

A different kind of energy

J. Krishnamurti - Santa Monica 1972 - Public Talk 4

I think we have talked about several things during the past three gatherings that we have had here. And this morning we ought to, I think, talk about and share together naturally, the question of how to have not only abundant physical energy but also a quality of energy that is not purely physical, brought about through friction, struggle – a quality of energy that is totally different. Because we need energy, not only to change ourselves in the light of our own understanding of ourselves, but also we need a great deal of energy to change the social structure in which we live.

Questioner: We can't hear over here. K: Oh, Lord. You can't hear. I don't know, it is not my fault. Can you hear now? Q: The speaker is too bassy. K: I am afraid I can't hear. Q: That is our problem, too. K: So what shall we do? Q: The technicians need to do their work. Q: We need more treble. Q: There is too much bass and not enough treble. The speaker system needs an adjustment. Q: The words are all muffled. K: Muffled. Is it better now? Audience: Yes. K: I had better talk a little bit louder.

As we were saying, we not only need a great deal of energy to change ourselves, in the light of our own understanding of ourselves, but also we need a great deal of energy to change the social order, to bring about a different society, a different culture. And we said, as yesterday, that thought has brought about considerable energy, thought in its conflict with others, thought in conflict with itself, thought – aggressive, separative, a great deal of friction, and this friction has given us considerable energy. And it is more so in this country, there is so much energy, physical energy. And we need also a different kind of energy that is not the result of conflict, struggle, competition, and the endless sorrow, which has its own energy. And that is what I would like this morning to talk about.

We see that a new quality of energy, not personal energy or a collective energy, an energy of a totally different dimension not of any particular group, country, of any religious belief and dogma, but an energy that is totally outside of all the human conflict, with all its energy that does bring about certain outward effects. I don't quite know how deeply I can go into this with you. Because it seems to me that all religions – because I am chiefly concerned with religion – all religions, whatever the organisation, belief, dogma be, have tried to capture an energy that is not brought about by thought. I am not talking about the religion which the priests have invented throughout the world, organised, with their vested interest in property, in God, in rituals, but a religion that has nothing whatsoever to do with any dogma, belief, ritual, that is not the product of a cunning thought, contriving to shape man's behaviour.

We are talking about a religion which is of the highest... Has something gone wrong? Q: It has turned off. K: Oh Lord. Q: We can hear you now. It is good now. K: Is it better now? A: Yes. K: Ah, at last. Where am I? We are talking of a different kind of religion, totally different, in which there are no saviours, masters, acceptance of authority, in which the priest doesn't intervene, in which there is direct perception. And that very perception brings about its own order, its own vitality, its own energy. Some religious leaders – really they shouldn't be called leaders at

all – religious teachers, have tried to convey, as far as I can understand, the quality of this energy which brings about order in existence. And this energy is not the result of friction, with which we are quite familiar. The more you are aggressive, the more energy you have. The more competitive, the more energy. Ultimately, you have heart failures.

But we are talking of an energy that comes through the total understanding of consciousness, and going beyond it. Our consciousness, that is you, is its content. The content is the quality of that consciousness. And whether that content be superficial, petty, narrow, bigoted, or clever, erudite, capable of great sacrifice, great wisdom, is still the content of that consciousness. Your consciousness, if you observe it closely, is it not made up of your racial inheritance, the communal collective beliefs, culture, morality. It is also made up of various beliefs, dogmas, fears, pleasures and so on. That consciousness is you. And because of its content it must be always limited, it must always have borders within the confines of which the contents function and live. Are we meeting each other?

Please, this is very serious because I want to go into this very deeply if I can this morning, because perhaps a few of us can capture this. I mean by capturing, you cannot hold it, as you cannot hold the heavens in your fist or the sea in your hands, but you can, if you give your attention somewhat to it, come upon it. And it seems to me it is most essential, if we are to create quite a different kind of culture, a different kind of society, morality. Our consciousness is always limited, whether it is conscious or unconscious. This division between consciousness and the deeper layers is quite artificial. And the psychologists, the analysts and the latest theorists want to shape man at the very root of the unconscious.

That is, as superficially you cannot be changed, because you are too well established in the habitual way of life – anger, jealousy, aggression, competition, calling yourself Catholic, Protestant or what you will. That apparently hasn't changed man he is still brutal, vicious, eager to kill on the least provocation. A society in which the mothers are quite willing to destroy their children through war. Superficially, apparently, human beings are almost impossible to change. So, unconsciously, if there is a radical change there, perhaps it will affect the outer behaviour, and so there is great endeavour going on. And the religions have done it, organised religions also, but they did it in the name of God, in the name of fear, through reward and punishment, hell and heaven – that too has failed. Education has failed. So, there are those people who are trying to affect the unconscious. To condition it much more so that the conscious mind conforms or acts according to the dictates of the unconscious. That is all within the field of consciousness.

And I feel, in examining all this – and I have been doing this for the last 50, 60 years of my life – I find in myself and in others, that the real transformation of the mind and the heart doesn't lie within this field of consciousness, it lies outside it. And the problem then arises, how is it possible to empty the whole content of consciousness so that there is a different mind, a different intelligence, a sense of compassion, love, which can function within the given culture?

You see, to put it differently, I can change myself through will, through determination, through every form of compulsion. Either that compulsion be reward or punishment. I can learn to behave, not be aggressive, not be competitive, not be greedy, envious, and all the things that

has brought about this unfortunate, insane society. That is fairly easy, I can set about doing it consciously, having determined consciously to pursue a certain path, and consciousness then accepts it, follows it. But that remains very superficial because it is still within the field of the known, still within the field of time, within the field of superficial activity, and therefore my life remains ordinary, mediocre, doing good here and there, superficial, rather petty, and so on.

So the mind says that is not good enough, that is still a bourgeois life, whether it is lived in America or in China or in Russia. So the mind tries to find out if there is a way of living in which conflict totally ceases, and therefore action of total intelligence, and not within the field of the consciousness with its content. Am I making myself clear? Good. I hope I am. Then my question to myself is: how am I, how is the mind – which is so conditioned, which functions irrationally, and at rare occasions rationally – how is that mind to transform itself without conflict and have an energy that is totally different from the energy that is brought about through conflict. An energy that never deteriorates. An energy that renews itself all the time, without any motive?

Now, having put that question to myself, I now want to find out how to empty, purgate, wash out this petty little mind with all its ambitions and crudities and cunningness and shoddiness, how is this possible? Are you putting this question to yourselves? In putting that question to oneself, who is going to answer it? Any teacher, any guru, any book? If they do, they are not the teachers. You know, most teachers unfortunately, gurus, have some kind of experience and they blow it up to the heavens. And they think that one experience resolves all our problems, it doesn't.

So there is nobody to answer this question, the question being there must be a total revolution in oneself not the revolution of blood and bomb and destruction and killing people, killing people in order to have peace, killing people in order to bring about a new society – that is all too immature, too childish, too brutal, too meaningless. But the mind and the heart must go a radical revolution. And that revolution cannot be brought about by will, because will means friction. It cannot be brought about by a new series of ideologies, invented by – it doesn't matter who it is because that still implies within the field of the known.

So as nobody can answer this, what is the mind to do? You are following this? What are you to do? First of

all, in asking this question, I see this whole movement, within the field of consciousness is the movement of thought. Thought, which is the response of memory, which is knowledge, the known, whether that thought is conscious or hidden. It is this whole movement of thought that limits consciousness, because thought is the response of the known. There is no question of that. If you did not know your name, your house, where you are going, where you live, what your job is, you would be in a state of amnesia. And thought is the response of the known – knowledge, experience, memory.

So the next question is: can thought, which has created the most marvellous thing in the world, and also thought which has brought about such devastating havoc in the world: wars, the utter lack of relationship with another, thought that has destroyed in the name of

Christianity – probably Christians have killed more people than anybody else in the world. Have you ever thought about it? Probably you aren't. So thought is consciousness, and any action by thought, however subtle, however lovely, however free it may consider itself, is still within the pattern of the old.

So the next question is: can that thought function in one field, logically, sanely, and rationally, and in the other field, completely silent? You understand my question? That is, can thought stop? Which is, can thought, as time, as movement, within the field of the known, stop, and only come into action when the known has to function? Are we meeting each other? Can we go on? Can I go on? A: Yes.

K: That is, when knowledge has to operate, it operates without the 'me'. The me who is aggressive, competitive, fearful, wanting power, position, pleasure, and all that. Only when knowledge is demanded in action, it acts completely, without the division which is brought about by thought as the me. So my question is then, can thought stop? So that there is a different quality of energy altogether? Because thought has brought about a great deal of energy and a great deal of mischief. And I see thought cannot bring about a radical revolution within the mind and within the heart. So, can thought come to an end but operate when it is necessary? Have you understood my question?

Now, we are going to find out, we are going to go into this question carefully, with real, earnest enquiry. Because you see, when thought comes to an end something new takes place. And this is what people, those people who talk about meditation have tried. There are those Zen groups, there are those transcendental – what are they – meditators, there are those who join various groups of meditation, all trying to bring about a cessation of thought so that a new quality of energy can come into being – the name doesn't matter. To me, to the speaker – because I have watched all this, the speaker has watched all this for many years, gone into it – to the speaker all these are rather immature, childish, and ultimately meaningless.

I'll show you why – because you have to understand this, because you are surrounded by all these things. First of all, one observes, if you have gone into this sufficiently, into yourself, not according to anybody, you will find that thought must stop sometime, so that you can see things differently, you can feel differently. That is absolutely so. If you are chattering all the time, as you are, comparing, judging, opinions, you know, endless chatter, chatter, chatter, obviously there is no space for something new to take place. Only when the mind is still, quiet, completely motionless, then perhaps there is something new taking place. Not new in terms of the old, not in terms of the known – something totally different.

So, let's examine the various groups, various systems of meditation to still the mind. First of all, there is the transcendental meditation. God, I don't know why you get involved in all this. You are the most gullible people in the world. Please. You have no reference, you have no background, you have no education about all this. Somebody comes along, promises you, do this, and you swallow the whole thing. So let's look at it. You know, the idea of this transcendental meditation is that you repeat a certain mantra. You know all about this, don't you? Need I go into this question of mantra? Oh no, don't waste time, you can invent your own mantra. Some guru has come from India to tell you his sacred mantra. You can invent it

for yourself, repeat certain phrases – Ave Maria or God knows what else, and you have your mantra.

Now, please listen. Listen – once you see the truth of it, you will never touch it. Because when you see the false you see the truth. And it is that truth that will free the mind from the false. You can repeat a mantra, a word, over and over again, verbally, loudly, moving your lips. Then you repeat those words silently. And after repeating silently for some time you float off, you jump over, you spring off from that. That is, spring off into something that you don't know, something that you hope to find. But before you repeat these words, mantras, whatever they do, your life is disorderly, your life is disturbed, confused, irrational, illogical, insane, and you hope to bring rationality, sanity into your life by repeating these mantras, these words. So you become less angry, a little more cheerful, perhaps not so aggressive, and so on – still very superficial.

We are talking about a life that is totally, radically different, a new race of mind and heart. And so that type of meditation – which is really not meditation at all, it is a form of self-deception. And I have discussed this matter in India with some of those people who have gone into this very thoroughly, and they say, you are quite right, sir, but not for us. You are right, what you say is truth, what you are saying is the highest form, but not for us. They don't say why because they have their investment, their disciples, their property, their following – you follow? So they say, keep it to yourself, not for us.

Then there are other forms of meditation, all wanting to still the mind, to make the mind completely quiet, so they offer systems, methods. If you have tried one method, all other methods are the same. The method is: daily practice. Either you sit down cross-legged, again, I don't know why you have to sit cross-legged, you can do this kind of meditation in bed or lying down in the sun, under a tree. But you see, when you sit cross-legged, according to your guru, it is more romantic, it is more conducive, and also when you sit straight, the basis of this is – if you sit straight, blood goes to your head more easily, that is all. So you sit straight and you practise. The more you practise, the more mechanical you become.

The practice will produce what you desire. What you desire is the highest form of pleasure, whether it is enlightenment, whether it is God, whether it is your super-sexual demands, or whatever it is, it is still a mechanical pursuit and therefore still within the field of the known, though you hope through the known to jump off. Because you have never understood what the known is. How can you jump off something if you have not laid the foundation rightly? If your life is not righteous, orderly, sane, where is the foundation? So those people who want to meditate, much better not to meditate. That is only an escape. But whereas if you gave your attention to bring about order in your life, not according to some psychologist but in the light of your own understanding, in the light of your own enquiry, understanding yourself. And out of that order comes the real action from which you can move, from which you can go very far.

So, any form of discipline, any form of contrivance by thought, which is what the systems do, contriving to force you to behave so that, not only in this world but have a mind that is quiet, it is a contrivance by thought and therefore limited. And there are those meditations who train you to be attentive. Beginning from your toe – you understand? – paying attention to

your toe and gradually working up, it is all so infantile. It doesn't matter who practises it, whether the ancient monks in Zen monasteries practise it, or you practise it in your quiet room, or a noisy room, or in a room filled with smog.

Because attention means attention to what you are doing in daily life, attention to the way you talk, the way you walk, the way you think, to be attentive to that. And you cannot be attentive if you are controlling. So you begin to see that control has no place in meditation. Then you ask: how am I to control thought? Controlling thought is not the ending of thought. Who is the controller? – do please listen to all this – who is the controller? Another part of the mind. Another segment of thought, which says, I must control in order to behave, in order to achieve, in order to be enlightened. Good Lord. So when you control, in that there is contradiction, there is conflict, there is suppression, and all the neurotic habits that those who are controlling have, and that those who do not control also have.

So, thought cannot be stopped by control. Thought cannot be brought to an end by will. Will is another part of desire. It is desire that says, I want to control in order to achieve heaven, God, truth. Sirs, you cannot achieve it, you cannot invite it. Your house must be in order, that is all your concern. So, thought can only come to an end naturally, easily, without conflict. And it comes to an end when you see the urgency of it, when you see the importance of it. When you see the importance of it, when you see for yourself what thought has done: the mischief, the divisions, the technological advancement, which is used by thought to destroy people, to corrupt people, when you yourself see the fact and the effect of thought, that very perception is the ending of thought.

Which means that awareness is not something to be practiced. To be aware, that is, to be aware of the birds, the sea, the movement of the water, to be aware of the things outwardly, the terrible confusion which the politicians are creating in the world, to see what the priests have done, what religions have done. To be aware of your environment, how you are destroying it, polluting the air. And to be aware of yourself in relation to another, in relation to your nature, to be just aware, not trying to correct it, to shape it. Then out of that awareness comes attention, total attention. In that attention thought comes to an end. I'll show it to you.

Are you listening to what is being said? Wait just a minute, sir, don't say yes. I don't think so. Are you completely, totally, with your mind, with your body, with your nerves, with your heart and mind, listening to what is being said?

When you are listening so intently, is there any movement of thought? At the moment, at the act of listening, seeing, thought is quiet. A second later it comes into being. Then your question is: how am I to maintain or continue that second of quietness? That is a wrong question to put because you can never sustain that moment of attention. If you want to sustain it, it is another form of greed. But if you understand, if you listen now completely, there is no consciousness with its content as the "me" which is trying to listen; there is only the act of listening without any interpretation, just to listen. That is the ending of thought.

Which means we are never attentive. We talk about it, we go to school to learn, or go to Japan or India or God knows what else, to learn to be attentive, which means you are never learning. You are 'going to learn' is different from learning. The act of learning is always in the present.

So, meditation is the most extraordinary thing if you know what it is. But you don't know what it is. So don't listen to anybody, including the speaker; don't join any groups – I am not advising you, I am just, if you are interested in this – don't follow any system, any person who says, "I know," they don't know. And a man who says, 'I know', he does not know. So you, in your own light of understanding, will come upon this strange energy which is incorruptible. This energy is the highest form of intelligence. And that intelligence does not come by or through any form of effort, however subtle, however stupid, however cunning; it comes naturally when you see the energy that has been wasted in mischief.

You know, we use music, literature, poems, and a sunset as a means to go off, as a means to something else. There is no means to reality. You are not silent because you want something new; then you are contriving, then you are cunning, then you become a merchant. Whereas if you really understood this thing, that is, a life in which you have brought about through understanding of yourself without effort, order out of disorder. Then when you have that foundation really well laid, then you will come upon this strange energy, and that transforms the whole mentation, the whole business of love.

Perhaps, if you are willing, we can ask questions about this, about what we have talked about this morning. There are a lot of questions I can ask about it. And I hope you will, because we are sharing this thing together, therefore you are responsible. Sharing doesn't mean just accepting or denying. Sharing – therefore when you share something you are responsible for it. Yes, sir?

Q: Sir, aren't you making a distinction when you speak of thoughts in action versus not using thoughts? Aren't you making a distinction between memory of facts, like your address, versus memory of patterns, especially patterns of relationship?

K: Sir, that is fairly clear. The gentleman asks, aren't you making a difference, isn't there a difference between memory of facts, memory as knowledge, which is the understanding of facts, and the freedom from the fact and going beyond it. Is that the question, sir?

Q: The lack of thoughts that represent patterns of relationships.

K: I am sorry, I can't hear. There is memory that represents fact and relationship.

A: Pattern. Patterns of relationship.

K: Patterns of relationship. There is memory that represents patterns of relationship. Do you have patterns in relationships? This is something new which I have not heard before. Do you have patterns of relationship? You behave towards one person in one way, towards another, another way, and to your boss another way, to your wife another way, if you have a cook, another way – is that the pattern of behaviour? Your analyst in one way, to your doctor another way – is that it? Is that it? What a complicated life you must have. You must be changing your masks all the time, aren't you? When you go to the doctor you put on one mask, when you meet your wife you put on a different mask, and your boss, and so on – changing, putting on masks. And you call that patterns of behaviour in relationships? Good Lord.

So you have different facets of relationship. That means you are never yourself, whatever that be, there is always a pretension, a pose. And that inevitably breeds conflict. You are different to your wife, different to your boss, different to the priest if you have one, obviously you are totally different to your analyst, if you have one. So, you are always living in contradiction and therefore conflict. Now when you see that, when you are really aware of that, honestly, you know, not deceive yourself, when you are actually aware that you are pretending all the time, putting on different faces all the time, when you see the falseness of it then you see the truth that you must be yourself. Then you begin to enquire what is yourself.

Is not yourself all these patterns? Are you following this? Is not yourself how you behave to the doctor, to the wife, to the child, and so on? That is yourself. So, you say: what is myself? To find that out there must be no pretension. Don't pretend to be one thing, say another, do another. Then you will find out what you are. You will find out what you are, which is, all these calculated pretensions. And when you go beyond all these pretensions, all these poses, all these imaginations, contriving remembrances, images, what are you at the end of it? Nothing at all, are you, aren't you? And we are frightened to be nothing. You say, well, if I am nothing, I'll be destroyed by society. Be destroyed by society. You won't be destroyed. You see, sir, when you are really nothing, which means thought, which has put together the "me," is no longer there. Then there is a totally different kind of energy, which is much more real than the imaginary "me" which has been put together by thought. Yes, sir?

Q: Since time started, how did this idea of thought ever come about?

K: How did the "me" come about?

Q: Yes. Originally, it seems like there was at one time there had not to be a "me," since there was, I believe, a beginning to man, then it had to come about somehow, the thought and the "me." How did it ever start?

K: How did this culture, how did the "me," how did the mischief ever start? Is that the question, sir?

Q: Yes.

K: All right, let's look into it, how did it start. How do you think it started? You know, they are investigating the higher apes. Some people have lived with them in Africa, written books, and they almost behave like human beings, contriving, inventing, jealous, frightened, aggressive. It started there, probably, because collectively they have to protect themselves. You can see all this phenomena, you don't have to ask me or anybody, you can see it for yourself. You can see how in the child the "me" begins. The other child has a bigger toy and your own child has a smaller one, so they fight. Haven't you noticed all these silly things? So there it is. What is important is not how it began but how to end all this mischief. Whether it can ever be ended collectively, or is it to be ended by an individual, as a human being? And what relationship has that human being who has freed himself from the mischief, what is his relationship to the others?

What is the relationship of a man who is really kind, good, not in terms of good and bad, but really completely good, what relationship has he with another who is mischievous, ugly? What is the relationship? Have you ever gone into it? You who love, if you really love, what is your relationship to a man who is mischievous, brutal, vicious? And in that relationship, if you have a relationship, you want to change that brutality. And so do you become brutal? Or because you are good, completely good, and flowering in that goodness, the miracle happens that the other is affected. That is all one can do. Any more? Yes, sir?

Q: Speaking of the mass, does man have a single homogeneous personality or is he made up of many facets and faces which comprise the totality? Does man have a single homogeneous personality?

K: Does man have a homogeneous personality? Of whom are you asking this? Me? Have you got a homogeneous personality? Have you, sirs? No answer. Naturally, because you are not a whole, complete, homogeneous. Why? Because in you there is violence and peace. In you there is the good and the bad – I am using the ordinary words – the irrational activity and rational activity, there is fear, there is hope, despair, guilt – you are made up of many fragments. And out of these fragments, or collecting these fragments together you hope to bring about a homogeneity. It is not possible. To be completely whole implies a mind that is not divided in itself.

Q: Are there any judgments which do not do violence to the truth?

K: Are there any judgments which do not violate truth, is that the question, sir?

Q: That is the question.

K: Are there any judgments which do not violate truth. What is judgment? You know, I used to know a man who was one of the highest judges in India. One day he said, "I am passing judgment over people every day of my life, since I have come to this position. And what is judgment, which I am passing on others?" So the more he thought about

it, the more he was convinced that he must give up his judgeship and his prominence and his way of life and retire into the woods to find out what is judgment. And he did retire, withdrew from the family, from the office, from the position, to find out what is truth and what is judgment. Are any of you willing to do that? Are any of you willing to withdraw, to find out what is truth and what is judgment? I am afraid you are not. You just want verbally to find out, don't you? You want to find out verbally what is truth and what is judgment, and what is the relationship between judgment and truth.

Why do you judge at all? Why do you say somebody is silly, somebody is this or somebody is that, how noble, how crooked – why? What is the measure you have? And you say: aren't you measuring when you say all the gurus are infantile? Am I? Am I judging? Or merely observing the fact without any prejudice, without any emotion behind it. Just to observe that the ant has four legs is not a judgment, that the elephant has a trunk is not a judgment, it is an observation of a fact. When there is the observation of a fact without any emotion, any prejudice, any judgment according to a conclusion, then that judgment is merely an

observation of the fact, and therefore it is truth. The fact is always the truth. The fact that one is lying, one is frightened, that is the truth. But to say that I must not be frightened, that is judgment. And when you say I must not be frightened, in that there is conflict. And therefore from that you develop courage, which is another form of resistance to fear. So when you state a fact, which anybody can observe, if they are willing to observe, then in that stating of the fact there is no judgment, but only the observation of the fact is the truth.