CHAPTER XII: KRISHNAMURTI

Time discord for Krishnamurti is the burden of the past, the past as enforced conformity to a way of life, as a frozen spectre chilling the warm present. So the mind is dulled and confused, made arthritic, filled with vain sorrow and preyed upon by that vampire fear. Life then is just a grind of mere existence: no sun, only a glare of cunning artifice; no perfume of the flower in ecstasy, only a cheap scent hiding foulness.

The past in itself is no burden. The living moment, even as the living universe, has its 'breath-rhythm'. If one is perfectly attentive, the shape of all that happens in the mind during the 'inbreathing' and 'outbreathing' vanishes into voidness in that still and silent pause after the outbreath. The next breath is a new breath fresh. Spirit, Life, is no old thing, nothing recognizable, nothing fixed or permanent or having continuity. It is new, newness itself, creativeness itself. Hence the Spirit or Life in action spells creative renewal, a new-ing, not a modifying or reconditioning of the old. Intellect cannot trap this in the fetty mould of thought, but wisdom understands it. This renewal means a complete dying to the shape of the past. No part of this shape is held back in the mind through pleasure, lust, greed,
fear, anger, hate, desire and stupidity or through imperfect attention. This does not mean that we annihilate the past, for in fact the immediate now is the living emergent out of the past and the past, changed and transformed, is the actual present. But it does not mean that you, the perfectly attentive one, are free and pure. Thus the past, in itself, is no burden.

If, however, we do not attend fully with a completely open mind to what is present now both within ourselves and outside ourselves — and such attentiveness is accompanied/appropriate action where necessary — various portions of the stream of impressions made on the mind by the living present as it becomes the dead past are held back. All these, the accumulated memories, constitute the burden. By not dying wholly to the past, which means by not being fully awake and alive to the present, we become less capable of perfect attention to the factual now. Thus the mind becomes increasingly dull and sluggish. The dead past, mumified or fossilized, is preserved (with slight modifications) through the centuries. To all this we conform slavishly. Or, we rebel against it in the wrong way. For we who are self-centred, violent, ignorant, unskilled, confused and frightened smash up what was previously established by people like ourselves, and
invariably give rise, out of our conceit, to another artificial, sterile philosophy and practice which leads us only to another misery and oppression and destruction in place of the old, sooner or later. All violent revolutions are rooted in hate, all intellectualist welfare schemes in greed; grounded in delusion, they are all roads to perdition.

The mind filled with the dead stuff of the past becomes, as it were, constipated, and we who alive now - in truth only partly alive - are out of step with the rhythm of Life. We accumulate the outworn lifeless forms because we believe they will protect us in the present against trouble and danger. Out of fear of Life, the half-alive put their trust in the dead for safety! We forget, or rather we refuse to face the fact, that Life offers no safety or security, and that to live means to live dangerously, to be 'vulnerable', that is, fully sensitive to the whole Life-process. This heavy burden of the past is the negative aspect of the male father figure, expressed as spiritual authority, rigid tradition, fixed ideas, belief and convictions, as a regressive clinging to outworn and stupid or even harmful ways, and as a stifling conditioning imposed by our socio-cultural heritage. Such is time's discord bruising Life.
If the wings of that Heavenly Bird, the Spirit of man, are wounded, how can there be ecstatic flight in unconditioned freedom through the pathless realm of Truth? How mournfully man plods in the stony rounds of repetitive thought and daily custom as if in a funeral procession! The secret longing of his heart is for Life, for the Kingdom of happiness which is/birthright. But alas! he is frustrated, enclosed in times discord. Must he remain imprisoned?

Krishnamurti's creative impulse has set the new rhythm vibrating through the world. For the first time in history our century witnesses one who speaks to all people that dwell on earth. He addresses himself to each and every person as a human being irrespective of his nationality, creed, caste, status and culture. His passionate concern for mankind is not for an intellectual abstraction labelled humanity but for each living man as he really is in himself. For Krishnamurti, the world or all humanity is really you the single person. It is your problem or confusion or sorrow which is the world problem and disorder and misery, for you are the world and the world is reflected in you. You, free and whole, are the living root of a world at peace in which life is zestful and meaningful.
Out of his own realization, Krishnamurti gives the Transcendent answer. His realization is embodied in what he says and writes of Truth, wisdom, love, beauty, virtue of the infinite, the immeasurable, the unknown, of God, man, nature, of life, death, meditation, and of the silence. Understanding himself by virtue of the clarity of an unconditioned mind, he understands his neighbour. Free of the illusion of any utopia, seeing the fact of the immediate situation, sensitive and fully attentive to you as you are, he does not dole out prim platitudes or sentimental consolations in answer to your perplexities or pain. He tries to help you to see for yourself the truth of the matter with a mind that is open and free. In order that the mind may be free and open he sweeps aside all that conditions and distorts it, namely, authority, hierarchy, dogma, doctrine, creed, ritual, ceremonial, belief, tradition and custom. All these are obstructions to seeing truth, to understanding yourself, says he who is a representative homo sapiens in the modern era of homo socialis. He is not destructive anarchist, pay your just dues, drive your car according to the rules, observe the courtesies, he says. He is a constructive radical on the foundation of a righteous life, continuously discover the truth for yourself, be awake
to the whole of life, be silent and let the benediction of the immeasurable unknown of truth, of god, come upon you.

Is all this the product of mere brilliance of mind? Or of fruitive realization? If in some blessed and supremely fortunate moment of unselfconsciousness you are suffused by the breath of the Transcendent, and if you remain clean and simple in heart thereafter, not flaunting your experience as a status symbol, not secretly consumed with pride, not lusting for spiritual authority, you will receive a rare gift of the spirit, namely, an active sense of Transcendence. This sense is your light by which you can see whether a man's utterances on Love, Death, Life, Truth, spring from living realization, the authentic source, or whether they are the product of mortal genius. Truth needs no defence. Nor does the Holy One. Consider the teaching of ancient India: see the Atman by means of the Atman. Or savour the words of Lao-Tzu: How do I know the origin of things? I know by Tao!

Krishnamurti never quotes anyone nor leaves upon any authority whatsoever, religious or secular, to support what he says. He exhorts everyone to stand on his own feet, to enter into the plenitude of hisaloneness which takes him out of the dismal dark of self-
enclosed, self-pitying loneliness and relates him to all. Here lies a possibility for the emergence of a truly human society instead of a collection of mechanical conformers. Krishnamurti not only rejects the burden of all past religious formulations, not only spares himself and his fellow man arguing or expounding their errors or truths, but also strenuously opposes allowing authority to be invested in him. He is wholly dissociated from the establishment of a new religion or a monolithic world culture around his personality or in his name. A Krishnamurti sect is anathema to him, for it would only become another divisive force in a world which is already tragically disunited. He bends every energy to release men from bondage and to be unconditionally free, free with the freedom which is not self-indulgence in any shape.

He never lays down a code of conduct, and never pretends to reveal the truth. 'I maintain that Truth is a pathless land, and you cannot approach it by any path whatsoever, by any religion, by any sect. (Star Bulletin, Aug-Sept 1929). There are no goals - wishful man's pretty pictures - for Truth has no bounds, no finitude. So there is no one who can lay down a path for you or show you a method for achieving a summum bonum called liberation or nirvana or perfection. He totally rejects teachers or gurus and also
the teachings of the past, because the whole of the past carried through memory is a crushing load on the mind. All teachers or gurus who lay down paths to which you must conform and creeds which you must believe, are your goalers. But you, if care for Truth, can be a learner. If you remain awake and give your full attention to what is actual and immediate, Truth will come upon you and the benediction of the immeasurable will flood you.

Away then with preconceived goals. Away also with the bond of authority, obedience of the teacher-pupil relationship and all disciplines that demand unquestioning conformity. But all means let there be a lively communication with any and every person. If the mind is open, and freely investigating one can learn incessantly — thereby conferring teacherhood upon the other person — and there is true discipline. Learning in freedom, the mind is ever young, innocent and vigorous.

Clearly then Krishnamurti is an awakener and liberator, fully belonging to our day and age, responding to to-day's world, a power for creative renewal, and outstandingly original. He is a world-inclusive springtide of Life, not just another streamlet out of the rapidly expanding retreating life-waves of the past. His advent, the spiritual complement of
the new knowledge of the nature of things through science and mathematics, of the new conceptions and structures and functions of world-society struggling for emergency out of the welter of violence and stupidity and fears afflicting mankind to-day, marks the ending - a consummative transformation let us hope - of an immense cycle of religious flowering for at least forty centuries. His advent also spells the dawn, containing both menace and promise, of a new great cycle.

What is not new - and it can never be old for it lives in the timeless - is Krishnamurti's affirmation of Transcendence, and his salve for the healing of the world, the distillate of understanding and love.

Life's pristine urge shoots up out of earth heavenwards. The wayward winds of circumstance curve it sinuously. They may form a river, or be lapped by earth lost to the sight of men yet nourishing in silence the everlasting mother. Some men's lives give rise to tides; others to fresh life.
Apart from Krishnamurti's deep insight into questions of spiritual life, his original approach to them has been a great attraction to all earnest and open-minded seekers. He does not base his teaching on any accepted dogma, any sacred book, or the doctrine of any reputed teacher. What he explains therefore is open to all religions, sects or parties; and this circumstance alone entitles him to be respected as a 'world teacher', as he was known in a different context. Though no authorities are cited in support of his teaching, none can complain that he builds on sand. No intricate or controversial scientific or philosophical theories indeed form the basis of his teaching; God, Soul and Immortality, which are the stock-in-trade of spiritual teachers do not figure very greatly in his talks. On the other hand, he depends for proof on what every one is directly acquainted with, namely, his own mind. Even here his appeal is not to rare qualities of the mind, such as flashes of genius, imaginative conceits of poets, or visions of mystics. He draws pointed attention to some of the fundamental defects or deficiencies of our ordinary mind and shows how we are being led astray, mainly because we are unconscious of their existence.
As soon as we become aware of these defects, all faulty habits of thought that owed their existence to our ignorance will vanish. 'Understanding' illumines and has its own way of prevailing against ignorance. We have merely to let it work smoothly; we do not need any particular effort, discipline or method, thought out by ourselves or suggested by others.

Why does Krishnamurti get annoyed when listeners make a demand on him for a method; when they ask him how his teaching, or any part of it, is to be applied in practice? He is at great pains to explain in detail how a problem originates and develops; he lays bare the whole anatomy of the problem, so that the very sight of the exposed parts, their mutual dispositions and inter-relations would explain what had otherwise appeared a confused and irresolvable tangle. The problem, according to him, only needed exposure and understanding; when that is forthcoming, no further solution is needed and none should be expected; the laying bare is itself the solution; "the solution is in the problem not outside it".

We usually dramatise the activity of our mind and consider will and emotion as the chief villains of the piece, constantly trying to undo the heroic and noble work of our reason and intellect. In Krishna-
murti's view there are no such independent forces battling with each other. There is only one force working actively in the mind, the force of wisdom, truth, or reality properly understood; and there is no counter-force. Truth comes to us, not by accumulation of ideas or knowledge, but by understanding the whole process of the working of our mind. If truth sometimes fails us, it is entirely due to some trace of ignorance that may have lurked behind. And ignorance is no positive force; it is mere privation or absence of positive truth; not a counter-force but an absence of force. Like light, truth alone illuminates; darkness cannot put out the light, nor ignorance truth; they are only absence of light and absence of understanding; mere negations. Will and emotions are merely forms of ignorance, having neither the status nor the power of a positive active force.

What then is wisdom or understanding? And how is ignorance to be equated with will and emotions? To Krishnamurti, knowledge means self-knowledge, which does not mean knowledge of some transcendental self, or some mysterious Atman, but a clear perception of our own mind in action. Again it is not introspection, because introspection gives us knowledge only of our conscious mind and leaves out much the larger part of the mind, which lies below the threshold of consciousness. Self-knowledge to Krishnamurti means knowledge
of the whole mind, conscious as well as unconscious. The difficulty of knowing the whole mind is that the unconscious does not come to us as an independent factor capable of being separately observed, but as a mass or volume of overtones lending colour to our conscious experiences. The unconscious which lends the overtones, pleasant or unpleasant, is an enormous region, made up of 'scars' of memory, remnants of past experiences, past training, past contacts with men, objects and books, our past thoughts and reasonings and even the whole weight of the racial memories we may have acquired in the course of our biological evolution. The unconscious can be distinguished, but not separated, from the conscious; it cannot therefore be introspected like our conscious experiences. The unconscious works secretly below the surface; and our conscious mind cannot, by any activity of its own, reach the depths of the unconscious or understand its ways of working.

The unconscious includes, not only memories of former facts and events observed by us - not only 'factual memories' - but also memories of our past values, or our past judgements of good and evil - the 'psychological memories' as named by Krishnamurti. Factual memories create no difficulties for us; we
do not nurse them unduly and, except in our reminiscent moods, rarely try to revive them. Usually we do not identify ourselves with them but leave them to work out their own destiny; and then they usually make for the success of our ends or purposes, whether implanted in us by nature (e.g. a child learning to walk or speak), or selected by our own choice (e.g. cycling motor driving etc). Factual memories, thus left to themselves, work selectively for our success in acquiring skills, including skill in reasoning or thinking. It is memories of value judgements, our approvals and condemnations, our subsequent jealousies and hatred, our pleasures and displeasures that make all the trouble for us. Not only do they affect our choice of means but they also shape our ends, in ways we do not know, or, if we knew, are not in a hurry to own up. Willy-nilly, our life is shaped by the unconscious in respect of both our means and ends. In fact the whole of our emotional life seems to be the outcome of our unconscious value judgements. As the unconscious never seems to take leave of us and always works secretly, we hardly know how we really stand with ourselves.

As Krishnamurti puts it, our mind is entirely conditioned by past psychological memories. We hardly perceive objects or take note of persons, but are pre-
judiced or conditioned by past judgements. My adjoin-
ing country may have the same natural features as mine,
but I consider mine as glorious while the other is
hateful to me. The reason obviously is that I do not
see the two-countries 'as they really are', but see
them through glasses coloured by past value judgements.
But it is exactly these values that we term emotions,
desires or conations. Emotion and will are not separate
faculties to be set against intellect and understanding;
they are merely the intellectual clouded by the uncon-
scious. It is therefore irrelevant to ask how I am to
cultivate my will, or control my emotions. If we
could bring into light the unconscious that was hidden
below the threshold, emotions and desires would be
laid bare and we would see things truly, 'as they are'.
For example, we would not see our neighbouring country
with a malignant eye, but would rather notice the simi-
lar natural features and the common humanity between
neighbours and, besides them and detached from them,
would be marshalled out memories of our past condemna-
tions. We would then immediately weigh the points that
are actually common against what are but memories of
the past. We can then discover the true form the false
and it is irrelevant to ask how I am to achieve the
truth.
Truth is unmistakable when it is fully presented to our view — this is the basis of Krishnamurti's teaching about awareness. When the working of our mind at any moment is split up into its constituents, namely — a present perception and overtones unconsciously added to it by memories of past experiences, we have simply to be aware of the factors, merely to hold them before our mind, 'without-doing a thing to them'; i.e. we should neither praise nor condemn them, we should not try to alter them, should not desire to achieve the opposite of them if they are 'bad', or carry them on if they are 'good' or pleasant; in other words, it should be 'choiceless awareness'. Making any of the above 'choices' only means inviting more activity of the conditioned mind, adding to the already troublesome overtones of memory, and making confusion worse confounded. On the other hand by our merely keeping quite, 'truth will have its own action' and prevail against falsehood. This disposes of the objection, sometimes raised, that awareness is strenuous, or is as difficult to 'practise', as any of the traditional forms of meditation. The objection would hold if awareness needed effort; but Krishnamurti specifically tells us that awareness is completely effortless; the presence of the slightest trace of effort implies the presence of choice; and awareness with choice is no
Effortless, indeed, but not lazy. The mind that holds its own workings in full view is quiet, unaffected by overtones, now that they are not allowed to trouble in secret. Though it is quiet, it is not 'the quiet of death'; on the other hand, being free from the conflicts and contradictions attendant on the overtones, it has an extremely clear and vivid outlook. It is alert and prompt in detecting and excluding the slightest trace of conditioning. It therefore keeps clear of all disturbances and is sensitive to truth, in a manner, and to a degree, unattainable by our conditioned mind, full as it is of its own disturbances. It is not a question of gaining sensibility which it did not possess, but one of recovering and retaining what already was there, and not allowing it to be obscured by accidental circumstances or overlaid memories. The question how we are to be aware does not arise.

Only if we are passively and effortlessly aware, i.e. take care not to agitate the already agitated mind, with the unconscious rise to the surface and show up how it has conditioned the mind. Only if we are choicelessly aware, i.e. do not try to condemn and change, or justify and continue, will our mind gain in
sensitivity or power to discriminate between truth and falsehood. And we may add that only if we remain in the state of awareness, i.e. a state in which we see truth as truth and false as false, shall our mind be transformed, then there will be a true revolution, not a reform in details which will keep alive the seeds of decay, but one that is basic, in which exposure to light has brought in health and has arrested further deterioration. The question how to transform is as irrelevant as the other question of 'how' we have discussed. The transformed state is a state of 'being' not a state of 'becoming'; it is not an ideal, an end to be desired and achieved. In the state that distinguishes the true from the false, truth will triumph of its own accord, our only concern being to see that falsehood does not creep in sideways or unawares. Transformation takes place spontaneously or not at all; and to retain that state, even for a short while, constant vigilance will have to be exercised against clandestine intrusions. The ways of the conditioned mind have to be carefully studied, if we are to keep them out at a safe distance, rendering them innocuous. But if we try to achieve transformation and seek ways and means for doing so, we shall walk straight into the trap of the conditioned mind.
The conditioned mind is always with us but its hold on us is not unvarying in its strength of potency. As awareness gives insight into the truth or falsity of a particular conditioned state, the hold of the false and the accidental, which in our ignorance we had regarded as the whole truth, gradually slackens. Though conditioned states continue to exist, they lose much of their opaqueness; the shadows they cast on the screen of life become fainter and fainter, and truth begins to shine through them in increasing glory. We become more and more confident that conditioning cannot completely overshadow truth. In the last analysis, shadows cannot exist without light, though light can shine without shadows.

It is a psychological revolution, a revolution in our mental attitude, that is not only independent of our environment, but independent of the limiting conditions of the mind itself. The mind then comes into its own and lives in the fullness of its powers. This does not mean the environment should be left untouched, nor that we should allow all mental defects to run their destructive course. On the other hand, Krishnamurti's revolution of the mind is fundamental, as it sets no limits to the reform of the mind through understanding how it gets conditioned. He insists that
all reform must be drastic, ending not in mere super-
ficial conformity, but in a real change of heart.
Without a revolution in mind, reforms of environment
will neither be honest nor permanent.

Krishnamurti thinks that this revolution takes
place immediately and is final; it is not a gradual
evolution or a slow growth, but is instantaneous in its
action. Changes in environment (e.g. distribution of
food, clothing and shelter), training the will, or
disciplining the mind all take time, but Krishnamurti
relies on our clearly distinguishing truth from false-
hood, a process which need not take time. Truth is not
a matter of degrees; either you understand or you don't.
We have, however, seen that truth has no limits, no
fixed frontiers; it is 'a voyage in uncharted seas'.
What therefore can take place immediately is a percep-
tion that we have taken a wrong direction. Whether
this alone will place us on the true path, how many
steps we shall have to travel and what scenes will
meet our eyes there, all these things will probably
depend on chance and individual temperament. In the
reported cases of religious 'conversions', the progress,
has been sudden and spectacular. Extraverts probably
show tangible results, while introverts can only claim
an inner change of heart that is not open to view.
In all cases, however, there must occur a distinct and unmistakable change in one's appreciation of individual and collective problems.

Awareness, therefore, may be said to pass through three stages, not necessarily separable in time, but clearly distinguishable from each other. In the first place, it allows the unconscious part of the mind, consisting of traces of past value judgements, past condemnations and justifications - to rise to the surface and present itself side by side with the direct challenge of the moment. Secondly, awareness distinguishes between the true, or the present challenge and the false or the memories that envelope the challenge with emotional overtones and make it seem different from 'what it is'. Lastly, awareness tends distinctly to shift the mind from the false to the true.

The common feature in the stages of awareness is that the mind is perfectly quiet, free from all disturbances.

The state of awareness needs no prodding from outside to make it function. On the contrary, any prodding will undo its work and we shall revert to the conditioned state. Awareness works only if it allowed free play without interference. What then is the explanation of the persistent questioning about the methods, or 'how' of awareness? Why does Krishnamurti's account of awareness fail to satisfy us? And why do we demand
to be further enlightened? Several explanations come to our mind; we may be exaggerating the falseness of the false and may be tempted to throw away the baby with the bath, to discard the true along with the false, so that we may be left with nothing on hand; and awareness may appear to us as a completely blank mind. Or, instead of treating awareness as an index of some pervasive presence, like the mariner's compass as an index of the magnetic field of the earth, we may ask such irrelevant questions as: who is it that is aware? What is he aware of? And we may form imaginary pictures both of the awarer and the aware. Again, the false of our conditioned mind is comparatively easy to detect, though even here we may commit mistakes; but the further questions: What is the Reality which awareness presents to us? and how does that Reality entertain the false at all? are hard to answer. Unless we satisfactorily understand Krishnamurti's few, but significant, references to these fundamental questions, his powerful teaching about our immediate daily problems will not take firm root. Probably because we have not come to grips with these larger problems, our confusion takes the form of irrelevant questions at lower levels and in particular, the recurring question of how.
Krishnamurti's style of exposition may be partly responsible for raising the question of 'how'. It has the faults of its undoubted merits. His is the method of the discoverer, not of the exponent; he begins with the known and dives into the unknown; he begins with the concrete particular, wants each listener to begin the same way with his own particular problem and, in the course of listening, proceeds from concrete to concrete steps and reach a conclusion that is clear to himself and may be acceptable to all. There are, alas, very few discoverers in the present day, in this game of discovery, as in all other games, specialisation has made most of us mere spectators of the performance of a few expert participants. Very few of us therefore have the will and the courage to take the perilous jump with Krishnamurti, or enjoy the thrills of creative venture. We are used to the passive role of pupils and imitators and are half-incredulous when he gives us credit for creativity. We are used to the teacher's sedate methods of exposition, giving us a complete account of the grounds on which the discovery is based, of every pitfall avoided, every step taken or rejected, and the conclusion finally and triumphantly reached as a matter of clear logical reasoning. Few know, and fewer can sympathise with, the inner history of the discoverer, the hopes, despairs,
brilliant suggestions and doubts, risks, trepidations and joys that accompany search and accomplishment. Krishnamurti wants us to go through the whole of this gamut, in our discoveries about subjects which are near and dear to us, subjects which make up our total life. The demand probably proves to be too much for us.

The subject matter of Krishnamurti's discourses does not, it is true, lend itself to the usual logical treatment. The subject is Reality, or Life itself in its totality; and Life is too vast, too dynamic, and too subtle to be presented in a fixed pattern, from which conclusions can be safely deduced. Physical sciences once adopted a rigid framework of Nature—the conception of the universe as a machine, but had to be abandoned as subtler phenomena began to be noticed. The technique of human sciences ignores individual differences with a view to emphasise averages and patterns. Philosophers are attempting to create a terminology with fixed meanings, which will result in their ignoring everything in life that refuses to be defined and framed in patterns. Organised religions have also laid down, each its own pattern of ritual and dogma. Krishnamurti is filled with resentment at all this obsession for patterns. Patterns only give us secondhand knowledge; we deceive
ourselves into the belief that we have understood the truth of a proposition, when we have only a superficial or a schematic acquaintance with it. To explain what happens when we are aware, or to lay down a theory of awareness is not awareness. Awareness is individual work and, even after studying the whole theory, one must personally go through the experience of awareness for understanding what it really is. We may do with second hand knowledge of the external world, but knowledge of the problems of life must be direct, if it is to cut any ice.

It needs a Krishnamurti to lead others to a direct experience. He has an uncanny way of entering into the heart of his questioners. The most unintelligible, and even the most inaudible of the questions is neatly repeated by him and his version not only illuminates the mind of the questioner but even indicates what turn the discussion may take. He has an amazing quickness of grasp and is impatient of verbosity. None among the audience can anticipate how a theme is going to develop or how an argument is going to end. And yet the by-paths never lead him astray and he is back on the rails in a moment. His method of exposition is original and inimitable. He has roused a genuine interest in spiritual matters among thousands who have
begun to feel convinced that the true salvation of the world, especially in its present critical state, lies in the understanding and adoption of the spiritual point of view. He has also created a confidence that the religious or spiritual mind is not beyond the grasp of the man of ordinary intelligence.

And yet listeners have an uneasy feeling that they have not caught the spirit of his teaching. Krishnamurti attributes their failure to want of keenness or genuine interest on their part. This is not the whole truth, because crowds are seen listening to him year after year with rapt attention. Even as they listen, they are probably plagued by the forbidden questions of why and how: why does interest flag? how is interest to be stimulated? The real reason may be that we have become unfit for his direct approach. The scientific spirit with its 'illumination' has penetrated our being and we have become lop-sidedly intellectual. All kinds of intellectual doubts assail us and we cannot rest until they are intellectually resolved. To take an instance, Krishnamurti often makes the challenging statement that if we see a bottle marked 'poison', we would not dream of drinking from it; why then do we cling to conditioned states after being told that they are conditioned? The intellectual
unconsciously draws a distinction like this: about poison, we condemn its use universally; but about conditioning, we are expected to shed it without condemnation. Harbouring doubts like this, we falter in proceeding with our experiment. Again our scientific theories of, say, the relation between brain and the mind, or our philosophical theories of causation and free-will surreptitiously come in the way of free experimentation.

Not that Krishnamurti has neglected the intellect. In fact, it has been one of his greatest achievements that he has brought spiritual teaching in the open when formerly it used to be based on faith, which tended to become blind faith, on instructions and practices that were conducted in secret, or on logic which preferred transcendental entities like God, Soul or the Absolute to actualities in life. He begins with the known and, pointing out the limitations of the known, leads us to the unknown. The actual manner in which the transfer from the known to the unknown takes place is not easily grasped by the intellectuals. Krishnamurti's is a negative approach to the unknown, while intellectuals are in the habit of thinking positively of the known and therefore speculatively make positive pictures of the unknown. By pointing out, however,
the limitations of the known, Krishnamurti may be said to treat the known negatively: to show that the known is not true, that the conditioned mind is the negation of the true mind. And by insisting that the unknown is really unknown and by rejecting all speculation about it, he treats it also negatively. It is the negative approach in the last stages of understanding that puzzles the intellectuals. Intellectual satisfaction, however, is not our aim in studying Krishnamurti. We satisfy the intellect lest it comes in the way of the transformation of our mind. We realise, however, that transformation is possible when the mind actually discards the domination of the known and allows itself to swim freely in the unknown. Intellect has to prepare itself for this transformation but finds the task too hard and too much against the grain.

Different persons emphasise different aspects of Krishnamurti's teaching. Some think that all our troubles are due to the confusion in our mind and everything will be all right if we attain peace.

Others think that our main trouble is our 'I'-obsession, and somehow we must eliminate the 'I' from our life. Similarly, greed, fear, authority, anger, pride, time-sense, and many other states of mind are
regarded as our trouble-makers and every one has his pet remedy against them. Krishnamurti takes up all these and similar subjects, one at a time, in his talks and all partisans think that they have his implicit support in their respective diagnosis and treatment of the ills of the mind. Questions of 'how' are bound to be raised if Krishnamurti's teaching is studied piecemeal, but he also takes a comprehensive view of the working of our mind and wants us to be so aware of it, that all partial views will take their right place in the total without any conflict. This comprehensive view is not a goal or an ideal, not a state of 'becoming'. It is a state of 'being' and to raise questions about the 'how' of such a state is as irrelevant as asking, say, how we are to make the apple gravitate to the earth.

Spiritual life as envisaged by Krishnamurti affords little scope for a method, such as our verbalising mind demands. This mind of ours is selective and attends to the selected aspect to the exclusion of all other aspects. That is why its conclusions can be neatly represented as a system or pattern. There can be e.g. a materialistic view of the universe because we neglect all other views. All our intellectual appeals aim at referring us to wider and wider systems;
and our highest aim is to discover, if possible, an all-comprehensive pattern or system. Krishnamurti no doubt has to use words but at every talk, he warns his listeners that the talk should be taken to be addressed individually to each listener who is expected not to be passive, not to listen merely to the words, nor to interpret them in terms of his own past knowledge, but to experiment along with the speaker, so that each talk could be 'a common voyage of discovery'. Such procedure excludes all formal method based on a pattern; it is an invitation to direct communion and direct understanding.

Awareness is undoubtedly the central theme of Krishnamurti's teaching. At its earliest stage he describes it as observation 'without condemnation, without justification and without identification'. The qualifying words, he explains, distinguish awareness from introspection with which we are familiar in all our reflective moods. When, for instance, I am introspecting jealousy, the observed mental state as well as the observer (I' are involved in the meshes of jealousy. Both are borne along and swept away by the current of jealousy. When, on the other hand, I am aware of jealousy, only the mental state is caught in the turmoil of the current, while 'I' in the state of awareness seems to be observing it from a safe distance outside the sweep of the current. In awareness
therefore the observer, standing out of the turmoil, seems to transcend it to that extent. Such transcendence is the distinctive mark of awareness at all stages. We must take note of its presence in this its earliest stage. This warning is necessary because many students of Krishnamurti are inclined to consider awareness as a kind of mysterious experience, totally out of reach of the ordinary man. No doubt awareness does present difficulties when it has to reach 'the deeper layers of consciousness', but we need not be scared into the belief that awareness is beyond our powers of comprehension and attainment.

The state of awareness cannot be cultivated; it is not to be conceived as a goal, to be reached progressive stages by some kind of discipline. It is not a state of 'becoming' but a state of 'being' a posture or attitude of mind that carries its own understanding with it, and effects a transformation, not in course of time but immediately. Like awareness, understanding also passes through many phases and, at every stage of awareness, helps us to transcend our ordinary, conditioned, verbalising mind. At the earliest stage, which we are describing now, understanding comes in the shape of a contrast between the intense turmoil of the observed mental state and the comparative quiet, or freedom from
disturbance of the observer. Such silence - not dead silence but best described as 'passive alertness' - is the characteristic of awareness at all stages; without it, it is not awareness at all.

(This chapter is indebted to A.D. Dhopeshwarkar "J. Krishnamurti and Awareness in Action". Popular Prakashan Bombay 1967).