problems never end, they increase. One has lived that kind of life. One has been brought up, educated, conditioned, to that kind of life. You come along as a friend - you like me, or you love me - you say to me: 'Look, your consciousness is not yours; you suffer as other people suffer'. I listen to it and I do not reject what you say, for it makes sense, it is sane and I see that in what you have told me there can Perhaps be peace in the world. And I say to myself: 'Now, can I be free from fear? I see that I am responsible, totally, for the whole of consciousness. I See that when I am investigating fear I am helping the total human consciousness to lessen fear. Then death has a totally different meaning. I no longer have phantasies that I am going to sit next to god, or that I am going to heaven through some Peculiar nebula. I am living a life which is not my particular life. I am living a life of the whole of humanity and if I understand death, if I understand grief, I am cleansing the whole of the consciousness of mankind. That is why it is important to understand the meaning of death and perhaps to find that death has great significance, great relationship with love, because where you end something love is. When you end attachment completely then love is.

Chapter 7 7th Public Talk

Saanen 26th July 1981

We have talked about the complex problem of existence, about the forming of images in our relationships with each other and the images which thought projects and which we worship. We have talked about fear, pleasure and the ending of sorrow and the question of what love is, apart from all the travail that is involved in so-called love. We have talked about compassion with its intelligence and about death. We ought now to talk about religion.

Many intellectuals, throughout the world, shy away from the subject of religion. They see what religions are in the present world, with their beliefs, dogmas, rituals and the hierarchical set-up of their established existence; and they rather scoff at and run away from anything to do with religion. And as they age and come near to that threshold called death, they often revert to their old conditioning: they become Catholics or pursue some guru in India or Japan. Religion throughout the world has lost its credibility and no longer has any significance in daily life. The more you examine, the more you are aware of the whole content of all the religious structures, the more sceptical you become about the whole business and like the intellectuals, you have nothing to do with them. And those who are not sceptical, treat religions romantically, emotionally, or as a form of entertainment.

If one puts aside the intellectual, the romantic and sentimental attitudes towards religions, one can then begin to ask, not with any naivety, but with seriousness: what is religion? - not looking for the mere meaning of that word, but deeply. Man, from ancient times, has always thought that there must be something beyond ordinary daily life, the ordinary misery, confusion and conflict of daily life. In his search he has invented all kinds of philosophies, created all kinds of images - from those of the ancient Egyptians and the ancient Hindus to modern times - always getting caught apparently in some kind of delusion. He deludes himself and out of those delusions he creates all kinds of activities. If one could brush all that aside, not hypnotizing oneself,

being free from illusion, then one can begin to examine, enquire very profoundly if there is something beyond all the contagion of thought, all the corruption of time, if there is something beyond one's usual existence in space and time and if there is any path to it, or no path, and how the mind can reach it, or come to it. If one asks that of oneself then how shall one set about it? Is any kind of preparation necessary - discipline, sacrifice, control, a certain period of preparation and then advance?

First of all it is important to understand that one should be free of all illusions. So, what creates illusions? Is it not the desire to reach something, to experience something out of the ordinary - extrasensory perception, visions, spiritual exPeriences? One must be very clear as to the nature of desire and understand the movement of desire, which is thought with its image and also have no motive in one's enquiry. It may seem very difficult to have no intention, to have no sense of direction so that the brain is free to enquire. There must be order in one's house, in one's existence, in one's relationships, in one's activity. Without order, which is freedom, there can be no virtue. Virtue, righteousness, is not something that is intellectually cultivated. Where there is order there is virtue; that order is something that is living, not a routine, a habit.

Secondly: is there something to be learnt? Is there something to be learnt from another? One can learn from another, history, biology, mathematics, physics; the whole complex knowledge of the technological world one can learn from another, from books. Is there something to be learned from psychology about our lives, about that which is eternal? - if there is something eternal. Or is it that there is nothing to learn from another because all the human experience, all the psychological knowledge that humanity has gathered together for millions of years, is within oneself. If that is so, if one's consciousness is that of the whole of mankind then it seems rather absurd, rather naive, to try to learn from somebody else about oneself. It requires complete clarity of observation to learn about ourselves. That is simple. So there is no psychological authority and no spiritual authority, because the whole history of mankind, which is the story of humanity, is in oneself.

Therefore there is nothing to exPerience. There is nothing to be learnt from somebody who says: `I know' or, `I will show you the path to truth' - from the priests throughout the world, the interpreters between the highest and the lowest. To learn about, to understand, oneself, all authority must be set aside. Obviously. authority is part of oneself, one is the priest, the disciple, the teacher, one is the experience and one is the ultimate - if one knows how to understand.

There is nothing to be learnt from anybody, including the speaker; especially one must not be influenced by the speaker. One has to be free to enquire very, very deeply, not superficially. One may have done all the superficial enquiry during the last five or fifty years, and have come to the point when one has established order, more or less, in one's life, and as one goes along one may establish greater order, so that one can ask: what is the religious mind which can understand what meditation is?

Within the last fifteen years, that word meditation has become very popular in the West. Before that, only very few, who had been to Asia, enquired into the Eastern forms of meditation. The Asiatics have said that only through meditation can you come to, or understand, that which is the timeless, which has no measure. But during recent years, those who have nothing to do but call themselves gurus, have come over to the West bringing that word. It has become a word that has made meditation seem like a drug. There are also the various systems of meditation - the Tibetan, the Hindu, the Japanese Zen, and so on. These systems have been invented by thought and thought being limited the systems must inevitably be limited. And also they become mechanical, for if you repeat, repeat, your mind naturally goes dull, rather stupid and utterly gullible. It is common sense all this, but there is such eagerness to experience something spiritual, either through drugs, through alcohol, or by following a system of meditation which it is hoped will give some kind of exciting experience; there is such boredom with the daily life of going to the office for the next forty years and at the end of it to die. There is such boredom with the established religions that when somebody comes along with

some fantastic notions people fall for them. This is happening; this is not exaggeration, this is not attacking anybody personally but a statement of the nonsense that is going on.

So, if one is sufficiently aware of all this one will have put it aside, for it is utterly meaningless; one does not have to go to India, or Tibet, or to Rome, if one uses common sense and has a critical mind that is questioning what others say and also questioning oneself. It is important to question anything that one considers to be correct, noble, or a real experience and it is essential to maintain a mind that is capable, rational, sane, free from all the illusions and any form of self-hypnosis.

Then what is a human being? The human being has lived on thought; all the architecture, all the music, the things that are inside the churches, the temples and mosques, they are all invented by thought. All our relationships are based on thought, though we say, 'I love you', it is still based on the image which thought has created about another. Thought, to the human being, is astonishingly important; and thought itself is limited; its action is to bring about fragmentation - the fragmentation between people - my religion, my country, my god, my belief as opposed to yours, all that is the movement of thought, space and time.

Meditation is the capacity of the brain which is no longer functioning partially - the brain which has freed itself from its conditioning and is therefore functioning as a whole. The meditation of such a brain is different from the mere contemplation of one conditioned as a Christian or a Hindu, whose contemplation is from a background, from a conditioned mind. Contemplation does not free one from conditioning. Meditation demands a great deal of enquiry and becomes extraordinarily serious in order not to function partially. By partially is meant to function in a particular specialization or particular occupation that makes the brain narrow in accepting beliefs, traditions, dogmas and rituals, all of which are invented by thought. The Christians use the word 'faith' - faith in god, in providence so that things will come out all right.

The Asiatics have their own forms of faith - karma, reincarnation and spiritual evolution. Meditation is different from contemplation in the sense that meditation demands that the brain acts wholly and is no longer conditioned to act partially. That is the requirement for meditation, otherwise it has no meaning.

So the question is: is it possible to live in this world, which demands certain forms of specialization, a skilful mechanic, mathematician, or housewife, yet to be free from specialization? Suppose I am a theoretical physicist and have spent most of my life in mathematical formulation, thinking about it, questioning it, cultivating considerable knowledge about it, so that my brain has become specialized, narrowed down and then I begin to enquire into meditation. Then in my enquiry into meditation I can only partially understand the significance and the depth of it because I am anchored in something else, in the theoretical physics of my profession; anchored there I begin to enquire theoretically whether there is meditation whether there is the timeless; so my enquiry becomes partial again. But I have to live in this world; I am a professor at a university; I have a wife and children, I have that responsibility and perhaps I am also ill; yet I want to enquire very profoundly into the nature of truth, which is part of meditation. So the question is: is it possible to be specialized as a theoretical physicist and yet leave it at a certain level so that my brain (the brain which is the common brain of all humanity) can say: yes, it has that specialized function but that function is not going to interfere?

If I am a carpenter, I know the quality of the wood, the grain, the beauty of the wood and the tools with which to work it. And I see that that is natural and I also see that the brain that has cultivated the speciality cannot possibly understand the wholeness of meditation. If as a carpenter I understand this, the truth of it, that I, as a carpenter have a place, but also that that specialization has no place in the wholeness of comprehension, in the wholeness of understanding meditation, then that specialization becomes a small affair.

So then we begin to ask: what is meditation? First of all, meditation demands attention, which is to give your whole capacity, energy, in observation. Attention is different from concentration. Concentration is an effort made by thought to focus its capacity, its energy, on a particular subject. When you are in school you are trained to concentrate, that is to bring all your energy to a particular point. In concentration you are not allowing any other kind of thoughts to interfere; concentration implies the controlling of thought, not allowing it to wander away but keeping it focused on a particular subject. It is the operation of thought which focuses attention, focuses energy, on that subject. In that operation of thought there is compulsion, control. So in concentration there is the controller and the controlled. Thought is wandering off; thought says it should not wander off, and I bring it back as the controller who says, 'I must concentrate on this.' So there is a controller and the controlled. Who is the controller? The controller is part of thought and the controller is the past. The controller says, 'I have learnt a great deal and it is important for me, the controller, to control thought.' That is: thought has divided itself as the controller and the controlled; it is a trick that thought is playing upon itself. Now, in attention there is no controller, nor is there the controlled, there is only attention. So a careful examination is required into the nature of concentration with its controller and the controlled. All our life there is this controller - 'I must do this, I must not do that, I must control my desires, control my anger, control my impetus.'

We must be very clear in understanding what concentration is and what attention is. In attention there is no controller. So, is there in daily existence, a way of living in which every form of psychological control ceases to exist? - because control means effort, it means division between the controller and the controlled; I am angry, I must control my anger; I smoke, I must not smoke and I must resist smoking. We are saying there is something totally different and this may be misunderstood and may be rejected altogether because it is very common to say that all life is control - if you do not control you will become permissive, nonsensical, without meaning, therefore you must control.

Religions, philosophies, teachers, your family, your mother, they all encourage you to control. We have never asked: who is the controller? The controller is put together in the past, the past which is knowledge, which is thought. Thought has separated itself as the controller and the controlled. Concentration is the operation of that. Understanding that, we are asking a much more fundamental question, which is: can one live in this world, with a family and responsibilities, without a shadow of control?

See the beauty of that question. Our brain has been trained for thousands of years to inhibit, to control, and now it is never operating with the wholeness of itself. See for yourself what it is doing; watch your own brain in operation, rationally, critically examining it in a way in which there is no deception or hypnosis. Most of the meditations that have been put forward from the Asiatic world involve control; control thought so that you have a mind that is at peace, that is quiet, that is not eternally chattering. Silence, quietness and the absolute stillness of the mind, the brain, are necessary in order to perceive and to achieve these forms of meditation, however subtle, have control as their basis. Alternatively you hand yourself over to a guru, or to some ideal and you can forget yourself because you have given yourself over to something and therefore you are at Peace, but again it is the movement of thought, desire and the excitement of attaining something you have been offered.

Attention is not the opposite of concentration. The opposite has its root in its own opposite. If love is the opposite of hate, then love is born out of hate. Attention is not the opposite of concentration, it is totally divorced from it. Does attention need effort? That is one of our principal activities; I must make an effort; I am lazy, I do not want to get up this morning, but I must get up, make an effort. I do not want to do something but I must. See how extraordinary it is that we cannot catch the significance of this immediately. It has to be explained, explained, explained. We seem to be incapable of direct perception of the difference between concentration and attention; unable to have an insight into attention and be attentive.

When does attention take place? Obviously not through effort. When one makes an effort to be attentive, it is an indication that one is inattentive and is trying to make that inattention become attention. But to have quick insight, to see instantly the falseness of all religious organizations, so that one is out of them. To see instantly that the observer is the observed and therefore one makes no effort, it is so. Effort exists when there is division. Does it not indicate that one's brain has become dull because one has been trained, trained, so it has lost its pristine quickness, its capacity to see directly without all the explanations and words, words, words. But unfortunately one has to go into this because one's mind, one's brain, cannot, for example grasp instantly, that truth has no path; it is unable to see the immensity of that statement, the beauty of it and put aside all paths so that one's brain becomes extraordinarily active. One of the difficulties is that one has become mechanical. If one's brain is not extraordinarily alive and active it will gradually wither away. Now one's brain has to think, it has to be active, if only partially, but when the computer can take over all the work and most of the thought, operating with a rapidity which the brain cannot, then the brain is going to wither. This is happening, it is not an exaggerated statement of the speaker, it is happening now and we are unaware of it.

In concentration there is always a centre from which one is acting. When one concentrates one is concentrating for some benefit, for some deep rooted motive; one is observing from a centre. Whereas in attention there is no centre at all. When one looks at something immense - like the mountains with their extraordinary majesty, the line against the blue sky and the beauty of the valley - the beauty of it for a moment drives out the centre; one is for a second stunned by the greatness of it. Beauty is that perception when the centre is not. A child, given a toy, is so absorbed by it that he is no longer mischievous, he is completely with the toy. But he breaks the toy and he is back to himself. Most of us are absorbed by our various toys; when the toys go, we are back to ourselves. In the understanding of ourselves without the toy, without any direction, without any motive, is the freedom from specialization which makes

the whole of the brain active. The whole of the brain when it is active is total attention.

One is always looking or feeling with part of the senses. One hears some music, but one never really listens. One is never aware of anything with all one's senses. When one looks at a mountain, because of its majesty, one's senses are fully in operation, therefore one forgets oneself. When one looks at the movement of the sea or the sky with the slip of a moon, when one is aware totally, with all one's senses, that is complete attention in which there is no centre. Which means that attention is the total silence of the brain, there is no longer chattering, it is completely still - an absolute silence of the mind and the brain. There are various forms of silence - the silence between two noises, the silence between two notes, the silence between thoughts, the silence when you go into a forest - where there is the great danger of a dangerous animal, everything becomes totally silent. This silence is not put together by thought, nor does it arise through fear. When one is really frightened one's nerves and brain become still - but meditation is not that quality of silence, it is entirely different. Its silence is the operation of the whole of the brain with all the senses active. It is freedom which brings about the total silence of the mind. It is only such a mind, such a mind-brain, that is absolutely quiet - not quietness brought about by effort, by determination, by desire, by motive. This quietness is the freedom of order, which is virtue, which is righteousness in behaviour. In that silence alone is there that which is nameless and timeless. That is meditation.

- Amsterdam -

Chapter 8 1st Public Talk

Amsterdam 19th September 1981

Most unfortunately there are only two talks and so it is necessary to condense what we have to say about the whole of existence. We are not doing any kind of propaganda; we are not persuading you to think in one particular direction, nor convince you about anything - we must be quite sure of that. We are not bringing something exotic from the East like the nonsense that goes on in the name of the gurus and those people who write strange things after visiting India - we do not belong to that crowd at all. And we would like to point out that during these two talks we are thinking together, not merely listening to some ideas and either agreeing or disagreeing with them; we are not creating arguments, opinions, judgements, but together - I mean together, you and the speaker - we are going to observe what the world has become, not only in the West but also in the East where there is great poverty, great misery, with enormous overpopulation, where the politicians, as here in the West, are incapable of dealing with what is happening. All politicians are thinking in terms of tribalism. Tribalism has become glorified nationalism. We cannot therefore rely on any politicians, on any leaders, or on any books that have been written about religion. We cannot possibly rely on any of these people, nor on the scientists, the biologists, or the psychologists. They have not been able to solve our human problems. I am quite sure you agree to all that. Nor can we rely on any of the gurus who unfortunately come to the West and exploit people and get very rich, they have nothing whatsoever to do with religion.

Having said all this it is important that we, you and the speaker, think together. We mean by thinking together not merely accepting any kind of opinion or evaluation but observing together, not only externally what is hapPening in the world, but also what is happening to all of us inwardly, psychologically. Externally, outwardly, there is great uncertainty, confusion,

wars, or the threat of war. There are wars going on now in some parts of the world; human beings are killing each other. That is not happening in the West, here, but there is the threat of nuclear war, and the preparation for war. And we ordinary human beings do not seem to be able to do anything about all that. There are demonstrations, terrorism, hunger strikes and so on. There is one tribal group against another and the scientists are contributing to that, and the philosophers, though they may talk against it, are inwardly continuing to think in terms of nationalism, according to their own particular careers. So that is what is actually going on in the outward world, which any intelligent human being can observe.

And inwardly, in our own minds and in our own hearts, we ourselves are also very confused. There is no security, not only, perhaps, for ourselves but for the future generation. Religions have divided human beings as the Christians, the Hindus, the Muslims, and the Buddhists. So considering all this, observing objectively, calmly without any prejudice, it is naturally important that together we think about it all. Think together, not having opinions opposing other sets of opinions, not having one conclusion against another conclusion, one ideal against another ideal, but rather thinking together and seeing what we human beings can do. The crisis is not in the economic world, nor in the political world; the crisis is in consciousness. I think very few of us realize this. The crisis is in our mind and in our heart; that is, the crisis is in our consciousness. Our consciousness is our whole existence. With our beliefs, with our conclusions, with our nationalism, with all the fears that we have, it is our pleasures, the apparently insoluble problems and the thing that we call love, compassion; it includes the problem of death - wondering if there is anything hereafter, anything beyond time, beyond thought and if there is something eternal: that is the content of our consciousness.

That is the content of the consciousness of every human being, in whatever part of the world he lives. The content of our consciousness is the common ground of all humanity. I think this must be made very clear right from the beginning. A human being living in any part of the world suffers, not only

physically but also inwardly. He is uncertain, fearful, confused, anxious without any sense of deep security. So our consciousness is common to all mankind. Please do listen to this. You may be hearing this for the first time so please do not discard it. Let us investigate it together, let us think about it together, not when you get home but now: your consciousness, what you think, what you feel, your reactions, your anxiety, your loneliness, your sorrow, your pain, your search for something that is not merely physical but goes beyond all thought, is the same as that of a person living in India or Russia or America. They all go through the same problems as you do, the same problems of relationship with each other, man, woman. So we are all standing on the same ground of consciousness. Our consciousness is common to all of us and therefore we are not individuals. Please do consider this. We have been trained, educated, religiously as well as scholastically, to think that we are individuals, separate souls, striving for ourselves, but that is an illusion because our consciousness is common to all mankind. So we are mankind. We are not separate individuals fighting for ourselves. This is logical, this is rational, sane. We are not separate entities with separate psychological content, struggling for ourselves, but we are, each one of us, actually the rest of human kind.

Perhaps you will accept the logic of this intellectually, but if you feel it profoundly then your whole activity undergoes a radical change. That is the first issue we have to think about together: that our consciousness, the way we think, the way we live, some perhaps more comfortably, more affluently, with greater facility to travel than others, is inwardly, psychologically, exactly similar to that of those who live thousands and thousands of miles away.

All is relationship, our very existence is to be related. Observe what we have done with our relationships with each other, whether intimate or not. In all relationship there is tremendous conflict, struggle - why? Why have human beings, who have lived for over a million years, not solved this problem of relationship? So let us this morning think together about it. Let us observe together actually what the relationship between a man and a woman is. All

society is based on relationship. There is no society if there is no relationship, society then becomes an abstraction.

One observes that there is conflict between man and woman. The man has his own ideals, his own pursuits, his own ambitions, he is always seeking success, to be somebody in the world. And the woman is also struggling, also wanting to be somebody, wanting to fulfil, to become. Each is pursuing his or her own direction. So it is like two railway lines running parallel, never meeting, except perhaps in bed, but otherwise - if you observe closely - never actually meeting psychologically, inwardly. Why? That is the question. When we ask why, we are always asking for the cause; we think in terms of causation, hoping that if we could understand the cause then perhaps we would change the effect.

So we are asking a very simple but very complex question: why is it that we human beings have not been able to solve this problem of relationship though we have lived on this earth for millions of years? Is it because each one has his own particular image put together by thought, and that our relationship is based on two images, the image that the man creates about her and the image the woman creates about him? So in this relationship we are as two images living together. That is a fact. If you observe yourself very closely, if one may point out, you have created an image about her and she has created a picture, a verbal structure, about you, the man. So relationship is between these two images. These images have been put together by thought. And thought is not love. All the memories of this relationship with each other, the pictures, the conclusions about each other, are, if one observes closely without any prejudice, the product of thought; they are the result of various remembrances, experiences, irritations and loneliness, and so our relationship with each other is not love but the image that thought has put together. So if we are to understand the actuality of relationships we have to understand the whole movement of thought, because we live by thought; all our actions are based on thought, all the great buildings, the cathedrals, churches, temples and mosques of the world are the result of thought. And everything inside

these religious buildings - the figures, the symbols, the images - are all the invention of thought. There is no refuting that. Thought has created not only the most marvellous buildings and the contents of those buildings, but it has also created the instruments of war, the bomb in all its various forms. Thought has also produced the surgeon and his marvellous instruments, so delicate in surgery. And thought has also produced the carpenter, his study of wood and the tools he uses. The contents of a church, the skill of a surgeon, the expertise of the engineer who builds a beautiful bridge, are all the result of thought - there is no refuting that. So one has to examine what thought is and why human beings live on thought and why thought has brought about such chaos in the world - war and lack of relationship with each other - and examine the great capacity of thought with its extraordinary energy. We must also see how thought has, through millions of years, brought such sorrow for mankind. Please observe this together, let us examine it together. Do not just oppose what the speaker is saying, but examine what he is saying together so that we understand what is actually happening to all of us human beings, for we are destroying ourselves.

Thought is the response of the memory of things past; it also projects itself as hope into the future. Memory is knowledge; knowledge is memory of experience. That is, there is experience, from experience there is knowledge as memory, and from memory you act. From that action you learn, which is further knowledge. So we live in this cycle - experience, memory, knowledge, thought and thence action - always living within the field of knowledge.

What we are talking about is very serious. It is not something for the weekend, for a casual listening, it is concerned with a radical change of human consciousness. So we have to think about all this, look together, and ask why we human beings, who have lived on this earth for so many millions of years, are still as we are. We may have advanced technologically, have better communication, better transportation, hygiene and so on, but inwardly we are the same, more or less - unhappy, uncertain, lonely, carrying the burden of sorrow endlessly. And any serious man confronted with this challenge must

respond; he cannot take it casually, turn his back on it. That is why these meetings are very, very serious because that is why we have to apply our minds and our hearts to finding out if it is possible to bring about a radical mutation in our consciousness and therefore in our action and behaviour.

Thought is born of experience and knowledge, and there is nothing sacred whatsoever about thought. Thinking is materialistic, it is a process of matter. And we have relied on thinking to solve all our problems in politics and religions and in our relationships. Our brains, our minds, are conditioned, educated to solve problems. Thinking has created problems and then our brains, our minds, are trained to solve them with more thinking. All problems are created, psychologically and inwardly, by thought. Follow what is happening. Thought creates the problem, psychologically; the mind is trained to solve problems with further thinking, so thought in creating the problem then tries to solve it. So it is caught in a continuous process, a routine. Problems are becoming more and more complex, more and more insoluble, so we must find out if it is at all possible to approach life in a different way, not through thought because thought does not solve our problems; on the contrary thought has brought about greater complexity. We must find out - if it is possible or not - whether there is a different dimension, a different approach, to life altogether. And that is why it is important to understand the nature of our thinking. Our thinking is based on remembrance of things past - which is thinking about what happened a week ago, thinking about it modified in the present, and projected into the future. This is actually the movement of our life. So knowledge has become all-important for us but knowledge is never complete. Therefore knowledge always lives within the shadow of ignorance. That is a fact. It is not the speaker's invention or conclusion, but it is so.

Love is not remembrance. Love is not knowledge. Love is not desire or pleasure. Remembrance, knowledge, desire and pleasure are based on thought. Our relationship with each other, however near, if looked at closely, is based on remembrance, which is thought. So that relationship - though you may say you love your wife or your husband or your girl friend - is actually

based on remembrance, which is thought. And in that there is no love. Do you actually see that fact? Or do you say, -What a terrible thing to say. I do love my wife? - but is that so? Can there be love when there is jealousy, possessiveness, attachment, when each one is pursuing his own particular direction of ambition, greed and envy, like two parallel lines never meeting? Is that love?

I hope we are thinking together, observing together, as two friends walking along a road and seeing what is around us, not only what is very close and immediately perceived, but what is in the distance. We are taking the journey together, perhaps affectionately, hand in hand - two friends amicably examining the complex problem of life, neither of them leader or guru, because when one sees actually that our consciousness is the consciousness of the rest of mankind, then one realizes that one is both the guru and the disciple, the teacher as well as the pupil, because all that is in one's consciousness. That is a tremendous realization. So as one begins to understand oneself deeply one becomes a light to oneself and not dependent on anybody, on any book or on any authority - including that of the speaker - so that one is capable of understanding this whole problem of living and of being a light to oneself.

Love has no problems and to understand the nature of love and compassion with its own intelligence, we must understand together what desire is. Desire has extraordinary vitality, extraordinary persuasion, drive, achievement; the whole process of becoming, success, is based on desire - desire which makes us compare ourselves with each other, imitate, conform. It is very important in understanding the nature of ourselves to understand what desire is, not to suppress it, not to run away from it, not to transcend it, but to understand it, to see the whole momentum of it. We can do that together, which does not mean that you are learning from the speaker. The speaker has nothing to teach you. Please realize this. The speaker is merely acting as a mirror in which you can see yourself. Then when you see yourself clearly you can discard the mirror, it has no more importance, you can break it up.

To understand desire requires attention, seriousness. It is a very complex problem to understand why human beings have lived on this extraordinary energy of desire as on the energy of thought. What is the relationship between thought and desire? What is the relationship between desire and will? We live a great deal by will. So what is the movement, the source, the origin, of desire? If one observes oneself one sees the origin of desire; it begins with sensory responses; then thought creates the image and at that moment desire begins. One sees something in the window, a robe, a shirt, a car, whatever it is - one sees it, sensation, then one touches it, and then thought says, 'If I put on that shirt or dress how nice it will look' - that creates the image and then begins desire. So the relationship between desire and thought is very close. If there were no thought there would only be sensation. Desire is the quintessence of will. Thought dominates sensation and creates the urge, the desire, the will, to possess. When in relationship thought operates - which is remembrance, which is the image created about each other by thought - there can be no love. Desire, sexual or other forms of desire, prevent love - because desire is part of thought.

We should consider in our examination the nature of fear because we are all caught in this terrible thing called fear. We do not seem to be able to resolve it. We live with it, become accustomed to it, or escape from it through amusement, through worship, through various forms of entertainment, religious and otherwise. Fear is common to all of us, whether we live in this tidy, clean country, or in India where it is untidy, dirty and overpopulated. It is the same problem, fear, which man has lived with for thousands and thousands of years and which he has not been able to resolve. Is it possible - one is asking this question most seriously - is it at all possible to be totally, completely, free of fear, not only the physical forms of fear but the much more subtle forms of inward fear - conscious fears and the deep undiscovered fears which we have never even known were there? Examination of these fears does not mean analysis. It is the fashion to turn to the analyst if you have any problem. But the analyst is like you and me, only he has a certain technique.

Analysis implies there is an analyser. Is the analyser different from that which he analyses? Or is the analyser the analysed? The analyser is the analysed. That is an obvious fact. If I am analysing myself, who is the analyser in me who says, 'I must analyse'? It is still the analyser separating himself from the analysed and then examining that which is to be analysed. So the analyser is that which he is analysing. They are the same. To separate them is a trick played by thought. But when we observe, there is no analysis; there is merely the observing of things as they are - the observing of that which actually is, not analysing that which is, because in the process of analysing we can deceive ourselves. If you like to play that game you can, and go on endlessly until you die, analysing, and never bringing about a radical transformation within yourself. Whereas to look at the present as it is - not as a Dutchman, an Englishman, or a Frenchman or as this or that - to see what is actually happening, is pure observation of things as they are.

To observe what fear is, is not to examine the cause of fear, which implies analysis and going further and further back into the origin of fear. It is to learn the art of observing and not translating or interpreting what you observe, but just observing, as you would observe a lovely flower. The moment you take it to pieces the flower is not. That is what analysis does. But observe the beauty of a flower, or the evening light in a cloud, or a tree by itself in a forest, just observe. So similarly, we can observe fear and what is the root of fear - not the various aspects of fear.

We are asking if it is at all possible to be free of fear, absolutely. Psychologically, inwardly, what is the root of fear? What does fear mean? Does not fear arise from something that has given you pain in the past which might happen again in the future? Not what might happen now because now there is no fear. You can see for yourself that fear is a time process. Something that happened last week, an incident which brought psychological or physical pain, and from that there is fear that it might happen again tomorrow. Fear is a movement in time; a movement from the past through the present, modifying the future. So the origin of fear is thought. And thought is

time, it is the accumulation of knowledge through experience, the response of memory as thought, then action. So thought and time are one; thought and time are the root of fear. That is fairly obvious. It is so.

Now it is not a question of stopping thought or time. Of course it would be impossible to stop them because the entity who says, 'I must stop thought' is part of thought. So the idea of stopping thought is absurd. It implies a controller who is trying to control thought and such a controller is created by thought. Please just observe this; OBSERVATION IS AN ACTION IN ITSELF, it is not that one must do something about fear. I wonder if you understand this?

Suppose I am afraid about something or other, darkness, my wife running away, loneliness, or this or that. I am frightened, deeply. You come along and explain to me the whole movement of fear, the origin of fear, which is time. I had pain; I went through some accident or incident that caused pain, that is recorded in the brain, and the memory of that past incident produces the thought that it might happen again, and therefore there is fear. So you have explained this to me. And I have listened very carefully to your explanation, I see the logic of it, the sanity of it, I do not reject it; I listen. And that means that listening becomes an art. I do not reject what you are saying, nor accept, but I observe. And I observe that what you tell me about time and thought, is actual. I do not say, 'I must stop time and thought', but having had it explained to me, I just observe how fear arises, that it is a movement of thought, time. I just observe this movement and do not move away from it, I do not escape from it but live with it, look at it, put my energy into looking. Then I see that fear begins to dissolve because I have done nothing about it, I have just observed, I have given my whole attention to it. That very attention is like bringing light on fear. Attention means giving all your energy in that observation.

Why is it that man pursues pleasure? Please ask yourself why. Is pleasure the opposite of pain? We have all had pain of different kinds, both physical and psychological. Psychologically, most of us from childhood have been

wounded, hurt; that is pain. The consequence of that pain has been to withdraw, to isolate oneself so as not to be further hurt. From childhood, through school, by comparing ourselves with somebody else who is more clever, we have hurt ourselves, and others have hurt us through various forms of scolding, saying something brutal, terrorizing us. And there is this deep hurt with all its consequences, which are isolation, resistance, more and more withdrawal. And the opposite of that we think is pleasure. Pain and the opposite of it is pleasure. Is goodness the opposite of that which is not good? If goodness is the opposite, then that goodness contains its own opposite. Therefore it is not good. Goodness is something totally separate from that which is not goodness. So is pleasure something opposite to pain? Is it a contrast? We are always pursuing the contrast, the opposite. So one is asking, is pleasure entirely separate, like goodness, from that which is not pleasurable? Or is pleasure tainted by pain? When you look closely at pleasure it is always remembrance, is it not? You never say when you are happy, 'How happy I am', it is always after; it is the remembrance of that which gave you pleasure, like a beautiful sunset, the glory of an evening, full of that extraordinary light, it gave great delight. Then that is remembered and pleasure is born. So pleasure is part of thought too - it is so obvious. The understanding of relationship, fear, pleasure and sorrow, is to bring order in our house. Without order you cannot possibly meditate. Now the speaker puts meditation at the end of the talk because there is no possibility of right meditation if you have not put your house, your psychological house, in order. If the psychological house is in disorder, if what you are is in disorder, what is the point of meditating? It is just an escape. It leads to all kinds of illusions. You may sit cross-legged or stand on your head for the rest of your life but that is not meditation. Meditation must begin with bringing about complete order in your house - order in your relationships, order in your desires, pleasures and so on.

One of the causes of disorder in our life is sorrow. This is a common factor, a common condition, in all human beings. Everyone goes through this tragedy

of sorrow, whether in the Asiatic world or in the Western world. Again this is a common thing we all share. There is not only so-called personal sorrow but there is the sorrow of mankind, the sorrow which wars have brought about - five thousand years of historical records and every year there has been a war, killing, violence, terror, brutality, the maiming of people, people who have no hands, no eyes - the horrors and the brutality of wars which have brought incalculable misery to mankind. It is not only one's own sorrow but the sorrow of mankind; the sorrow of seeing a man who has nothing whatsoever, just a piece of cloth, and for the rest of his life he is going to be that way - not so much in these Western countries, but in the Asiatic world it is like that. And when you see that person there is sorrow. There is also sorrow when people are caught in an illusion, like going from one guru to another, escaping from themselves. It is a sorrow to observe this, the clever people going off to the East, writing books about it, finding some guru - so many fall for that nonsense. There is the sorrow that comes when you see what the politicians are doing in the world - thinking in terms of tribalism. There is personal sorrow and the vast cloud of the sorrow of mankind. Sorrow is not something romantic, sentimental, illogical; it is there. We have lived with this sorrow from time measureless, and apparently we have not resolved this problem. When we suffer we seek consolation, which is an escape from the fact of sorrow. When there is that grief, you try every form of amusement and escape, but it always is there. Apparently humanity has not resolved it. And we are asking the question: is it possible to be free of it completely? Not avoiding it, not seeking consolation, not escaping into some fanciful theory, but is it possible to live with it. Understand those words 'to live with it': they mean not to let sorrow become a habit. Most people live with sorrow, with nationalism, which is most destructive, they live with their own separate religious conclusions, they live with their own fanciful ideas and ideals, which all again bring conflict. So live with something, live with sorrow, not accepting it, not becoming habituated to it - but look at it, observe it without any escape, without any question of trying to go beyond it, just 'hold it in your hand' and look. Sorrow is also part of the tremendous sense of loneliness: you may have many friends,

you may be married, you may have all kinds of things, but inwardly there is this feeling of complete loneliness. And that is part of sorrow. Observe that loneliness without any direction, without trying to go beyond it, without trying to find a substitute for it; live with it, not worship it, not become psychotic about it, but give all your attention to that loneliness, to that grief, to that sorrow.

It is a great thing to understand suffering because where there is freedom from sorrow there is compassion. One is not compassionate as long as one is anchored to any belief, to any particular form of religious symbol. Compassion is freedom from sorrow. Where there is compassion there is love. With that compassion goes intelligence - not the intelligence of thought with its cunning, with its adjustments, with its capacity to put up with anything. Compassion means the ending of sorrow and only then is there intelligence.

Chapter 9 2nd Public Talk

Amsterdam 20th September 1981

We are like two friends sitting in the park on a lovely day talking about life, talking about our problems, investigating the very nature of our existence, and asking ourselves seriously why life has become such a great problem, why, though intellectually we are very sophisticated, yet our daily life is such a grind, without any meaning, except survival - which again is rather doubtful. Why has life, everyday existence, become such a torture? We may go to church, follow some leader, political or religious, but the daily life is always a turmoil, though there are certain periods which are occasionally joyful, happy, there is always a cloud of darkness about our life. And these two friends, as we are, you and the speaker, are talking over together in a friendly manner, Perhaps with affection, with care, with concern, whether it is at all possible to live our daily life without a single problem. Although we are highly educated, have certain careers and specializations yet we have these unresolved struggles, the pain and suffering, and sometimes joy and a feeling of not being totally selfish.

So let us go into this question of why we human beings live as we do, going to the office from nine until five or six for fifty years, and always the brain, the mind, constantly occupied. There is never a quietness, there is never peace, but always this occupation with something or other. And that is our life. That is our daily, monotonous, rather lonely, insufficient life. And we try to escape from it through religion, through various forms of entertainment. At the end of the day we are still where we have been for thousands and thousands of years. We seem to have changed very little, psychologically, inwardly. Our problems increase, and always there is the fear of old age, disease, some accident that will put us out. So this is our existence, from childhood until we die, either voluntarily or involuntarily die. We do not seem to have been able to solve that problem, the problem of dying. Especially as one grows older one remembers all the things that have been the times of pleasure, the times of pain, and of sorrow, and of tears. Yet always there is this unknown thing called

death of which most of us are frightened. And as two friends sitting in the park on a bench, not in this hall with all this light, which is rather ugly, but sitting in the dappling light, the sun coming through the leaves, the ducks on the canal and the beauty of the earth, let us talk this over together. Let us talk it over together as two friends who have had a long serious life with all its trouble, the troubles of sex, loneliness, despair, depression, anxiety, uncertainty, a sense of meaninglessness - and at the end of it always death.

In talking about it, we approach it intellectually - that is, we rationalize it, say it is inevitable, not to fear it or escape from it through some form of belief in the hereafter, or reincarnation, or, if you are highly intellectual, telling yourself that death is the end of all things, of our existence, our experiences, our memories, be they tender, delightful, plentiful; the end also of pain and suffering. What does it all mean, this life which is really, if we examine it very closely, rather meaningless? We can, intellectually, verbally, construct a meaning to life but the way we actually live has very little meaning. Living and dying is all we know. Everything apart from that is theory, speculation; meaningless pursuit of a belief in which we find some kind of security and hope. We have ideals projected by thoughts and we struggle to achieve them. This is our life, even when we are very young, full of vitality and fun, with the feeling that we can do almost anything; but with youth, middle and old age supervening, there is always this question of death.

You are not merely, if one may point out, listening to a series of words, to some ideas, but rather together, I mean together, investigating this whole problem of living and dying. And either you do it with your heart, with your whole mind, or else partially, superficially - and so with very little meaning.

First of all we should observe that our brains never act fully, completely; we use only a very small part of our brain. That part is the activity of thought. Being in itself a part, thought is incomplete. The brain functions within a very narrow area, depending on our senses, which again are limited, partial; the whole of the senses are never free, awakened. I do not know if you have

experimented with watching something with all your senses, watching the sea, the birds and the moonlight at night on a green lawn, to see if you have watched partially or with all your senses fully awakened. The two states are entirely different. When you watch something partially you are establishing more the separative, egotistically centred attitude to living. But when you watch that moonlight on the water making a silvery path with all your senses, that is with your mind, with your heart, with your nerves, giving all your attention to that observation, then you will see for yourself that there is no centre from which you are observing.

Our ego, our personality, our whole structure as an individual, is entirely put together from memory; we are memory. Please, this is subject to investigation, do not accept it. Observe it, listen. The speaker is saying that the `you', the ego, the `me', is altogether memory. There is no spot or space in which there is clarity - you can believe, hope, have faith, that there is something in you which is uncontaminated, which is god, which is the spark of that which is timeless, you can believe all that, but that belief is merely illusory. All beliefs are. But the fact is that our whole existence is entirely memory, remembrances. There is no spot or space inwardly which is not memory. You can investigate this; if you are enquiring seriously into yourself you will see that the `me', the ego, is all memory, remembrances. And that is our life. We function, live, from memory. And for us, death is the ending of that memory.

Am I speaking to myself or are we all together in this? The speaker is used to talking in the open, under trees, or in a vast tent without these glaring lights, then we can have an intimate communication with each other. As a matter of fact there is only you and I talking together, not this enormous audience in a vast hall, but you and I sitting on the banks of a river, on a bench, talking over this thing together. And one is saying to the other, we are nothing but memory, and it is to that memory that we are attached - my house, my property, my experience, my relationship, the office or the factory I go to, the skill I like being able to use during a certain period of time - I am all that. To all that, thought is attached. That is what we call living. And this attachment creates all

manner of problems; when we are attached there is fear of losing; we are attached because we are lonely with a deep abiding loneliness which is suffocating, isolating, depressing. And the more we are attached to another, which is again memory, for the other is a memory, the more problems there are. I am attached to the name, to the form; my existence is attachment to those memories which I have gathered during my life. Where there is attachment I observe that there is corruption. When I am attached to a belief, hoping that in that attachment there will be a certain security, both psychologically as well as physically, that attachment prevents further examination. I am frightened to examine when I am greatly attached to something, to a person, to an idea, to an experience. So corruption exists where there is attachment. One's whole life is a movement within the field of the known This is obvious. Death means the ending of the known it means the ending of the physical organism, the ending of all the memory which I am, for I am nothing but memory - memory being the known. And I am frightened to let all that go, which means death. I think that is fairly clear, at least verbally. Intellectually you can accept that logically, sanely; it is a fact.

The Asiatic world believes in reincarnation, that is that the soul, the ego, the 'me', which is a bundle of memories, will be born next time to a better life if they behave rightly now, conduct themselves righteously, live a life without violence, without greed and so on, then in the next reincarnation they will have a better life, a better position. But a belief in reincarnation is just a belief because those who have this strong belief do not live a righteous life today. It is just an idea that the next life will be marvellous. They say that the quality of the next life must correspond to the quality of the present life. But the present life is so tortuous, so demanding, so complex, that they forget the belief, and struggle, deceive, become hypocrites, and accept every form of vulgarity. That is one response to death, believing in the next life. But what is it that is going to reincarnate? What is it that will continue? What is it that has continuity in our present daily life? It is the remembrance of yesterday's experiences,

pleasures, fears, anxieties, and that continues right through life unless we break it and move away from that current.

Now the question is: is it possible, while one is living, with all the energy, capacity and turmoil, to end, for example, attachment? Because that is what is going to happen when you die. You may be attached to your wife or husband, to your property. You may be attached to some belief in god which is merely a projection, or an invention, of thought, but you are attached to it because it gives a certain feeling of security however illusory it is. Death means the ending of that attachment. Now while living, can you end voluntarily, easily, without any effort, that form of attachment? Which means dying to something you have known - you follow? Can you do this? Because that is dying together with living, not separated by fifty years or so, waiting for some disease to finish you off. It is living with all your vitality, energy, intellectual capacity and with great feeling, and at the same time for certain conclusions, certain idiosyncrasies, exPeriences, attachments, hurts to end, to die. That is, while living, also live with death. Then death is not something far away, death is not something that is at the end of one`s life, brought about through some accident, disease or old age, but rather an ending to all the things of memory - that is death, a death not separate from living.

Also we should consider as two friends sitting together on the banks of a river, with the clear water flowing - not muddied, polluted water - seeing the movement of the waves pursuing each other down the river, why religion has played such a great part in people's lives from the most ancient of times until today? What is a religious mind, what is it like? What does the word `religion' actually mean? Because historically civilizations have disappeared, and new beliefs have taken their place, which have brought about new civilizations and new cultures - not the technological world of the computers, the submarines, the war materials, nor the businessmen, nor the economists, but religious people throughout the world have brought about a tremendous change. So one must enquire together into what we mean by `religion'. What is its significance? Is it mere superstition, illogical and meaningless? Or is there

something far greater, something infinitely beautiful? To find that, is it not necessary - we are talking this over together as two friends - is it not necessary to be free of all the things which thought has invented about religion?

Man has always sought something beyond the physical existence. He has always searched, asked, suffered, tortured himself, to find out if there is something which is not of time, which is not of thought, which is not belief or faith. To find that out one must be absolutely free, for if you are anchored to a particular form of belief, that very belief will prevent investigation into what is eternal - if there is such a thing as eternity which is beyond all time, beyond all measure. So one must be free - if one is serious in the enquiry into what religion is - one must be free of all the things that thought has invented about that which is considered religious. That is, all the things that Hinduism, for example, has invented, with its superstitions, with its beliefs, with its images, and its ancient literature such as the Upanishads - one must be completely free of all that. If one is attached to all that then it is impossible, naturally, to discover that which is original. You understand the problem? If my mind, my brain is conditioned by Hindu superstitions, beliefs, dogmas and idolatry, with all the ancient tradition, then it is anchored to that and cannot move, it is not free. Similarly, one must be free totally from all the inventions of thought, the rituals, dogmas, beliefs, symbols, saviours and so on of Christianity. That may be rather more difficult, that is coming nearer home. But all religions, whether Christian, Muslim, Hindu, Buddhist, are the movement of thought continued through time, through literature, through symbols, through things made by the hand or by the mind - and all that is considered religious in the modern world. To the speaker that is not religious. To the speaker it is a form of illusion, comforting, satisfying, romantic, sentimental but not actual.

Religion must affect the way we live, the significance of life, for then only is there order in our life. Order is something that is totally disassociated from disorder. We live in disorder - that is, in conflict, contradiction, saying one thing, doing another, chinking one way and acting in another way; that is

contradiction. Where there is contradiction, which is division, there must be disorder. And a religious mind is completely without disorder. That is the foundation of a religious life - not all the nonsense that is going on with the gurus with their idiocies.

It is a most extraordinary thing how many gurus have come to see the speaker, some of them because they think I attack them. They want to persuade me not to attack, they say what you are saying and what you are living is the absolute truth, but it is not for us because we must help those people who are not as fully advanced as you are. You see the game they play - you understand? So one wonders why some Western people go to India, follow these gurus, get initiated - whatever that may mean - put on different robes and think they are very religious. But strip them of their robes, stop them and enquire into them, and they are just like you and me. So the idea of going somewhere to find enlightenment, of changing your name to some Sanskrit name, seems strangely absurd and romantic, without any reality - but thousands are doing it. Probably it is a form of amusement without much meaning. The speaker is not attacking. Please let us understand that: we are not attacking anything, we are just observing - observing the absurdity of the human mind, how easily we are caught; we are so gullible.

A religious mind is a very factual mind; it deals with facts, with what is actually happening with the world outside and the world inside. The world outside is the expression of the world inside; there is no division between the outer and the inner. A religious life is a life of order, diligence, dealing with that which is actually within oneself, without any illusion, so that one leads an orderly, righteous life. When that is established, unshakeably, then we can begin to enquire into what meditation is.

Perhaps that word did not exist in the Western world, in its present usage until about thirty years or so ago. The Eastern gurus have brought it over here. There is the Tibetan meditation, Zen meditation, the Hindu meditation, the particular meditation of a particular guru - the yoga meditation, sitting cross

legged, breathing - you know all that. All that is called meditation. We are not denigrating the people who do all this. We are just pointing out how absurd meditation has become. The Christian world believes in contemplation, giving themselves over to the will of god, grace and so on. There is the same thing in the Asiatic world, only they use different words in Sanskrit, but it is the same thing - man seeking some kind of everlasting security, happiness, peace, and not finding it on earth, hoping that it exists somewhere or other - the desperate search for something imperishable - the search of man from time beyond measure.

So we should enquire together, deeply, into what meditation is and whether there is anything sacred, holy - not the thing that thought has invented as being holy, that is not holy. What thought creates is not holy, is not sacred, because it is based on knowledge, and how can anything that thought invents, being incomplete, be sacred? But all over the world we worship that which thought has invented.

There is no system, no practice but the clarity of perception of a mind that is free to observe, a mind which has no direction, no choice. Most systems of meditations have the problem of controlling thought. Most meditation, whether the Zen, the Hindu, the Buddhist, the Christian, or that of the latest guru, tries to control thought; through control you centralize, you bring all your energy to a particular point. That is concentration, which means that there is a controller different from the controlled. The controller is thought, memory, and that which he is controlling is still thought - which is wandering off, so there is conflict. You are sitting quietly and thought goes off; you are like a schoolboy looking out of the window and the teacher says, 'Don't look out of the window, concentrate on your book.' We have to learn the fact that the controller is the controlled. The controller, the thinker, the experiencer, are, we think, different from the controlled, from the movement of thought, from the experience. But if we observe closely, the thinker IS the thought. Thought has made the thinker separate from thought, who then says, 'I must control.' So when you see that the controller is the controlled you totally remove conflict. Conflict exists only

when there is the division. Where there is the division between the observer, the one who witnesses, the one who experiences and that which he observes and experiences, there must be conflict. Our life is in conflict because we live with this division. But this division is fallacious, it is not real, it has become our habit, our culture, to control. We never see that the controller is the controlled.

So when one realizes that fact - not verbally, not idealistically, not as a Utopian state for which you have to struggle, actually in one's life that the controller is the controlled, the thinker is the thought - then the whole pattern of one's thinking undergoes a radical change and there is no conflict. That change is absolutely necessary if one is meditating because meditation demands a mind that is highly compassionate, and therefore highly intelligent, with an intelligence which is born out of love, not out of cunning thought. Meditation means the establishment of order in one's daily life, so that there is no contradiction; it means having rejected totally all the systems of meditation so that one's mind is completely free, without direction; so that one's mind is completely silent. Is that possible? Because one is chattering endlessly; the moment one leaves this place one will start chattering. One's mind will continue everlastingly occupied, chattering, thinking, struggling, and so there is no space. Space is necessary to have silence, for a mind that is practising, struggling, to be silent is never silent. But when it sees that silence is absolutely necessary - not the silence projected by thought, not the silence between two notes, between two noises, between two wars, but the silence of order - then in that silence, truth, which has no path to it, exists. Truth that is timeless, sacred, incorruptible. That is meditation, that is a religious mind.

- Longer, Unedited Versions -
Saanen 1st Public Talk

12th July 1981

I see some of my old friends are here - I am glad to see you. I am sorry we are having bad weather - this is Switzerland!

As we are going to have six or seven talks we should go into what I am going to say very carefully, in detail, covering the whole field of life. So please those who have heard the speaker before please be patient, please have some kind of tolerance, if one may repeat, repetition has certain value. And as we are going to discuss, or talk over together, the many problems of our lives, it is important that we hear each other carefully, affectionately, with a sense of comprehension, not only the verbal meaning but what lies behind the word.

Prejudice has something in common with ideals, beliefs and faith. And as we are going to talk over together, observing the state of the world together, and what is happening in the outward world and also in the inward, psychological world of man, we must be able to think together. In thinking together our prejudices, our ideals and so on prevent the capacity and the energy required to think together, to observe together, to examine together, to discover for ourselves what lies behind all this confusion, misery, terror, destruction, tremendous violence; to understand all this, not only the mere outward facts that are taking place but also to understand the depth of all this, the significance of all this, we must be able together to observe - not you observing one way and the speaker another, but together observe the same thing. And that observation, that examination is prevented if we cling to our prejudices, to our particular experience, to our particular comprehension. So if we are to think together, and the thinking together becomes tremendously important because we have to face a world that is rapidly disintegrating, degenerating, where there is no sense of morality, nothing sacred in life, no one respects another. And to understand all this, not only superficially, casually, but we have to enter into the depths of it, into what lies behind all

this, why after all these millions and millions of years of evolution, why man, you and the whole world whether it is East, or West, or North, or South, why man has become like this - violent, callous, destructive, facing wars, the atomic bomb and all the technological world is becoming more and more, evolving. And perhaps that technological improvement may be one of the factors why man has become like this. So please let us think together, not according to my way or your way, but the capacity to think.

Thought is the common factor of all mankind. There is no Eastern thought, or Western thought, there is only the capacity to think, whether one is utterly poor or greatly sophisticated living in an affluent society, whether he is a surgeon, a carpenter, a labourer in the field, or a great poet, thought is the common factor of all of us. We don't seem to realize that. Thought is the common factor that binds us all. You may think differently, according to your capacity, to your energy, to your experience and knowledge; another thinks according to his experience, to his knowledge, to his conditioning. So we are all caught in this network of thought. This is a fact, indisputable and actual.

And to understand all the chaos in the world - and as we have been programmed both biologically, physically, programmed mentally, intellectually, one must be aware of this being programmed, like a computer. The computer has been programmed by the experts who programme it according to what they want. The speaker has talked a great deal with the professionals, the computer builders, and they are advancing so rapidly that these computers which have been programmed will outstrip man in thought. These computers learn - please follow all this. If you want to find out more about it you can discuss, read about them. These computers can learn, gather experience, and from that experience learn, accumulate knowledge according to being programmed. So gradually they are going to outstrip all our thinking, more accurately, with greater speed and so then what is man? I hope you are understanding all this. The computer experts, some of them are so frightened when the computer can do almost anything the human being can do. Of

course it cannot write, compose as Beethoven, or as Keats and so on but it will outstrip our thinking.

So we human beings have been programmed to be Catholics, to be Protestants, to be Italians, to be British, Swiss and so on. For centuries we have been programmed - to believe, to have faith, to follow certain rituals, certain dogmas, we have been programmed to be nationalists, we have been programmed to have wars. So our brain has become as the computer and it is not so capable because its thought is limited, whereas the computer being also limited but being able to think much more rapidly than human beings, it will outstrip us.

So these are facts, this is what actually is going on, especially in California, England and so on. Then what becomes of man? Then what is man? You understand my question? If the machines can do almost all that human beings can do, robots and the computer, what is the future society of man? When cars can be built by the robot and the computer, probably much better, then what is going to become of man as a social entity? These and many other problems are facing us. We cannot any more think as Christians, Buddhists, Hindus and Muslims and so on. We are facing a tremendous crisis; a crisis which the politicians can never solve because they are programmed to think in a particular way; nor can the scientists solve or understand the crisis; nor the business world, the world of money. So the crisis, the turning point is in our consciousness. Right? Please follow this step by step because we are going into it very carefully. The turning point, the perceptive decision, the challenge, whatever word you may like to use, is not in politics, in religion, in the scientific world, but one has to understand the consciousness of mankind, which has brought us to this point. One has to be very serious about this matter because we are really facing something very dangerous in the world, where the proliferation of the atomic bomb, where some lunatic will turn it on. We all must be aware of all this.

So, unless one is very, very serious, not flippant, not casual but is concerned with the whole of humanity, and to understand this human behaviour, human thought that has brought us all to this point, we must be able very carefully, hesitantly, with great observation, understand together what is happening both out there and inwardly. The inward psychological activity always overcomes the outer, however much you may have regulations, sanctions, decisions outwardly, lay down certain rules, regulations, all these are shattered by our psychological desires, fears, anxieties, the longing for security, the fear of loneliness. Unless we understand all that, however much we may have outward semblance of order, that inward disorder always overcomes that which is outwardly conforming, disciplined, regularized. I hope we understand this clearly. One may have carefully constructed institutions, politically, religiously, economically, whatever the construction of these be, unless our inward consciousness is in total order that disorder will always overcome the outer. We have seen this historically, it is happening right now in front of our eyes. This is a fact. (Noise of train.) There is our good old train! That train is as regular as we come here! It is quite amusing, isn't it? There is a great deal of humour in this but we won't go into that for the moment.

So please be serious even for this hour, if you cannot be serious all the time at least give your being serious whilst you are here.

As we said, the turning point is in our consciousness. Our consciousness is a very complicated affair. Volumes have been written about it both in the East and in the West. We are not aware of our own consciousness and to examine that complicated consciousness one has to be free to look, to be choicelessly aware of its movement. And that is what we are going to do together. When we use the word 'together', it is not that the speaker is directing you to look at it in a particular way, or to listen to all the movement, the inward movement of our consciousness. We are together looking at consciousness, which is not yours or mine, theirs or his. Consciousness is common to all mankind. All mankind whether they live in the Far East or the Near East, or in the far West, that consciousness, with all its content, is common to all mankind. When you

go to India, or the Far East, there they suffer inwardly as well as outwardly, as here. They are anxious, uncertain, utterly despairingly lonely, as you are here. They have no security, they are jealous, greedy, envious, suffering. And in the West it is the same thing. So human consciousness is one whole, it is not your consciousness or mine. It is the consciousness of humanity. Please understand this. It is logical, sane, rational because wherever you go, in whatever climate you live, whether you are affluent or degradingly poor, whether you believe in god, or in christ or in some other entity, the belief, the faith is common to all mankind. The picture may vary, the image may be different, the symbol may be totally different from another but that is common to all mankind. This is not a mere verbal statement. If you take it as a verbal statement, as an idea, as a concept, then you will not see the depth of it, the deep significance involved in this. The significance is that your consciousness is the consciousness of all humanity because you suffer, you are anxious, you are lonely, insecure, confused, exactly like another who lives ten thousand miles away from you. The realization of it, the feeling of it, the feeling in your guts, if I may use that word, is totally different from mere verbal acceptance of that. When one realizes that you are the rest of mankind, you have a tremendous energy, you have broken through the narrow groove of individuality, the narrow circle of me and you, they and we. And we are going to examine together this very, very complex consciousness of man, not the European man, not the Asiatic man or the Middle East man, but this extraordinary movement that has been going on for millions of years as conscious movement in time.

Please don't accept what the speaker is saying for then it will have no meaning, but if you begin to doubt, begin to question, be sceptical to enquire, not hold on to your own particular belief, faith, experience or the accumulated knowledge that you have been given, or that you have, and reduce it all to some kind of petty little 'me'. If one may point out very respectfully, you are not facing the tremendous issue that is facing man. So we are thinking together - I mean together - not you think one way, I think another, together as human

beings confronted with this tremendous danger of existence of the whole of humanity. Because the atom bomb, the wars, whether in the Middle East or somewhere else, the terror that is spreading all over the world, the kidnapping, the killing, the brutality of it all, we as human beings are responsible for all this. So we have to examine very closely and carefully the state of consciousness. We understand the meaning of that word to be conscious, to be aware, to recognise, to see what our actual consciousness is.

First thought and all the things that thought has made, put together, is part of our consciousness, the culture in which we live, the aesthetic values, the economic pressures, the national inheritance. If you are a surgeon, a carpenter, specialize in a particular profession, that group consciousness is part of your consciousness - right? You understand what we are saying? Are we making it difficult? We are not scholars, at least the speaker is not. We are dealing with human existence with all its complexities. If you live in a particular country with its particular tradition, with its religious culture and so on, that particular form has become part of your consciousness, the group consciousness - right? - the national consciousness, the particular professional consciousness. These again are facts. If you are a carpenter you have to have certain skills, understand the wood, the nature of the wood, the instrument, so you gradually belong to a group that has cultivated this special particular form and that has its own consciousness; like the scientist, like the archeologist, like the animals have their own particular consciousness as a group and so on and so on, that is part of your consciousness. Right? Please see the fact of this for yourself. If you are a housewife you have your own particular consciousness, like all the other housewives, it is a group consciousness. Permissiveness has spread throughout the world; it began in the West, far West and has spread right through the world. That is a group conscious movement - right? See the significance of it. Please understand, go into it for yourself, see what is involved in it. They are discovering scientifically, they are experimenting with certain animals, say in England and say in Australia, and those animals learn much quicker there because one set of animals, like rats, have learnt after

twenty generations certain actions, and the twenty fifth or twenty eighth learn much more rapidly. And in Australia these rats have learnt much quicker without going through all the experiments - you understand all this? So it is not a genetic transformation, genetically evolving, but there is the group consciousness that is operating - you understand this? I hope you understand this.

The Catholic consciousness: one group believes in something, that begins to activate, live, spread - you understand? So our consciousness is not only a group, national, economic consciousness, a professional consciousness, but also much deeper consciousness which is our fears. Man has lived with fear for generation after generation, with pleasure, with envy, with all the travail of loneliness, with depression, confusion. Watch it in yourself as we are talking. And with great sorrow, with what he calls love and the everlasting fear of death. This is his consciousness, not only the professional, the group, the national, but all the rest of it, which is common to all mankind. Do you realize what it means, that you are no longer - please don't resist this, look at it - you are no longer an individual. This is very hard to accept because we have been programmed like the computer to think we are individuals. We have been programmed religiously to think that we have souls separate from all the others. And being programmed our brain works in the same pattern century after century.

So if one understands the nature of our consciousness, the particular endeavour, the 'me' that suffers, that has become something global, then a totally different activity will take place. That is the crisis we are in. We have been programmed by the computer. Like a computer, being programmed, we can learn, occasionally have an insight and being programmed our brain repeats itself over and over and over again - right? Just see the actual fact of that: that I am a Christian, I am a Buddhist, I am a Hindu, I am against Communism, Democrat - you follow? - repeat, repeat, repeat. And in this state of repetition there is an occasional break through.

So how shall a human being who is actually the rest of mankind, how shall he face this crisis, this turning point? How will you as a human being, who has evolved through millenia upon millenia, thinking as an individual, which is, actually, if you observe, you are not an individual, it is an illusion - you know, like any neurotic person it is very difficult for him to give up certain belief deeply rooted in him. So are we prepared as human beings to face a turning point, see what actually is and that very perception is the decision to move totally in another direction.

So first let us understand together what it means to look: to look at our mind, at our brain, at the actuality of thought. You all think, that is why you are here. You all think and thought expresses itself in words and those words are means to communicate, either through a gesture, through a look, through some bodily movement, to express what you are thinking briefly, or through the usage of words, the words being common to each one of us, we understand through those words the significance of what is being said. And thought being common to all mankind - it is a most extraordinary thing if you discover that. Then you say it is not your thought, it is thought. And so we have to observe, or rather learn about how to see things actually as they are, not being programmed to look. Do you see the difference? Can we be free of being programmed and look? If you look as a Christian, as a Democrat, as a Communist, as a Socialist, as a Catholic, as a Protestant - which are all so many prejudices - then we shall not be able to understand the enormity of the danger, the crisis, that we are facing. If you belong to a certain group, or follow a certain guru - and I hope none of you do, forgive me if I say that - or committed to a certain form of action, then you will be incapable because you have been programmed, you will then be incapable of looking at things actually as they are.

So can we look together? Because the speaker doesn't belong to any organization, to any group, to any particular religion, no nationality, etc. etc. It is only then you can observe. If you have learnt a great deal, accumulated a great deal of knowledge from books, from experience and so on, your mind

has already been filled, your brain is crowded with your experience, with your particular tendency and so on. All that is going to prevent you from looking. Can we be free of all that to look? To look at what is happening actually in the world. That is the criteria, the terror and all that, the terrible religious sectarian divisions. One guru opposed to another idiotic guru, the vanity behind all that, the power, the position, the wealth of these gurus, it is appalling. Now look at it. In the same way to be free to look at what we have been programmed. If you are an engineer you have spent years and years and years learning all the implications of being an engineer, that is part of your consciousness. If you have followed a certain guru, that is part of your consciousness. That is part of your being programmed as a Catholic and so on and so on and so on. Can you look at yourself, not as a separate human being but a human being that is actually the rest of mankind? To have such a feeling means that you have tremendous love for human beings. Then when you are able to see clearly without any distortion, then you begin to enquire into the nature of consciousness, not only professional and all the rest of it, the group, but also much deeper layers of consciousness.

We have to enquire into the whole movement of thought because thought is responsible for all the content of consciousness, whether it is the deeper layers of consciousness or the superficial layers, all the content - the professional, the group, the particular religious programme, all that is the movement of thought - right? If you had no thought there would be no fear, no sense of pleasure, no time; thought is responsible. Right? Not only responsible for the beauty of a marvellous cathedral, but thought is also responsible for all the nonsense that is inside the cathedral. All the great paintings, the poems, the music, all that is the activity of thought: perceiving the sound, hearing the marvellous sound and transmitting it on paper. That is the movement of thought. The poet imagining, like Keats, and putting into words the marvellous Odes of Keats, and thought is responsible for all the gods in the world, all the saviours, all the gurus and all the obedience, following, the whole works is the result of thought, which may be turned into pleasure, gratification, escape from

loneliness and all that. Thought is the common factor of all mankind. The poorest villager in India or in the Asiatic world, thinks, as the business man, the chief executive thinks, as the religious head thinks. That is a common everyday fact. That is the ground on which all human being stand. You cannot escape from that. And we have to find out whether thought has brought about not only great things in the world like surgery, communication, satellites, you know what technologically it has done in the world, and also thought has been responsible for the division of man - the American, the Russian, the English, the French, the Swiss, the Muslim - you follow? - thought has been responsible for the division of man. Thought has been responsible for the division of all religions - right? Obviously. If there was no thought there would be no religions, as organized now, baptism, you know, all that stuff.

So thought has done marvellous things to help man but also thought has brought about great destruction, terror in the world. So we have to understand the nature and the movement of thought. Why you think in a certain way. Why you cling to certain forms of thought. Why you hold on to certain experiences. Why thought has never understood the nature of death and so on and so on. When you are serious, and not relying on some philosopher, brain specialist and so on, you can watch it for yourself, which is: why thought, which has done extraordinary things to help man, and also why thought at the same time brings about such degradation, degeneration, destruction - right?

We have to enquire: what is thought? Not why you think in a particular way, we will come to that later. But we are examining the very structure of thought, not your thought because it is fairly obvious what your thought is because you have been programmed, as an engineer, as a poet, as a scientist, as a housewife, as a scholar, as a religious man, a guru, you have been trained, trained, trained. And if you begin to look at your particular programmed brain, you are limiting your outlook - right? But if you enquire seriously into what is thinking then you enter into quite a different dimension. Not the dimension of your particular little problem, which we will come to a little later but first you must understand the tremendous movement of thought, the nature of thinking,

not as a philosopher, not as a religious man, not as a particular profession, or a housewife or this or that, but the enormous vitality of thinking - right? Is this clear?

Shouldn't we stop here? It is half past eleven. Can you tolerate more? Because probably you are merely listening to the speaker, you are not actually working. You are not actually listening, watching, examining, exploring into yourself. Because we are again programmed to listen to somebody. Please there is no teacher and the taught. There is no prophet and the disciple. There is no guru and his follower, the one who knows and the one who does not know; but only a human being in travail. It is only the man who has stepped out of all this knows what is truth. We will come to that much later.

So since it is half past eleven shall we go on with it? Let's continue the day after tomorrow with this: thought is responsible for all the cruelty, the wars, the war machines and the brutality of war, the killing, the terror, the throwing bombs, taking hostages in the name of a cause, or without a cause. Thought is also responsible for the cathedrals, the beauty of their structure, the lovely poems, it is also responsible for all that. Thought is also responsible for all the technological development, the computer with its extraordinary capacity to learn and go beyond man: thought. So we have to enquire into thought. What is thinking? Thinking is a response, a reaction to memory - right? If you had no memory you wouldn't be able to think. Memory is stored in the brain as knowledge, as knowledge which has come through experience. Listen carefully to this. This is how our brain operates. The speaker is not a brain expert - thank God! - nor a neurological expert but you can watch it, how you act for yourself without going to any professor, without any psychologist and so on, you can watch the operation of your own brain. First experience, that experience may have been from the beginning of man, which we have inherited, that experience gives knowledge, then that knowledge is stored up in the brain, from knowledge there is memory and from that memory thought. From thinking you act - right? So from that action you learn more. So you

repeat the cycle. Experience, knowledge, memory, thought, action, from that action learn more and repeat. You follow this? Right?

So this is being programmed - right? We are always doing this: having remembered pain, in the future to avoid pain, and not do the thing that will cause pain, which becomes knowledge, repeat that. Sexual pleasure, repeat that. This is the movement of thought. Please this is clear, see the beauty of it, how mechanically thought operates. And thought says to itself, "I am free to operate". Thought is never free because it is based on knowledge and knowledge is always limited, obviously. Right? Watch it please, carefully watch it. Knowledge must be always limited because knowledge is part of time - right? I will learn more and to learn more I must have time. I do not know Russian but I will learn Russian. It may take me six months or a year or whatever time. So knowledge is the movement of time. Right? So time, knowledge and thought and action, in this cycle we live. So thought is limited, obviously, so whatever action that thought does must be limited, and any form of limitation of thought must create conflict - right? Anything that is limited must be divisive - right? Come on Sirs!

That is, if I say I am a Hindu, I am Indian, that is limited and that limitation brings about not only corruption but conflict because you say "I am a Christian", "I am a Buddhist". I am this - which is limitation, so there is conflict between us. You understand? Yes? Thought is always limited because knowledge and ignorance always go together - right? - and thought is the child of knowledge and therefore it is limited, and whatever its action is, that action must be limited and therefore it must bring conflict. And our life from birth to death is a series of struggles and conflict and we are always trying to escape from that conflict, which again becomes another conflict. So we live and die in this perpetual endless conflict. And we never ask the root of that conflict, which is thought, because thought is limited. Please don't say, "How am I to stop thought?" - that is not the point. The point is to understand the nature of thought, to look at it.

I think that is enough. May I get up now?

Saanen 2nd Public Talk

14th July 1981

Shall we continue where we left off yesterday - or the day before, sorry?

We were saying, weren't we, that human consciousness is similar in all human beings. Our consciousness, whether we live in the East or West, is made up of many layers of fears, anxieties, pleasures, sorrow, beliefs, every form of faith and perhaps in the content of that consciousness there is also love, compassion, and from that compassion a totally different kind of intelligence. And always there is this fear of ending, which is death. And also human beings throughout the world from time immemorial have sought, have tried to find out if there is something sacred beyond all thought, something that is incorruptible, timeless and so on. And also we were saying, there is not only group consciousness, like the business people with their consciousness, the scientists with theirs, and the carpenter with his, and so on, all these layers or the content of consciousness are the product of thought. Thought has created extraordinary things technologically, from the extraordinary computers, to communication, to robots and so on, surgery, medicine - if you like that kind of medicine. And also thought has invented religions. Please don't be angry or impatient, or irritated when we point out certain things, when we say all the religious organizations throughout the world are put together, invented, brought together by thought. And thought has invented the computer. We must understand the complexity and the future of the computer. The computer is going to outstrip man in his thought; the computer is going to change the structure of society, the structure of government, the structure of society. This is not some fantastic conclusion of the speaker, or some fantasy, this is actually going on now, of which we are not aware. The computer can learn, invent and has a mechanical intelligence. The computer is going to make employment of human beings practically unnecessary. Perhaps human beings may have to work a couple of hours a day.

Please these are all facts that are coming. You may not like it, you may revolt against it but it is coming. And thought has invented it, and human thought is limited, but the mechanical intelligence of the computer is going to outstrip man. So what is a human being then? You are following all this? These are facts, not some specialized conclusion of the speaker. As we pointed out the day before yesterday, we have talked to several computer experts and all the rest of it. It is going to revolutionize totally our lives.

And when you consider what its capacity is, then we have to ask ourselves: what is a human being to do? It is going to take over all the activities of the brain, most of it. And what happens to the brain then? You understand? Please follow this a little bit. They are concerned about a human being whose occupation is taken over by the computer, by the robot and so on, then what becomes of the human? We have been programmed biologically, intellectually, emotionally, psychologically through a million years, and we repeat over and over again the same pattern. As we pointed out the other day, we have stopped learning.

We will go into that question of what is learning. Whether the human brain which has been programmed for so many, many centuries, whether it is capable of learning and immediately transforming itself into a totally different dimension. If we are not capable of that, the computer, which is much more capable, more rapid, more accurate, is going to take over the activities of the brain - right? See the importance of this please. This is not something casual, this is very, very serious, desperately serious. The computer can invent a new religion. It can be programmed by an expert Hindu scholar, by the Catholic, by the Protestant, by the Muslim, and it will turn out a marvellous structure for a new religion. And we, if we are not at all aware of what is happening, will follow that new programmed structure which has been put forward by the computer. See the seriousness of all this, please.

So our consciousness has been programmed for thousands and thousands of years. And we have been conditioned, programmed, wired - if you like to put

it that way - to think as individuals, to think as separate entities struggling, struggling, in conflict, from the moment you are born until you die. We are programmed to that. We have accepted that. We have never challenged, we have never asked if it is possible to live a life totally absolutely without conflict. We have never asked it and therefore we will never learn about it. We repeat. It is part of our existence to be in conflict, nature is in conflict - that is our argument - and progress is through conflict. That's what we have been programmed with for millions of years. And religious organizations throughout the world have maintained this individual salvation. And we are questioning very seriously whether there is an individual consciousness, whether you, as a human being, have a separate consciousness from the rest of mankind. You have to answer this, not just play with it.

My consciousness and yours, if we have been brought up, programmed, conditioned to be individual, then my consciousness is all this activity of thought - fear is thought, we will go into that presently. Pursuit of pleasure is the movement of thought. And the suffering, the anxiety, the uncertainty, the deep regrets, wounds, the burden of centuries of sorrow, is part of thought. Thought is responsible for all this. What we call love has become sensual pleasure, something to be desired, and so on.

So as we ended up last time we met here, we went somewhat briefly into the whole movement and the nature of thought. Please as we said, and we will repeat it over and over again until we are quite sure of it, that we are thinking together and the speaker is not telling you what to think. He is not doing propaganda, it is a horrible thing, propaganda. He is not telling you how to act, what to think, what to believe, and so on, but together we are investigating the catastrophe that is taking place in the world outside of us, the utter ruthlessness, violence, thought and all the rest of it, and also inwardly in each human being the extraordinary conflict that is going on. Together we are examining, taking the journey together, perhaps hand in hand. So it is not, if one may point out, that you are merely listening to some ideas, to some conclusions: we are not talking about conclusions, beliefs, ideas. We are

together looking at this world that human beings have produced, for which all of us are responsible. So first we must be clear in our understanding, at whatever level that understanding be, whether it is intellectual understanding, which is merely verbal, or the understanding of the deep significance and that understanding acts. We have come to a point where we have to make a decision - not by the exercise of will, but the decision that naturally will take place when we begin to understand the whole nature and the structure of the world outside of us and inside. That perception will bring about a decision, action. Right?

So first let us examine together what thought is. Though the speaker has repeated several times what thought is but each time when we talk about it you discover something new. Unless you do it together, not merely listen to what the speaker is saying, if you are doing it together then you will, for yourself, discover the truth and the significance and the limitation of thought.

Thought has created the problems which surround us. And our brains are trained, educated, conditioned to solving problems. Please understand this. Thought has created the problems, like division between nationalities, thought has created the division and therefore the conflict between various economic structures, thought has created, invented various religions and divided them and therefore there is conflict. And the brain is trained to solve these conflicts which thought has created. I wonder if you see all this. Can we go on? Do we understand this problem together? And unless we deeply understand the nature of our thinking, the nature of our reactions, which is part of our thinking; and thought dominates our lives, whatever we do, whatever action takes place, thought is behind that action. Every activity whether it is sensual activity, or intellectual activity or merely biological, physical activity, thought is operating all the time. Biologically through centuries it has been programmed, conditioned - the body acts in its own way, breathes, but the brain which has evolved through millenia upon millenia, that has been programmed to a certain pattern, which is obvious. If you are a Catholic, or a Hindu, or a Buddhist, or whatever it is, you repeat it over and over and over again.

And, as we asked the other day, what is thought? Why has thought become so extraordinarily important in our lives? Is there an action which is not born of thought? We have to enquire into all this, it is not just ask these questions and wait for somebody else to answer. Nobody is going to answer them. And if you put the question to yourself and are serious in the question, you will break the pattern. I will show you as we go along. The speaker will go into it.

Thought is the movement of time. I will go very carefully into it. Please let us go together into it. Thought is the movement of time and space. Which is: thought is memory, the remembrance of past things. Thought is the activity of knowledge, knowledge which has been gathered together through millions and millions of years and stored as memory in the brain. Please the speaker is not an expert on the brain. But if you observe your own activity you will see that experience and knowledge is the basis of our life. And knowledge is never complete, it must always go together with ignorance. See the importance of this, please understand this. Knowledge we think is going to solve all our problems, whether it is the knowledge of the priest, the guru, the scientist or the philosopher, or the latest psychiatrist. But we have never questioned whether knowledge in itself, not about something - you understand the difference? - whether knowledge in itself can solve any of our problems, except perhaps technological problems. So we must go into it.

Knowledge comes through time. If one has to learn a language you need time. If you have to learn a skill you need to have time. If you want to drive a car efficiently, you have to learn about it. That requires time. You have the knowledge of how to drive, how to do something skilfully if you are a carpenter, or a surgeon, or to put together a computer you must have knowledge, which means time. That same movement, which is the movement of time, is brought over to the psychological field; there too we say, "I must have time to learn about myself". "I must, in order to change myself from 'what is ' to what should be', I must have time". The same activity as in the technological world, we have brought over that same movement into the psychological world. You are following all this? Which means that time is a great factor in our life - the

tomorrow, the past and the present. So time is thought. Time is the acquisition of knowledge through experience both there in the world, and here inwardly, it requires time. That is what we have been programmed. You are following this? Are we understanding each other a little bit?

So, being programmed that time is necessary to bring about a deep, fundamental change in human structure, we employ thought - right? Which is: I am this, I shall be that. As you would say in the technical world, "I do not know how to put together a computer but I will learn". So time, knowledge, memory, thought: they are a single unit, they are not separate activities, they are a single movement. And thought, being of time, must be limited - right? Thought, the outcome of knowledge, and knowledge being incomplete, thought must everlastingly be incomplete, therefore limited - right? And whatever is limited must bring about conflict. Nationality is limited. A religious belief is limited. An experience which you have had, or which you are longing for, is limited. Every experience - I don't want to go into that for the moment, it is too complicated - every experience must be limited.

Questioner: Why?

K: Because there are more experiences. I may have an experience sexually, the experience of the possession of wealth, the experience of giving up and going to a monastery - they are all limited. So knowledge is limited. And so thought is limited. Thought, being limited, creating problems, national divisions, economic divisions, religious divisions, racial divisions, which is happening in the world, and therefore bringing tremendous conflict, and having created the problem thought says, "I must solve it". And so it is always functioning in the resolution of problems - you understand? I wonder if you get this? See what we are doing. And the computer, which has been programmed, can outstrip all of us because it has no problems, it evolves, learns, moves. I won't go into that for the moment.

So: our consciousness which we have been programmed as the individual consciousness - right? - we are questioning whether that consciousness which

you have accepted as individual is actually individual at all. We are thinking together. Don't resist it. Don't say, "What will happen if I am not individual?". Something totally different may happen, but as long as we have been programmed through time endlessly that we are individual, our consciousness is individual, is that so? You may have a skilful individual training in a particular trade, in a particular profession, you may be a surgeon, a doctor, an engineer, and so on, that doesn't make you an individual. You may be tall, short, black, white, purple - whatever colour it is - but that doesn't make you an individual. You may have a different name, a different form - does that make individuality? Or the acceptance of the brain that has through time said, "I am an individual, it is my desire to fulfil, to become, to struggle" - so we are examining that so-called individual consciousness, which is yours, whether that individual consciousness is not the consciousness of the entire humanity, apart from the training as a doctor, as a surgeon - you know, all that.

Is consciousness, your consciousness, which you have accepted as separate, is it so and what is the nature of your consciousness? Please, as we said, look at it, together. The consciousness that we think is separate from the rest of mankind, that consciousness is the sensory responses, part of it, sensory responses. And also those sensory responses are naturally, necessarily programmed: to defend oneself, to be hungry, to breathe unconsciously - you are doing this. So that biologically you are programmed. Then the content of your consciousness is the many hurts, the wounds that one has received from childhood until now, the many forms of guilt. I am beginning slowly, we are going to expand it. The various conclusions, ideas, imaginary certainties, the many experiences, both sensory, sexually and other forms of psychological experiences, and there is always the basis, the root of fear in its multiple forms. Please we are looking at it together, your own consciousness, which is you. Fear, and with it naturally goes hatred, where there is fear there must be violence, aggression, the tremendous urge to succeed, both in the physical world as well as in the psychological world; fear has many factors which we will go into when we are talking about fear. And the

constant pursuit of pleasure - pleasure of possession, pleasure of domination, the pleasure of money which gives power, the pleasure of a philosopher with his immense knowledge, the guru with his circus. Pleasure again has innumerable forms.

And then there is also sorrow, pain, anxiety, the deep sense of abiding, endless loneliness, and not only the so-called personal sorrow but also the enormous sorrow mankind has brought about through wars, through neglect, through this endless sense of conquering one group of people by another. And in that consciousness there is the racial group content, and ultimately there is death. This is our consciousness: belief, certainties, and uncertainties, great sense of anxiety, loneliness, sorrow and endless misery. This is the fact. And we say this consciousness is mine. Is that so? You go to the far East, or the Near East, India, America, Europe, anywhere you go where human beings are, they suffer, they are anxious, lonely, depressed, melancholic, struggling, conflict, the same, like you, similar to you. So is your consciousness different from another? I know it is very difficult for people - you may logically accept this, which is intellectually, verbally you say, "Yes, that is so, maybe", but to feel this total human sense that there is no humanity except you, you are the rest of mankind, that requires a great deal of sensitivity, it is not a problem to be solved - you understand? It isn't that I must accept that I am not an individual and how am I to feel this global human entity? Then you have made it into a problem, and the brain is ready to solve the problem! Do this. Don't do that. Go to a guru. You know, all the circus that goes on. But if you really look at it with your mind, with your heart, with your whole being, totally aware of this fact, then you have broken the programme. It is naturally broken. But if you say, "I will break it", you are again back into the same pattern.

I wonder if you understand this? Shall I go over it again? Is it necessary for the speaker to repeat this? Please don't accept this because the speaker feels this. To him this is utter reality, not something verbally accepted because it is pleasant. But it is something that is actual. Then, if that is so, which is logically reasonably, sanely examined and see that it is so, but the brain which has

been accustomed to this programme of the individuality is going to revolt against it - which you are doing now. Which is - listen - which is the brain is unwilling to learn - right? Whereas the computer is willing to learn because it has nothing to lose. Here we are frightened of losing something. And if you don't understand this we can go into it over and over again, but a serious person confronting the world situation, the world catastrophe, the terror, the atom bomb, the endless competition between nations, that is destroying human beings, that is destroying us, each one. And the decision comes when you perceive the truth that you are not an individual.

So can the brain learn? That is the whole point. So we have to go into this question of what is learning. You understand? Learning for most of us is a process of acquiring knowledge - right? I do not know Russian but I will learn. I will learn day after day, learning, memorizing, holding on to certain phrases, words, the meanings, syntax, verbs, regular verbs and all the rest of it. I apply and can learn any language within a certain time. So to us learning is essentially the accumulation of knowledge, skill and so on. That is, our brains are conditioned to this pattern - right? Accumulate knowledge and act. Right? That is what we do. So, look, are we learning? When I learn a language, I am learning, there knowledge is necessary. But am I learning psychologically about the content of my mind, of my consciousness, and learning there implies examining each layer of it, accumulating knowledge about it and from that knowledge act. The same pattern as the other - you are following? And I am questioning, that is only a part of learning. If the brain is repeating this pattern, learning a language, learning about the content of my consciousness is similar because I need time, which means I am accumulating knowledge about myself, my consciousness. And then I determine what the problems are and the brain is ready to solve the problems because it has been trained to solve problems - right? So I am repeating this endless pattern and that is what I call learning - right? I go to a guru, if I am silly enough and he will tell me what to do, what not to do, be initiated - all that tommy rot that goes on!

So what does it mean to learn? Is there a learning which is not this? You understand? We are enquiring. Please don't say there is no other way than this, or, "Tell us the other way", but together we are doing it. So you are not learning from me. The speaker has nothing to tell you. But together we are looking. This is the pattern the brain has been programmed to, always accumulating knowledge, and knowledge has become so astonishingly important. And we don't see that knowledge in itself is limited. Now we are going to find out if there is a different action of learning, which is not accumulation of knowledge. You understand the difference? Please somebody say yes or no!

Let me put it differently: experience, from experience knowledge, from knowledge memory, memory, the response of memory is thought, then thought acts, from that action you learn more, so you repeat the cycle - right? This is the pattern of our life. And we are saying that form of learning will never solve our problems, because it is repetition - you understand? More knowledge, better action, but that action is limited and so on, keep repeating. That is clear. Right? And the activity of that knowledge will not solve our human problems at all. It is so obvious, we haven't solved them. After five million years we haven't solved our problems: we are cutting each other's throat, we are competing with each other, we hate each other - not here - we want to be a success, we want to have - you know, the whole pattern is being repeated from the time man began and we are still there. So this pattern has not solved the problems - right? Is that clear? Do what you will along this pattern and no human problem will be solved, either politically, religiously, economically because it is thought that is operating.

Now, is there another form - we will use the word for the moment - of learning? Learn, not in the context of knowledge, but a different form of non-accumulative action - let's call it that way. Right? Non-accumulative perception-action. So we have to enquire whether it is possible to observe the content of our consciousness, to observe the world and my consciousness without a single prejudice - right? Is that possible? Don't say it is not possible,

how am I to get rid of prejudice - just ask the question. See whether when you have a prejudice you can observe clearly - right? You cannot, obviously - right? If I have a certain conclusion, a certain set of beliefs, concepts, ideals, and I want to see clearly what the world is, all my conclusions, ideals, prejudices and so on will actually prevent it. It is not how to get rid of my prejudices but to see clearly, intelligently, that any form of prejudice, however noble or ugly, any form of prejudice will actually prevent perception. When you see that prejudice goes. What is important is not the prejudice but the demand to see clearly - right? I wonder if you are meeting me?

If I want to be a good surgeon I can't become a good surgeon with all my ideals and prejudices about surgeons, I have to actually do it. So can you see that a new form of action, a new form of non-accumulative knowledge, is only possible and therefore breaks the pattern, breaks the programme so that you are acting totally differently. Have I put the question clearly? (Gosh, I am struggling so much to put it clearly. No, I am not struggling, sorry.) Is this clear? That is: the way we have lived over millions of years has been the repetition of the same process of acquiring knowledge and acting from that knowledge, which is limited. And that limitation creates problems and the brain has become accustomed to solving the problems which knowledge has created. So it is caught in that pattern. And any form of learning is to add more to it. And we are saying that pattern will never under any circumstances solve our human problems. It is so obvious, because we have not solved them up to now. There must be a different, a totally different, movement, which is: the non-accumulative perception-action. And to have the non-accumulative perception is to have no prejudice. It is to have absolutely no ideals, no concepts, no faith, because all those have destroyed man, they have not solved the problems. Do you understand? Are you doing it now? Otherwise there is no point in just listening to the nonsense. Unless you do it, it has no meaning. You grow old and die. You may attend these Conferences year after year, and it is nice to meet each other, but...

So: have you a prejudice? Have you a prejudice which has something common with ideals? Of course. Right? Ideals are the future, to be accomplished, and ideals become tremendously important in the process of knowledge. So can you observe without accumulation the destructive nature of prejudice, ideals, faith, belief, and your own conclusions and experiences? Can you do this? Don't ask the speaker, "Have you done it?" Otherwise the speaker wouldn't be here. So please understand this. There is group consciousness, we went into it, I am not talking irrelevantly, I want to point out something. There is group consciousness, national consciousness, linguistic consciousness, and professional consciousness, racial consciousness, and fear, anxiety, loneliness, pursuit of pleasure, sorrow, love, death, all that is part of it - right? If you are keeping on acting in that circle, you maintain the human consciousness of the world - you understand? Just see the truth of this. Because you are part of that consciousness and if you sustain it by saying, "I am an individual. My prejudices are important. My ideals are essential" - you follow? "My guru is a better guru than the other guru" and so on and so on, you are repeating the same thing over and over again.

Now the maintenance, the sustenance and the nourishment of that consciousness comes when you are repeating that pattern, you sustain it. But when you break away from that consciousness, you are introducing a totally new factor in the whole of that consciousness. You understand? Please understand this: they are experimenting, as the speaker pointed out the other day, with various forms of group consciousness. They haven't come to that. If one group has learnt something quickly, the animals that belong to that group learn much quicker because the consciousness of that group is enlivened by a new factor. You understand? Now if we understand the nature of our own consciousness, see how it is operating in this endless cycle of knowledge, action, division and so on, that consciousness has been sustained for millenia, millions of years, if when you see the truth that any form of prejudice, all this is a form of prejudice, and break away from it, you give a new factor into the old. You understand what I am saying? Which means are you, as a human being,

who is the rest of mankind, of whose consciousness you are, and whether you can move away from the old pattern, the old pattern of obedience, acceptance, you know, all that, that is the real turning point in our life. Because man cannot go on repeating this pattern, it has lost its meaning, except in the biological and technical world. In the psychological world it has totally lost its meaning. If you fulfil, who cares? If you become a saint, what does it matter? You follow? Whereas if you totally move away from that you affect the whole of consciousness of mankind. Right, that's enough.

Saanen 3rd Public Talk

16th July 1981

May we continue where we left off the day before yesterday? I would like, if I may, to repeat what we said a little bit. We are not trying to convince you of anything. That must be clearly understood. We are not trying to persuade you to accept a particular point of view, nor trying to impress you about anything. We are not doing any propaganda - that is dreadful, for and against, and so on. We are not talking about personalities, or who is right and who is wrong, but rather trying to think out together, which seems to be the most difficult thing to do: to observe together what the world is and what we are, what we have made of the world and what we have made of ourselves. We are trying together to examine both the inward and the outward man. And to observe clearly one must be free to look. If one clings to one's particular experience, opinion, judgement, prejudice, then it is not possible to think together. And the world crisis which is right in front of us demands, urges us to think together so that we can solve the human problem together, not according to any particular person, to a particular philosopher, to a particular guru, to any particular person. We are trying, looking, observing together. And this is important to bear in mind all the time, that the speaker is merely pointing out and we are together examining it. So it is not one sided but rather co-operating together and examining, taking a journey together and so act together.

As we pointed out, our consciousness is not our consciousness, our individual consciousness. This is very important to understand because our consciousness is not only the specialized group, the national and so on, but also all the travail, the conflicts, the misery, the confusion, sorrow and so on. And we are examining together that consciousness, which is the human consciousness, which is our consciousness, not mine but ours.

Now one of the factors that is demanded in this examination is that one has to have the capacity of intelligence. According to the dictionary meaning, intelligence means to discern, to understand, to distinguish. And also it means

observing, gathering, putting it together all which we have gathered and act from that. That gathering, that discernment, that observation, can be prejudiced and then that intelligence is denied when there is prejudice. And that intelligence, if you follow another that intelligence is denied: following another, however noble, however this or that, denies your own perception, denies your own observation, you are merely following somebody who will tell you what to do, what to think and so on. And if you do that, that intelligence doesn't exist because in that intelligence there is no observation. Intelligence demands doubt, questioning, not being impressed by persons, by their enthusiasm, by their energy. Intelligence demands that there must be impersonal observation. And intelligence is not only the capacity to understand that which is rationally explained verbally but also it demands that we gather as much information as possible, knowing that information can never be complete about anybody, about anything, and therefore where there is that intelligence there is hesitation, rational impersonal thinking, observation and clarity of thinking. Intelligence also implies the comprehension of the whole; the whole of man, all his complexities, all his physical responses, his emotional reactions, his intellectual capacity, his affection, his travail, all that, to perceive all that at one glance and act, that is supreme intelligence.

And intelligence has not so far been able to transcend conflict - right? And we are going this morning, together, to see if it is possible if the brain can be free from conflict, because we have lived with conflict from the time we are born until we die. The constant struggle to be, or to become, to become something, so-called spiritually, psychologically or in the world, which is, to become successful, to fulfil, that is the whole movement of becoming. I am this but I will be that. And the ultimate reaching, destination, direction, is towards the highest principle, whether that principle is called God, Brahmin, or any other name one gives to it. This constant struggle to become, or to be. Both are the same. When one is trying to become in various directions, then you are denying being. And when you try to be you are becoming also. See this movement of the mind, of thought: I am, I think I am, and being dissatisfied

with what I am, discontented with what I am, I try to fulfil in something, or drive towards a particular direction, pleasurable, it may be painful but at the end pleasurable. So there is this constant struggle to be and to become.

What is it that we are trying to become, all of us? Physically we want more money, better house, better position, more power, more money, a better status. Biologically, if one is not well, to become well. Psychologically, that is the whole inward process of thought, consciousness, the whole drive, inwardly, is from the perception or the recognition that one is nothing, actually, but to become, move away from that, through education, through university - if one is so-called lucky enough to go to any university - get a good career, job, that will give you position, money, etc. etc. Psychologically, inwardly, there is always the escape from 'what is', always running away from that which I am, with which I am dissatisfied to something which will satisfy me. Whether that satisfaction is deep contentment, happiness, a projection of thought as enlightenment, as acquiring greater knowledge, this is the process of becoming - I am, I shall be - right? That involves time. Now the brain is programmed to this. All our culture, all our religious sanctions, everything says become - right? You see this phenomenon all over the world. It is not only in this Western world but in the East and Far East, and West, everyone is trying to become, or be, or avoid, and so on. Is this the cause of conflict, inwardly and outwardly? Inwardly there is this imitation, conformity, competition with the ideal. And also outwardly there is this competition between so-called individuals of one group against another group, nation against nation and so on. So inwardly and outwardly there is this drive to be and become something.

We are asking: is this the basic cause of our conflict? Or man is doomed forever as long as he lives on this marvellous earth, doomed to perpetual conflict? One can rationalize this conflict, say nature is in conflict, the tree struggling to reach the sun is in conflict, and that is part of our nature because through conflict, through competition, we have evolved, we have grown into this marvellous human being that we are. This is not being said sarcastically, this is what most of us do think. So our brain is programmed to conflict. And

we have never been able to resolve this problem. You may neurotically escape into some phantasy and hold on to that phantasy and be totally content. Or imagine that you have inwardly achieved something and be totally content with that. And any questioning, any doubt, any scepticism that must be exercised by an intelligent mind, must question all this: why human beings after millions and millions of years, from the beginning of man, we have lived with conflict. There are in those caves where man is fighting evil in the form of a boar, or this or that. From the ancient times of the Sumerians, there has been conflict, the Egyptians and so on up to the present evolution of man he has lived in conflict. We have accepted it, we have tolerated it, we have said it is part of our nature to compete, to be aggressive, to imitate, to conform, is part of this everlasting pattern of conflict.

Please we are observing together. I am not - the speaker is not verbally putting a map of conflict and you accept that map, but rather together we are observing the conflict in ourselves and outwardly - right?

Since our brains have been programmed to this conflict, like a computer that is programmed, but the computer can learn, can discover its own fallacies, its own mistakes and correct them. A highest mathematician can inform or programme the computer with all his theories and so on, and the computer being so programmed discovers new theorems. This has been proved, not programmed by the professor, it has the capacity to learn, to discover, which is a mechanical, perhaps, intelligence. They are trying to bring about ultra intelligence machines which go far beyond our human brain. And our human brain has not solved this problem for ourselves but the machine has solved it. You follow all this?

So why is man who is so highly sophisticated in one direction, so utterly unintelligent in other directions? Does conflict end through knowledge? Please put these questions to yourself. Knowledge about knowing oneself, or knowledge about the world, knowledge about matter. The world, the society, learning more about society, better organizations, better institutions and so on,

will that solve our human conflict - acquiring more and more knowledge? Or the freedom from conflict has nothing whatsoever to do with knowledge? You are following all this? Please together we are thinking this out, not the speaker talking to himself, he can do that in his own room, if he wants to, but together we are working this out.

We have knowledge, a great deal of knowledge about the world, matter, about the universe, and also a great deal of historical knowledge about ourselves. The whole of history is the story of mankind. And if we know how to read that book, which is me, myself, my consciousness, I may have tremendous knowledge about myself, and will that knowledge free the human being from conflict? You understand? Please go along with me. Or it has nothing to do with analysis, discovering the various causes and factors of conflict. We can go into that. Will the cause, or many causes, through analytical discovery, will that free the brain from conflict, conflict not only while we are awake during the daytime, but also this conflict carried on when we are asleep? You can examine the dreams, interpret dreams, go into the whole nature of why human beings dream at all, and will that solve conflict? Will the analytical mind, brain analysing very clearly, rationally, sanely the cause of conflict, there are many causes, many factors of conflict, will that analysis end conflict? Analysis being not only time but the analyser separating himself from the object, which is conflict, and then try to analyse that conflict, so separating himself from conflict - you follow? Will that solve it? Or it has nothing whatsoever to do with any of these processes. That is, analysis, discovering the cause, and trying to force ourselves to be free from that cause, or through various examinations acquiring a great deal of knowledge about ourselves, will that solve the problem of conflict? Or following somebody who says, "I will show you the way. I am free from conflict but I will show you the way" - will that help you? This has been the part of the priest, part of the guru, part of the so-called enlightened man - 'Follow me, I will show you. Or I will point out to you the goal'. And we have had all these through millenia upon millenia, history

shows this and yet man has not been able to solve that one deep rooted conflict. Right?

Let us together find out, not agree, not a verbal indication, not an intellectual verbal concept, let's find out together if there is a perception, an action that will end conflict, not gradually, end it immediately. You understand my question? Please first understand the question. What are the implications of that question? The brain being programmed, or wired, programmed to conflict. It is caught in that pattern. You can see it for yourself. And we are asking if that pattern can be broken immediately, not gradually. Either you think you break it through drugs, through alcohol, through sex, through different forms of discipline, through different forms of handing oneself over to something, man has tried a thousand different ways to escape from this terror of conflict - right? And we are asking: is it possible for a brain so conditioned to break that conditioning immediately? Right? This is maybe a theoretical, non-actual question. You may say it is impossible, it is just a theory, it is just a wish, a desire to be free of this. But if you examine the thing rationally, logically, which is part of our intelligence, time will not solve this conditioning - right? That is the first thing to realize, not tomorrow, there is no psychological tomorrow - I won't go into that for the moment - that implies time. If one sees actually, not verbally, deeply in one's heart, in one's mind, in the very, very depths of one's being time will not solve this problem. That means you have already broken the pattern, beginning to see the cracks in the pattern because we have accepted time - right? - as a means of unravelling, breaking up this programmed brain. So when you observe clearly that time, under no circumstances, will free the brain from time - I mean by time, as it is now conditioned, programmed, I will examine it, make efforts to break it, uncondition it, all that process involves time - right? So when you do that you are caught in the same pattern, you have not moved away from it - right? But once you clearly for yourself see absolutely, irrevocably, that time is not a factor then already you begin to see the cracks in the world, in the enclosure of the brain - right? Are you doing it now? Because philosophers and scientists

have said time is a factor of growth, biologically, linguistically, technologically, time is necessary, but they never go - perhaps some may have, we don't know - never enquired into the nature of psychological time. And this enquiry into time implies the whole psychological becoming - right? I am this, but I will be that. I am unhappy, unfulfilled, desperately lonely but tomorrow will be different.

So is our brain, which is common to all mankind, it is not your brain, you may have certain peculiarities, tendencies, but this brain of mine and yours has evolved through time, it is not my brain. Biologically it is so, it is not my brain. And that brain has been evolving through centuries to come to this point through conflict. Are we moving together? Do we see together the rationality of it, the logic of it, that our consciousness is not ours but human consciousness - which we went into very carefully the other day. And to realize that it is the human consciousness, you have already broken the pattern of individual consciousness. Right? So if one realizes that time is a factor of conflict then that very perception is action, decision has taken place, you don't have to decide, the very perception is the action and decision. Right? Please we have to work together, it is not just you listen and agree or disagree, we are working together.

Now there are multiple forms of conflict, as there are a thousand opinions so there are a thousand ways of conflict. We are not talking about the many forms of conflict but conflict itself. Not my particular conflict - I don't get on with my wife, or with my businessman, or this or that - but the conflict of the human brain in its existence. Is there a perception - please just first listen, you may not agree or agree, but just listen first - is there a perception not born of memory, not born of knowledge, a perception that sees the whole nature of conflict, the whole nature, the nature and the structure of conflict, the perception of that whole, is there such perception at all? You understand my question? Not analytical perception, not intellectual observation of the conflict, various types of conflict, nor an emotional response to conflict, but we are asking: is there a perception not of remembrance, which is time, which is

thought, is there a perception which is not of time or thought, which can see the whole nature of conflict, and that very perception is the ending of that conflict? That is my question. You understand the question? That is, thought is time - right? Do you see that? Thought. Thought is memory, knowledge, experience put together in the brain as memory. All that is the result of time. "I didn't know a week ago but I know" and so on, the multiplication of knowledge, the expanse of knowledge, the depth of knowledge is of time. So thought is time. Right? Obviously. Any movement, any psychological movement is time - right? It is not - don't agree with me, it is so. If I want to go from here to Montreux I must use time. If I want to learn a language, time. If I want to meet somebody at a distant place it requires time. That time can be shortened or lengthened. And the same process, the outer process is carried inwardly. "I am not, I will be" - and the expanse of that. So thought is time. Thought and time are indivisible. Can we go on? Do we see this fact?

And we are asking a question: is there a perception which is not time and thought? That perception is entirely out of the pattern of the brain which has been accustomed to certain patterns, certain moulds, certain ways. Is there such a thing? And perhaps that alone is going to solve the problem. Because we have not solved the problem in a million years of conflict, we are continuing the same pattern. We must find intelligently, hesitantly, with care, if there is a perception which covers the whole of conflict and that very perception breaks the pattern. Right?

Now how shall we meet this together? You understand? The speaker has put this question forward. He may be wrong, he may be silly, irrational, but after you have listened to him very carefully, if you have listened, it is our responsibility, yours as well as mine, as well as the speaker, to see if it is so, if it is possible - right? Not say, "Well it is not possible because I haven't done it. It is not within my sphere. I haven't thought enough about it. Or I don't want to think about that way at all because I am satisfied with my conflict because I am quite certain one day humanity will be free of conflict." That is all just an escape from the problem - right? Are we together in this now? Together being

aware of all the complexities of conflict, aware, not denying it, it is there, it is there as actual as pain in the body, it is there, one is aware of it, aware without any choice, it is so. And at the same time asking the question whether there is a different approach to this altogether? You understand?

Now can we observe - it doesn't matter what it is - without the word, without the naming, without the remembrance? You understand? Can you do it? To look at your friend, or your wife, or whatever it is, to observe the person, without the word 'my wife', 'my friend', we belong to the same little group, without any of that, to observe. Which is, not observing through remembrance. Can we do that? Have you ever directly tried it? Now as you are sitting there, can we do it together? That is, not only look at the person without naming, without time and remembrance, and also at ourselves - you understand? The image that we have built about ourselves, the image that we have built about the other, to look at that image as though you were looking at it for the first time, looking at a rose for the first time. Will you do that? That is, to learn to look. Learn to observe this quality without all the operation of thought. Don't say it is not possible. Sirs, it is like going to a professor not knowing his subject but you want to learn from him. I am not your professor. You want to learn from him. So you go to him and listen. You don't say, "I know something about it", or "You are wrong", or "You are right", or "I don't like your look". You listen, you find out. And as you begin to listen sensitively, with awareness, you begin to discover whether he is a phoney professor with a lot of words, or a professor that has really gone into the depths of himself. You understand? Now can we together so listen and observe, without the word, without remembrance, without all the movement of thought? Which means, complete attention - right? Attention not from a centre to attend, but attention which has no centre. Of course, if you have a centre from which you are attending, that is merely a form of concentration. But if there is no centre but you are attending, which means you are giving your complete attention, in that attention there is no time. Right? I wonder if you see this?

Suppose I am listening to you. You are telling me a story. A story which is a story of myself, a story of mankind. You are telling me that story and I am listening to you because I don't know anything about it. But as I am listening not only to what you are saying verbally, to communicate what you think, but in that very sensitive attention to listening I am not only listening to the words but I have gone beyond the words, I am capturing the depth of the meaning of what you are saying. You understand? Are we doing this?

Many of you, unfortunately or fortunately, have heard the speaker for many years. And you see this breaking the programme of the brain has not come about. And you repeat that statement year after year, it hasn't come about. Is it because - please listen - is it because you want to attain, become, have that state of brain in which the pattern has been broken - you follow? That is, you have listened, it has not come about, and you are hoping it will come about. Which is another form of becoming. Right? So you are still in conflict. And you brush me aside and say you won't come here any more because you haven't got what you want. "I want that but haven't got it". So the wanting is the becoming. I wonder if you see all this. The desire to be something is the beginning of conflict. And that desire is part of the programmed brain. And we are saying to break that pattern, observe without the movement of time, thought. It sounds very simple, but see the logic of it, the reason, the sanity of it, not because the speaker says so, it is sane.

So one must exercise the capacity to be logical, rational and know its limitation, because rational thinking, rational observation is still part of thought, and knowing that thought is limited, be aware of that limitation and don't push it further because it will still be limited however far you go. Whereas if you say: "Can I observe a rose, a flower without the word, without the colour, just look at it?", that look brings about great sensitivity, breaks down this sense of heaviness of the brain, and gives extraordinary vitality because thought has its own energy through conflict, obviously. But there is a totally different kind of energy when there is pure perception, which is not related to thought, time. Right?

I think that is enough for this morning, isn't it?

Saanan 4th Public Talk

19th July 1981

I hope you are all warm! The Ice Age is coming!

The speaker has talked about meditation and the things involved in meditation at the end of the talks because he feels that unless we put the house in order meditation has very little value. Meditation is really quite important if one knows or understands the deep meaning of meditation. And he has purposely put it at the end of the talks because order in our lives must be established righteously before we can even think about meditation and that which is eternally sacred.

And so we will talk this morning about order, and we have talked about it also during the last three talks. And order is necessary, order in our action, order in our relationship with each other, order in our daily, everyday activity. And to understand the very quality of order, which is totally different from discipline - discipline, the root of it, is to learn, not to conform, not to obey, not to imitate, but rather the order that comes through learning, learning about ourselves, not according to some philosopher, some psychologist, but to discover order for ourselves, which is free from all sense of compulsion, from all sense of determined effort, or order along a particular direction. And to discover that order which comes very naturally and therefore in that order there is righteousness, not according to some pattern, but order not only in the outward world which has become so utterly chaotic because in ourselves we are not clear, we are confused, uncertain. And so to learn about ourselves, and that learning is part of order. And to learn about oneself, not according to some psychologist however erudite, however verbal, but if you follow another you will not be able to understand yourself. And it is necessary to understand ourselves in order to have order.

We live in disorder, both outwardly, politically, religiously, socially and also economically, except in the technological world we live in some kind of chaotic,

meaningless existence. To find out what is order we must begin to understand, if we may point out, the nature of our relationship. We live, and our life is a movement in relationship; we cannot possibly live alone because however one may think one lives alone one is always related to something or other, either to the past, or some projected image in the future. So life is a movement in relationship. And in that relationship there is disorder. And we must together examine closely why we live in our relationship with each other, however intimately or superficially, why we live in such disorder in our daily life.

As we have been pointing out during the past three talks, we are thinking together, the speaker is not pointing out anything, or trying to persuade you to think in a particular direction, or put any kind of persuasive subtle pressure on you. On the contrary, we are together thinking over our problems, human problems, thinking together and discovering what our relationship with each other is. Whether in that relationship there is order. Whether in that relationship we can bring about order. And so to understand the full meaning of relationship with each other, however close, however distant, we must begin to think, we must begin to understand why the brain creates images. I hope we are following each other. Why we have images about ourselves and images or pictures about others, why in us, each one has a peculiar image and identifies oneself with that image, why human beings throughout the world have created an image about themselves, whether that image is necessary, whether that image gives one a sense of security, whether that image does not bring about separative action, and in relationship, intimate or otherwise, why this image exists, for images separate human beings.

Please, we are thinking together, I am not telling you how to think or what to think. The speaker is not pointing out but together we are investigating into this very complex problem of relationship. If we could look closely at our relationship with our wife, husband, friend, or whatever it is, and look at it very closely, not try to avoid it, not try to brush it aside but if we could together examine it and find out why human beings throughout the world have this capacity, this extraordinary machinery, that creates images, that creates

symbols, patterns, and in those patterns, symbols, images, one finds great security. We have to examine that together.

If you observe, and I hope you don't mind the speaker pointing this out to you, if you observe one has an image about oneself. Either one has an imagination of conceit, arrogance, or the contrary to that. Or one has accumulated a great deal of experience, acquired a great deal of knowledge which in itself creates the image. Why do we have images about ourselves? Please put that question to yourself and look at it. Whether those images do not separate people. If you have an image as a Swiss or a British, or French and so on, do not those images not only distort our observation of humanity but also do they not separate? And therefore wherever there is separation, division, there must be conflict; as there is conflict going on in the Middle East, the Arab against the Israelite, the Muslim against the Hindu, the Christian against all the rest of the world. This is going on. There is not only national division, economic division, which are all images, concepts, ideas, and the brain clings to these images - why? Is it because of our education? Is it because of our culture where the individual is the most important, where the collective society is something totally different from the individual. That is part of our culture, part of our religious training, part of our daily education. And when one has an image about oneself as being British, and so on, having that image gives one certain security. This is fairly obvious. That is, having created the image about oneself and that image becomes permanent, semi permanent, and behind that image or in that image one tries to find security, safety, a form of resistance. Right?

And when one is related to another, however delicately, however subtly, however physically, biologically, there is a response both psychologically as well as sensory, based on this image. Again, that is a fact. If one observes, if you are married or living with somebody, in our daily life the image is formed, whether you are acquainted or live with a person for a week or ten years, the image is slowly formed step by step, every reaction is remembered, stored up in the brain so the image is formed about my wife and the wife about the

husband - right? Are we following this? And the relationship may be physical, sexual, sensory but actually the relationship is between these two images - right?

The speaker is not saying something extravagant, or exotic, or fantastic, but he is merely pointing out - or rather together we are learning that these images exist. And these images exist because we can never know another completely. If I am married or have a girl-friend, I can never know my wife completely, I think I know her because after having lived with that person I have accumulated various incidents, various irritations and all the rest of it which happen in daily life, and she has also gathered those reactions, and those reactions with their images are established in the brain - right? And those images play an extraordinarily important part in our life. Apparently very few of us are free of any form of image. The freedom from images is real freedom - right? Because then in that freedom there is no division brought about by images. If I am a Hindu, born in India - which the speaker is but he is not a Hindu - suppose the speaker is born in India with all the conditioning that goes on, the conditioning of the race, a particular group with their superstitions, with their religious beliefs, dogmas, rituals, the whole structure of society, he lives with that image, which is his conditioning. And however much he may talk about brotherhood, unity, wholeness - those are merely words, they have no actual daily meaning. But if he frees himself from all that imposition, all that conditioning, all that superstitious nonsense then he is breaking down the image.

And also in his relationship, if he is married or lives with somebody, is it possible not to create an image at all? You understand? That is, not to record an incident which may be pleasurable or painful in that particular relationship, not to record either the insult or the flattery, the encouragement or discouragement - you follow? All that is taking place in our daily relationship, is that possible not to record at all? Are we meeting each other? Because if the brain is constantly recording everything that is happening to it psychologically, then it is never free to be quiet, it can never be tranquil, peaceful. If the

machinery is operating all the time it wears itself out, which is obvious. And this is what happens in our relationship with each other, whether that relationship is as a politician, as a guru, as a disciple, whatever the relationship is, if there is constant recording of everything then the brain slowly begins to wither away and that is essentially old age - right?

So we are asking together, I am not putting the question to you, but together we are investigating and we come upon this question: whether it is possible in our relationship with all its reactions and subtleties, with essential responses, whether there is a possibility of not remembering? That is: is it necessary to explain further? Suppose I am married and my wife bullies me, flatters me, encourages me and so on and so on and so on; it is our daily education that is responsible for this remembrance, remembrance of that irritation, remembrance of that encouragement, remembrance of that depression which she or the other person feels and lives in that depression, therefore it feels separated. You follow? This recording is going on all the time. And we are asking psychologically whether it is possible not to record, but only record that which is absolutely necessary?

The brain records because it is necessary in one direction. That is, it must record all the things it may learn mathematically. If I am to be an engineer I must know, record all the mathematics, the pressures and so on and so on, I must record. If I am to be a physicist I must record all the previous physicists and what they have said. If I am to learn to drive a car I must record and so on. But we are asking whether it is necessary to psychologically, inwardly, record in our relationship at all? - Right? This remembrance of things past, is that love? When I say to my wife, "I love you", is that a remembrance of all the things we have been through together - remembrance, the incidents, the travail, the troubles, the struggles, which are all being recorded, stored in the brain and when I say I love my wife, is that remembrance actual love? Do you understand my question?

So is it possible to be free and not to record at all? Please don't wait for an answer from the speaker whether it is possible or not, but let us together find out. That is, it is only possible not to record when there is complete attention. Right, I will show you. I don't know why we want explanations. Why our brains are not swift enough to capture, have an insight into the whole thing immediately. Why we cannot see this thing, the truth of all this, and let that truth operate and therefore cleanse the slate, to have a mind, a brain that is not recording at all psychologically. But as most human beings are rather sluggish, rather like to live in their old patterns, in their particular habit of thought, anything new they reject because it is much better to live with the known rather than with the unknown. In the known there is safety, at least we think there is safety, we think there is security in the known so we keep repeating, walking, struggling within that field of the known. And to discover together an observation without the whole process of the machinery of memory operating.

Now you have put that question to me and we have put the question to you: is it possible in our relationship with each other, intimate or not, is it possible not to create an image about each other? Because that image, the remembrance of things past, which is the image, divides people. It is not only the image, but if I am ambitious, competing, trying to become chief executive, or psychologically something or other, and my wife is also doing something else equally in other directions, how can we have a relationship? You understand my question? This is actually what is going on in the modern world: the man and the woman, each is seeking his own particular career, their own ambitions, separate ambitions, greed, envy, success, identification, and perhaps they meet in a bed and they call that relationship. So observing all this in one's daily life, one inevitably asks: is there a relationship which is not actually based on this?

Then one has to enquire very closely and deeply, what is love? Are you waiting for me to tell you? This is a very complex question, because all of us feel we love something or other, not only the abstract love, love of a nation,

love of a people, love of god, love of gardening, love of overeating; we have abused that word so terribly. So we have to find out basically what is love. You see love is not an idea - right? Love of god is an idea, love of a symbol is still an idea. When you go to the church and kneel down and pray, you are really worshipping, or praying to something which thought has created - right? And so, see what happens, thought has created it, actually this is a fact, and you worship that which thought has created, which means you are worshipping in a very subtle form yourself - right? I know this is probably a sacrilegious statement but it is a fact. That is what is happening throughout the world. Thought creates the flag, the symbol of a particular country, then you fight for it, you kill each other, will destroy the earth in competition with another nation, and so the flag becomes a symbol of our love. And similarly there is the religious love, the devotion to a symbol. Again see what thought does. You create the symbol, thought creates the symbol with all the attributes of that symbol, romantic, logical, sane, and having created it you love it, you become totally intolerant of any other thing. Again thought having created it, thought which is your own particular education, conditioning, and you worship that, which is you are worshipping yourself. That is how all the gurus exist in the world, all the priests, all the religious structure is based on that. See the tragedy of it. Because we have lived for millions and millions of years we are still extraordinarily destructive, violent, brutal, cynical human beings.

And also when we say we love another, in that love there is desire, pleasure, projections of various activities of thought. So one has to look into and find out whether love is desire, whether love is pleasure, whether in love there is fear. Because where there is fear there must be hatred - right? Please, I am not telling you all this, you know all this. Where there is fear there must be jealousy, anxiety, possessiveness, domination.

So to understand the depth of relationship and the beauty of relationship, because there is beauty in relationship. The whole cosmos is a movement in relationship; cosmos means order and when one has order in oneself one has order in one's relationship, and therefore order in our society. So one must

enquire in this relationship if we find it is absolutely necessary to have order, and therefore out of that order comes love. One must enquire into what is desire. Right? Desire to become something, desire to reach illumination, god, desire for this or that. So this has been one of the problems, perhaps the problem, for human beings. Must I go into all this?

You see one must ask something else too: what is beauty? You see the snow, the fresh snow on the mountains this morning, clean, a lovely sight if you are not too cold! And those solitary trees standing black against that white. And looking at the world about us, the marvellous machinery, the extraordinary computer with its special beauty, and the beauty of a face, the beauty of a painting, beauty of a poem - we seem to recognize beauty out there in the museums, when you go to a concert and listen to Beethoven, or Mozart, or whatever you listen to, there is great beauty. Always out there, in the hills, in the valleys, in the running waters, and the flight of birds and the singing of a blackbird in the early morning, but is there beauty only out there? Or is beauty something that only exists when the 'me' is not? You understand? When you look at those mountains on a sunny morning, clear against the blue sparkling sky - I am not being romantic - the very majesty of that drives away all the accumulated memories of yourself for a moment - haven't you noticed that? There the outward beauty, the outward magnificence, the majesty and the strength of that mountain wipes away all your problems, everything for a second out of you. You have forgotten yourself. Where there is total absence of yourself beauty is. But we are not free of ourselves. We are terribly selfish people, concerned with ourselves, with our problems, with our agonies, with our sorrows, with our loneliness. And out of that desperate loneliness we want identification with something or other. Out of that loneliness we cling to somebody, to a belief, to an idea, to a person, specially to a person. And in that dependency all our problems arise. And where there is dependency, psychologically, fear begins. When you are tied to something corruption begins - right?

So one must go into this question of what is desire, because that is the most urgent, vital drive in our life. We are not talking about the desire for a particular thing but desire itself, not for something. Let's go into it very carefully. Because as one must know, all religions have said that if you want to serve god subjugate desire, destroy desire, control desire. And all religions have said substitute for that desire the image thought has created - right? The image that the Christians have, the Hindus and all the rest of it. You substitute an image for the actual. Follow all this. The actual is desire, the burning of it. And one thinks one can overcome that by substituting that for something else. This has been the pattern of all religious thinking. Or, surrender yourself to that which you think is the master, the guru, is the symbol, etc., which again is the activity of thought. I don't know if you are following all this. So one has to very carefully understand the whole movement of desire. For obviously desire is not love, desire isn't compassion. Without love and compassion meditation becomes utterly meaningless because love and compassion have their own intelligence, it is not the intelligence of cunning thought.

So let us together - the speaker means together, not the speaker explains and you follow, then you will be merely followers. Whereas if both of us together, step by step, understand the nature of desire, why it has played such extraordinary importance in our life, how it distorts clarity, how it prevents the extraordinary quality of love and so on. It is important that we understand and not suppress, not try to control it, nor to direct it in a particular direction which may give you peace and all the rest of it, but rather examine together, please together, the nature and the movement of desire. Shall we go on? You are not tired? It is nice and warm in here!

Please bear in mind the speaker is not trying to impress you, guide you, help you, nothing. But together we are walking, perhaps hand in hand, along a very subtle, complex path. And one has to listen to each other. One has to listen to find out the truth about desire. When one understands the truth, the significance, the meaning, the fulness, the truth of desire, then desire has quite a different value or drive in one's life.

And also one must look at something else too: which is, when you observe desire, are you observing it as an outsider looking at desire? You understand? Or you are observing desire as it arises? Not desire something separate from you, you are desire. You see the difference? Either I observe desire, which I have when I see something in the window which pleases me, and I have the desire to buy it, and then the object is different from me. Right? But the object is different but desire is me - right? So there is a perception of desire without the observer watching desire. Am I making this somewhat clear? No. All right I will explain.

I can look at a tree. The tree is the word by which I recognize that which is standing in the field. But I also know that the word is not the tree - right? The word is not the tree. My wife is not the word - right? But I have made the word my wife. I don't know if you see all the subtleties of all this. So I must very clearly understand from the beginning the word is not the thing. The word 'desire' is not the feeling of it - right? The extraordinary energy there is behind that reaction. So I must be very watchful that I am not caught in the word. And also the brain must be active enough to see that the object may create desire - right? - but there is a desire which is separate from the object. You are following all this? Are we together in this? Are we so aware that the word is not the thing? That desire is not separate from the observer who is watching desire? That the object may create desire but there is desire independent of the object - right? And each one has a separate desire - the religion, one's god, and so on and so on. So one must be aware of all this.

So we are going to find out what is desire, not the object in the window or on the road, or the person I see, but how does desire arise? Right? How does desire flower? Why is there such extraordinary energy behind it? Please we are together in this, not I explain and you follow but together we are moving because this has a great importance in relationship. If we don't understand deeply the nature of desire we will always be in conflict with each other. I may desire one thing and my wife may desire another. My children may desire

something totally different. So we are always at loggerheads with each other. And this battle, this struggle, is called love, relationship.

We are asking: what is the source of desire? How does desire begin? And we must be very truthful in this, very honest, because it is very, very deceptive, very subtle unless we understand the root of it. For most of us, all of us, sensations are important, sensory responses - right? The touch, the taste, the smell, the hearing. And for most of us a particular sensory response is more important than the other responses. If we are artistic we see something specially. If we are trained as an engineer or this or that, then the sensory responses are different and so on. So we never observe with all the sensory responses totally. We respond, or observe in our responses about something special, divided. Now let's find out if it is possible to respond totally with all your senses. See the importance of that. That is, if one responds totally with all one's senses there is the elimination of a centralized observer. I wonder if you are following all this? Right? But when we respond to a particular thing separated, then in that separation begins the division - right? Find out when you go out of this tent, when you look at the river, the flowing waters, the light on the waters, the swiftness of the waters, find out if you can look at it with all your senses. Don't ask me how, then that becomes mechanical. You understand? But if you say let me look at it, find out. That is, to educate ourselves in the understanding of the sensory responses which will be total. I must come back to something else - sorry. That is only part of it.

We are asking what is the source of desire? As we said, sensory responses - we will begin with sensory responses. You see something, the seeing brings about a response. You see a green shirt, or a green dress, the seeing awakens the response. Then the contact takes place - right? Then from that contact thought creates the image of you in that dress, or you in that car, or you in that house. So watch it, go slowly into this. Sensory responses, the seeing, the hearing, the tasting, sensory responses, then the contact, not only with the eye but touching it, then thought creating the image of you in that shirt, or in that dress, or in that car and then the desire arises. You follow this?

The seeing of a car in the road, nice lines, highly polished, etc., the power behind it, then I touch it, feel around it, go around it, examine the engine. Then thought creates the image of me getting into the car and starting the ignition, putting my foot down and driving it. Just see it. This is actually what goes on - right? So desire begins, the source of desire is when thought creates the image, up to then there is no desire. There is sensory responses, contact, which is normal, all right, healthy, but then thought creates the image and from that second begins desire. You follow? I see a beautiful vase; feel the shape of it, the beauty of it, the Grecian and all the rest, I won't go into it. And touching it, looking at it, the beauty of it, and gradually creating the image, wanting it begins.

If this is clear then the question is: is it possible for thought not to create the image? You understand this? This is learning about desire, which in itself is discipline. You understand? Learning about it is discipline, not the controlling of desire. I wonder if you understand this? Is this clear? Learning about desire, if you learn about something it is finished. But whereas if you say you must control desire, then you are totally in a different field altogether. But if you say look, I understand now that when thought creates the image, at that second desire begins. Now is it possible to see the whole of this movement, the whole of it, not just sections of it, when you see the whole of it you will understand that thought will not interfere with its image but only you see, have sensation, what is wrong with that? Are you understanding? No, you don't!

Because you see we are all so crazy about desire, we want to fulfil ourselves through desire - right? But we don't see what havoc desire has created in the world. Desire for individual security, desire for individual attainment, success, power, position, prestige - you follow? We don't feel we are totally responsible for everything we do. And if one understands desire, the nature of it, then what place has desire? Or has it any place where there is love? Is love something so extraordinarily outside of human existence that it has really actually no value at all? Or because we have not seen the beauty and the depth and the greatness, sacredness of this word - not the word - of

the actuality of it, that we haven't the energy, time, to study, to educate ourselves to understand what it is. Because without love and compassion with its intelligence, meditation has very little meaning. And without that perfume that which is eternal can never be found. And that is why it is important to put our house, the house in which we dwell, not only in the house outwardly but the house of our life, of our being, of our struggles, there to bring complete order. Finished!

Saanan 5th Public Talk

21st July 1981

We have got three more talks - today, Thursday and Sunday. We have to cover quite a bit during these three talks. First we have to consider together whether the brain, which is now only operating partially, whether that brain has the capacity to function wholly, completely. I do not know if you have gone into that question at all. Because we are only using now a part of it. One can observe this for oneself without going to any specialist. One can see that any specialization, which may be necessary, whether that specialization does not bring about the functioning of only a part of the brain: if one is a scientist, specialized in that subject, naturally only one part of him is functioning; or if one is a mathematician and so on. And we are asking whether - together we are asking, I am not imposing the question on you, we must ask this question: whether the brain, though in the modern world one has to specialize, whether it is possible to allow the brain to operate wholly, completely. That is one of the problems that we are going to discuss this morning.

And the other problem is: what is going to happen to humanity, to all of us, when the computer which will outthink man accurately, much more quickly, rapidly - as the computer experts are saying it can - with the help of the robot man will then only have a couple of hours of work a day. This is going to happen within the next five, ten, twenty years. Then what will man do? Either he is going to follow the entertainment field, which is already taking place: sports are becoming more and more important, if you watch the television. Entertainment in different forms, football, you know all that is happening. And also religious entertainment. Either humanity is going to follow the whole movement of entertainment; or he is going to turn inwardly, which is not an entertainment, which demands much greater capacity of observation, examination, non-personal perception and so on inwardly. These are the two possibilities. And this is happening already, the entertainment world is going to take over - the cinemas, you know, all the rest of it. Or the computer can

formulate a new religion, putting all the religions together, synthesize, bring out something totally new. And humanity - which is another form of entertainment - will follow that, or enter into something totally different. That is one problem.

And the other is the whole content of our consciousness is basically fear, pleasure, the pursuit of pleasure and the avoidance of fear, and the suffering of mankind. That is the basic content of our human consciousness with its varieties. Right? These are the three problems that man is facing. If humanity is going to follow entertainment, it is very simple. And one hopes these Gatherings are not a form of entertainment.

And also whether the brain can be totally free so as to function wholly, because any specialization, any following a certain path, a certain groove, certain pattern, must inevitably make the brain function partially and therefore limited energy. I hope we are thinking together about all this.

And we live in a world of specialization - engineers, physicists, surgeons, carpenters - you know, the whole mechanical world. And also specialization of a particular belief, of a particular dogma, rituals, they are all specializations. And those certain specializations, which are necessary, like surgeons, carpentry, and so on, whether in spite of that specialization, whether the brain can function completely, wholly, not partially, and therefore have tremendous energy. I hope we are following each other. We are thinking together - right? Is this a problem at all to any of us? Or the speaker is imposing the problem onto you? We have so many problems, I don't know why we have so many problems, but don't let us add another problem to already innumerable other problems. This is, I think, a very serious question into which we have to enquire together.

If one observes one's own activity you will find more and more that the brain functions only, operates only very partially, very, very little. And therefore our energy becomes less and less and less, as we grow older. Biologically, physically, when we are young we are full of this vitality, but as we get educated, follow a livelihood and need specialization, that brain becomes

small, narrow, limited, and therefore the energy becomes less and less and less, but it has its own vitality - right?

So we are asking whether that brain, though it may have to have a certain form of specialization, not necessarily religious, because that is superstition, we can put all that out, whether, suppose I am a surgeon, I have to specialize, whether in spite of that the brain can operate wholly. It can only operate wholly, completely with all the tremendous vitality of a million years behind it, only when it is completely free. Is this somewhat clear? Are we meeting each other? As a question - we are going to enquire whether the brain can ever be totally free, in spite of the specialization, which is necessary for a livelihood. And it may not be necessary if the computer takes over. It won't take over surgery, obviously. It won't take over the feeling of beauty, looking at the evening stars, Orion, Pleiades and so on, but it may take over other functions altogether - right? So can the human brain be totally free? You understand my question? - without any form of attachment? - attachment of any kind, physical, attachment to certain beliefs, experience and so on. Can the brain be so completely free? If the brain cannot be so totally free it will begin to deteriorate, because when it is occupied with problems, with specialization, livelihood and so on and so on, it is active. The brain is active, but when the computer takes over this activity the brain will have less and less problems and therefore it will gradually deteriorate - right? This is happening, it is not something in the future, this is actually happening now when you observe one's own activity - right?

So the question is we have to find an answer to whether the brain can be totally free, and therefore function altogether, not partially - right? And whether our consciousness, with its content, basically fear, the pursuit of pleasure and all the implications of that, grief, pain and sorrow, being hurt inwardly and so on, that is the basic content of one's consciousness. You may have other forms of consciousness, a group consciousness, racial consciousness, national consciousness, the consciousness of a particular group, the consciousness of the Catholic group, the Hindu group and so on and so on,

but basically the consciousness with its content is fear, pleasure, the pursuit of pleasure, pain, sorrow, death - right? This is the central content of our consciousness - right? We are thinking together, please. Right? We are thinking together, examining together. The speaker is not laying down anything. We are together observing the whole phenomenon of existence, human existence, that is our existence. As we pointed out earlier, we are mankind because our consciousness, whether it is as a Christian living in the Western world, or in the Middle East, or in the Asiatic world, that consciousness, its content is basically fear, pursuit of pleasure, pain, hurts, sorrow and the never ending burden of all this - right? So our consciousness is not personal, mine. This is very difficult to accept because we have been so conditioned, so educated, that we resist this actuality, which means we are not individuals at all, we are the whole of mankind. This is not a romantic idea, it is not a philosophical concept, it is not absolutely an ideal; if one examines it closely it is a fact. So we are going together to find out whether the brain can be free from the content of its consciousness - right?

Sirs, why do you listen? Why do you listen to the speaker? Or in listening to the speaker you are listening to yourself - right? Is that what is taking place? The speaker is only pointing out, acting as a mirror in which you see actually yourself. The actuality of one's own consciousness, not the description which the speaker is pointing out, not the description which becomes merely an idea, if you merely follow the description. But through the description you yourself perceive actually your own state of mind, brain, your own consciousness, then the listening to the speaker has a certain importance. But if you are merely listening to the speaker as a telephone, then it has very little value - right? So please don't say to yourself at the end of these talks and questions and answers, "I haven't changed. Why have I not changed? It is your fault. You have spoken for sixty years perhaps and I have not changed." Is it the fault of the speaker? Or you have not been able to apply it? So if you don't apply it naturally it is the fault of the speaker! Then you become cynical and do all kinds of absurd things. So please bear in mind that we are listening not to the

speaker but through the description and the words we are looking at our own consciousness, which is the consciousness of all humanity. The Western world may believe in a certain symbol, religiously, certain figure, certain rituals; and the Eastern world also has the same thing but behind it the same fear, the same pursuit of pleasure, grief, pain, being hurt, wanting this - the whole of that is the movement of common humanity - right?

So in listening we are learning about ourselves, not following the description and therefore learning the description, but actually learning to look and therefore bringing about a total freedom in which the whole of the brain can operate - right? After all sirs, meditation, love and compassion is the operation of the whole of the brain. When there is the operation of the whole there is integral order. And when there is integral, inward order there is total freedom. And it is only then that there can be something which is timelessly sacred. That is not a reward; that is not something to be achieved; but it comes about, that which is eternally timeless, sacred, only when the brain is totally free to function wholly, and in that wholeness there is order and so freedom.

So, after stating that let us proceed to find out together whether the content of our consciousness, which is the operation of thought - right? - the content is put together by all the activities of thought, which we will go into, and whether that content can ever be free so that there is a totally different dimension altogether. Right? First let us observe together the whole movement of pleasure. There is not only biological, sexual pleasure, there is pleasure in possession, pleasure in having money, pleasure in achieving something that you have been working towards, there is pleasure in power, political, religious, power over a person, power in acquisition of knowledge, and the expression of that knowledge as a professor, as a writer, as a poet, the gratification that comes about through knowledge, and the pleasure of leading a very strict, moral, aesthetic life, the pleasure of achieving something inwardly which is not common to ordinary man. And this has been the pattern of our existence for millions of years - right? Our brain is conditioned to it, therefore our brain has

become limited - right? I wonder if you see this? Anything that is conditioned must be limited and therefore the brain, when it is pursuing these forms and many other forms of pleasure, it must inevitably become small, limited, narrow. And probably unconsciously realizing this one seeks different forms of entertainment, a release through sex, through different kinds of fulfilment and so on - right? Please observe it in yourself, you are not listening to me, you are listening to yourself, to your own activity of daily life. And if you observe, your brain is occupied all day with something or other, chattering, talking, endlessly - you follow? - that is going on, like a machine that never stops. And so the brain is gradually wearing itself out, and it is going to be inactive if the computer is going to take its place - you follow? All the things computers will do.

So why is man, human beings, caught in this perpetual pursuit of pleasure, why? Please find out, let's find out. Is it because he is so utterly lonely? Escape from that sense of isolation? Is it that he has been, from childhood, conditioned to this? Is it because thought creates the image of pleasure and then pursues it? You are following? So can we ask together whether thought is the source of pleasure? Right? Is it? Find out. That is, one has had some kind of pleasure, either eating very tasty food, sexual, or the sense of being flattered and so on and so on, thought - or rather the brain has registered it. These incidents which have brought about pleasure have been recorded in the brain, and the remembrance of that pleasure of yesterday, or last week, that remembrance is the movement of thought - right? And so thought is the movement of pleasure - right? Thought has registered that incident, pleasurable, exciting, worthwhile to remember, and it is stored, held, attached, and thought projects in the future and pursues it - right?

So the question then is: why does thought or memory of an incident that is over, finished, carry on? Is that part of our occupation? A man who wants money, power, position, is perpetually occupied with it. Perhaps similarly the brain is occupied with this question of remembrance of something a week ago which gave great pleasure, being held in the brain and thought projects future

pleasure and pursues it. This is the repetition of pleasure which is the movement of thought and therefore limited. Right? I wonder if we see this. And therefore the brain can never function wholly, it can only function partially.

Now the next question that arises is: what am I to do? If this is the pattern of thought, how can thought be stopped? Or how can the brain not register that incident of yesterday which gave me delight? That is the obvious question. Right? Now why do you put such a question? Just investigate it. Why? Is it because you want to escape from the movement of pleasure, and that very escape is another form of pleasure? You understand? Right? Whereas if you say, look, this is a fact. The fact is the incident which gave great delight, pleasure, excitement, and the fact is over, it is not a living thing of that which happened a week ago. It was a living thing then but now it is not - right? Can you finish last week's pleasure, entertainment, excitement, finished, end it, not carry it over? It is not how to end it. It is not how to stop it. But just see the fact how the brain is operating, how thought is operating. If one is aware of that thought itself will come to an end. That is the registering of last week's pleasure is ended, finished. Right? Please sirs, if we don't do this don't accuse the speaker of not making it clear, and therefore becoming cynical, or being helped to be cynical.

And the other problem is fear. Again this is the common ground of all mankind, whether you are living in a small house, or in a palace, whether you have no work or have plenty of work, whether you have tremendous knowledge about everything on earth, or whether you are a priest, whether you are the highest representative of god, or whatever it is, there is still this deep rooted fear in all mankind. That is a common ground on which all humanity stands. There is no question about it. That is an absolute, irrevocable fact, it cannot be contradicted. It is a fact. And again as long as the brain is caught in this pattern of fear its operation is limited - right? And therefore it can never function wholly. So it behoves us, it is necessary if humanity is to survive completely as human beings not as machines, one must find out for oneself whether it is possible to be totally free from this fear, not only physical fears of

losing a job, of getting hurt, of having pain which has been experienced last week, and carry on with that remembrance of that pain, and therefore hoping that pain will not recur and fear involved in it. There is a biological fear and deep psychological rooted fears. You are looking at yourself, not at the speaker. The speaker is not important. What is important is to look at the content of our consciousness with its fear. We are not talking about the various forms of fear - fear of old age, fear of death, fear of loneliness, fear of anxiety, fear which breeds hate, fear of not arriving, not achieving, not fulfilling, not reaching Nirvana, or whatever you want to reach spiritually. We are not talking about the objects of fear but fear itself - right? See the difference. We are afraid about something, or fear of something. Fear of yesterday, or fear of tomorrow, which is fear of time - right? I want to go into that a little bit.

So we are talking about fear itself, not the expressions of fear - clear? What is fear? When there is fear, is there any sense - no, let me put it differently: When there is fear, at that very moment is there a recognition as fear? Do you understand my question? There is fear in me, suppose. Is that fear describable at the moment it is taking place, the reaction, or after? The after is time - right? I wonder if you see this. Right? Are we meeting together in this? I am afraid - suppose I am afraid. Either I am afraid about something, or I am afraid of something that I have done in the past which I don't want you to realize, or know, or something has happened in the past which again awakens that fear. Or is there a fear by itself without the object? And when there is fear at the second do you call it fear? Or only after it has come? Do you understand all this? It is surely after it has happened. Which means what? The memory of other incidents of fear has been held in the brain and the moment that reaction which takes place, the memory says "That is fear" - right? Are we together in this? I will explain again. Gosh, how we depend on explanations! How terrible!

I recognize that at the immediacy of that feeling, you don't call it fear. It is only after it has happened that I name it as fear. The naming of it as fear is the remembrance of other incidents that have arisen which have caused fear - right? I remember those fears of the past and the new feeling arises and I

immediately identify it with the word fear - right? That is simple enough. So there is always the memory operating on the present.

So we are enquiring: what is fear? Is fear time? Fear of that something which happened a week ago, which has caused that feeling which I have named as fear, and the future implications that it must not happen again, and it might happen therefore I am afraid of it - you follow? So I am asking myself and you are asking yourself: is it time that is the root of fear? Right? Are you getting bored with all this? Are you getting bored with all this? No? I hope not.

So what is time? Do you understand this? Time by the watch is very simple. There is sunrise at a certain time and the sun sets at a certain time. And yesterday, today, tomorrow. That is a natural sequence of time. There is also psychological time in us. That is, the incident which happened last week, which has given pleasure, or which awakened the sense of fear, and the remembrance of that projecting not only in the present being modified, but the future, I may not have a job, I may lose my position, I may lose my money, I may lose my wife - you follow? - time. So is fear part of time? Right? It looks like it. Right? And what is psychological time? There is time by the clock, obviously. If one has to catch a train, it is fixed, there is time. To go from here to there requires time, and so on. Time implies space - right? Not only physical time which needs space, there is also psychological time which needs space - yesterday, last week, modified today, tomorrow. There is space and time - right? That is simple. So is fear the movement of time? And is not the movement of time psychologically the movement of thought? You are following all this? Please this is very good education for each one of us.

So thought is time - right? Time is fear. Obviously. I have had pain sitting with the dentist. I remember it, stored, projected, hope not to have that pain again - thought is moving. Which is, time of yesterday's pain, held and not wanting it again. So fear is a movement in space and time which is thought. Right? If one sees that not as an idea but as an actuality, which means one has to pay attention to that pain, that fear which happened last week, to give to

that fear complete attention at the moment it arises then it is not registered. Do this and you will find out for yourself. When you give complete attention to an insult, there is no insult. Or if somebody comes along and says, "What a marvellous person you are", and if you pay attention it is like water on a duck's back - right? So please see the truth of this for yourself, that when you realize, time, space, thought is the movement of fear, that is a fact, not described by the speaker, but if you have observed it for yourself that is an absolute fact, you can't escape from it. You can't escape from a fact, it is always there. You may try to avoid it, you might try to suppress it, do every kind of escape, but it is always there - right? And if you give complete attention to the fact, the fact is not, psychologically. You understand?

So the content of our consciousness is the movement of thought, time and space. Whether that space is very limited, or wide, extensive, it is still a movement of time, space, thought. (Noise of jet plane.) It has now gone behind the other mountain. I hope you have observed something. The extraordinary mechanical power of that instrument - right? The tremendous power. And thought has created it. Thought has created different forms of power in ourselves but they are all limited. And when there is freedom from this limitation there is an astonishing sense of power, not mechanical power, a tremendous sense of energy, much more than that jet. It has nothing to do with thought and therefore that power, that energy cannot be misused. But if thought says, "I will use it", then that power, that energy is dissipated.

We have got five minutes more left. We must also talk over together the other factor which exists in our consciousness, which is sorrow, grief, pain and the wound, the hurts that exist in most human beings from childhood. The hurt, from that hurt, psychological hurt, the pain of it, the remembrance of it, the holding on to it, and the grief that arises from it, and also there is sorrow involved in it; and also there is the global sorrow of mankind which has faced thousands and thousands of wars, millions and millions of people have cried. And this war machine is still going on, directed by the politicians, by our nationalism, by our feeling that we are separate from the rest, 'we and they',

'you and me'. That is a global sorrow which the politicians are building, building, building. And we are ready for another war - I hope there won't be, but when you are preparing for something there must be some kind of explosion somewhere. It may not be in the Middle East, it may happen here, as long as you are preparing for something you are going to get it - it is like preparing food. But we are so - if I may use the word without disrespect - we are so stupid to allow all this to go on: terrorism - you know, the whole of it.

So, we are asking - and perhaps we shall continue with it the day after tomorrow - we are asking whether this whole pattern of being hurt, lonely, pain, resistance, withdrawal, isolation, which causes further pain, grief, sorrow of my son's death, sorrow of losing something, losing some precious belief that I have held, the disillusionment that comes when I have followed somebody, one has given one's life, one's endeavour, struggled for somebody, surrender oneself to somebody, and then get disillusioned and from that pain, anxiety, uncertainty, sorrow. You have noticed all this. That is the pattern of our consciousness. When one asks: is it possible ever to be free, ever, of all this? It is possible if we apply, not endlessly talk about it. If I realize that I am hurt from childhood, psychologically and see all the consequences of that hurt, the consequences are I resist, I withdraw, I don't want to be hurt anymore, I encourage isolation and therefore I am building a wall round myself; and my wife also is hurt and she is doing the same thing - right? I don't know if you realize all these things. So that is, the consequences of being hurt from childhood are pain, resistance, withdrawal, isolation, more and more, deeper and deeper fear. And the global sorrow of mankind - I don't know if you have ever thought about it even. How many human beings, have been tortured through wars, tortured under dictatorship, Totalitarianism, tortured in different parts of the world. And also there is the sorrow of my brother, son, wife, running away, or dying, and the sorrow of separation, the sorrow that comes about when one is interested in something completely and the other is not - you are following? In this sorrow there is no compassion, there is no love. And the ending of sorrow brings love, not pleasure, not desire, love. And where

there is love there is compassion. With compassion comes intelligence, which has nothing whatever to do with the intelligence of thought.

So one has to look very closely at ourselves as humanity, why we have born all these things all our lives, why we have never ended it. Is it part of our indolence, part of our habit? And if you say, "It is part of our habit, part of our conditioning. What am I to do about it? Let's talk about it. How am I to uncondition myself?" Keep at it. That is what we are all doing. "I can't find the answer, I will go to the guru next door" - or further away, or the priest, or this or that. We never say: Look, let me look at myself closely and see if one can break through it, like any habit. If you have a habit of smoking, it can be broken very easily, or drugs, alcohol. But we say what does it matter. I am getting old anyhow, the body is destroying itself, so a little more pleasure, what does it matter? So we carry on. We don't feel utterly responsible for all the things we do. We either blame it on the environment, on society, on our parents, on past hereditary, it is genetic - some excuse but never apply it. And if one really has the urge, the immediate urge to find out why I am hurt, why one is hurt. One is hurt because one has built an image about oneself. That is a fact. When you say, "I am hurt" - it is the image that you have about yourself. Somebody comes along and puts his heavy boot on that image and you get hurt. You get hurt through comparison: I am this but somebody else is better. As long as one has an image about oneself you are going to get hurt. That is a fact. But if you pay attention to that fact that as long as you have an image of any kind somebody is going to put a pin into it. As long as I have an image about myself, because I address lots of people, a big audience, become stupidly famous in the world and all that rot that goes on with reputation, and I want to maintain it, you are going to hurt it. Somebody else has a bigger audience - you follow? So I get hurt. So if you give complete attention to the image you have about yourself, attention, not concentration, give attention, then you will see the image has no meaning, it disappears. Right, we will stop there. We will continue the day after tomorrow.

Saanen 6th Public Talk

23rd July 1981

We have covered most of the problems of our life, the complicated existence. And we also ought to go into whether it is possible to end sorrow. I think we ought to talk it over together and go into it rather deeply and find out for ourselves what are the implications of sorrow, and whether sorrow and love can exist together. And what is our relationship to the sorrow of mankind, not only our own personal daily grief, hurt, pain, and sorrow that comes with death? And also, as we were pointing out the other day, mankind has suffered thousands of wars, wars that seem to have no end. We have left it to the politicians all over the world to bring about peace, and what they are doing, if you have followed them, will never bring peace. We are all preparing for war. When you prepare you are going to have some kind of blow up, whether in the Middle East, here in the West, Far West or in Asia. And we human beings have never been able to live in peace with each other. We talk about it a great deal. The religions have preached, talked, about peace - peace on earth and goodwill and so on. But apparently that has never been possible - to have peace on earth, on the earth on which we live, which is our earth, and not the British earth and the French earth and so on, it is our earth. And apparently we have never been able to resolve the problem of killing each other.

Probably we have violence in our heart. We have never been free from any sense of antagonism, any sense of retaliation, never free from our fears, sorrows, wounds and the pain of daily existence. Except for the very, very rich and the people who have position, apparently all the rest of us can never have peace, comfort, always in travail. That is part of our life, part of our daily suffering. And this suffering, without love man has tried many, many ways to be free of it, he has suppressed it, escaped from it, identified himself with something greater, handed himself over to some idea, some ideals, beliefs and faith and so on. But apparently this sorrow can never end. We have become accustomed to it, we put up with it, we tolerate it, we never ask

ourselves seriously, with a great sense of awareness, whether it is possible to end sorrow.

And we also should talk about, together talk over the whole immense implications of death because death is part of life, though we have postponed, avoided even talking about it, it is there. So we ought to go into that too. And whether love, not the remembrance of pleasure which has nothing to do with love and compassion, whether that love and compassion with its own peculiar all-comprehending intelligence, whether that love can exist in our life.

These are the problems or questions which we are going to talk over together this morning.

First of all do we, as human beings, want to be really free from sorrow? Or we have never actually gone into it, faced it and understood all the movement of it, what are the implications involved in it, why human beings, who are so extraordinarily clever in their technological world, why sorrow has never been resolved. I think it is important to talk it over together this question, and to find out for ourselves whether sorrow can really end.

We all suffer, in different ways. There is the sorrow of death of someone, there is the sorrow of great poverty which the East knows very well, great sorrow of ignorance - we use the word 'ignorance' in the sense not of book knowledge but the ignorance of not knowing totally oneself, the whole complex activity of the self. And if we don't understand that very deeply there is the sorrow of that ignorance. And there is the sorrow of never being able to realize something fundamentally, deeply, though we are very clever at achieving technological success and success in this world. And also we have never been able to understand pain, not only physical pain but also the deep psychological pain. One is sure that one knows all these things, one is aware of all this, however learned or not very erudite, we know all these things: that there is personal sorrow of not being beautiful outwardly or inwardly, there is the sorrow of constant struggle, conflict from the moment we are born until we die, there is the sorrow of attachment with its fear, with its corruption, and there is

the sorrow of not being loved and asking, craving to be loved, and there is the sorrow of never realizing something beyond thought, that which is eternal. And ultimately there is the sorrow of death.

Now we have described various forms of sorrow. And the factor of sorrow is self centred activity - right? We are all so concerned with ourselves, with our endless problems, with old age, not being able to have a global deep inward outlook. And together this morning can we go into it, not verbally, intellectually, but actually realize the sorrow that one has had, or that one is having, and the sorrow of the whole world.

Physical pain one can understand, do something about it, and perhaps not register it, not record it. I do not know if you have ever tried that. You may have had pain last week and finished with that pain when that pain is over, not record it. That is possible if you go into it very carefully, it is possible to have physical pain and end it the moment it is over, not carry the remembrance of it at all. It is possible so that that pain does not interfere or bring about neurotic activity in our daily life, and not make that as an excuse to hurt others.

And we bear psychological pain. We all have, as we pointed out the other day, images of ourselves and about others. The brain is always active in either daydreaming, being occupied with something or other, or imagining, creating from that imagination pictures, ideas, and gradually from childhood one builds this structure of the image which is me. And each one of us is doing this constantly, and it is that image that gets hurt, which is me. Right? As we pointed out, when one is hurt there is this resistance, which is building a wall round oneself not to be hurt anymore and therefore more fear and isolation, and the feeling of having no relationship and encouraging loneliness which brings about sorrow also. I hope we are together thinking, following this and not merely listening to a series of words and ideas which will become rather boring. But if we actually see, are aware how this hurt, with all its consequences, is part of our life, and whether those wounds can ever

disappear completely because if that doesn't disappear completely it is part of our sorrow. Are you following this? Are we thinking together?

And there is this pain of isolation, separateness. Not only as a race, as a community, as a nation, but also isolating ourselves as an individual, and all the consequences, the travail, the misery of that individual. And our activity is always self centred, which is one of the factors of isolation.

Now the question then is, after having described the various forms of sorrow, whether we can look at it without verbalization, without running away from it, or by intellectual adaptation to some other form of a religious or intellectual conclusion, but to look at it completely, not move away from it, stay with it. You understand? What we mean by that is, suppose I have a son who is deaf and dumb, who may die, and I am responsible, I have produced him. And it gives sorrow knowing that he can never look at the beautiful sky, never hear the running waters. And there is this sorrow, to remain with it, not move away from it. You understand? Are you following? That is, I have this great pain, this sorrow, either of his deformity, or the death of someone with whom I have lived for many years and the ending of that person. There is this sorrow. Sorrow is the essence of isolation - right? I wonder if you understand that? Right? When we are totally isolated, completely alone and that feeling is sorrow. Now to remain completely with that feeling, not verbalize it, rationalize it, escape from it, transcend it, all the movement that thought brings about. Are we meeting each other? So that when there is that sorrow, and when thought doesn't enter into it at all, which means that you are completely sorrow, not that you are trying to overcome sorrow, you are totally sorrow. And when there is that totality of it then there is the disappearance of it. It is only when there is fragmentation then there is travail. You understand this? Are we meeting each other?

So when there is sorrow, to remain with it without a single movement of thought, and the wholeness of sorrow is not that I am in sorrow, I am sorrow. So there is no fragmentation involved in sorrow. So when there is that totality

of that, and there is no movement away from that, then there is the withering away of it - right? Are we together in this?

You see without ending sorrow how can there be love? We have associated sorrow and love strangely together. I love my son and when he dies I am full of sorrow. So we have associated sorrow with love. Now we are asking when there is suffering can love exist at all? We are asking then: is love desire? Is love pleasure? And when that desire, that pleasure, is denied, there is suffering. And we say suffering as jealousy, attachment, possession and all that is part of love. That is our conditioning, that is how we are educated, that is part of our great inheritance, tradition. Now we are asking: love and suffering cannot possibly go together. Right? That is not a dogmatic statement, a rhetorical assertion, but when one looks into the depth of sorrow and understands the movement of it, in which is involved pleasure, desire, attachment, and the consequences of that attachment which brings about corruption, if we are tied to anything it will bring corruption inevitably. And when one is aware without any choice, without any movement, aware of the whole nature of sorrow, then can love exist with sorrow? You understand? Or love is something entirely different? I think we ought to be clear that devotion to a person, to a symbol, to the family, to something or other, is not love - right? Please, is it? I am devoted to you for various reasons, there is a motive behind that devotion. Love has no motive - right? If there is a motive it is not love, obviously. If you give me pleasure, sexually, various forms of comfort, dependency, the motive is I depend on you because you give me something in return. And as we live together I call that love. Is it?

So one questions where there is motive can love exist? And where there is ambition, whether in the physical world, or in the psychological world; ambition to be on top of everything, to be a great success, to have power, religiously, or physically; where there is aggression, competitiveness, jealousy, can love exist? Obviously, not. But we recognize it cannot exist and yet we go on. Look what happens to our brain when we are playing such kinds of tricks. I say, "I love you", I have a motive behind that love. I am ambitious, I want to be

spiritually next to god, specially on his right hand! I want to achieve illumination - you know, all that deception. You cannot achieve illumination. You cannot possibly achieve that which is beyond time. But that is our constant endeavour, psychologically. So I am ambitious, competitive, conforming, jealous, fearful, hating, all that is going on psychologically, inwardly. Either we are conscious of it, or deliberately avoiding it. And yet I say to my wife or father, or whatever it is, "I love you". So what happens when there is such deep contradiction in my life, in my relationship? How can that contradiction have any sense of deep integrity? You are following all this? And yet this is what we are doing until we die.

So can there be no ambition and yet live in this world - go to the office, factory, being a Shop Steward - oh, you may not know that word - the ambition of a guru - you understand? Can one live in this world without ambition, without competition? Look what is happening in the outward world. There is competition between various nations, which is taking place, please look at what is happening in the world for god's sake. The politicians are competing with each other, economically, technologically, in the instruments of war, they are competing and so we are destroying ourselves. We allow this to go on because we are also inwardly competitive. When we realize the politicians are never going to solve a thing, but if we are totally responsible for ourselves and have this deep integrity then we affect the consciousness of the world.

As we pointed out, if a few of us really understand this whole movement of what we have been talking about for the last sixty years, and if a few of us are really deeply involved and have brought about the end of fear, sorrow and so on, it will affect the whole consciousness of mankind? You are doubtful whether it will affect the consciousness of mankind? Hitlers have affected the consciousness of mankind - right? Napoleon, the Ceasars, the butchers of the world have affected mankind. And also the good people have affected mankind. I mean good people, not respectable people, but the good being those who live a life wholly, not fragmented. And the great teachers of the world have affected human consciousness. Individuals have affected human

consciousness. But if there were a group of people who understand all this, what we have been talking about, not verbally but actually live that life with great integrity, then it will affect the whole consciousness of man. This is not a theory; this is an actual fact, because great warriors have affected mankind. If you understand that simple fact you will see it goes right through: television, newspapers, everything is affecting the consciousness of man.

So love cannot exist where there is a motive, where there is attachment, where there is ambition and competitiveness, and love is not desire and pleasure. Just feel that, see it. And also what is the relationship between human beings when death occurs, when death takes place? Right? Let's talk about it together.

Because we are going through all this in order to bring about order in our life - right? Order in our house, which has no order, where there is so much disorder in our life. And without establishing an order that is whole, integral, meditation has no meaning whatsoever. See the logic of it. Right? Because if my house is not in order I may sit in meditation, hoping that through meditation I will bring order. But what happens when I am living in disorder and I meditate? I have fanciful dreams and illusions and all kinds of nonsensical results. But a sane man, intelligent, logical, must first establish order in daily life, then we can go into the depths of meditation together, and the meaning of that meditation, the beauty of it, the greatness of it, the worth of it and so on.

We have also to understand what death is. Whether we are very young, middle aged or old, it is part of our life, as love is part of our life, pain is part of our life, agony, suspicion, arrogance, all that is part of our life. But we do not take death as part of our life. We want to postpone it, put it as far away from us as possible, to have a time interval, space between the living and the dying. So we ought to, together, go into this question, which is again rather complex, what death is. If you have observed, and I am sure you have, all religions have somehow avoided this question. Avoided it in the sense, in the Christian world it is, you know, somebody suffers for you. And in the Asiatic world there is the

whole idea that you have lived in the past, you will die and be born next life. If you are going to be born next life, live rightly now, lead a righteous life, lead a life which doesn't harm, hurt others, which is not cruel and so on. But those who believe in an after life, in the Asiatic world don't care a pin about leading a righteous life. It is just a belief and like all beliefs it has no substance.

So putting all that aside, the Christian concept of death and suffering, and the Asiatic conclusion about reincarnation, karma, that which you sow you will pay, that is part of that Asiatic concept, putting those two aside, the Christian and the Asiatic, concern or explanation or lack of confrontation with death, let us together go into it. It may be unpleasant because nobody wants to face that. You are living now, healthily, having pleasure, fear, anxiety, there is the tomorrow, hope, all that. And one doesn't want to be concerned with the other thing which is the ending of all this. So if we are intelligent, sane, rational, we have to face not only the living, the implications of the living, but also the implications of dying. We must know both. That is the wholeness of life, in which there is no division.

So what is death, apart from the physical ending, biological usage of an organism that has lived wrongly, drinks, drugs, over indulgence, asceticism, denial, you know this constant battle between the opposites, not a balanced harmonious living, but extremes, and so the body goes through a great struggle imposed by thought? I don't know if you realize that: thought dictates and the body is controlled by thought, and thought being limited, as we went into, so everything it does brings about disharmony. And we live in disharmony physically, forcing it, controlling it, subjugating it, driving it - this is what we are all doing. Fasting, you know, Northern Ireland, for political or religious reasons, it is the same thing, violence. The body can endure for many years, old age, not get senile. And as the body will inevitably come to an end, the organism will die, is that what is death? Is the organism coming to an end, either through some disease, old age, accidents, it will come to an end, and is that what we are concerned about with death? Is it - please follow this - is it thought identifies itself with the body, with the name, with the form, with all the

memories, and says "Death must be avoided"? So is that what we are afraid of? The coming to an end of a body that has been looked after, cared for, if you care for it, dies? I don't think we are afraid of that specially. We are a little bit slyly anxious about it but that is not of great importance. But what is far more important for us is to end the relationships that we have had, the pleasures that we have had, the memories, pleasant and unpleasant, the thing that we call living - right? The daily living, going to the office, factory, doing some skilful job, having a family, being attached to the family, with all the memories of that family, my son, my daughter, my wife, my husband, that unit, which is fast disappearing but there is that feeling of being related to somebody, though in that relationship there is great pain, anxiety and all the rest of it, it is there. I am at home with somebody. Or you are not at home with anybody. If you are not at home with anybody, then that has its own sorrow. So is that what we are afraid of? The ending of my relationship, my attachments, the ending of something I have known, something to which I have clung, something in which I have specialized all my life, and all that I am afraid of ending - right? That is, the ending of all that is me - right? All that, the family, the name, the form, the tradition, the inheritance, cultural education, the racial inheritance, all that is me, me that is struggling, me that is happy - is that what we are afraid of? The ending of me, which is all that? Which is, the ending psychologically of the life which I am leading, the life which I know psychologically with its pain, sorrow, all that, is that what we are afraid of?

And if we are afraid of that, and have not resolved that fear, death inevitably comes, and what happens to that consciousness - please listen - what happens to that consciousness which is not your consciousness, which we went into very thoroughly, it is the consciousness of mankind, consciousness of the vast humanity, not my consciousness - we went into that very carefully and I won't go into it now, I haven't time. So please see as long as I am afraid as an individual with my limited consciousness, it is that that I am afraid of - right? Are you following this? It is that which I am scared of. And to avoid that I go through all kinds of nonsense, Gabriel and you know all that

stuff. And I realize, one realizes that is not a fact - right? It is not a fact that my consciousness is totally separate from everybody else - right? It is an illusion, it is an absurdity, it is illogical, it is unsanitary, if I can use that word, unhealthy. So - follow this carefully - I realize this, perhaps in my heart, in my feeling, I realize that I am the whole of mankind, not an individual consciousness, that is too silly, illogical, it has no meaning. And I, who have lived this kind of life, which is pain, which is sorrow, which is anxiety, all that, if my brain has not transformed some of all that, my life is only further confusion to the wholeness. You understand? I wonder if you understand this? But if I live it, realize that my consciousness is the consciousness of mankind, and for the human consciousness I am totally responsible, then freedom from the limitation of that consciousness becomes extraordinarily important, because then I am contributing or I am breaking down the limitation of that consciousness. So death has a totally different meaning. You are following? Are we meeting each other?

Look sirs: I have lived a so-called individual life, concerned about myself, my problems. And those problems never end, they are increasing. I live that kind of life. I have been brought up, educated, conditioned to that kind of life. You come along and tell me pleasantly, as a friend, or you like me, or you love me, you tell me: look, your consciousness is not yours. You suffer, so do other people suffer and so on. I have gone into this. So you tell me all that. I listen to it and it makes sense to me. I won't reject what you say because it makes logical sense, sanity and I see in what you have told me that perhaps there can be peace in the world. So I have listened to you, and I say to myself, now can I be free from fear? Right? Because I am responsible totally for the whole of consciousness - right? So when I am investigating fear and the moving away from fear I am helping the total human consciousness to lessen fear. You understand? Is this somewhat clear? Then death has a totally different meaning. Not that I am going to sit next to god or I am going to heaven through some peculiar nebulae, but I am living a life which is not my particular life. I am living a life of the whole of humanity and if I understand death, if I end

grief, I am cleansing the whole of the consciousness of mankind. That is why it is important to understand the meaning of death. And perhaps death has great significance, great relationship with love because where you end something love is. When you end completely attachment, then love is. Right? Right sirs.

Saanen 7th Public Talk

26th July 1981

We have been talking about the complex problem of existence. We have talked about forming images in our relationship with each other, the images which thought has projected and which we worship. We have also talked about fear, pleasure and the ending of sorrow. We have also gone into the question of what is love, without all the travail that is involved in that word. We have also talked about compassion with its intelligence. And we ought now, this morning, to talk about what is religion.

Most of the intellectuals throughout the world shy away from that word. They see what religions are in the present world, with their beliefs, with their dogmas, with their rituals, and the hierarchical set-up of the established religion. And they rather scoff at it and run away from anything to do with religion. And as they get older, get very near that threshold called death, they begin to revert to their old conditioning: they either become Catholics or pursue some guru, or trot off, if they have money, to India or to Japan. And religion throughout the world has lost totally its creditability, it no longer has any significance in daily life. They may go to the marvellous cathedrals, churches, and all the things that go on in them, but their heart isn't in it. The more you examine, the more you criticize, the more one is aware of the whole content of all the religious structure, one becomes very sceptical, very doubtful of the whole business. And so the intellectuals have nothing to do with it. And those who are not, either treat it romantically, emotionally, or something you go to to be entertained.

But if one puts aside all the intellectual, the romantic, sentimental attitude towards religion, one can then begin to ask, not with any naivety but with seriousness, in which is included doubt, one begins to ask: what is religion - not the mere meaning of that word, the etymological meaning, but deeply, what is religion? Man, from the ancient of times, has always thought that their must be something beyond the ordinary daily life, the ordinary misery,

confusion, conflict of daily life. And in his search he has invented all kinds of philosophies, all kinds of images, created all kinds of images from the ancient Egyptians and the ancient Hindus to modern times, but he always gets caught apparently in some kind of illusion. He begins to delude himself. And out of that illusion he begins to create all kinds of activities. And again, if we could brush all that aside, because we have examined it sufficiently, gone into it fairly deeply, with all the contemporary religions, then one begins to ask oneself: what is, and if there is something, beyond all the contagion of thought, all the corruption of time? If there is something beyond the usual existence in space and time. And if we begin to ask that of ourselves, how shall we set about it? Is any kind of preparation necessary? Discipline, sacrifice, control, all that - a certain period of preparation and then advance.

And we are asking ourselves, we are thinking together, if there is anything beyond, and if one does not hypnotize oneself, if one is free from illusion, then one can begin to examine, enquire very profoundly, what is truth and if there is any path to it, or there is no path, or how can the mind reach that, or come to it?

So we are going together this morning, together, to enquire, explore into these problems. First of all it is important to understand, is it not, that one should be free of all illusions, otherwise the mind remains in various forms and varieties of illusions. So what creates illusions? Is it not desire, wanting to reach something, wanting to experience something, wanting to have, desiring something out of the ordinary, extra-sensory perception, visions, spiritual experiences, and so on. So one must be very clear as to the nature of desire, which we talked about considerably in the past talks, and understand the movement of desire, which is thought with its image, which we went into, and also to have no motive in our enquiry. That is very difficult: to have no intention, to have no sense of direction, then the brain is free to really enquire. Again, we have been into these problems right through our talks. We said there must be order in our house, in our existence, in our relationship, in our activity. Without that order, which is freedom, there can be no virtue. Virtue,

righteousness, is not something that is intellectually cultivated. Where there is order there is virtue, and the order is something that is living, not a routine, a habit.

And another point is: is there something to be learnt? We are thinking together please. Is there something to be learnt from another? You can learn from another history, biology, mathematics, physics, the whole technological world with all its complex knowledge, you can learn from another, from a book, from one who has already studied all that. And is there something to be learned from another psychologically? Please, this is an important question that we must investigate together: to learn from another psychologically about ourselves, about that which is eternal, if there is something eternal. Or there is nothing to learn from another because all the human experience, all the psychological knowledge that one has, that humanity has gathered together for millions of years, is within oneself. You are following? Therefore if that is so, that is, we are the rest of mankind, our consciousness is the whole of mankind, and our consciousness is that. And it seems rather absurd and rather naive to go out and learn from somebody else about ourselves, because it requires a clarity of observation to learn about ourselves. That is simple. There is no psychological authority and therefore there is no spiritual authority, because the whole history of mankind, which is the story of humanity, is in us. Right? Therefore there is nothing to experience. I wonder if you see this. There is nothing to be learnt from somebody who says, "I know". Or, "I will show you the path to truth". This has been the whole trend of the priests throughout the world. They are the interpreters between the highest and the common. From the ancient of days they have played this game. And to learn about, to understand ourselves, all that authority must be set aside - right? Obviously. Because that authority is part of us. We are the priests, we are the disciples, we are the teachers, we are the experience, we are the ultimate, if we know how to understand - right?

So there is nothing to be learnt from somebody, including the speaker, specially from the speaker, because one greatly accepts other people's

influence, impressions - right? So one has to be free to enquire. And to enquire very, very deeply, not superficially because we have done all the superficial enquiry during the last six or sixty years, and we have come to the point when we say we have more or less established order in our life, more or less, and as we go along we will establish greater order, then we can ask: what is the religious mind which can understand what is meditation? - which we are going into.

Within the last perhaps ten, fifteen years, that word has become very popular in the West. Before only very few who had been to Asia or India talked and enquired into their form of meditation, because the Asiatics and the Hindus have said - we will call the Hindus and the Asiatics one word - Asiatics - the Asiatics have said only through meditation can you come to, understand that which is timeless, which has no measure. But during the last ten or fifteen years those who have nothing to do call themselves gurus, come over to the West and have brought that word. It became a word that rather made it like a drug. The word 'meditation' actually means, the dictionary meaning, to think over, ponder over, be concerned with and so on. And these people who brought that word from the East sold it to those gullible people, you paid for it, paid for the mantras which they brought, and you gradually learned their tricks. And also you learnt the various mantras which they brought along. You know the word, I am sure, like guru, mantra, meditation, is part of the daily common coin. The word 'mantra' in Sanskrit, I believe, means consider, ponder over, meditate, in not becoming. You understand? - not becoming. And also that word means to put aside all self-centred activity. Mantra means that. Which is, ponder over, meditate on not becoming and put away altogether the self-centred activity - right? That is the real meaning of that word mantra. You cannot sell that. You cannot go to somebody and say, "Give me money and I will tell you". And those people who have done it have become enormously rich people, it has become something commercial.

And also there have been various systems of meditation - the Tibetan, the Hindu, the Japanese, Zen and so on and so on. Right? And these systems

have been invented by thought, obviously. And thought being limited the systems must inevitably be limited. And also they become mechanical if you repeat, repeat, repeat, your mind naturally goes dull, rather stupid and utterly gullible. Right? It is common sense all this, but we are all so eager to experience something spiritual, either through drugs, through alcohol, or follow a system that you hope will give you some kind of exciting experience because we are bored with our own daily life, going to the office for the next forty years, at the end of it die, we are bored with all that. We are bored with our present religions and so somebody comes along and brings some fantastic notions and we fall for it. This is happening. We are not exaggerating, we are not attacking anybody personally but we are just examining the nonsense that is going on.

So if one is sufficiently aware of all this and has put aside all this, because it is utterly meaningless, you don't have to go to India, or to Tibet, or god knows somewhere else, or even to Rome, because if one uses not only common sense but has a critical mind, a mind that is questioning, not only what others say but also questioning yourself, which is far more important, not to accept anything that you yourself see that it is correct or noble or real experience, to question it, to have a mind that is capable, rational, sane, that is essential. And to have a mind that is free from all the illusions, a form of self-hypnosis. If that is possible in a world that has more or less gone mad, violent, terror, wars, the atomic bomb and the computer that is going to take over all the activities of thought. Then what is a human being? The human being has lived on thought; all the architecture, all the music, the things that are inside the churches, the temples and mosques, they are all put there by thought, invented by thought. All our relationship is based on thought, though we say, "I love you", it is still part of the image which thought has created about another. So thought to us is astonishingly important, and thought itself, as we have examined very carefully, is limited, it has the capacity to break up, to bring about fragmentation between people, as my religion, my country, my god, my

belief and so on and so on, all that is the movement of thought: thought, space, and time, which we talked about.

Now together, if we have gone that far, we can begin to examine what is actually meditation. The Christian form of that is contemplation. Contemplation is different from meditation. Meditation is the capacity of the brain, which is no longer functioning partially - which we talked about also - but the brain that has freed itself from its conditioning and therefore functioning as a whole, such a brain is different from mere contemplation. I can be conditioned as a Christian, a Hindu, whatever you will, and also contemplate from my background, from my conditioning. That contemplation does not free my conditioning. But meditation demands, and therefore it becomes extraordinarily serious, and it requires a great deal of enquiry and attention not to function partially, which we again explained carefully. By partially we mean in a particular specialization, or to function in a particular occupation, to narrowly make the brain, or allow the brain to accept beliefs, traditions, dogmas, rituals, which are only partial. All those are invented by thought. The Christians have this word 'faith'. And if one has faith in god, or whatever you will, things will be all right, or things will come out all right! This has been the slogan for two thousand years. And the Asiatics have their own form of faith - karma, reincarnation, evolution, time and so on.

So meditation is different from contemplation in the sense that meditation demands that the brain is no longer conditioned to act partially but wholly. Right? That is the requirement for meditation, otherwise meditation has no meaning.

So the question then is: is it possible, living in this world, which demands certain forms of specialization; a skilful carpenter, skilful mechanic, skilful mathematician, or a very skilful housewife, it doesn't matter, living in this world which demands this and yet to be free from specialization. I wonder if we are together in this? Suppose I am a physicist, that is, theoretical physicist and I have spent my life, most of my life in formulating mathematically, thinking about it, questioning it, asking, cultivating a tremendous knowledge about it,

and my brain has become specialized, narrowed down, and yet I begin to enquire into meditation. Right? And in my enquiry into meditation I can only partially understand the significance and the depth of that word because I am anchored in something else - right? I wonder if we are meeting each other? Right? I am anchored in my theoretical physics as my profession; anchored there I begin to enquire theoretically whether there is the timeless, whether there is meditation and so on. So my enquiry becomes partial again - right? But I have to live in this world, I am a professor at some university. I have got a wife, children, I have the responsibility of all that and perhaps I am also ill. I have got the responsibility of all that, and yet I want to enquire very profoundly into the nature of truth, which is part of meditation. So my approach is partial. So my question is: is it possible to be specialized as a carpenter and yet leave it at a certain level so that my brain, the brain which is common brain to all humanity - this is very difficult for people to accept, your brain is not your brain, it has been growing for millions of years, accumulating all kinds of things, and so on, knowledge, it is not yours, your consciousness is not your consciousness, which you readily accept but you would rather resist when we say that your brain is not yours, it has grown through space and time, which is common to all humanity. This we won't go into now.

So my question is: being specialized, can my brain say, yes it has its function but that function is not going to interfere - right? I wonder if you are understanding all this? I am a carpenter, I know the quality of wood, the tools, the grain, the beauty of the wood and so on. I say, yes, that is natural, I must have that, but the brain that has cultivated the speciality cannot possibly understand the wholeness of meditation - right? If I as a carpenter understand this, the truth of it, that I as a carpenter have a place, but that specialization has no place in the wholeness of comprehension, in the wholeness of understanding meditation. If I see the truth of that then specialization becomes a small affair. Right? Are we meeting?

So then we begin to ask: what is meditation? Why certain parts of the world, the Asiatic world, have given importance to this word. Asia is not

geographically separate from the rest of the world - it is geographically separate but Asia is you and me - right? Because we are part of humanity, part of our consciousness, we are the rest of humanity. So when one part of humanity has given a great deal of time for two or three four thousand years, as the Egyptians have done, as the Hindus have done, it is part of our enquiry to find out.

First of all meditation demands attention - right? To attend, which is to give your whole capacity, energy, in observation. Attention is different from concentration. I hope you are following all this. Are we together in this? Concentration is an effort made by thought to focus its capacity as energy on a particular point - right? That is concentration. When you are in a school the teacher says, concentrate on your book, don't look out of the window, look at your beastly book. And you are trained to concentrate, that is. to bring all your energy to a particular point. Which means in that concentration you are not allowing any kind of other thoughts to interfere, that is to control; concentration implies controlling thought, not to wander away - right? I hope you are following this - but to focus your thought on a particular subject, on a particular page, on a particular picture. Which is, thought says that it is important to focus my attention, focus my energy on that - right? It is the operation of thought. I wonder if you see. It is the operation of thought in which there is compulsion, control, which says, "Look".

So in concentration, please understand this carefully if you don't mind, in concentration there is the controller and the controlled - right? My thought is wandering off, I say it should not wander off, I bring it back, the controller who says, "I must concentrate on this". So there is a controller and the controlled - right? Who is the controller? The controller is part of thought, the controller is the past - right? The controller who says, "I have learnt a great deal and it is important for me, the controller, to control thought." That is, thought has divided itself as the controller and the controlled, so it is a trick that thought is playing upon itself. I wonder if you see all this. Please we must understand this very carefully because in attention there is no controller, nor the controlled,

there is only attention. So it requires a careful examination into the nature of concentration with its controller and the controlled - right? All our life there is this controller - I must do this, I must not do that, I must control my desires, control my anger, control my impetus - you know, control, control. Therefore I have gradually learnt to inhibit myself and there are those people who say, "Don't inhibit, do whatever you like" - right? That is the game also being played by the gurus.

So one must be very clear in understanding what is concentration and what is attention. As we are pointing out, in attention, that is to attend, there is no controller. Please understand this because as we are going to find out presently: is there a way of living our daily life in which there is no controller? Right? That is part of meditation. I wonder if you see. This is a question one must ask oneself. Is there, in daily existence, a way of living in which every form of control doesn't exist at all, because control means effort, control means division between the controller and the controlled. I am angry, I must control my anger. I smoke, I must not smoke and I must resist smoking - right? And so on and so on. What we are saying is something totally different and therefore it may be misunderstood and may be rejected altogether, which is very common because we say all life is a control. If you don't control you will become permissive, nonsensical, it has no meaning, therefore you must control - right? Religions, philosophy, your teachers, family, mother, control. But we have never enquired into who is the controller. The controller is put together in the past, the past is the knowledge, which is thought, thought has separated itself as the controller and the controlled. And concentration is all that.

And in understanding that we are asking a much more fundamental question, which is: can one live in this world with a family and all the rest of it, without a shadow of control? Right? First of all, see the beauty of that question. Because our brain has been trained for thousands of years to inhibit, to control, control, it is never operating with the wholeness of the brain - right? See what it is doing for yourself. You are not learning from me, from the speaker, you are watching your own brain in operation, rationally, a critical

examination in which there is no deception, hypnosis and so on. And most of the meditations that have been put forward from the Asiatic world, are to control; control thought so that you have a mind that is at peace, you have a mind that is quiet, not eternally chattering. Because silence, quietness, absolute stillness of the mind, brain, is necessary in order to perceive - right? Therefore all the types of meditation, however subtle, have the basis to control; or hand yourself over to some guru, to some ideal - right? And forget yourself because you have given yourself over to something and therefore you are at peace. Which is again the movement of thought, desire and the excitement of something you have offered and have been accepted. You follow all this?

So whereas attention is something entirely different. It is not the opposite of concentration - right? If it is the opposite then the opposite has its root in its own opposite - right? If love is the opposite of hate, then love is born out of hate - right? I wonder if you see this? Any opposite has its root in its own opposite. So we are saying that attention is not the opposite of concentration, it is totally divorced from it. So we are going to enquire together, what is attention. Does it need effort? Right? That is one of our principal activities, I must make an effort. I am lazy, I don't want to get up this morning but I must get up. Make an effort - right? I don't want to do something but I must. (I am getting tired of this.)

See how extraordinary it is that we cannot catch the significance of this immediately. It has to be explained, explained, explained. We seem to be incapable of direct perception between concentration and attention. Right? To have an insight into attention and be attentive. We will go into it.

When does attention take place? Obviously not through effort. When you make an effort to be attentive, it is an indication that you are inattentive and trying to make that inattention become attention - you understand? (I am tired of these explanations.) Personally I have never learned about any of all this nonsense. Personally nobody explained all this to me, thank god! Personally I

have never read about all this, it wouldn't be authentic, it would have no meaning. But to have quick insight, you understand? To see instantly the falseness of all religious organizations, all of them, and therefore you are out of it. To see instantly that the observer is the observed and therefore no effort, it is so. It is only effort exists when there is division. You are following? So does it indicate that our brains have become so dull because we have been trained, trained, so it has lost its pristine quickness, its capacity to see directly without all the explanations and words, words, words. But unfortunately one has to go into this because our minds, our brains cannot grasp instantly for example that truth has no path. You understand? To see the immensity of that statement, the beauty of that statement and put aside all paths - the Asiatic, the Western, North, South, East, West, so that your brain becomes extraordinarily active.

One of the difficulties is that we are becoming mechanical. The computer is learning more and quicker than we are learning. The computer can go so far ahead of us. And so if our brains are not extraordinarily alive and active, our brains will gradually wither away, because now we exist because we have to think, we have to be active partially, but when the computer can take all the work, most of the thought, and operate at a rapidity which the brain cannot, then the brain is going to wither - you understand? Please realize all this, this is happening, it is not an exaggerated statement of the speaker, it is happening now. We are unaware of it.

So we are enquiring into what is attention. In concentration there is always a centre from which you are acting - right? You can see it. This is clear? When I concentrate, I am concentrating for some benefit, for some deep rooted motive, for something to gain and so on, which is, from a centre I am observing. Whereas in attention there is no centre at all. When you look at something immense, like the mountains, their extraordinary majesty, the beauty of the valley, the line against the blue sky, the beauty of it for a moment drives out the centre - haven't you noticed this? And you are for a second stunned by the greatness of it. Beauty is that perception when the centre is

not. You understand? Like a child given a toy, he is so absorbed by the toy he is no longer being mischievous, he is completely with the toy. But he breaks the toy and he is back to himself. Right? So most of us are absorbed by various toys. And when the toys go we are back to ourselves. Now in the understanding of ourselves without the toy, that understanding without any direction, without any motive, that very understanding is the freedom from specialization which makes the whole of the brain active. Now the whole of the brain when it is active is total attention.

Now I'll point out something else. We are always looking or feeling with one of the senses - right? I like the taste of something, or hear some music, but one never listens, one never looks at anything with all one's senses - right? Have you ever done it? Oh go on, sirs. When you look at a mountain, because of its majesty, your senses are fully in operation, therefore you forget yourself - you understand? Now when you look at the movement of the sea or the waters, or the sky and the slip of a moon, when you look at it totally, with all your senses, that is complete attention in which there is no centre. Which means that attention is total silence of the brain that is no longer chattering, completely still. Is it taking place with you now? Is your brain completely still? Because we are talking about a stillness, an absolute silence of the mind, of the brain. Because there are various forms of silence - the silence between two noises, the silence between two notes, the silence between thoughts - right? The silence when you go into a forest, where there is great danger, of a dangerous animal, everything becomes totally silent. I don't know if you have noticed - no you haven't, here you have killed everything.

So this silence is not put together by thought, or through fear. When you are really frightened your whole body, your nerves, your brain becomes still - haven't you noticed it? Oh Lord! So this is not that quality of silence, it is entirely different. It is the operation of the whole of the brain with all its sense active, it is that freedom which brings about total silence of the mind. And it is only such a mind, such a brain - mind-brain, I don't want to divide it into two for the moment, we will stick to the brain - such a brain that is absolutely quiet, not

brought about by effort, by determination, by desire, by motive, it is the freedom of order, which is virtue, righteousness in behaviour; and in that silence alone there is that which is nameless and timeless. That is meditation.

Amsterdam 1st Public Talk

19th September 1981

Most unfortunately there are only two talks and so we have to condense what we have to say about the whole existence of life. We are not doing any kind of propaganda; we are not persuading you to think in one particular direction, nor convince you about anything. We must be quite sure of that. We are not bringing something exotic from the East, all that nonsense that goes on in the name of the gurus and those people who write strange things after visiting India. We do not belong to that crowd at all. But we would like to point out that during these two talks we are thinking together; not merely listening to the talks, listening to some ideas, either agreeing or disagreeing with those ideas, we are not creating any kind of arguments, opinions, judgements, but together - I mean together, you and the speaker are going to observe what the world has become, not only in the Western world but also in the East where there is a great deal of poverty, great misery, an enormous amount of population, where the politicians, as here in the West, are incapable of dealing with what is happening. They are all politicians thinking in terms of tribalism. Tribalism has become the glorified nationalism. And we cannot therefore rely on any politicians, or on any leader, or on any books that have been written about religion. We cannot possibly rely on any of these people, neither the scientists, nor the biologists, nor the psychologists. They have not been able to solve our human problems. I am quite sure you agree to all that. Nor can we rely on any of the gurus. Unfortunately these people come to the West and exploit people and get very rich, and they have nothing whatsoever to do with religion.

Having said all that, it is important that we, you and the speaker, think together. We mean by thinking together not merely accepting any kind of opinion or evaluation but together observe, not only externally, that is, what is happening in the world, but also what is happening to all of us inwardly, psychologically. Externally, outwardly there is great uncertainty, confusion,

wars, or the threat of war. There are wars going on in some part of the world, human beings are killing each other. That is not happening in the West, here, but there is the threat of the nuclear war, the bomb, and the preparation for war. And we ordinary human beings do not seem to be able to do anything about all that. There are demonstrations, terrorism, hunger strikes and so on and so on. This is what is actually going on in the outward world; one tribal group against another tribal group; the West, America against another country and so on. The scientists are contributing to all that, and the philosophers, though they may talk against all that but inwardly they continue in terms of nationalism, according to their own particular career and so on. So that is what is actually going on in the outward world, which any intelligent human being can observe.

And inwardly, in our own minds and in our own hearts, we are also very confused. There is no security, not only perhaps for ourselves but for our future, our future generation. Religions have divided human beings as the Christian, the Hindus, the Muslims and the Buddhists and so on.

So considering all this, looking objectively, calmly without any prejudice, observing, it is naturally important that we think about all this together. Think together: not have opinions opposing another set of opinions; or one conclusion against another conclusion, one ideal against another ideal; but rather think together and see what we human beings can do. The crisis is not in the economic world, nor in the political world, but the crisis is in our consciousness. I think very few of us realize that: the crisis is in our mind and in our heart. That is, the crisis is in our consciousness. Our consciousness, which is our whole existence with our beliefs, with our conclusions, with our nationalism, with all the fears that one has, the pleasures, the apparently insoluble problem of sorrow, the thing that we call love, compassion, and the problem of death, if there is anything hereafter, and the question of meditation, beyond time, beyond thought, if there is something eternal. That is the content of our consciousness. That is the content of every human being, whether they live in this country or in Asia, in India or in America or Russia. The content of

our consciousness is the common ground of all humanity. I think this must be made very clear right from the beginning.

As a human being living in this part of the world, he suffers, not only physically but also inwardly. He is anxious, uncertain, fearful, confused, anxious, without any sense of deep security. It is the same in Asia, with every human being there, it is the same in India, it is the same in America, in Russia. So our consciousness is common to all mankind. Please do listen to this. You may be hearing this for the first time and so don't please discard it. Let's investigate it together, let's think about it together. Not when you get home but now. That your consciousness - what you think, what you feel, your reactions, your anxiety, your loneliness, your sorrow, your pain, the search for something that is not merely physical but goes beyond all thought, is the same as a person living in India or Russia or America. They go through the same problems as you do, the same problems of relationship with each other, man, woman. So we are all standing on the same ground, consciousness. Our consciousness is common to all of us. And therefore we are not individuals. Please do consider this. We have been trained, educated, religiously as well as scholastically, that we are separate souls, individuals, striving for ourselves, but that is an illusion because our consciousness is common to all mankind. So we are mankind. We are not separate individuals fighting for ourselves. This is logical, this is rational, sane. So we are not separate entities with separate psychological content, struggling for ourselves. But we are, each one of us is actually the rest of human kind.

So logically, perhaps you will accept it intellectually, but if you feel that profoundly, then our whole activity undergoes a radical change. That is the first issue that we have to think together about: that our consciousness, the way we think, the way we live, perhaps more comfortably, affluently, with greater facility to travel and so on, apart from that inwardly, psychologically you are exactly similar to those who live thousands and thousands of miles away.

And so we have to think about these problems together. First the problem of relationship: all life is relationship, the very existence is to be related. And when you observe what we have done with our relationship with each other, whether it is intimate or not, whether between two human beings, man and woman, in that relationship there is tremendous conflict, struggle - why? Why have human beings who have lived for over a million years, why have they not solved this problem of relationship? That is, two people living together without conflict, apparently we have not solved it. So if we could this morning perhaps for an hour, think together about it. Let's together observe actually what is that relationship between a man and a woman, because all society is based on relationship. There is no society if there is no relationship, society becomes then an abstraction. So we should together, this morning, consider together what actually our relationships are.

If one observes it closely there is conflict between man and woman. The man has his own ideals, his own pursuits, his own ambition, he is always seeking success, to be somebody in the world. And also the woman is struggling, also wanting to be somebody, wanting to fulfil, to become. Each is pursuing his own direction. So it is like two railway lines running parallel, but never meeting, perhaps in bed but otherwise, if you observe closely they never meet actually, psychologically, inwardly - why? That is the question. When we ask why, we are always asking for the cause; we think in terms of causation, hoping thereby if we could understand the cause then perhaps we would change the effect. May I ask now - you all understand English I hope. If not I am talking to myself, which is rather absurd. One has not been in this country for ten years but one is glad to be back here again, but if we don't understand English then I am afraid our communication is not possible. So one hopes that you understand English as clearly as possible. Unfortunately one can speak in French or Italian but that would be equally difficult.

So we are asking a very simple but very complex question: why is it that we human beings have not been able to solve this problem of relationship though we have lived on this earth for millions and millions of years? Is it because

each one has his own particular image put together by thought, and our relationship is only based on two images; the image that the man creates about her and the image the woman creates about him? So we are in this relationship two images living together. That is a fact. If you observe very closely yourself, if one may point out, you have created an image about her, and she has created a picture, a verbal structure about you, the man. So relationship is between these two images. These images have been put together by thought. And thought is not related to love.

Is thought love? Are all the memories of this relationship with each other, the remembrances, the pictures, the conclusions about each other, are if one observes closely without any prejudice, are the product of thought, are the result of various remembrances, experiences, irritations, loneliness. And so our relationship with each other is not love but the image that thought has put together.

So we have to examine, if we are to understand the actuality of relationship, we have to understand the whole movement of thought because we live by thought, all our actions are based on thought; all the great buildings of the world are put together by thought, all the cathedrals, churches, temples and mosques are put there by thought, constructed by thought. And what is inside all these religious buildings - the inside, the figures, the symbols, the images - are all the inventions of thought. There is no refuting that. So thought has created not only the most marvellous architectural buildings and the contents of those buildings, but also it has created the instruments of war, the bomb, various forms of that bomb. Thought has also put together the surgeon, the marvellous instruments, so delicate in surgery. And also thought has made the carpenter, he must study the wood, the instruments and so on. So thought has done all this. The content of a church and the surgeon, the expert engineer who builds a beautiful bridge, are all the result of thought. There is no refuting that however much one may argue. So one has to examine what is thought. Why human beings live on thought. Why thought has brought about such chaos in the world - war, lack of relationship with each other, the great

capacity of thought with its extraordinary energy. And also what thought has done through millions of years, bringing sorrow for mankind. Please observe this together, let's examine it together. Don't let's oppose what the speaker is saying but let's examine what the speaker is saying together so we understand what is actually happening to all human beings. We are destroying ourselves.

So we have to go very carefully into the question of thought. Thought is the response of memory. Memory is not only the remembrance of things past but also thought which projects itself as hope in the future. So thought is the response of memory, memory is knowledge, knowledge is experience. That is, there is experience, from experience there is knowledge, from knowledge there is memory, or remembrance, and from memory you act. So from that action you learn, which is further knowledge. So we live in this cycle - experience, knowledge, memory, thought, action. In this cycle human beings live, always living within the field of knowledge. I hope this is not boring you. If you are bored, I am sorry. If you want something romantic, sentimental, something that pleases you, I hope you won't listen. But what we are talking about is very serious. It is not something for the weekend, for a casual listening because we are concerned with the radical change of human consciousness. So we have to think about all this, look together, see if it is possible why human beings who have lived on this earth for so many millions of years are still as we are. We may have advanced technologically, better communication, better transportation, hygiene and so on, but inwardly we are the same, more or less; unhappy, uncertain, lonely, carrying the burden of sorrow endlessly. And any serious man confronted with this challenge must respond, he can't take it casually, turn his back on it. That is why this meeting and tomorrow morning's meeting is very, very serious because we have to apply our minds and our hearts to find out if it is possible to radically bring about a mutation in our consciousness and therefore in our action and behaviour.

So as we were saying, thought is born of experience, knowledge and so there is nothing whatsoever sacred about thought. It is materialistic, it is a

process of matter, thinking. And we have relied on that, on thought to solve all our problems, political, religious, relationship and so on. And our brains, our minds are conditioned, educated to solve problems. Thought has created the problem and then our brains, our minds, are trained to solve problems. If you have an engineering problem you solve it; a problem of disease one solves it and so on. Our minds are trained to solve problems. These problems are created by thought psychologically, inwardly. You follow what is happening? Thought creates the problem psychologically and the mind is trained to solve problems, so thought creating the problem thought then tries to solve the problem. So it is caught in the same old process, a routine. So problems are becoming more and more complex, more and more insoluble. So we must find, if it is at all possible, if there is a different way of approaching this life, not through thought because thought has not solved our problems. On the contrary thought has brought about greater complexity. We must find if it is possible, or if it is not possible, if there is a different dimension, a different approach to life altogether. And that is why it is important to understand the nature of thought, the nature of our thinking. Our thinking is based on remembrance, remembrance of things past. Which is, thinking about what happened a week ago, thinking about it modified in the present, and projected into the future. This is the movement of our life, which is an actuality. So knowledge has become all important for us but knowledge is never complete. Knowledge about anything is still incomplete, will always be incomplete. Therefore knowledge always goes with ignorance, knowledge always lives within the shadow of ignorance. That is a fact. It is not the speaker's invention, or conclusion, but that is so.

So love is not knowledge. Love is not remembrance. Love is not desire or pleasure. Desire, pleasure, remembrance are based on thought. So our relationship with each other, however close, however near, if you look at it closely, is based on remembrance, which is thought. So in that relationship actually, though one may say you love your wife or your husband or your girl friend and so on, it is actually based on remembrance, which is thought.

Therefore in that there is no love. Would you actually see that fact? Or do we say, 'What terrible things you are saying. I do love my wife' - but is that so? Can there be love when there is jealousy, possessiveness, attachment, when each one is pursuing his own particular ambition, greed, envy, direction, like two parallel lines never meeting. Is that love? So one has to enquire if one is to pursue the problem of existence seriously, profoundly, one must examine what is desire. Why human beings have been driven by desire. Can the speaker go on with all this? Sorry, you have to bear this but it is your fault that you are here! And perhaps also the speaker's! I hope we are thinking together, observing together, as two friends walking along that road and seeing what is around us; not only what is very close, what is immediately perceived, but also what one sees in the distance; because we are taking the journey together, perhaps affectionately, hand in hand, or as two friends amicably examining the very complex problem of life in which there is no leader, there is no guru, because when one sees actually that our consciousness is the consciousness of the rest of mankind then we realize we are both the guru and the disciple, the teacher as well as the pupil, because we are all that, it is all in our consciousness. That is a tremendous realization. So that as one begins to understand oneself deeply one becomes a light to oneself and not depend on anybody, on any book, on any authority, including that of the speaker, so that we are capable of understanding this whole problem of living and be a light to ourselves.

So we must examine together desire, because if desire is love then desire creates problems. Love has no problems, and to understand the nature of love, compassion, with its own intelligence, we must understand together what is desire. Desire is extraordinary vitality, extraordinary persuasion, drive, achievement, and the whole process of becoming, success, is based on desire - desire which makes us compare with each other, imitate, conform. So it is very important in understanding the whole nature of ourselves to understand what desire is, not to suppress it, not to run away from it, not to transcend it, but to understand it, to look at it, to see the whole momentum of it. We can do

that together, which doesn't mean that you are learning from the speaker. The speaker has nothing to teach you. Please realize this. The speaker is merely acting as a mirror in which you can see yourself. And then when you see yourself clearly you can discard the mirror, it has no importance, you can break it up.

So to understand desire requires attention, seriousness, it is a very complex problem: why human beings have lived on this extraordinary energy of desire as the energy of thought. What is the relationship between thought and desire? What is the relationship between desire and will? Because we live a great deal by will. So what is the movement, the source, the origin of desire? If one observes oneself one sees the origin, the beginning of desire begins with sensation, sensory responses, sensory responses with its contact, sensation, then thought creates the image, at that moment begins desire. Please let's look at it very closely. One sees something in the window, a robe, a shirt, a car, a scarf, whatever it is. You see it: sensation, then touching it; and then thought saying, "If I put that shirt or that dress on how nice it will look" - it creates the image and then begins desire. Right? Do you follow all this? See it for oneself, it is fairly simple. You see something very nice, there is the sensation created through nervous responses, optical response, then thought saying, "How nice I would look with that dress" - or shirt, or coat, or whatever it is, then desire begins. So the relationship between desire and thought is very close. If there was no thought there would only be sensation; not all the problems, created by desire. I hope we are meeting each other.

So desire is the quintessence of will. So thought dominates sensation and creates the urge, the desire to possess. Right? Am I talking to myself, or are you all in it? Perhaps all this may be new to you, but we have to think about all these things together, not as separate individuals with his own particular conclusions but together observe all this and be very clear about all this.

So where in relationship thought operates, which is remembrance, creating the image about each other, where there is that image created by thought

there can be no love. Or where there is desire, sexual or other forms of desire, prevents - because desire is part of thought - prevents love.

And also we should consider in our examination together the nature of fear, because we are all caught in this terrible thing called fear. We don't seem to be able to resolve it. We live with it, become accustomed to it, or escape from it; through amusement, through worship, through various forms of entertainment, religious and otherwise. So we must together examine again the nature and the structure of fear. Please, fear is common to all of us, whether you live in this tidy, clean country, or in India where it is untidy, dirty, overpopulated, and so on. It is the same problem, fear. And man has lived with it for thousands and thousands of years, and we haven't been able to resolve it. Is it possible - one is asking this question most seriously - is this at all possible to be totally completely free of fear, not only physical forms of fear but much more subtle forms of fear inwardly. Conscious fears and the deep undiscovered fears, fears that are deeply in our consciousness which we have never even examined that they are there.

Examination does not mean analysis. I know it is the fashion that if you have any problem turn to the analyst. I hope there aren't any here! And the analyst is like you and me, only he has got a certain technique. But we must examine what is observation and analysis. Analysis implies there is an analyser. Is the analyser different from that which he analyses? Or the analyser is the analysed? You understand the question? The analyser is the analysed. That is an obvious fact. I am analysing myself but who is the analyser in me who says, "I must analyse"? It is still the analyser separating himself from the analysed, and then examining that which is going to be analysed. Right? So the analyser is that which he is examining, analysing. Both are the same. It is a trick played by thought. So when we observe there is no analysis, merely to observe things as they are. To observe actually what is, not to analyse 'what is' because in the process of analysis one can deceive oneself. And if you like to play that game you can go on endlessly until you die, analysing, and never bringing about a radical transformation within oneself.

Whereas observation, to look, to look at the present world as it is, not as a Dutchman, Englishman, or French or this or that, but to see actually what is happening: that is observation, pure observation of things as they are.

So we have to examine or observe what fear is, not what is the cause of fear, we will look at that presently, not what is the cause of fear which implies analysis, going further, further back, the origin of fear, we will find that out in a minute; but to learn the art of observing, not translating what you observe, or interpreting what you observe but just to observe, as you would observe a lovely flower. The moment you tear it to pieces the flower is not. That is what analysis is. But to observe the beauty of a flower, the light in a cloud, the evening light, a tree by itself in a forest, just to observe it. So similarly if we can to observe fear. What is the root of fear, not the various aspects of fear? Right? Can we go on with this? That is, suppose I am afraid. Suppose - I am not - suppose I am afraid - I must make this point very clear. What the speaker says he lives, otherwise he wouldn't get up on a platform and talk about it. He has done it for sixty years, he wouldn't deceive himself, one can, but he has gone into it very, very deeply. So what he says is what to him is a fact, not just an illusion, an escape.

So we are asking if it is at all possible to be free of fear, absolutely. Psychologically, inwardly, what is the root of fear? What does fear mean? Fear of something that has given you pain, fear of what might happen. That is, the past or what might happen in the future. Right? Not what might happen now because now there is no fear. But you can see for yourself fear is a time process. Right? Fear of something that has happened last week, an incident which has brought psychological pain, or physical pain, and the fear that it might happen again tomorrow; losing a job, not achieving something you want, not achieving illumination and all that stuff. So fear is a movement in time. Right? A movement from the past through the present, modifying itself to the future. So the origin of fear is thought. Right? And thought is time, because thought is the accumulation of knowledge through experience, memory,

response of memory, thought, action. So thought, time, are one, and thought, time, is the root of fear. Right? That is fairly obvious. It is so.

Now it is not a question of stopping thought or time. Of course it would be impossible to stop it because who is the entity that says, "I must stop thought"? Which would be absurd because that entity is part of thought. Are you following all this? So this idea of stopping thought is impossible. That implies a controller who is trying to control thought. The controller is created by thought. So please just listen to this, just observe. The observation is an action in itself, not that one must do something about fear. You get it? I wonder if you understand this?

Look: suppose I am afraid about something or other, darkness, my wife running away, or I am lonely, or this or that. I am frightened, deeply. You come along and tell me, you explain to me the whole movement of fear, the origin of fear, which is time. I had pain, or I went through some accident, incident that has caused fear, recorded it in the brain and that memory of that past incident might happen again, and therefore there is fear. So you have explained this to me. And I listen very carefully to your explanation, I see the logic of it, the sanity of it, I don't reject it, I listen. And that means listening becomes an art. I don't reject what you are saying, nor accept, but observe. So I observe that what you tell me about time, thought, is actual. I don't say, "I must stop time and thought", but you have explained to me, don't do that, but just observe how fear arises, it is a movement of thought, time. Just observe this movement. And don't move away from it, don't escape from it, live with it, look at it, put your energy in your looking. Then you will see that fear begins to resolve because we have done nothing about it, we have just observed, you have given your attention to it. That very attention is like bringing light on fear. Attention means giving all your energy in that observation. Is this clear somewhat?

Q: It is important also...

K: Sir, unfortunately we have only two talks, I wish there were more talks. If you begin to ask questions we will come to something different. But I hope you don't mind if I go on. May I?

So observation without analysis implies giving your total attention to a problem. The problem which is relationship; the problem which is fear; and also we have to go into the problem of pleasure. May I ask what time it is?

Q: Quarter past twelve.

K: Quarter past twelve. We have talked for an hour. Do you want to continue another half hour, twenty minutes? Can you bear it?

Audience: Yes.

K: It's up to you, not to me, sirs.

Also - sir, would you mind not taking photographs. Please, this is very serious all this. This is not something you play with for a day and drop it. It concerns our lives, our whole existence. And if you are at all serious we must give our attention to all this.

Why is it that man has pursued pleasure? Please ask yourself why. Is pleasure opposite to pain? Please go into it a little bit. We have all had pain of different kinds, both physical and psychological. Psychologically most of us from childhood have been wounded, hurt, that is pain. And the consequences of that pain has been to withdraw, isolate oneself, not to be further hurt. We are hurt from childhood, through school, by comparing ourselves with somebody else who is more clever. We have hurt ourselves, and others have hurt us through various forms of scoldings, hurting, saying something brutal, terrorizing us. And there is this deep hurt with all its consequences, which is isolation, resistance, more and more withdrawing. And the opposite of that we think is pleasure. Pain and the opposite of it is pleasure. Is that so?

So we have to examine closely if you have the energy, if you have the time, if you want to, is goodness opposite of that which is not good? If goodness is

the opposite, then that goodness contains its own opposite. Right? Therefore it is not good. Goodness is something totally separate from that which it is not. Right? So is pleasure - please just listen to this if you don't mind, one is asking this most respectfully - is pleasure something opposite of pain? Or it is a contrast? Right? And we are always pursuing the contrast, the opposite. So one is asking, is pleasure separate entirely, like goodness, which is not pleasure? You understand? Or is pleasure tainted by pain? So when you look closely at pleasure it is always remembrance, isn't it? One never says when one is happy, "How happy I am", it is always after, the remembrance of that thing which gave you pleasure and the remembrance of that pleasure; like a sunset, when you look at the glory of the evening, full of that extraordinary light, it gives great pleasure, great delight. Then that is remembered, then pleasure is born. So pleasure is part of thought too. It is so obvious.

So the next problem is - it is very complex, like all our human problems - is it possible to end all sorrow? Because where there is sorrow there is no love. Where there is sorrow obviously there cannot be intelligence. We will go into that word, which is a very complex word, intelligence.

You know the understanding of relationship, fear, pleasure and sorrow, is to bring order in our house. Without order you cannot possibly meditate. You understand that word? Unfortunately that word has been brought to the West by the Eastern people. Now the speaker puts meditation at the end of the talks because there is no possibility of right meditation if you have not put your house, your psychological house, in order. If the house is in disorder, psychological house, what you are, if that house is not in order what is the point of meditating? It is just an escape. It leads to all kinds of illusions. And you may sit cross legged or stand on your head for the rest of your life but that is not meditation. Meditation must begin with bringing about complete order in your house; order in your relationship, order in one's desires, pleasure and so on.

And also one of our causes of disorder in our life is sorrow. This is a common factor, common reality in all human beings. Everyone goes through this tragedy of sorrow, here or in the Asiatic world or in the Western world. Again this is a common thing we all share. There is not only so-called personal sorrow but there is the sorrow of mankind, sorrow which wars have brought about; five thousand years of historical record, every year there has been a war, killing each other, violence, terror, brutality, maiming people, people have no hands, eyes and so on, the horrors and the brutality of wars, which has brought incalculable misery to mankind. It is not only one's own sorrow but the sorrow of mankind, the sorrow when you see a man who has nothing whatsoever, just a piece of cloth and for the rest of one's life he is going to be that way. Not in these Western countries but in the Asiatic world it is like that. And when you see that person there is sorrow. There is also sorrow when people are caught in illusion; like going from one guru to another, which is escaping from yourself. That is a sorrow, to observe this. The clever people going off to the East, writing books about it, paging some guru, and we all fall for that nonsense. That is also sorrow. Sorrow that comes when you see what the politicians are doing in the world. Thinking in terms of tribalism, that is also sorrow.

So there is personal sorrow and the vast cloud of sorrow of mankind. Sorrow is not something romantic, sentimental, illogical, it is there. My sons dies and it has shattered one's life. And we have lived with this sorrow from time measureless. And apparently one has not resolved this problem. When one suffers one seeks consolation, which is an escape from the fact of sorrow. When there is that grief, you try every form of amusement, escape, but it is always there. And apparently humanity has not resolved it. And we are asking the question: whether it is possible to be free of it completely? Not avoiding it, not seeking consolation, not escaping into some fanciful theory, but to live with it. Just let's understand what we mean by that word to 'live with it', not to let it become a habit like most people do; they live with nationalities, which is most destructive, they live with their own separate religious conclusions, they live

with their own fanciful ideas and ideals, and that again brings their own conflict. So if you live with something, to live with sorrow, not accept it, not become habituated to it; that is, to look at it, to observe it without any escape, without any question of trying to go beyond it, just to hold it in your hand and look. Which is, sorrow is also part of this tremendous sense of loneliness, you may have many friends, you may be married, you may have all kinds of things but inwardly there is this feeling of complete loneliness. And that is part of sorrow. To observe that loneliness without any direction, without trying to go beyond it, without trying to find a substitute for it; to live with it, not worship it, not become psychotic about it. Which means to give all your attention to that pain, to that grief, to that sorrow. So when my son dies, or somebody whom I think I love, dies, there is great grief, and without running away from it just to... It is a great thing to understand suffering because then where there is freedom from sorrow there is compassion. And one is not compassionate as long as you are anchored to any belief, to your particular form of religious symbol, compassion is freedom from sorrow. And where there is compassion there is love, and with that compassion goes intelligence - not the intelligence of thought with its cunning, with its adjustments, with its capacity to put up with anything. Compassion means the ending of sorrow and only then is there intelligence.

We will continue tomorrow if you don't mind, talking about death, what happens, if anything happens after death, and what is the significance of death, and what is meditation. That is if you can bear it until tomorrow.

(Clapping) Please don't clap. May I most respectfully request that you don't clap. By clapping you are not encouraging me. You are clapping because you understand it for yourself.

Amsterdam 2nd Public Talk

20th September 1981

I am afraid this is the last talk. Like two friends sitting in the park on a lovely day talking about life, talking about their problems, investigating seriously the very nature of their existence and asking themselves seriously why life has become such a great problem; why, though intellectually you are very sophisticated, yet our daily life is such a grind, without any meaning, except survival, which again is rather doubtful, why life, everyday existence, has become such a torture. One may go to church, follow some leader politically or religiously, but the daily life is always a turmoil, though there are certain periods which are occasionally joyful, happy, but there is always a cloud of darkness about our life. And these two friends talking together, as we are, you and the speaker, we are talking over together in a friendly manner, perhaps with affection, with care, with concern, whether it is at all possible to live a life, our daily life without a single problem. And though we are highly educated, have certain careers, specialized, yet we have these unresolved struggles, pain, suffering, joy and sometimes a great feeling of not being totally selfish. And together, if we can this morning, go into this question why human beings live as we do live - go to the office from nine o'clock until five or six for the next fifty years; or be occupied all the time, not only with our own problems, but also the brain, the mind is constantly occupied, there is never a quietness, there is never peace, there is always this occupation with something or other. And that is our life. That is our daily, monotonous rather lonely insufficient life. And we try to escape from it through religion, through various forms of entertainment.

At the end of the day we are still where we were for the last thousand and thousand years. We seem to have changed very little psychologically, inwardly. And our problems increase, and always there is the fear of old age, disease, some accident that will put us out. So this is our existence, from childhood until we die, either voluntarily or involuntarily die. And we don't seem

to have been able to solve that problem also, the problem of living and the problem of dying. Specially as one grows older one remembers all the things that have been; the times of pleasure, the times of pain, the times of sorrow, the times of tears. But always there is this unknown thing called death of which most of us are frightened. And as two friends sitting in the park on a bench, not in this hall with all this light and so on, which is rather ugly, but sitting on a bench in the park with sunlight, and the dappling light, the sun coming through the leaves, the ducks on the canal and the beauty of the earth, talking over together. And that's what we are going to do, talking over together as two friends who have had a long life, a long serious life with all the troubles; the troubles of sex, loneliness, despair, depression, anxiety, uncertainty, a sense of meaninglessness to all this. And there is always at the end of all this, death.

And in talking about it, either we intellectually approach it; that is, rationalize it, say it is inevitable, don't be frightened, or escape through some form of belief, the hereafter as the Asiatics believe, reincarnation, or if you are highly intellectual this is the end of all things, end of all our existence, our experiences, our memories, tender, delightful, plentiful. And also with it goes the great pain and the suffering. What does it all mean, this life which is really, if one examines very closely, rather meaningless? One can intellectually, verbally construct a meaning to life, but the way we live has very little meaning actually.

So there is thing called living and dying. That is all we know. Everything apart from that becomes a theory, a speculation; or a pursuit of a belief in which one finds some kind of security, hope. But those beliefs are also very shallow, rather meaningless, as all beliefs are. Or you have ideals projected by thought, and struggle to achieve those ideals. This is our life; whether we are very young, full of vitality, fun, a sense that one can do almost anything, but even then with youth, middle age and old age, there is always this question of death, dying. Can we, this morning, talk over together this? Please, as we pointed out yesterday, we are thinking about it together. You are not merely, if one may point out, listening to a series of words, to some ideas, but rather

together, I mean together, investigate this whole problem of living and dying. And either one does it with one's heart, with one's whole mind, or partially, superficially, and so with very little meaning.

So first of all we should look: our brains never act fully, completely, we only use a very small part of our brain. That part is the structure of thought. That part being in itself a part and therefore incomplete, as thought is incomplete, so the brain functions within a very narrow area, depending on our senses, which again our senses are partial, never all the senses free, awakened. I do not know if you have not experimented with watching something with all your senses; watching the sea, the birds and the moonlight at night on a green lawn; if you have not watched partially or with all your senses fully awakened. The two states are entirely different. When you watch something partially you are establishing more the separative, egotistic attitude and living. But when you watch that moonlight on the water making a silvery path with all your senses, that is, with your mind, with your heart, with your nerves, giving all your attention to that observation, then you will see for yourself that there is no centre from which you are observing.

So can we observe what is living, the actuality, and what does it mean to die - together? Our life, daily life, is a process of remembrances. Our brain, mind is entirely memory. Right? Are we together in it? You see the difficulty is that I am not sure that we are understanding each other. I don't know how much English you know, and that is not an insulting statement, whether we understand English completely, what the speaker is saying. Or you are partially listening, partially understanding English, and so attention wandering off and so one looks rather dazed from here! The language that the speaker is using is very ordinary non-specialized language. It is simple English. So I hope we understand each other.

We are saying we are - we, our ego, our personality, our whole structure - entirely put together as memory, we are memory. Right? Please this is subject to investigation, don't accept it. Observe it, listen. The speaker is saying, the

you, the ego, the me, is altogether memory. There is no spot or space in which there is clarity. Or you can believe, hope, have faith that there is something in you which is uncontaminated, which is god, which is a spark of that which is timeless, you can believe all that. But that belief is merely illusory; all beliefs are. But the fact is that our whole existence, we are entirely memory, a remembrance. There is no spot or space inwardly which is not memory. You can investigate this, if you have time, perhaps not this morning because we have a lot to cover, but if you are enquiring seriously into yourself you will see that the 'me', the ego, is all memory, remembrances. And that is our life. We function, live from memory. And for us death is the ending of that memory. Right?

Am I speaking to myself, or are we all together in this? You see the speaker is used to talking in the open, under trees, or in a vast tent without these glaring lights; and one can then have an intimate communication with each other. As a matter of fact there is only you and me talking together, not all this enormous audience in a vast hall, but you and I sitting on the banks of a river, on a bench, talking over this thing together. And one is saying to the other, we are nothing but memory, and it is to that memory that we are attached: my house, my property, my experience, my relationship, the office I go to, the factory, the skill I like being able to gather during a certain period of time; I am all that. And to that, thought is attached. That's what we call living. And this attachment, with all its problems, because when you are attached there is fear of losing, we are attached because we are lonely, deep abiding loneliness which is suffocating, isolating, depressing. And the more we are attached to another, which is again memory, the other is a memory - my wife, my husband, my children, are physically different from me, psychologically the memory of my wife, I am attached to that, to the name, to the form, my existence is attachment to that memory which I have gathered all my life. Where there is attachment I recognize, observe there is corruption. When I am attached to a belief, hoping in that attachment to that belief there will be certain security, both psychologically as well as physically, that attachment not only

prevents further examination, but I am frightened to examine even when I am greatly attached to something - to a person, to an idea, to an experience. So corruption exists where there is an attachment. And one's whole life is a movement within the field of the known. This is obvious. And death means the ending of the known. Right? Ending of the physical organism, ending of all the memory of which I am. I am nothing but memory, memory being the known. And I am frightened to let all that go, which means death. I think that is fairly clear, at least verbally. Intellectually you can accept that. Logically, sanely, that is a fact.

So the question is: why human beings throughout the world, though they believe, some of them, in the Asiatic world, in the rebirth of themselves in the next life; the next life being much more dignified, more prosperous, better houses, better position. So those who believe in reincarnation, that is, the soul, the ego, the 'me', which is a bundle of memories being born next life; the next life is a better life because if I behave rightly now, conduct myself righteously, live a life without violence, without greed and so on, the next life I will have a better life, better position. But that is, the next life, a belief in reincarnation, is just a belief because those who have this strong belief don't live a righteous life today. Right? You are following all this? It is just an idea that the next life will be marvellous. The beauty of the next life must correspond to the beauty of the present life. But the present life is so tortuous, so demanding, so complex, we forget the belief and struggle, deceit, hypocrisy, every form of vulgarity and so on. That is one aspect of death, that is, believing in something next life.

But those who do not accept such theory, though they are trained to compile evidence of reincarnation, which is rather absurd too - you understand all this - because what is it that is going to reincarnate? What is it that has continuity? You understand my question? Are we talking together? What is it that has continuity in life, in our daily life? It is the remembrance of yesterday's experience, pleasures, fears, anxieties and there is that continuity right through life unless we break it and move away from that current. Right?

Now the question is: is it possible while one is living, with all the turmoil, with that energy, capacity, to end, say for example, attachment? Because that is what is going to happen when you die. You may be attached to your wife, to your husband, to your property - not to property, that is dangerous - we are attached to some belief, belief in god. That belief is merely a projection, or an invention of thought, but we are attached to it because it gives a certain feeling of security however illusory it is, we are attached to that. Death means the ending of that attachment. Now while living can we end voluntarily, easily, without any effort, that form of attachment? Which means dying to something we have known. You follow? Can we do this? Because that is living and dying together, not separated by a hundred years, or fifty years, waiting for some disease to push us off. But living with all our vitality, energy, intellectual capacity, with the greater feeling, to end certain conclusions, certain idiosyncrasies, experiences, attachments, hurts, to end it. That is, while living also living with death. You understand this? Are we meeting each other? So that death is not something far away, death is not something that is at the end of one's life, through some accident, disease, old age, but rather living, to all the things of memory, ending that, which is death. That means death is not separate from living.

Also, as we said yesterday, we should consider together, sitting on the banks of a river on a bench, water flowing, clear, not muddied, polluted water, seeing all the movement of the waves pursuing each other down the river, we also as two friends sitting there, talk together about what is religion. Why has religion played such a great part in our lives from the ancient of times until today? What is a religious mind like? What does the word 'religion' actually mean? Because historically, not that one has read a great deal about it but one has observed how civilizations disappear, to be reborn again with a different religion, religions have brought about new civilizations, new culture; not the technological world, not the computers, the submarines, the war materials; nor the businessman, nor the economists; but religious people throughout the world have brought about a tremendous change. So one must

enquire together what we mean by that word 'religion'. What is its significance, whether it is mere superstition, illogical, meaningless? Or there is something far greater, something much more infinitely beautiful. And to find that is it not necessary - we are talking over together as two friends - is it not necessary to be free of all the things thought has invented as religion? You understand my question? I want to find out what is the significance of religion. What is the depth of it? What is its end? Because man has always sought something beyond the physical existence. He has always looked, searched, asked, suffered, tortured himself to find out if there is something which is not of time, which is not of thought, which is not belief or faith. And to find that out one must be absolutely free, otherwise if you are anchored to a particular form of belief that very belief will prevent investigation into what is eternal, if there is such a thing as eternity which is beyond all time, beyond all measure. So one must be free, if one is serious in the enquiry into what is religion, one must be free of all the things that thought has invented, put together about that which is considered religious. That is, all the things that Hinduism has invented, with its superstitions, with its beliefs, with its images, and the ancient literature as the Upanishads and so on, one must be completely free of all that. If one is attached to all that then it is impossible, naturally, to discover that which is original. You understand the problem?

That is, if my mind, my brain is conditioned by the Hindu superstition, beliefs, dogmas, idolatry, with all the ancient tradition, my mind then is anchored to that, therefore it cannot move, it is not free. Therefore one must be free completely from all that - being a Hindu. Right? Similarly, one must be free totally from all the inventions of thought, as the rituals, dogmas, beliefs, symbols, the saviours and so on of Christianity. That may be rather difficult, that is coming near home. Or if you go to Ceylon or the Tibetan, the North, Buddhism, with all their idolatry, as the idolatry of Christianity, they too have this problem: being attached as security to the things thought has invented. So all religions, whether Christianity, Muslim, Islam, Hinduism, or Buddhism, they are the movement of thought continued through time, through literature,

through symbols, through things made by the hand or by the mind, all that is considered religious in the modern world. To the speaker that is not religion. To the speaker it is a form of illusion, comforting, satisfying, romantic, sentimental but not actual, because religion must affect life, the way we live, that is the significance of life. Because only when there is order, as we talked about yesterday, in our life.

Order is something that is totally disassociated with disorder. We live in disorder, that is, in conflict, contradiction, say one thing, do another, think one thing and act another, that is contradiction. Where there is contradiction which is division, there must be disorder. And a religious mind is completely without disorder. That is the foundation of religious life, not all the nonsense that is going on with the gurus with their idiocies.

You know it is a most extraordinary thing: many gurus have come to see the speaker; many of them because they think I attack the gurus. You understand? They want to persuade me not to attack. They say, what you are saying and what you are living is the absolute truth, but not for us, because we must help those people who are not as fully advanced as you are. You see the game they play. You understand? So one wonders why the Western world, or some of the Western people go to India, follow these gurus, get initiated - whatever that may mean - put on different robes and think they are terribly religious. But strip them of their robes, stop them and enquire into their life, they are just like you and me.

So the idea of going somewhere to find enlightenment, changing your name to some Sanskrit name, seems so strangely absurd and romantic without any reality, but thousands are doing it. Probably it is a form of amusement without much meaning. I am - the speaker is not attacking. Please let's understand: we are not attacking anything, we are just observing; observing the absurdity of the human mind, how easily we are caught, we are so gullible.

So a religious mind is a very factual mind, it deals with facts. That is, facts being what is actually happening, with the world outside, and the world inside. The world outside is the expression of the world inside, there is no division between the outer and the inner - that is too long to go into. So a religious life is a life of order, diligence, dealing with what is actually within oneself, without any illusion so that one leads an orderly, righteous life. When that is established, unshakably then we can begin to enquire what is meditation.

Perhaps that word did not exist about twenty years ago, or thirty years ago in the Western world. The Eastern gurus have brought it over here. There is the Tibetan meditation, Zen meditation, the Hindu meditation, the particular meditation of a particular guru, the meditation of yoga, sitting cross legged, breathing, you know, all that. All that is called meditation. We are not denigrating the people who do all this. We are just pointing out how absurd meditation has become. The Christian world believe in contemplation, giving themselves over to the will of god, grace and so on. They have the same thing in the Asiatic world, only they use different words in Sanskrit, but it is the same thing: man seeking some kind of everlasting security, happiness, peace, not finding it on earth, hoping it exists somewhere or other, the desperate search for something imperishable. This has been the search of man from time beyond measure. The ancient Egyptians, the ancient Hindus, Buddhists and so on, and some of the Christians, have followed this.

So to enquire together, to go into, deeply into, what is meditation and whether there is anything called sacred, holy: not the thing that thought has invented as being holy, that is not holy. What thought creates is not holy, is not sacred because it is based on knowledge, and knowledge being incomplete, and whatever thought invents, how can that be sacred. But we worship that which thought has invented all over the world.

So together, having established, some partially, others completely, totally, order in their life, in their behaviour, in which there is no contradiction whatsoever, having established that, and rejected, totally rejected, all the

various forms of meditation, their systems, their practices because when you practise you are repeating over and over and over again, like a pianist when he practises he may be practising the wrong note. You understand? So it is easy to conform to a pattern, to obey something somebody has said that will help you to reach the highest state of whatever it is. So you practise, you accept systems because you want to get something other than 'what is'.

Now we are saying quite the contrary. There is no system, no practice; but the clarity of perception of a mind that is free, which has no direction, no choice, but free to observe. Most meditations have this problem, which is controlling thought. The one who practises is different from that which he is practising. I hope you are following all this, if it interests you. So most meditation, whether the Zen, the Hindu, the Buddhist, the Christian, or the latest guru, is to control your thought because through control you centralize, you bring all your energy to a particular point. That is, concentrate. Which is, there is a controller different from the controlled. Are you following all this? Which is, the controller is the past, which is still thought, still memory, and that which he is controlling is still thought, which is wandering off, so there is conflict. You are sitting quietly and thought goes off, you want to concentrate, like a schoolboy looking out of the window and the teacher says, "Don't look out of the window, concentrate on your book". And we do the same thing. So one has to learn the fact, the controller is the controlled. Is that clear? Must all this be explained, step by step? That is - I'll explain, please.

The controller, the thinker, the experiencer, we think is different from the controlled, from the movement of thought, from the experiencer and the experience, we think these two are different movements. But if you observe closely, the thinker is the thought. Thought has made the thinker separate from thought, which then he says, I must control. You are following all this? This is so logical, so sane. So when the controller is the controlled, then you remove totally conflict. Conflict exists only when there is division. Right? Between you and the Germans, between the Israelis and the Arabs. Where there is nationalistic, or economic, or social division there must be conflict. So inwardly

where there is the division between the observer, the one who witnesses, the one who experiences is different from that which he experiences, there must be conflict. And our life is conflict because we live with this division. But this division is fallacious, is not real, it has become our habit, our culture, to control. We never see the controller is the controlled. Right? Do you get all this?

So when one realizes that, not verbally, not idealistically, not as a utopian state for which you have to struggle, but to observe it actually in one's life that the controller is the controlled, the thinker is the thought, then the whole pattern of our thinking undergoes a radical change because there is no conflict. And that is absolutely necessary if you are meditating because meditation demands a mind that is highly compassionate. And therefore highly intelligent, the intelligence which is born out of love, not out of cunning thought.

So meditation means the establishment of order in our daily life, in which there is no contradiction. Then rejecting totally all the systems, meditations, all that, because the mind must be completely free, without direction, and also it means a mind that is completely silent. Is that possible? Because we are chattering endlessly; the moment you leave this place I know you will start chattering. So our minds are everlastingly occupied, chattering, thinking, struggling, and so there is no space. Space is necessary to have silence. For a mind that is practising, struggling, wanting to be silent is never silent. But when it sees that silence is absolutely necessary, not the silence projected by thought, not the silence between two notes, between two noises, between two wars, but the silence of order. And when there is that absolute silence, not cultivated silence, which is what must meditations try to do, cultivate silence; that is, cultivate thought which is never silent. I don't know if you see the absurdity of it. So when there is that silence then one discovers - sorry, one doesn't discover - in that silence truth, which has no path to it, exists. Truth then is timeless, sacred, incorruptible. That is meditation, that is a religious mind.