

Insights into Immensity

*Krishnamurti and David Bohm
in dialogue 1961-1986*

Krishnamurti text used with permission of Krishnamurti Foundation Trust Ltd.
Any personal views expressed are the author's own and do not necessarily reflect the
views of Krishnamurti Foundation Trust Ltd.

For more information about J. Krishnamurti please see: **www.jkrishnamurti.org**.

Cover typography Marjaana Virta

Back cover photo Mark Edwards
Copyright Krishnamurti Foundation Trust Ltd.
Reproduced with permission.

© Heikki Peltola 2020

Nostetuo tanto Helsinki

First published in Finnish *Mielen tuolle puolen* (Basam Books Oy 2015).

Book website **WWW.KBOHM.COM**

ISBN 978-951-98466-6-8

Heikki Peltola

Insights into Immensity

*Krishnamurti and David Bohm
in dialogue 1961-1986*

Contents

1. A journey beyond 7

- Two roads crossing 11
- Thought cannot solve the mystery of the mind 10
- Our mindless mental models 11
- The 'me' is a mistake 13
- Beyond thinking 14
- Be free to see 17
- Time will not help us 19

2. Ten Insights 21

- Human problems have one root 24
- Thinking is the cause of human disorder 26
- We are not individuals 26
- Eliminating psychological conditioning 30
- The world is one whole 31
- Psychological time is the enemy of man 32
- There is no psychological evolution 34
- The observer is the observed 34
- Nobody can help you to see the truth 35
- The essence of existence is beyond thinking 36

3. Towards a new kind of mind 37

- The rocky road 38
- Meeting of minds 41
- A path to the pathless land 43
- Words are letters 45
- Two worlds, one mind 49
- Dialogues in brief 52

4. Words from silence 55

The Gstaad sessions 1965

- 1 Thought is a danger! 56
- 2 Can you hear silence? 60
- 3 Never a dull moment 62
- 4 Fixing the brain pain 64
- 5 Gone with the flow 66
- 6 World without words 67

5. Seeing all as it is 70

Read between the lines 70

The Brockwood Parks sessions 1975

- 1 Shrinking in thinking 74
- 2 Let the facts act 78
- 3 A drum vibrates to the emptiness 80
- 4 Seeing is doing 82
- 5 Crooked like a cork screw 84
- 6 Step out of your stable 86
- 7 Meeting the mystery 89
- 8 Stream gone wrong 92
- 9 Healing the damaged brain 94
- 10 The process revisited 95
11. Can wisdom be learnt? 97
- 12 Eliminating desire 98

6. Are we willing to change? 101

Transformation of man (with David Shainberg) 1976

- 1 Life is more than me 103
- 2 Lost in concepts 106
- 3 Still crazy after all these years 109
- 4 To live you must leave 110
- 5 Two rails never meet 112
- 6 Occupied by acute matters 113
- 7 Sensing the sacred 115

7. All time is now 117

Sessions 1980 at Ojai and Brockwood Park

- 1 Ending as a new beginning 121
- 2 Towards the ground 122
- 3 Insight transforms thought 124
- 4 Old maps mislead us 127
- 5 Out of the shock a new mind 129
- 6 Mutation in the brain cells 131
- 7 Dispelling darkness 132
- 8 Immensity calling 134
- 9 Old brain cannot create a new mind 136
- 10 Cosmos is in meditation 139
- 11 From a little pond to the ocean 140
- 12 A thorn in thought 142
- 13 Knocked by knowledge 144
- 14 The universe as the body of the mind 145
- 15 Refuse to have problems! 148

8. The potent powers of our mind 153

Meetings with scientists 1978-1982

Why you compare? 153

Within me, without me 155

Free will or no choice? 157

The brain is more than a computer 158

Master of own time 160

Sustaining selfishness 162

From animal to human 165

Clear the confused mind! 167

Healthy mind is whole 168

9. Future in the now 170

The last sessions 1983

Life is a live broadcast 172

Terminate the tyranny of thought! 174

10. The world is for all 178

If you cannot answer, change the question 180

Clarity is necessary 182

11. "It ends" 185

Sources 194

Summary of published dialogues 197

1. A journey beyond

We live in two worlds. One is true, the other imagined.

What is actually *happening* is true and real. What we *think* of it is an image made by our mind. To us it is the only world we know.

For a long time I lived believing that the world I see is actual. It feels so real and it was the only world I knew. Then I woke up. I realized that all my thoughts and feelings come from my own mind.

The first of these two worlds is immense and whole, far beyond what we can ever experience or imagine. It covers everything there ever was, is and will be. The second world is limited by our mind, based on what we see, know, believe and hope to be.

All problems in our life come about when the images in our head meet the real world, *what is*. We like to blame the world, but it is our mind that is not working in the correct way.

The power of our mind is monumental. For good and for bad, it is the force and source of our ups and downs, joys, fears and tears. It makes, takes and fakes. It tells us what we want and will do and what we will not do. It decides what we believe, feel, hate and love.

All is not right in the mind. Thoughts dominate us, makes our life small and numbing. There are even more serious consequences: we have become a threat to ourselves. There are catastrophes, because our way of living produces more problems than we can solve.

We have to fix this fatal error before it is too late. Time is running out, and instead of tackling the problem we fight about whose beliefs are right or least wrong.

Our main task as human beings is to *free our brain and mind* from the tyranny of thought and to be free to see the world as it actually is. This book shows how it can be done, but first we must understand, why are we in this mess?

Two roads crossing

Insights into Immensity is a magical tour to a world about which we know nothing. We are guided by two wise men, who shared a burning desire to solve the deepest mystery of existence.

Jiddu Krishnamurti and David Bohm discussed fundamental human issues between 1961 and 1986 and did it in a way that is beyond anything we know.

Thousands of people have been profoundly touched by these dialogues. For many years I waited and hoped that somebody would write a book about the dialogues. When nobody turned up, I decided to do this myself, because I find it urgently important to take this option seriously and drop the egocentric and barbarous way we are living.

David Bohm was an esteemed American scientist, a professor of theoretical physics at London University, who worked with Einstein and whom the Dalai Lama calls his scientific guru. As a physicist Bohm's interest was in understanding the wholeness of the universe, which according to him is impossible, if we don't understand consciousness and the mind.

Jiddu Krishnamurti was a seer and speaker from India, who was 11 when he was discovered by theosophists. He was supposed to bring a revolutionary message from the spiritual masters which would change our thinking.

He decisively discarded his messianic role maintaining that truth is a living thing and nobody can teach it to anyone. Yet he spent his whole life trying to "liberate human beings from mental cages".

One odd sentence from Krishnamurti was the reason the two men met: "The observer is the observed". To Bohm these words is a conclusion from revolutionary findings in new physics. To Krishnamurti it was a personal insight that changed his outlook on life and human beings. He saw as clearly as we see our fingers that divisions in the world are projections of our minds. They are caused by false programs in our heads and they can and *must* be changed. Soon!

To Krishnamurti the chaos in the world is the outcome of the chaos in our minds. There will be no better world if we cannot bring order into our confused mind.

The two men met in May 1961 in London and had regular discussions for almost 25 years in Switzerland, England and America. Many of these dialogues were recorded and most of them are published in books or audio and video tapes.

In their work, both men wanted to understand fundamentals, Bohm in science and Krishnamurti in the spiritual area. Their meetings were deep dives into the mysteries of our mind by two top brains of the last century.

The urgent need for a *mutation in the human brain* was one of Krishnamurti's key insights and in dialogues with Bohm he could clearly articulate delicate nuances of his spectacular view.

This unique collaboration produced thoughts that not only challenge our basic ideas of *who we are* and *why we live* as we do, they also give us an idea what we *must* and *must not do* in order to find it out for ourselves.

*Thought cannot solve
the mystery of the mind*

The dialogues crystallize possible answers to our basic human problems. They are not always easy to follow, but open a beautiful view to reality beyond reality. Far from reasoning based on clever concepts, they take us to a territory where words have no meaning. Using words they point to a realm beyond words, to total freedom.

They challenge our conventional ideas by presenting an inquiry: *What if?* We are asked not to listen or read the words, but to *put the questions to ourselves*. Only the spiritually lazy expect to get an easy answer to the big questions in life. The mystery of existence will not be revealed by reading manuals.

The purpose of these dialogues is not to speculate or announce fundamental truths, but to face the facts of life not as we imagine or would want them to be, but as they factually are. This is a magical tour to a reality unknown to our mind.

Dialogues deal with big things only: life, truth, reality, limits of thought, brain and mind, meditation, insight,

intelligence, love and what is sacred. They don't mumble old mantras, they dig or dive or reflect as deeply as it is possible for a human being to go.

The dialogues show that we have two possible ways to watch the world: one way is to look at it as we are *used* to observing it, which is the world coloured by our knowledge and experiences. The other way is to see what the world is without filters.

Too often we choose the first, the “bad old way”, although it frequently gets us into trouble; in fact, it may be the root of *all* our problems.

We could leave the world of old images anytime and feel the mystery of life in our bones and minds, but we are either afraid, unable or unwilling to do so.

The dialogues studied the same issues as religions and science do, but they don't parrot worn-out wisdoms, but draw us a new mental map that is not based on time and thought, but focuses on seeing the world with fresh eyes.

To see the world we have to stop using the old instruments that we have used to interpret the world. Thinking will not help us solve the mystery of the mind. On the contrary, it prevents us from seeing the world as one.

Our mindless mental models

What we call living is a journey in space and time. We are born, we die and life is in between. What living actually is goes beyond our personal thinking. We know it does, but yet life is a very personal project: *my* life.

We are aware that there must be life beyond our personal sight and site, but our most passionate interest is in that part of the universe that we happen to live in all day and night.

Above all we are human beings. We feel high and low. We cherish our dear memories and try to get rid of the painful ones. We aspire, desire, hope and wish, have goals and missions. We fill our days with doing and feeling. We laugh and cry, enjoy, regret, feel afraid and frustrated. We love and are loved, hurt and are hurt.

And we are not to blame. Of course we know that our mind map of the world does not hold up to heavy criticism. We make mistakes, cannot help it. We are producing outcomes that neither we nor anyone wants. Somehow the black holes of our mind draw us away from the light and joys of life to darkness.

We know a lot about our mind, but very wise we are not. Knowledge has not removed ignorance and sheer stupidity from the world. Observing the world we do *not* witness a paradise. Awful things hit the news every day.

Serious people have a good reason to be worried. They ask: is there any way to stop this *madness* and change this appalling course before it is too late?

What if there is a simple way? - not easy, but *simple*.

This book puts forth an alternative world view, based on a radical outlook on human beings and the cosmos around us. It calls for a *transformation* of the human psyche, an insight that would change our relationship to everything.

Our mind is a tiny ripple in a sea of immense energy. We are a small ripple on it but could liberate ourselves

from this self-made prison. Yet, there are two big obstacles in our way.

Firstly, we must find out the *real role of thinking* in this play we call life. This leads us to ask something that we have forcefully avoided and would not like to believe.

The 'me' is a big mistake

An honest explorer will realize a self-delusion that has been pushed into our consciousness, and which is not easy to remove. We believe that thinking is a fine way to find a solution, but we are now assured that it is the cause of troubles, not the hero but the villain of the story.

Our thinking is not willing to be the silent witness of reality, but wants to modify the world to its own image, leave a mark. In doing this our thinking bumps into many barriers that it cannot avoid.

Then we will meet another monster: that of *time*. We assume that life happens essentially in time. Why did we make such an assumption? Because we remember. More thorough investigation shows us that thinking is also behind time.

To free the mind we must understand what thinking and time *together* do to our mind. They create an image of 'me' living in time. One can easily see that this picture comes from the mind, from one specific part of the mind. This imagined being that we call 'me' blocks us from going beyond the mind.

The state of the world is a sad proof of our human tendency to self-centred thinking and action. It seems that we have not learned from our mistakes. On the

contrary, we have become skilled in blaming others and circumstances and think we can deny our own involvement.

To free the human mind is quite a mission. We are not free now and perhaps we never will be. Most people don't even want it. If fairy godmother gave us three wishes, very few would choose freedom of the mind.

To be free does not mean that we may do whatever we want. It means that we see the world as it is. When one sees like this, one is free to do what is right.

We are born to love and be loved, connect with other people and share the world with them. A baby has a human mind, but not a sense of self. Babies are not selfish. They need other people to give them food and shelter. When they 'grow up', they start to think they can control their life and mind more than they actually can.

This book explores if it is possible for us to change deeply. Can we see everything with fresh eyes? We are not served with instant instructions to a better life, but a challenge to create a new kind of human being, one who can see the world beyond the mind.

Beyond thinking

In the spring of 1977 Krishnamurti came into my life. I was 24, just graduated from university, beginning to start a career and find my place in the world.

Deep questions had interested me and I felt that I could affect my life. I believed in the power of thinking and had strong proof of the significance of will and images

in building my personality. I loved to read and write and did a considerable amount of both of them.

In a library, I found a book titled *Beyond Thinking*. It was a Finnish translation of Krishnamurti's book *Freedom from the Known*. I thought the title was odd and silly: is somebody seriously asserting that there is something beyond thoughts?

The more I read the book, the more these strange ideas began to influence my *seeing* the world around me and *thinking* about it. Especially one sentence in the second chapter had a devastating effect on me.

Krishnamurti talks about self-knowledge saying that to understand ourselves, we need innocence and humility. Then he says: "A confident man is a *dead* human being."

It took several weeks to understand what on earth he meant by this. So many books I had read had convinced me that confidence is an essential ingredient in living a fulfilling life.

The answer was in the next chapter, but I did not grasp it then. He said we are not free to look and learn, because our minds are shaped by a particular culture we happened to live in and we move in a narrow mental circle conditioned by all that has influenced us.

I started to read his other books and became more puzzled and more and more thrilled. Then I learned that the author was still alive.

The next year I went to Saanen, in the Swiss Alps, to hear him talk. It was beyond anything I had ever seen, experienced or could even imagine. I found no words to describe what happened in my thinking. It opened a world I did not know to exist.

I read more of his books and listened to tapes from his talks. I floated high! Firstly, I tried to talk about my new conviction to my friends, but noticed that they had no idea of what was so special in this.

Not only my thinking changed, something strange happened to my seeing and hearing. I felt strangely as if I had never seen or heard. I could no longer eat meat or fish - or "dead animals" as Krishnamurti calls them - and I did not want to drink alcohol because I felt it smothered my mind. I preferred to be drunk from life and not *waste one second* not feeling the intensity and immensity of living!

I first heard of David Bohm while reading the last chapter of *The Awakening of Intelligence*. His discussion with Krishnamurti gives a new meaning to the concept of intelligence, being one of the key factors in understanding life.

My next mental kick was seeing the videotapes of seven discussions between Krishnamurti, Bohm and American psychiatrist, David Shainberg. The three men sat in a cosy living room and discussed image-making and fragmentation. In the last meeting they talked about what is sacred in life. That really blew my mind.

Krishnamurti is amazingly energetic, Bohm is smart and patient. Shainberg is the "common man" who tries to learn.

Some years later I realized the real weight of David Bohm as a scientist and thinker.

In his book *Wholeness and the Implicate Order*, published in 1980, he proposes that the world we see is only an explicate part of the invisible, implicate order that is the basis of cosmos. To understand the universe,

we must start from wholeness and not from parts. The book opened a new fascinating perspective to cosmos.

The most profound is the series of fifteen dialogues that took place in 1980 in America and England.

Listening to these recordings was then and still is a stunning and purifying experience.

The last two published dialogues recorded in June 1983 are about the future of humanity. They are more a summary of the essence of Krishnamurti's insights than an effort to speculate the possible future we as a species have. It does not go into new territories but serves as a natural finish to the long series of profound investigation.

Be free to see

In the Krishnamurti Foundation archives there are about 150 documents about sessions in which both Krishnamurti and Bohm were present. In many of them Bohm was one of the participants, but in 52 published dialogues he was a very important contributor.

In this book I concentrate on meetings in which Bohm had an active role and new territories were explored. I report in chronological order and try to use the exact phrases used in the dialogues.

The first six discussions presented are from 1965, the next twelve from 1975. There were often various topics but in these seven dialogues in 1976 there was one clear theme: transformation of man, meaning the whole humanity.

I have recommended this series to many people to start from. It is very intense and very deep.

The deepest explorations were in fifteen conversations in 1980. Four sessions from 1982 deal with the nature of the mind and the last two are from 1983. Also there were three meetings with Buddhist scholars in 1978 and three singular explorations from 1972, 1981 and 1982.

I have grouped key issues into ten insights. I give a brief overview of the central topics in each dialogue. I tell only the conclusions and not the phases toward it.

The best way to enjoy these dialogues is not to read *about* them, but to *listen* to them in silence. Half of these meetings were videotaped, so they can be watched, too.

Seeing the intensity helps our own inquiry. It may also help to retain your focus by listening to them with other seriously interested people.

Krishnamurti often emphasized the art of *listening*. There are many blocks preventing us from actually listening. When we do it without thought interfering, something magical happens in our mind.

Some people find Krishnamurti's view of life negative, accusing, or even blaming. They feel the effect of his words is depressive, more disturbing than relieving. Some find him very difficult to understand or wonder why he questions without answering.

I understand the critics, but do not agree.

To me his mission was crystal clear and his message simple, very positive and highly energizing: to *free us from all problems* so that we can as human beings live together in peace and harmony. To do that we must get rid of some mental baggage that we have gathered into our minds. Then we will be free to love.

Time will not help us

It is important to understand that our problems are *not personal*. We *literally* share the world and its problems. Unless we change, we will destroy this lovely planet. Seeking personal happiness is a rather selfish desire. Even if we at times find personal gratification, our common problems are not resolved.

We *must learn* to live and love in a way that is not self-centred and separative. It is possible only if there is a fundamental change in our consciousness and thinking is put back in the place where it belongs.

What is challenging in Krishnamurti's message is the proposition that *no time* is needed for human transformation. It happens now or it does not happen. We *are* free or we are *not*. We either *see* or we *do not* see.

There are two possible ways to meet this statement. The wrong way is to seek a way to change. There *is no way*: seeking makes the seeker and that prevents the transformation.

Understanding time may be the key in helping us to end seeking. When this happens, mind is not moving in time. It is – as Krishnamurti puts it – with '*what is*'. Thinking stops, but the world keeps on moving.

This book is a tour into the world where egos are not allowed. We are guided by the two top brains, of Krishnamurti and David Bohm, but every single step must be taken *together*. The truth is not in the words, it is in seeing something actual. To see one must be free.

I am deeply grateful to the people who have made the path recording, transcribing and editing the dialogues.

I have had the joy of meeting both Krishnamurti and Bohm personally and have felt their vital clarity. This book is my tribute to these extraordinary figures.

For all these years, I have often wondered why we still have not been able to drop old stupefying beliefs and thought patterns even though the damage they do is before our eyes.

There are many possible answers, but the question remains open. We *must* and, some day, perhaps *will* see beyond the mist of hazy and lazy thinking and will be totally free from the *tyranny of thought*.

2. Ten Insights

The dialogues between Krishnamurti and David Bohm do not deal just with daily mundane issues. They do not offer you simple advice about how to live a happy life but help us solve the fundamentals of how to be a human being. When that is clear, you need no advice.

Krishnamurti had often talked to intellectuals and scientists, but in Bohm he found a partner who could follow his train of thought, ask the correct questions, make a contribution and hold the intensity for a long time. As a top scientist Bohm was familiar with probing into new territories and eager for innovative solutions.

Three things make these dialogues exceptional: the *method* used, the *issues* discussed and the *solutions* given. A notable dimension to these dialogues comes from their time span of 25 years.

The special feature of the method used comes from its participative nature. Questions put are so complex that answering them requires total attention and fierce intensity also from the *listener*.

It is totally inadequate to listen and make opinions for or against. Every single question must be put to yourself and understood so that you feel it in your guts. Verbal acceptance is self-deception and leads to superficial replicating of other people's ideas.

Therefore, the goal of these dialogues is not to have a verbal agreement but to share the actuality beyond words, to see together something that is the same to all of us.

The condition of such a state is that we not only agree, but actually *see* the answer in our mind.

Following a conversation we are accustomed to agree or disagree, weigh the words read or heard, make conclusions. Instead of having a dialogue and learn something new together we are in debate and defend our old views or adopt the suggestion made by someone whom we think is smarter than we are.

Real sharing is possible only if we start from 'not knowing'. Knowledge is a burden in understanding reality and it *blocks* open investigation and prevents fresh insight.

In listening deeply our mind stays alert, energetic and creative. It is curious, whole in a healthy manner. This quality produces the ecstasy of learning together.

The dialogues give an incredible view into human nature. The men not only suggest the cause for the awful state of our consciousness, but also propose a *solution*, a way out of this mess: eliminate everything that is not true. What a request!

Many issues in the dialogues embrace the world: truth, reality, the ground of existence, mind and brain, the self, consciousness and time, love, compassion, meditation, mystery, universe and cosmic order. I wonder if anybody else has before or after tried to cover all this and manage to put it into words.

Of course, various versions of so-called truth have been offered, but there is no agreement about it.

Krishnamurti and Bohm had some obvious advantages. Krishnamurti had been pumped full of theosophical doctrines and Bohm had the latest upgrade of radical

findings in modern physics. Neither of them were satisfied with these, but continued their tour beyond them.

The solution is simple, but to find it we have to remove many small and a few large blocks out of our way. The first big block is about the self and the second is about time. When these two are clear, we are quite far away, if not “there”.

Ten immense insights

There are many radical insights that challenge us to rethink our present world view.

To me the ten key issues are: the cause of human problems, the role of thinking, individuality, human conditioning, division, time, psychological evolution, attention, awareness and the essence of existence.

Present view	Proposed view
1. Human problems	
Human problems are solved one by one as they come up.	Human problems have one root and they can be solved all at once.
2. The role of thinking	
Thinking helps us to get rid of our psychological problems.	Thinking is the cause of disorder and it prevents seeing.
3. Individuality	
We are unique personalities and separate individuals.	We are not individuals, the ego is an image created by thought.

4. Human conditioning	
We can modify, not eliminate our human conditioning.	We can eliminate psychological conditioning.
5. Division	
The world is divided and consists of separate parts.	Dividing the world is the cause of inward and outward conflict.
6. Time	
Living is a process in time from the past to the future.	Psychological time is the enemy of man.
7. Psychological evolution	
To become better we need time, will and ideals.	There is no psychological evolution or becoming.
8. Attention and awareness	
There is an objective reality outside of us.	The observer and the observed are one indivisible movement.
9. Mental authority	
We need mental help and guides in our inner issues.	Nobody can help us to know ourself or see the truth.
10. Essence of existence	
All-important is what you believe in, think, feel and do.	The essence of existence is beyond thinking and acting.

1. Human problems have one common root.

Our human problems are so diverse that it may seem almost ridiculous to suggest, as Krishnamurti does, that they could all be solved in the blink of an eye. And yes, the task is impossible if we take each problem and seek a solution one by one.

We must take a totally different view.

Krishnamurti says that *all* problems have a *common* factor, a root cause, one stem. They are all connected to each other. This realisation is the *first insight*.

To understand it, we must delve deeper than we have ever done and instead of scattering our energy here and there we must focus on seeing the one central thing at the back of our mind.

Bohm likes to use the analogy of a polluted river. We can either clean the dirty water endlessly or eliminate the *cause* of pollution upstream. In the case of our mind the root cause is in our *thinking*, but not in *what* we think, but in *how* we think. Bohm puts it: we must focus not on the *content* but on the *process* of thinking.

We are wasting our time in seeking answers to the wrong questions. We get lost in wandering in a strange territory without a proper map. Instead of running faster it is wise to *stop* and not go further before we know the right route.

The first thing is not to see *what we think* but to be aware that *we are thinking*.

This leads to the second insight; the *role of thinking* in our life.

2. Thinking is not the solution, it is the cause of human disorder.

As opposed to what thinking is usually regarded as being, Krishnamurti argues that thought does not help but *prevents* us from seeing the facts of life.

In watching something there are two things happening: what actually takes place is one and what we think of it is another.

What *happens* is what happens. What we *think* of it has as many variations as there are watchers. Life seems to happen outside of us, but the essential part of it happens in fact inside of us, in our consciousness.

This causes our drama and tragedy: we live in our own worlds. We think it is real, but it is made up of our thoughts and is true only to us.

The unfortunate consequence of this is that there seems to be *nothing* that we *totally agree about*. As long as we worship thinking and keep it on a pedestal, we will *never* get rid of this net of problems.

The third insight is a tough one, because it is against our common sense perception about ourselves. It is the belief that the ego is real.

3. We are not individuals.

We feel there is somebody inside our body, a self, an ego, a person that is different and separate from other persons. We come to this conclusion when we watch our lives, look into a mirror or see other people: I *am* here and they are *there*. I think I have my own thoughts and the others think theirs. So we have good reasons to suppose that we are *separate individuals*.

To deny the separateness of physical body would be stupid and neurotic. But is there psychological separateness? If yes, how does it come about and why do we stubbornly think it is real?

Our logic is this: I *know* that I am real, because I *think*. I remember what I was and did yesterday and I know what I experience today. I like some people, some not. I see, feel and react in my personal way. I *am* me!

Yet there is one problem with my ego. Nobody has *seen* it or can *show* where it is. I can see and smell my body or feel the presence of others, but that is only the external, physical side.

Of course, I feel I *am more* than my body! But *what* exactly is the ego and *where* is it? Is it in the brain, in the body, around the body or everywhere?

Our gut feeling is that there is something inside us controlling and looking at our thinking. We feel that there is an observer in me observing my thoughts. When I say 'I think', it means that I feel that there is an 'I' *doing thinking*, reacting to my own thoughts.

From this we conclude that *the ego is real*. It is definitely something far more than my thoughts and mental moods. *I am very real!* And because I am, you are and all others are. The world is full of separate egos.

But have we ever asked, why we are so certain about this? And would I exist if I didn't think? The answer is quite clear.

To Krishnamurti the ego is only an *idea* based on experiences, memory and knowledge. To him the image of an individual is a fatal mistake, a mixture of

misunderstanding, wrong conditioning and unjustified self-importance. What a pill to swallow!

We have identified ourselves with some things and thoughts and call them ours. All thoughts come from someone or something outside us. We collected them in a thousand yesterdays, chose what we like and rejected many. There is nothing original in our thoughts.

We watch the world through the filters of our conditioned brain and make an image of it. We see and sense separate objects in interaction and think that the world is built that way.

It simply is not true. Our senses fool us. Actually, we are not separate egos: we are inseparable entities in the flow of the world.

The inevitable and unhappy result of our individual outlook on life is that we no longer live in the same world. Each one of us lives in a world made by our own *mind* and shaped by our own *past*.

Thus we not only live in *different* worlds but also in the past world of *memories* and recollections, and we project our version of future based on that.

These inwardly separate worlds *do not* meet except outwardly - and not always happily. Still worse is that they even *cannot* meet. Our bodies can touch, but our thoughts cannot.

On the contrary, they collide all the time causing nuisance or even severe battles between and among people. We can think alike, but as long as there are two separate thoughts, there is no meeting of minds.

The world where everyone lives in an isolated box is a severely divided world. There are many kinds of divisions: geographical, racial, sociological, religious, political, educational. Add to that: each one of us is also inwardly divided into many pieces.

We may get used to these divisions and perhaps see no possibility to get rid of them although we see many appalling consequences of them: endless conflicts, hatred, many forms of violence, cruelty, fear, insecurity, loneliness.

The basis of these divisions is the *idea of individuality*, supporting the idea of separate selves fighting for their space and rights in a world that consists of matter and mind, things and thoughts.

There are few or no important matters that we people actually and totally agree about and share globally. On a personal level our daily actions are based on images, opinions and beliefs. When we meet someone who has different views on life, we either oppose, quarrel, tolerate or run away.

Seven billion different worldviews on one small planet brings a great number of problems, especially when everybody thinks he is right and a good human with good intentions while all others are more or less wrong, misguided or just bad people.

Which of us is right? Only those who see the world as it is and not through their 'individual' ideas and ideals. But can anybody actually live like that? Aren't we all conditioned to a mindset based on personal experiences and knowledge?

Furthermore, we might quite rightly ask, what is the world actually?

Is there and can there even be a common ground or truth that we can agree about?

We can only find that out by looking at the world without our inward filters and concepts, but we hardly ever do so. We don't even try but instead of trying we stick to our ideas as stubbornly as everybody else. Many people seem to be even *proud* of their prejudices and narrow-minded views!

According to Bohm and Krishnamurti, the problem is that we *do not realize* that our actions are based on images and what this means in our relationships. We *feel* we are dealing with facts also when we are stuck in images.

Only a small part of our images are based on facts, and we are unable to separate which part. This is due to thinking. We mistakenly think that our thoughts *reflect* or *interpret* the world more or less as it is. It does *not*.

The interpretation takes place in the brain. We define and classify our perceptions in a nanosecond and react unconsciously before we even notice that we have reacted. Our reactions are based on our knowledge and experiences, not the fact.

This leads us to the fourth insight about human conditioning and its nature.

4. We can and must eliminate psychological conditioning.

There is a vast agreement that the human mind is conditioned and that humanity is fragmented into billions of bits. But we disagree on what we should *do* about this.

Many people feel that little or nothing can be done. They say that we can *change* the conditioning slowly.

Krishnamurti and Bohm propose a radical alternative. They say that we must *release* mankind from psychological conditioning and it happen will immediately, without us *actively* doing a thing about it.

When we see what conditioning is doing to us, the inevitable consequence of this *perception* is that the conditioning falls away like an autumn leaf and we will start to behave in a totally different way. The trouble is that we don't see.

The partial way in which we have tried to solve our problems has not solved them and never will. On the contrary, it effectively *prevents* us from finding solutions. The only solution is a state of insight, where our mind *naturally* frees itself from conditioning. Then we will start to live in direct contact with the facts and 'float in the stream of life'.

The fifth insight is about seeing our habit of dividing the world.

5. The world is one whole, not fragmented.

For practical reasons we must sometimes divide reality into some limited areas, but when we apply it to *everything* we end up with a world of conflicts.

Division is a cunning trick of thinking. When we separate two things in our thoughts, we start to act as if they were actually separate. We fail to see the connection, the link between them.

One example of a division we cling to is individuality. It is based on a materialistic view of reality.

To Krishnamurti and Bohm, thought is a material process and the source of division. It is the very nature of thought to divide. There can be no holistic thought.

The trouble with division is that it creates conflict. The whole is never in conflict; only parts of it can be. Ending division means the ending of conflict.

The sixth insight has to do with *time*. It is a deeply rooted belief in our mind that everything in the cosmos – including us - is *moving in time*. There are some processes that do that but not all.

6. Psychological time is the enemy of man.

After seeing that the separate 'me' is only an image created by thinking, there is still one tough myth to be resolved: that of *time*. According to Krishnamurti, time is the real enemy and to get rid of it is a prerequisite for freedom.

Chronological time - time by the clock - is necessary, but the continuation created by our mind is the basic element of all our troubles. Time brings fear, sorrow and desire into our mind. Without time we would be free of all these.

Imagine a world without fear, sorrow and vain desires. What a paradise it would be!

To Krishnamurti time and thought go together. The perception of time is an outcome of thinking. Without thinking there is no time, and also the other way around: without time there is *no thought* needed, except functionally.

It is quite easy to understand the logic of this.

Time consists of the past, this moment and the future. Time is a movement from the past to the future. In between there is the present in which we are actually living.

The past is what we have collected into our memory. It is stored up in our brain and this storage is available if needed.

In this thinking about our thousand yesterdays, we have a feeling that there is time moving, but actually, it is of course not so. The only movement is *in our brain*. Everything is happening now and if there is no thinking, the now is timeless.

Based on our past memories we project our future. We know what we have done and plan what we will do. That is just fine.

Problems arise when this idea of time is brought into our psyche. Then we create this thing we call the 'me' and assume that it is living in time. There was a 'me' yesterday, there is a 'me' right now and there will be a 'me' tomorrow.

Only one of these three is actual: there is a 'me' right now. But what is the 'me' actually in the now?

The past 'me' is limited by our experiences, knowledge and memory. The future 'me' is a dream based on hopes and desires or a nightmare based on our fears. Usually it is *all* these: we hope for the best and are afraid that the worst will happen.

This movement in time we call living. Krishnamurti challenges this narrow view vigorously. There is more to life than this shallow affair, he says, much more than this. To perceive it one must end time, stop the process we have adopted.

There are powerful forces in our way. Our lives are anchored in time, continuance and causality. Time is our *curse*, but we regard it as our *only hope*. We believe that whatever we are now, there is a possibility to be better in the future. We must trust, believe and work for our ideals to come true. This is the beginning self-deception.

The seventh insight is that of *becoming*. The idea of mental progress is to Krishnamurti a primitive and vain form of self-deception. To him the only thing that matters is what we are and do *now*.

7. There is no psychological evolution.

When we cannot deal with psychological facts, we create an ideal. Pursuing that ideal means living in perpetual conflict. We need time to become what we want to be, so we are no longer living in the now.

To end time means to *stay with the facts of life* from moment to moment. Doing that, we are free of time and thought and get rid of conflicts and psychological problems. When there is no becoming, there is only timeless flow.

The eight insight is very fundamental. It is a sentence that was very important for both Krishnamurti and Bohm.

8. The observer and the observed are one movement.

To be aware of reality and to go beyond thought, thinking must remain in its proper place and not twist facts according to the program of our conditioning.

Attention means seeing and listening to everything around us with an open mind. In pure attention there is no me, time, division or becoming, no observer different from the observed.

Living with facts is the essence of attention and awareness. No illusion, no memory, no hope, just to be absorbed by the beauty of everything. It is a state of no problems.

The last two insights are closely related. After meeting many obstacles in understanding oneself and going beyond thought, many people give up hope of finding the way and turn to others for help. A big mistake! It is easy to find comforting thoughts from others whom we have appointed as an authority and to fill our life with spiritual gymnastics. But this only further confuses the mind and the confused mind can never choose correctly.

The ninth insight is freedom from all *authority*, including that of our own.

9. Nobody can help us see the truth.

If we want to see the truth, we must say goodbye to all mental guides. It is okay to ask the way when you are lost, but nobody knows the truth. They may know *their* version of truth. Truth is a *living* thing that we cannot hold in our mind. It is at the same time everywhere and nowhere.

When we actually realize that nobody can show us the light, we have to be a light to ourselves. Then the door is wide open for the tenth insight.

The last, tenth insight is like a resume and goes far beyond what we can ever grasp:

10. The essence of existence is beyond thinking and acting.

We are programmed to think that what we believe in, think, feel and do is all important. That is the content of our consciousness.

Only a free mind is able to enter the world beyond limits and see into the dimension that Krishnamurti calls what is and Bohm refers to as the implicate order. We cannot touch it with thought, but our thoughts are influenced by it when they are in order.

For *what is* to be, thought must come to an end. There must be insight and intelligence that are not produced by thought. That brings about a new order in the mind and that *is the solution* to human chaos.

As long as we worship thinking and keep it on a pedestal there will be conflict and disorder in our minds and in the world. The insight that thought is not the solution, but the very tool of destruction is a shock to the brain. It does not *want* to see this. And perhaps it even *cannot* see it in the same way as we usually see things and thoughts.

We are invited to share a dialogue about our life and find out whether we can live in an intelligent and coherent manner. If we can actually share our life and mind, we will go beyond our certainties and convictions and enter the limitless.

The ten insights mentioned here are not to be seen as steps in the path to freedom. Nor are they tasks to do. They clean the table and empty the content of consciousness so that it changes to something totally different. The crazy paradox is that only an empty mind is full, filled with existence.

3. Towards a new kind of mind

Our ways to face and escape a world in crisis are various. If we want to do something, one way is to pick one small, sublime or fashionable issue and fight for that. Most people feel that world scale issues are not their problem; they concentrate on finding their own happy corner and shut the door behind them.

Religions have had a monopoly in explaining the world and people in it. Religious books and traditions offered a sound ground to build a worldview. The first ancient philosophers and much later science challenged the churches in a serious way. Reason and logic were believed to be able to explain what the universe is and what our place here is.

Since the 17th century, the mechanistic worldview took a strong hold in our minds due to new theories in physics and biology. Many natural scientists believed that soon the world could be understood and explained. They were not right.

In the beginning of 20th century, two revolutionary theories shook the foundations of the mechanistic world view: Albert Einstein with published his theory of relativity and at the same time Max Planck and Niels Bohr started to develop ideas that were to become the body of quantum theory.

According to quantum physics, atoms are not what they were thought to be. There is no solid material inside them. Particles are energy and fields. They are so connected that it is impossible to see them as separate.

The new ideas were literally inexplicable. They were weird, abstract and against senses and common sense. There was one big problem: they were contradictory. Both of them simply couldn't be true.

As a young physicist, David Bohm was puzzled by the confusion raised by these irrevocable contradictions. Bohm felt troubled that there was no common view of what existence is about.

He got interested in general philosophical questions related to physics. He felt that there was a parallel between what consciousness is and what matter is. The movement we see outside is essential to what we feel inside.

Bohm was especially inspired by the work of Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel and William James, but meeting an Indian born sage Jiddu Krishnamurti changed his life and thinking.

The rocky road

David Bohm was born in America in the small town of Wilkes-Barre in Pennsylvania on 20th December 1917. He graduated from Pennsylvania State University in 1939.

In the war years, Robert J. Oppenheimer asked Bohm to join the Manhattan Project team in Los Alamos. Their top-secret mission was to make the atom bomb. However, the state authorities rejected Bohm's participation in the project because of his sympathies with communism.

After the war Bohm was asked to move to Princeton University where he befriended and worked with Albert Einstein. Besides science, Einstein was also interested in human and social issues.

Bohm's interest in communism produced the biggest trauma of his life. He was exiled from his home country because he refused to testify against his colleagues in the McCarthy trials.

Later he was cleared of all charges, but Princeton University refused to renew his contract, in spite of strong support from Professor Einstein.

After four years in Brazil and two years in Israel, Bohm moved to Bristol and then to the Birkbeck College of London University where he spent 26 years of his life. For 25 academic years from 1961 to 1987 he was the professor of theoretical physics. He worked until his death in October 1992.

Bohm revealed his hand already in his first book on quantum theory in 1951, called *Quantum Theory*. He writes that "there is no reason to divide the world into different parts. One should start from the supposition that the whole universe is an undivided whole and is in perpetual change".

The same idea refined into a theory was published in 1980 in a book *Wholeness and the Implicate Order*. Bohm suggests that reality consists of two different orders. The *explicate order* is known to us from classical physics. Yet the other is the essential part from which everything manifest unfolds. Bohm calls it the *implicate order*.

We think and see the world consisting of separate particles and fields, but according to the quantum view

everything is fundamentally connected to everything and cannot be independent of its surroundings.

It has taken years before these discoveries started to affect our way of seeing reality. Our human way of seeing and emphasizing details leads to wrong interpretations and conflicts in all areas of life. The true nature of things can become revealed only when they are examined in living situation.

We don't do this, because we have divided the world into thousands of pieces that we see as separate and slowly changing. In science and politics fragmentation and inertia can be seen very clearly, but it also exists in all areas of our lives. We have grown so accustomed to it that we cannot see it and its consequences.

The mechanistic and fragmentary way of life is powered by not only our education and long traditions, but also by our daily perceptions, which emphasize the idea of individual existence.

One possible way out could be to investigate how our perception makes the *images* of reality.

In describing the reality, old theories supposed that the observer and the observed are two different things: there is somebody looking at something. They affect each other, but are they really separate?

The quantum physics says they are two sides of the same coin, one movement. This led Bohm to study human assumptions and beliefs. Instead of studying the outside world, he asked, why do we think the way we think?

Bohm became convinced that the *essence* of the universe can *not* be seen by physics. It has to be searched from the mind, especially from philosophy, psychology and even religion. This was an abomination to the majority of physicists.

To find the missing link Bohm needed a seer. He found one when he met Krishnamurti.

Meeting of minds

Bohm started reading material outside his own field, putting questions like: What is truth and reality? Why are we here on earth? Is there something beyond our mind? The interest was perhaps both professional and personal due to his difficult personal life experiences.

In 1959, Bohm's wife Saral found a book in the public library in Bristol. The book was *The First and Last Freedom* by Krishnamurti. Browsing through it she saw the phrase: "The observer is the observed". She thought that might be of interest to her husband. And it surely was.

Bohm gorged himself on the book, and borrowed other books by the same author. Unfortunately, the Bristol library had only a few.

He wrote to the American publisher asking about the writer and received a letter suggesting that he get in touch with the Krishnamurti organization in England. He was told that in May 1961 Krishnamurti would give a series of talks in London.

There were 12 talks for 150 people invited to Kenneth Black Memory Hall in Wimbledon. This happens to be the first Krishnamurti talks that were totally recorded.

Bohm went to the talks and found the speaker to be a fine-boned man dressed in a Savile Row suit. The tone and style of talking gave an impression that this is the very first time he put forward these questions. Yet he was very assertive and emphatic.

In Bohm's biography *Infinite Potential*, F. David Peat gets poetic in describing the impression Krishnamurti made:

"His features were handsome and delicate, a face that lit up in animation as he spoke, hands gracefully employed to emphasize his words, eyes at one moment soft and compassionate and, at the next, burning with passion. He would invite his audience to suggest a topic and then tentatively, like a connoisseur handling an exceptional piece of porcelain, gently turning it in his hands, commenting on its beauty, pointing out singular features, inviting his audience to participate in his enjoyment rather than offering a dogmatic opinion."

In talking, Krishnamurti lured the listeners to join him on a journey. He investigated human problems with such passion and intensity that listeners were drawn to the edge, to face the facts as they are. He also asked people to *suspend their need to act* so that something *totally different* could come into existence.

In the first London talk, Krishnamurti proclaimed that 'a fundamental inward revolution is necessary.' To 'meet life as a whole, one must have a totally different mind'.

After the talk, Bohm felt an urgent need to speak with Krishnamurti. A meeting was arranged at the house in Wimbledon where Krishnamurti was staying.

Bohm did not know too much about the remarkable life of Krishnamurti. He was interested in what he *said* about consciousness and the mechanism in which the thinker separates himself from thinking and assumes to be an independent entity.

At their first encounter the two men sat for a long time in silence, but according to Bohm there was no annoying tension in the situation.

Saral Bohm broke the silence, suggesting that Bohm would tell about his work to Krishnamurti, who listened attentively and seemed to grasp the spirit of what Bohm said.

Bohm felt there was intense communication and openness with no holding back, similar to that which he had experienced in talking to Einstein many times. When Bohm used the word totality, Krishnamurti grabbed the physicist by the arm saying, "That's it, that's it. Totality."

The meeting was everything Bohm dreamed of and it led to a long and fruitful collaboration.

A path to a pathless land

The story of Jiddu Krishnamurti is in many ways exceptional. He was born in May 1895 in India and died in Ojai, California in February 1986 at the high age of 90 years. His life was in many ways unique and without fear of exaggerating can be called an astonishing story.

The leaders of the Theosophical Society believed that Krishnamurti was the one that would be the next World Teacher, the reincarnation of a spiritual master called Lord Maitreya.

Thousands of theosophists believed that this boy was to raise humanity to the next step of spiritual understanding. In the early 1920s, he was appointed to be the head of the association that had over 30 000 members.

Krishnamurti felt uneasy about his messianic role and the worship appointed to him. In August 1929 he dissolved the organization made for 'his becoming'. In the famous speech in Ommen, Holland, he declared that from then on his only concern was to *set man absolutely, unconditionally free*.

"I maintain that truth is a pathless land, and you cannot approach it by any path whatsoever, by any religion, by any sect.

Truth cannot be organized. It is impossible to organize a belief. If you do, it becomes dead. No organization can lead man to spirituality. I have only one purpose: to make man free, to urge him towards freedom, to help him to break away from all limitations, for that alone will give him eternal happiness, will give him the unconditioned realization of the self.

I desire those who seek to understand me to be free; not to follow me, not to make out of me a cage which will become a religion, a sect. Rather should they be free from all fears – from the fear of religion, from the fear of salvation, from the fear of spirituality, from the fear of love, from the fear of death, from the fear of life itself.

I want to set man free, rejoicing as the bird in the clear sky, unburdened, independent, ecstatic in that freedom. Organizations cannot make you free. No man from outside can make you free. My only concern is to set men absolutely, unconditionally free."

After leaving the association, Krishnamurti gave talks in India, Europe and America, wrote books and founded schools. The hundreds of talks and many of the discussions he held have been documented accurately, first in shorthand, then on audio and from the end of the seventies on video.

Preservation and publication is organized by Krishnamurti Foundations in three continents: Krishnamurti Foundation Trust in England, KFA in America and KFI in India.

Words are letters

The essence of his teachings did not change much during the 57 public years. Krishnamurti did not want to forward a doctrine or pattern, but urged us to think for ourselves. He warned about adopting another man's truth and being infatuated by words. As the word 'food' does not feed us, words are only letters without meaning, whatever they refer to.

In writing Krishnamurti's biography Mary Lutyens asked him, What is the essence of his teachings?

He gave a written answer that was published in the third part of the biography, *The Open Door*.

"The core of teaching is contained in the statement he made in 1929 when he said, "Truth is a pathless land".

Man cannot come to it through any organization, through any creed, through any dogma, priest or ritual, not through any philosophical knowledge or psychological technique. He has to find it through the mirror of relationship, through the understanding of the contents of his own mind, through observation and not

through intellectual analysis or introspective dissection.

Man has built in himself images as a fence of security—religious, political, personal. These manifest as symbols, ideas, beliefs. The burden of these images dominates man's thinking, his relationships, and his daily life. These images are the causes of our problems for they divide man from man. His perception of life is shaped by the concepts already established in his mind.

The content of his consciousness is his entire existence. The individuality is the name, the form and superficial culture he acquires from tradition and environment. The uniqueness of man does not lie in the superficial but in complete freedom from the content of his consciousness, which is common to all humanity. So he is not an individual.

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

In observation one begins to discover the lack of freedom. Freedom is found in the choiceless awareness of our daily existence and activity.

Thought is time. Thought is born of experience and knowledge, which are inseparable from time and the past. Time is the psychological enemy of man. Our action is based on knowledge and therefore time, so man is always a slave to the past.

Thought is ever limited and so we live in constant conflict and struggle.

There is no psychological evolution. When man becomes aware of the movement of his own thoughts, he will see the division between the thinker and thought, the observer and the observed, the experiencer and the experience.

He will discover that this division is an illusion. Then only is there pure observation which is insight without any shadow of the past, or of time. This timeless insight brings about a deep, radical mutation in the mind.

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

Many are annoyed that Krishnamurti does not usually give a clear answer, but puts questions. That is pedagogically justified, almost ingenious, but it works only when the question causes the movement of thought and not just pacifies the brain to wait for an answer.

In his books, Krishnamurti deals with the same big issues as in the dialogues with Bohm. His wish was that people would have a chance to listen to his message as authentically as possible, without interpretation.

His teachings are presented in over one hundred books and they have been widely translated. Usually books are edited from public talks, discussions with individuals or small groups.

One exception is *Krishnamurti's Notebook* which he wrote himself 1961 and two other notebooks that he dictated to a tape recorder, *Krishnamurti Journal* 1982 and *Krishnamurti to Himself - his Last Journal* published in 1987.

The life of Krishnamurti is documented in detail. The biography of Mary Lutyens was published in three volumes. The first volume *The Years of Awakening* tells about his life till 1933, *The Years of Fulfilment* from 1933 to 1980 and *The Open Door* the last years.

Many others have written also about Krishnamurti. Some of the books are very personal. Krishnamurti's personal assistant Mary Zimbalist has also published a comprehensive account about the last decades of Krishnamurti's life that she spent with him. They are available on the net, called *In the Presence of Krishnamurti*.

Bohm's influence can be seen in how Krishnamurti expresses himself, but also in the contents. Time and thought started to come up in the seventies and with them some essential concepts in Krishnamurti's philosophy.

Intelligence is one of them, not referring to any kind of clever thinking, but something that one grasps immediately. Another word, *insight*, means deep understanding without thinking.

The meaning of the word *mind* changed in Krishnamurti's teachings after he and Bohm talked about it in 1980. Before that it was almost a synonym to the word consciousness, but in a dialogue in April 1980 '*mind*' referred to something that goes much beyond consciousness. In free meditation, mind can expand so that it covers the whole universe.

Bohm supposes that it was his influence that made Krishnamurti understand the value of words. Careless use of words can mislead and eventually distort things.

Krishnamurti did not appreciate knowledge or scientists very much. Bohm was an exception to this.

It took 20 years of friendship before he started to call his dear friend David. It was always Doctor Bohm, not because of formality but out of appreciation.

Many people regard Krishnamurti as an enlightened master, others consider him to be a nearly totalitarian character. To me the most important thing is the exceptional message, but the man is also very interesting, one of a kind.

Time after time Krishnamurti tried to say that it is not important what he, we or others think or say. It is much more important to ask, *what is true?*

To discover that, one has to learn to *listen* and watch everything as it is, without a single thought.

Krishnamurti tried to show us that we don't *really* listen. We think and may feel we listen, but we actually make conclusions, like or dislike, agree or disagree, react without even noticing it. These reactions are based on personal experiences, not listening to what is actually expressed.

Two worlds, one mind

In their many dialogues, Krishnamurti and Bohm shared a common interest in penetrating deeply to the recesses of our mind. Thanks to recordings we have a chance to join this inspiring tour that may solve the challenge we have to face in order to survive.

Even before meeting Krishnamurti, Bohm felt that science may not produce the solution to fundamental human questions. Knowing more is not the answer.

After reading Krishnamurti's books, parts clicked in his head. He realized that the outward chaos is not due to the outward structures of the world, but that its root is in the mind that is functioning incoherently.

The world does not always work as we expect or hope it should. And when something unexpected happens, we react in personal ways. Some fall into depression, some get frustrated, some become phlegmatic. There are always those who don't mind the disappointments for very long and go on without delay.

Bohm realized that we are *blind* to the process of the mind. We make interpretations we are not aware of and tend to draw lines where they should *not* be and see limits that are not true. The bigger our problems become, the more helpless we feel in front of them.

The nature of the inward change Krishnamurti refers to, is verbally expressed in the diaries he wrote in nine months from June 1961 to March 1962. They were published 15 years after they had been written, in the book called *Krishnamurti's Notebook*. The text in the original edition is from three diaries but the fourth was found and published in 2003.

The states of consciousness Krishnamurti goes through experiences show that he either has an exceptionally direct communion with something profound or his imagination is quite vivid.

In describing what he feels, he uses words like otherness, benediction, presence, sense of intensity and immensity.

On September 13th he wrote:

It was a strange day yesterday. That otherness was there all day, on the short walk, while resting and very intensely during the talk. It was persistently there most of the night, and this morning, waking early, after little sleep, it continued. Strangely the body becomes very quiet, very still, and motionless every inch of it is very alive and sensitive.

There is a danger that one starts to create imaginary and untrue states of mind. Mary Lutyens assures in the foreword of the book that Krishnamurti's states were not hallucinations caused by drugs, fasting, epilepsy or spiritual practices. They were perhaps part of the process that had begun in the twenties.

It is important that we don't let these states become a goal of life or even make them significant experiences. They are and must be as natural as rain and sun that come and go independently of our will and wants.

With Bohm, Krishnamurti had a chance to penetrate the mysteries of life and mind beyond the superficial bourgeois indifference. They had to invent new meanings to old words in order to awaken the human potential, to dust the brain cells from their worn out routines.

Bohm was neither the first nor the last intellectual that became interested in Krishnamurti's ideas. As a scientist, he was able to follow complex developments. From the very beginning it was clear to both that there was a possibility to go very, very deep and find something totally original.

Dialogues in brief

Krishnamurti and Bohm first met in May 1961 and ever since they had discussions regularly in London, in California and in Switzerland where Krishnamurti held his yearly gatherings.

The first entry in the Krishnamurti Foundation archives is a recording made on 19th August 1964. It is recently published.

Next year in Gstaad, Switzerland they had a series of six dialogues about thinking process and intellect, the nature of consciousness. Bohm was only one of a group of people, but he was the one that could follow Krishnamurti's lines of thinking and even challenge him.

In probing into the question of reality and its relationship to thinking they had to establish new words to explain why we human beings behave in this monstrous way and what could make us love.

The October 1972 discussion introduced Bohm to the readers of Krishnamurti's books. It presented two very important concepts: *intelligence* and *insight*. They have served ever since as precious tools in operating beyond thinking.

In a comprehensive series of 12 discussions in 1975 Bohm suggests to differentiate between *reality* and *actuality*, the first pointing to everything that we can think about – including illusions - and the second referring to what is actually happening and is never distorted by conditioned thought.

The seven dialogues with David Shainberg in 1976 is an intensive four-day session with depth and beauty.

It captures our mind to investigate relationships and penetrates into a world where image-making and fragmenting of images are not possible.

In June 1978, Bohm attended three discussions with two Buddhist scholars. Krishnamurti did not want to compare his and Buddha's teachings but wanted to start and stay in the level of daily life. Bohm is rather passive but could once again clarify the apparent differences in participants' thinking.

The 15 dialogues in Ojai and England in 1980 were the highlights of these series of meetings. To free the mind from its self-created darkness, we need an insight into the energy that is beyond thought, time and matter.

The next year there was only one discussion a few months before Bohm had a heart bypass operation in June 1981. They talked with computer expert Asit Chandmal in Ojai about what will happen to mankind when computers take over.

An old friend of Bohm, Nobel laureate Maurice Wilkins, joined the crew in February 1982 for one discussion about thinking together and mastering one's inward time.

Two months later, there was a foursome with English biologist Rupert Sheldrake and American psychiatrist John Hidley. The central topic in four one-hour sessions in Ojai was the nature of the mind. Krishnamurti is more than persistent in showing what is wrong with our prevailing world view and how it could be changed.

The last two dialogues were held in 1983 about the future of humanity. The message is grim: if man does not change, there is no future for this species.

Bohm had a minor contribution in a scientists' conference at Brockwood Park in 1974 and 1975 and in the Krishnamurti Foundation members' meeting in 1977.

In the following chapters, I report some of the essential points in these historical meetings. It is not possible to convey the passion shared in these meetings, but thanks to audio and video recording we still have an authentic possibility to attend them.

In my summary I have used only the original tapes, not the edited texts. A list of dialogues with dates, main topics and active participants is enclosed. They are all available, being a veritable treasure chest worth opening.

It is not important where to start and what to listen to. The only thing that matters is *how* one listens. It is not what is said but what it means. The real meaning is not in the words said, it is in life.

For the sake of fluency I have referred to Krishnamurti the same way as he used to call himself: simply 'K'.

4. Words from silence

Krishnamurti and Bohm met and discussed quite regularly ever since their first meeting. Yet, the first published series of dialogues between them took place in Gstaad, Switzerland after the Saanen gatherings from 15th to 29th August 1965.

Krishnamurti had a summer gathering in a village surrounded by four mountains, called Saanen in the Swiss Alps, from 1961 to 1985.

In the early Sixties there were ten talks during three weeks in a tent near the camping place. Over the years the numbers of talks went down but the numbers of listeners went up.

After the public gatherings a small group of people close to K assembled in the beautiful chalet Tannegg, where K lived during his stay in the Swiss mountains. Present were David Bohm and his wife Saral, Mary Zimbalist, Alain Naudé, Margo Laborde and Robin Monro. They met six times talking about pleasure, the background noise of thinking, frustration, brain and mind, transformation of man and time.

What they talked about was never planned beforehand. One meeting usually lasted one hour. The shortest was 60 minutes and the longest 85.

Thought is a danger!

First discussion in Gstaad 15 August 1965

Krishnamurti started the first discussion telling that they had talked with David Bohm in London about creation, pleasure principle and about negation that leads to something positive. Bohm adds that they also talked about movement of mind without thought.

The first topic is pleasure. K asks why people seek it. Bohm reckons that when something pleasant happens to us, we make 'an inadequate record of it and a demand for repetition'. We want to have more. This demand for more is the root of desire which we mistakenly call pleasure.

K wants to give a different meaning to pleasure and *enjoyment*. We enjoy seeing lovely trees or birds, we feel joy. When we think of the joy afterwards, it becomes pleasure. We want to experience it again. Enjoyment is actual, seeking pleasure is thinking. Then we move from experiencing the actual facts to wanting something we don't have.

When thought confuses facts and non-facts, we create illusions. Instead of sticking to the facts we give value to something that has no real value.

Bohm emphasizes that thought is a *reflection* like a mirror or television screen. It is only a reaction to what we observe, but our mind thinks that we see something real.

Thought can either reflect facts correctly or in a way that creates confusion. The image of a microphone does

not create problems, because a microphone is an actual thing. It is a different matter, when thought begins to create images from the 'me', other people, life and the world in general.

The first type of thinking is necessary, the other type is very detrimental, dangerous, and poisonous. But where is the line between necessary and illusory thinking, and why do we cross it?

K answers that *there is no such line*. These two types are not in "watertight compartments". Both of them are thinking, and we must be aware of it as one movement. The question is essentially: Why have we *divided* thinking and why we do not feel the danger of thinking with the same intensity as we feel hunger?

Because we have never *asked* this passionately and seriously. If we would ask, we would know the answer, but as long as we don't have any reason to doubt the role of thinking in our confusing life, we don't even raise the question.

Instead of wondering where the line might be, we must simply start from facts and remain with them. If we stick to facts and see what is actually happening outside and inside us, there is no need to draw a line.

Seeing the facts means that we realise that our thoughts are only reflections. This is our basic problem. Our illusions are real to us. The problems are real to us; we don't regard them as products of our imagination.

We fail to see this, because our thoughts are quick and cunning. When something happens, we react in a second: 'how marvellous', 'how terrible' or 'not important'.

Then we react to our reaction. Thought says: 'I must' or 'I must not'. Now there is a conflict between our thoughts and we choose to act in some way. Usually the strongest thought 'wins', but because of conflicting views we stay in a state of confusion.

It is not easy to be aware of the thinking process and just observe the ping-pong reactions inside our mind without interfering with it. If we could just observe the flow of facts and reactions, the whole process would change. We don't allow this observation to happen, for many reasons.

Facts and thoughts mix in our minds and we are incapable of separating them. We fail to see that all our thoughts are only images. As K puts it: the word is not the thing. Yes, we know that our image of a tree is not the tree, but unfortunately it does not help us see the tree without thoughts.

Many thoughts have a counterpart in reality, but our mind is full of concepts that don't have one. They are real only because we think they are real.

It is easy to see illusions and irrational beliefs in other people. Our own illusions get a different treatment from us. We get angry and launch defences if somebody dares to question our idiosyncrasies, illusions or to expose our self-deception.

Many people see the fallacy of thought. In India and Asia they have tried to eliminate illusory thinking by meditating, creating systems, methods and disciplines. Controlling thoughts will not free the mind, because all effort is based on thinking. Whatever you try to do to thought, it is still part of thought.

In the West, thinking is regarded as the highest form of function. We think we *are* what we *think* we are. The western world concentrates on *changing thoughts* so that the outcome would be something good or good enough. That too is thinking.

Consequently, on both sides of the world living is based on thinking. If we are not happy with facts as they are, we create an idea of change, set a goal and start a program to make things better.

To K this is absurd. To him it means that we build our lives on images and illusions. The content of our thinking varies but the process is the same. As long as our living is based on images, we are not dealing with facts.

When we see a danger, we must *act*, otherwise we get hurt. But as we don't realise the danger of thinking, we regard it as something important and essential in our life.

We do not question the significance of thinking, because we are afraid that we lose everything if we relinquish thoughts, because our whole life is built on thinking.

"It's like throwing me into a swimming pool when I don't know how to swim", K says. "I have lived all my life recognising my experiences and thoughts. Now we are inviting me to a field which is most dangerous, because it is going to leave me completely empty."

In this emptiness there is no thinking, no illusions, only silence and clarity. Then we see everything as it is. Thinking has only a functional meaning, it can take place but only when it is needed for doing something practical.

There is nothing we can do for this silence to happen. There is no way to prepare for this silence because that would mean entering time. We just 'leave the window open and let the air come in if it wants to'.

Can you hear silence?

Second discussion in Gstaad 18 August 1965

A style of thinking we are usually not aware of, is introduced in the discussion three days later. We know the kind of thinking we use when we have a problem to think over and deliberately set about to find a solution.

Another kind of thinking is constantly going on in the background of our daily routines. It comes from automatic responses to what is happening to us. K calls it a *humming noise of consciousness*. We are not aware of this process and don't perhaps even regard it to be thinking.

When we meet daily issues with that noise, we get confused and cannot think clearly. When the noise stops, there is acting without thinking. Then there is sudden silence and stillness just like in a house when the electricity stops working. In that silence a problem has no existence, there is only fact and action.

When the background noise stops, there is clarity and sense of order. One knows exactly what to do and what not to do. Living is then as natural as breathing, not a problem anymore. There is only action, no thinking about doing; we just do what has to be done.

This noise has become such an essential part of our life that we don't even notice it. It is an inseparable part of us. In fact, it is what we think we actually are.

The noise expresses me as I am, what I like and don't like, what I think and want, how I react, what I am afraid of, my values, what I believe in, hate, disgust, what makes me happy and sad. It is the essence of me, in good and bad.

This noise causes me an enormous amount of trouble, but it also gives me my daily pleasures. It is the pain in my bones but also the source of my ecstasy and awe. I am used to it and cannot even consider living without it.

For most of us this noise is appropriate, harmless, necessary and valid. But in reality it surely is not. It is the very source of our problems. If we want to get rid of our problems, we must stop this endless noise in our head.

We cannot do so of course, if we don't even hear it. And most of us are totally deaf to it, completely unaware of it.

If we hear this constant noise and realize what it does to us, we want to stop it. Then we ask *how* to do it. That question comes from the noise.

K's odd advice is to *do nothing*, don't even try to do anything. Whatever we do, it is the noise that gives us advice. When we just observe the noise, it will end. When we focus on facts, everything that is not relevant vanishes without effort. Then we can hear the silence and that is absolutely beautiful.

Never a dull moment

Third discussion in Gstaad 21 August 1965

At the beginning of the third discussion Bohm asks, what is the mechanism or the dynamo that causes the noise of the mind?

We often sense some faint thoughts that seem to have tremendous and powerful effects. We should be able turn off the harmful noise without losing the useful function of thought.

There would be no problem if we had only positive thoughts, but the noise has also many ugly, rude and undesired elements in it. To avoid and fight negativity we strengthen positive thoughts and emotions. It may help, but usually the power of negative forces is much stronger and very penetrating.

However good our life is, we feel that it could be better. In many ways I could be a better person, do more good, and achieve much more in various areas of life.

Our background voice may be very satisfied with many things, but it is never completely happy, simply because it keeps comparing things. In the area of measures there is always more or less. This brings the thorn of frustration into our garden.

In the long run, functioning with practical doings is not good enough. There is something missing. We want more and we also feel there could or must be more.

Now we are apt to make a big mistake. We try to search for the missing element with an instrument that can never bring it to us. We fail to see that because of its very relative nature, thought can never be totally satisfied and gratified. On the contrary, thought is the main source of the whole problem. Our ambition, our desires and urges produce frustration and disappointment.

We want to live a life that has meaning and depth. We try to get inspired and feel grateful, but life throws problems and difficulties at us day after day. They are thrown at us in the form of people and things we don't like or even hate, or we are disappointed with the offerings of life and want more. At the back of our mind there is fear of not succeeding or losing everything we cherish.

Trying to fight against frustration we fill our mind with positive ideas and goals and keep ourselves so busy that there is no time for despair. The more we fight, the more we get frustrated.

To K, all doings based on thought cause and nourish inward conflict. The noise in our head makes us react rather desperately to the discomfort we feel. We escape to doing more or wanting more, but it does not work: feelings of frustration keep coming back as soon as there is nothing happening to us.

We function like a machine and work according to our inward rules like a diligent bureaucrat. But inside we are dead human beings, there is no spirit.

"What will make us see that thought in essence breeds frustration?" K asks.

If the narrow nature of thinking is seen thoroughly, frustration goes away and never comes back. We move to an area beyond the tyranny of thought.

Fixing the brain pain

Fourth discussion in Gstaad 24 August 1965

The difference between brain and mind is what Krishnamurti wants to talk next about. Can the heavily conditioned brain ever stop its destructive way of functioning? It is giving continuity to reactions, and this endless process makes the brain dull and literally exhausts it so that it cannot be fresh and creative.

It is not working properly in its narrow and neurotic circle. Is it possible for the brain to move beyond the structure of the memory and function holistically?

Bohm comments that science has no answer to this. It is possible to investigate the brain and nerves only in function and it is not clear how much of brain functions have to do with memory. And science has even less to say about the mind.

To K the brain is limited, but the mind means total perception, total awareness. There is no fixed point from which the mind moves and so no direction. In this movement "nothing changes and nothing is fixed". There is no thing and no movement. This dynamic stability brings a totally new element into our life.

For the brain to be fully alive there must be no contradiction in it. Our energy is wasted in conflict, unnecessary reactions, opposing desires, opinions,

exercising will etc. We react automatically to outward happenings.

When facing something unpleasant we activate a thought process and create either an opposite or an ideal state. This process is an escape from fact and conflict is born.

Our habit is to react to pain by seeking pleasure. When we are lonely, we seek company. If we fear something, we try to remove it. These subtle reactions are unconscious but they have the same root. K says that all this stems from *fear of not being*.

Bohm adds that every time we try to fix a problem, we create another problem. We have not realised that we must get rid of the root of the problems, not the branches of it as we usually try to do.

What happens to our relationships if we hold on and keep up with facts only?

“There is affectionate listening and learning. You can criticise me and I will listen with affection. There is no resistance and my relationship has moved to a different dimension. There is no image, no idea, no conflict and the brain can now move in a different area”, K answers.

“The brain itself has undergone a tremendous change, because there is no contradiction. It is moving in another way. It does not react according to the old reflexes of the animal.”

Then there is a peace which is not experienceable.

Gone with the flow

Fifth discussion in Gstaad 25 August 1965

Next day K is full of energy. He jokes about having slept well and wants to discuss the transformation of man, a sudden mutation in our brain cells. Without it existence is shallow.

Watching the world and people you start to hope that there would be a way or catalyst, some happening that would completely revolutionize our whole existence. Small refinement is utterly valueless.

Contrary to what many traditions suggest, K assures that this transformation is not a gradual process. It takes place immediately, through a single act, a single incident.

"Time is the most destructive thing!" K announces.

"If I am an ordinary man with good intentions, I must first see the futility of churches, leaders and gurus and throw them out in one breath like you blow out birthday candles with one blow and burn all bridges behind me."

But it is not enough to live a simple life, to behave well. Our life may still be full of problems. We may find our passion in doing something but we are still struggling. There is perhaps "a flame but no heat, the perfume is missing".

Bohm finds it difficult to understand that inward transformation could happen in a flash or out of time. K insists that there is no time involved in inward change.

The idea of time is the basic problem, because it is a product of thought.

“Thought is time. When there is no thought, there is no time. When I look at a flower, I can look at it botanically, with knowledge, or without time, not thinking that it is a rose. I can look at my responses, reflexes, ambitions or greed without time. There is no effort, therefore there is passion.”

If there is no thought involved in the watching, there is no wasting of energy. One form of waste is comparing. If we do not compare, there is no movement away from the facts. We go with the “free flow of facts”.

When the movement in time stops, there is complete stillness.

“Is it possible to walk down the street, look at everything - shop windows, people passing, and their dresses - without thought, and so walk with silence? Yes sir, it can be done. Of course it can, we have done it”, K says meaning obviously himself.

K ends the fifth session in a comic relief, joking to Bohm that he as a scientist should write about this kind of mind. If he stated all this it would be more convincing than said by ‘some Asian cuckoo’.

World without words

6. discussion in Gstaad 29 August 1965

Bohm starts the last meeting with an eight minute monologue about time in science, pointing out different problems that the concept of time has given rise to

especially in psychology, philosophy and physics.

K asks what time means to Bohm as a human being. To him, there are two kinds of time: psychological and by the watch. The first is about growing in time and the latter is needed to catch a train or learn a skill. The latter is factual but the first is a fallacy.

Bohm says that to him time is flowing or moving. Existence means duration, one thing becoming something else in time. K accepts this but asks:

“Do you exist except as thought and memory? If you are only functioning, there is no thought which identifies itself with the function.”

When we think and talk about existence, we think in terms of time. And we strongly feel that we actually live in time. That is the mistake the human race has grown up with and from this mistake may have arisen all our other mistakes.

Time exists only when there is an observer looking. When I see the flower, there is no observer seeing the flower, no experiencing and no centre looking.

K says that without a centre we are ‘completely free of the machinery that creates illusion’. We are also free of comparison.

“To be a cook without comparison means that I love cooking. There is no frustration or wanting to be the prime minister or the rich man in that car. I am completely in love with what I am doing.”

When working with that great intensity we don’t need artificial stimulation, drugs, excitement or harsh discipline. There is no friction. Energy is not wasted in conflict.

Our relationship to action and people changes and the brain is no longer thinking in terms of becoming something. This attention and presence cannot be communicated. If thought is still, that stillness is felt without using words.

5. Seeing all as it is

It took ten years before the next series of dialogues took place. In the archives there are five "lunchtime conversations" in June 1967 but they are unpublished.

The reason for this pause may be that the end of the Sixties and early Seventies both men were busy organizing new foundations and Brockwood Park School in England.

A precious jewel is one discussion from 1972 about intelligence. It became one of the key concepts in Krishnamurti's teachings and it was an important element in the yet to come discussions about mind.

Read between the lines

Conversation at Brockwood Park 7 October 1972

David Bohm opens the conversation by telling that he likes to look up the meaning of words in an etymologic dictionary, which says that the word intelligence comes from two words: *inter* and *legere* and means 'to read between the lines', the meaning of it. It also means mental alertness.

"Thought is like the information in a book and intelligence has to read it to see what it means. This is very different from what people have in mind when they measure intelligence."

Intelligence is not something a learned and bright person has in solving logic problems; it is a must-have ability for everyone. We all have potential for it and we all need it in daily living.

K often used this word in his talks emphasizing that intelligence has nothing to do with thought. Thinking takes place in the 'old brain'. Our thoughts are products of a physical and electrochemical process, strictly material, concrete and mundane; nothing abstract or spiritual as often is suggested.

Intelligence gives *meaning* to words and feelings. True meaning can *never* be produced by thinking, because thoughts are mechanical and measurable but intelligence is neither.

K argues that there can be *no* intelligence, when we are *thinking*. So the cessation of thought is a prerequisite for the awakening of intelligence: for intelligence to operate, thinking *must stop*. That is almost the opposite of how we usually see intelligence.

Bohm points out that our conditioning is based on the idea of living in time. Time is the essence of our existence, which is perhaps even a stronger conditioning than the idea of observer being different from the observed.

Thought functions in time, but intelligence is out of time. Yet there is a relationship between them. Intelligence can 'read' thought but thought cannot interpret intelligence. It can perhaps move intelligently or unintelligently but it requires intelligence to recognize an unintelligent thought.

Bohm says that intelligence cannot be dependent on conditions yet it cannot operate if the brain is not

healthy. So in one sense it is, however, dependent on the brain. Yet the brain is only an instrument of intelligence or tool for it. Thought is "the pointer which points beyond the domain of time". Without intelligence thought is barren and has *no* value.

Intelligence can operate only when the brain is quiet but there is no way to *make* it quiet. There seems to be an insurmountable hindrance there. And as thought has unfortunately conquered the world and intellect dominates it, there is very little space left for intelligence to operate.

Bohm asks, Why does intelligence allow thought to take dominance? K answers:

"Thought must have security, it is seeking security in all its movement, but the idea of security doesn't exist in intelligence. Intelligence itself is secure, but thought is seeking pleasure, comfort and physical security. The whole western world is based on measure and the eastern world used thought to go beyond the material world but used thought and therefore was caught in thought."

Physical security is, of course, necessary. In our animal background there is an instinctive response to pleasure and security. We want them and when we don't get them, thought takes over but does not see what it is doing. Then we create a world of illusion, miasma, and confusion leaving no opportunity for intelligence.

Thought cannot produce security nor sustain happiness, because it is always functioning in measurement, comparison and conflict. It is bound to produce fear, sorrow and destruction.

Thought is responsible for this terrible chaos in the world, because it is advocating fragmented action, not activity of wholeness.

Nationalism is one frightening example of a product of thinking. Seeing the falseness of it would be intelligence. But, sadly, thought can never be controlled or dominated by intelligence, it moves on its own.

As long as we are dominated by thought, we are functioning in measurement, comparison and conflict, and there is no chance for intelligence to act.

Bohm reckons that religious people have perhaps used the word god as a metaphor for intelligence. This concept was born from primitive fear of nature, and gradually there grew the idea that there is a super-father. Trust God, have faith, then God will operate through you, they said.

The image of God being so total overrides rationality and produces absolutely unintelligent behaviour, disharmony and chaos. Millions of people have been killed in the name of God.

The same game is in politics. In their limited framework, they fight for their own unintelligent purposes and are unaware of or don't mind the consequences. There is no intelligence there.

Is there a common source of intelligence and thought and can thought find it? Both of them are forms of energy but thought is confused, polluted, dividing and fragmenting itself. Intelligence is not polluted. It cannot divide itself as my intelligence and your intelligence, because it is common to everyone.

When one realises that it is important to be free of the mechanism of thought, we either try to control it,

subjugate it or abandons it. All that is still the operation of thought and seeing all that in one glance is insight.

Insight takes place when we listen not only to the words but to the meaning. The seeing changes us, not the verbalization, but "listening with ears that hear much deeper". That is the way to break a conditioning, a habit, an image. The conscious level of the brain resists this. It is hard, clever, subtle and brittle. It can never be intelligent, have an insight. Intelligence can act on thought, but paradoxically not when we are thinking.

There is a common source to thought and intelligence. If we find it, there is no me and you. To see it there must be freedom. As long as we are caught in thought, we are not free to see. Thought can never touch the source, because the limited instrument can never hold the immeasurable.

Shrinking in thinking

First conversation at Brockwood Park 18 May 1975

Three years later Krishnamurti and Bohm met in England twelve times from May to October talking about truth, reality and actuality, limits of thought, perception, insight, attention and awareness.

Three of the twelve discussions were published in 1977 in *Truth and Actuality*, five of them in 1999 in the book *The Limits of Thought* and four of them only on audio.

In the first dialogue, the relationship between consciousness, reality and truth was explored.

Are these three eternally divorced and are all these mere projections of thinking? If thought didn't operate, would there be any reality? If yes, what would it be like?

It may sound like giving boring definitions to abstract concepts, but actually it laid an important foundation for future dialogues. If this is missed, the rest is missed, too.

Consciousness is defined consisting of everything we can think: not only our thoughts but also our feelings, desire, will and reactions make the content of our consciousness.

Reality is all we can *think* and are *conscious* of, including also things that exist independently of thinking like nature, stars and cosmos.

"Reality is something *reflected in consciousness*", Bohm says. "But *truth* goes beyond it, because reality is always conditioned. Illusions are real, but they are not true."

For instance, Christ is real in the minds of people who believe in him, but not to one who has never even heard of him. The image is real also in the sense that it affects how people act, so it is very factual and actual, but it is not true in the fundamental way, because it is made up by thinking.

Our reality may be reasonable, rational, logical, sane and wise, or it can be irrational belief or most stupid self-deception that causes pain and chaos to us and others. Usually it is both.

Therefore, it is essential to see but difficult to understand that *everything* we can think about is

neither true nor factual. It is thought-made reality that causes all our trouble.

Thusly, if we want to have a healthy mind, we must see the difference between reality and truth. The content of our consciousness may have a counterpart in reality or not. Bohm says it would be more apt to say that our thoughts are either correct or incorrect. They are correct, if the counterpart exists.

All would be fine, if thought remains in its place, but insidiously it becomes the equivalent of truth. When something is *real* to us, we see it as a thing which stands independently of thought.

Bohm tries to explain:

“If you are walking on a dark road and see something, first you feel it is real and you react, next moment you realize that it was imagined. The fact is the actual act but our reaction is based on what we think to be true.”

Reality is anything thought, which either *reflects* or *projects*, but which is not the same as truth. The two are eternally separated. We can never come from reality to truth. The picture that our brain makes from reality is vague, illusory and an inferior model of the actual world. To regard it as truth could be considered amusing, if it did not have such serious impact in our lives.

Thought is a force that leaves unfortunate tracks when it romps in reality.

The wallpaper is *created* by thought; it is real, not imagined. If you hit me, it is also very real, not imagined. But all reality is determined by conditions and all things in our reality influence all other things

directly or indirectly. Subsequently, reality can be seen as a movement of thought.

Because we see everything filtered through our own experience and background, our reality can never be totally independent of us. A tree has a relatively independent existence but it is our consciousness that makes an image of it.

The actual world is not an opinion. Bohm suggests using the word *actuality* about everything that is actually happening and the word *reality* about everything that is produced and conditioned by thought.

If a man is sane and healthy, his thoughts and consciousness are true and reflect quite accurately what is actually happening in the world. His reality is very different from the reality of one who is irrational, neurotic and perhaps insane.

Sane and insane persons do not use the same kind of energy. The vitality of the ego comes from contradictions. It creates its own energy. When we have opposing desires, we fight to fulfil them. Usually we don't realise why we have to do something, we just do and do and do...

The energy of truth is operating when we realize that we *cannot* come from reality to truth. That is where meditation comes in. Meditation is generally seen as moving from one reality to another but it is really seeing what is.

At the end of this discussion Krishnamurti is so excited that he suggests that they should meet every weekend.

Let the facts act

Second conversation at Brockwood Park 24 May 1975

Living the truth is the key issue in the next meeting. The action of reality must be entirely different from the action of truth which is unrelated to the past and out of time.

We know action based on memory and hope, but can we ever *live in the present*? That means to live with *what is* and let the truth operate. That is possible only if we perceive reality as it actually is and *let the facts act*.

There must be no thoughts interpreting happenings and there can be no division between the observer and the observed, one part of reality watching the other part. If we cannot find this indivisible action, we will always live in time, in conflict and in sorrow.

Seeing actuality is not possible without total freedom. And seeing *is* acting, we act like we see. So we do not see first and *then* do.

Seeing the truth can only take place in *nothingness*, which is pure energy. In nothingness there are no things. It is no-thing-ness. Reality is *some-thing*, nothingness means *no-thing-ness*.

“The action of nothingness which is intelligence in the field of reality, operates in reality without distortion”, K puts it.

To be free we must not be concerned about truth but focus on reality and its distortions. We don’t know the truth. We only know consciousness which is filled with

knowledge and experiences, absorbed by itself and incapable of seeing anything as it is.

Instead of seeking truth we must see that we distort things all the time and resist facts. If we see and don't get frightened, we have energy to push the false aside.

In our consciousness there is such fully distorted content that one life is not enough to clear it all. Luckily there is a shortcut.

If we feel separate from other people or from nature, we will not have compassion. When thought operates in me dividing the world into *mine* and *not mine*, there is duality and love cannot live in that.

When there is the perception of the whole, then we love other people without excluding anybody. There is no dependency and attempt to *own* the one we love.

For truth to be, there must be space in the mind. Space is the freedom of nothingness, because as soon as there is a thing, the mind is not free.

There is no space in the mind crowded with thoughts. It is controlled by environment, occupied, and filled with problems that distort the mind.

Thought without the quality of seeing is a distorting factor.

Thought contains two factors: it reacts and it reflects. Immediate reactions make things feel so real. Thought usually reacts so fast that we do not realise it is thought reflecting things. The thing we know enters into what we see and we lose track of the reflection and then it becomes an illusion.

When our mind discards all distortions, thought has only a rational function and something totally different starts to happen.

A drum vibrates to the emptiness

Third conversation at Brockwood Park 31 May 1975

Insight is the topic of the third session. How does insight take place? What is the quality of the mind into which thought does not enter?

Ordinary thinking is dominated by words, which raise images and images raise other words. Words carry feelings and feelings make us act or prevent us from acting.

Bohm proposes that there might also be non-verbal thinking, but K opposes this. To him, thinking is nothing but responses of memory.

Bohm does not give up. He is apt to distinguish two ways of using words and images. One is the thought-based process in which the word produces the associated image and together they produce an action.

In the other kind of thinking, words are used only in *communicating* insight or the data leading to it. Bohm remembers K's simile "like a drum vibrating from the emptiness within" and admits that the word non-verbal is a bit misleading.

K is ready to admit that when thought is used to *express* the insight, it is of a different quality than thought running on its own.

Both agree that insight in itself can never be the process of organised thought, but thought can communicate not only the insight, but also some of the data which leads us to have an insight.

According to Bohm, thought seems in some indirect way to almost *reject* insight. Is there any action that would break through this rejection? Thought cannot do it, but intense insight might break through this rejection. Seeing something with passion might break the pattern of thought.

Many are expecting a path marked out in the field of reality, but it must be "an empty house, have no inhabitants". In our personal reality we seek security both physiologically and psychologically. But there is *no security*: nobody is safe in the realm of things where everything fades sooner or later.

Realizing this, we either get frightened and invent security and permanency or have an insight into the wholeness of consciousness. K says ambiguously: "In nothingness there is complete security and stability'.

At first this may sound implausible but after thinking it over we might get the insight and see the truth in it. Of course, there is no way to prove it and no guarantee that it is true, but insight brings peace to the restless.

Insight does not take care of our need for physical security, but it changes our view of reality, freeing us from a lot of confusion. There would be no wars between nations if people were not nationalistic. There would be at least considerably less violence if we had no beliefs and fanatic convictions.

All our life we are fighting economically, socially, religiously. If we feel secure inwardly, our activity in the world would be intelligent and more harmonious.

Seeing is doing

Fourth conversation at Brockwood Park 14 June 1975

The next issues are desire, goodness and beauty.

K and Bohm first investigate why desire has become such an extraordinarily important issue in our life. Do we desire simply because we are missing something?

Bohm finds an interesting link between desire and beliefs. Craving or longing for something comes from a sense of lacking something; so does belief, which stems from feeling empty.

“We believe what we *desire* to believe. The whole story of belief, hope and despair is in desire”, Bohm concludes.

We long for abstract things but also very concrete ones. Some are realistic and can come true, some are not. Some are self-centred, some general. When we for instance see the ugly state of our society, we hope to make it better, although there is no guarantee.

The essential question is, *why* do we long for something? What is the drive behind our wanting to do something? K sees five phases in this process.

Desire usually springs from *perception*. We see something wonderful. Then there is *contact* and *sensation*. We touch or make an image in our mind.

When thought enters, *desire* is born. We want to get something which is in our imagination, which is not real. The final, fifth step is *action*.

If there is no thinking, there is only action from perception. Then perception itself is action where no desire is needed. Desire for pleasure may be one way to try to cover our inward emptiness. This urge may rise because we are unable to see beauty around us. When we don't experience it, we must imagine it.

The essence of beauty, love or goodness cannot be created by thinking. Thinking can imagine or express them but not create them.

"When we die to all things thought has created, there is nothingness. I know nothing about it, I can't even imagine it. The purity of beauty, goodness and truth is in nothingness", K says.

"There is a one-way connection from nothingness to things, not from things to nothingness", K puts it.

In nothingness there is no measurement, there is nothing to be measured. Thought operates in the area of measures, it cannot perceive nothingness.

It must end, or as K puts it, "die to the reality", die to all the things of measurement, of movement, of time. There is ending with no motive. It is not done because of reward but without any hidden agenda.

The measured good, beautiful things and correct actions are in reality but the purity of beauty, goodness and truth are in nothingness. It is something totally different from my daily relationships with its images.

Crooked like a cork screw

Fifth conversation at Brockwood Park 22 June 1975

We know that thought is "crooked like a cork screw" – as K puts it - and because of its divided nature causes us conflicts. Because consciousness is in constant movement, it has never found energy which is not contradictory.

Thought may never see the futile nature of its own movement. If it did, it would be an intellectual comprehension expressed in words, not an actual fact perceived. Seeing this can be within consciousness or outside it. If it is inside, it is thought and means contradiction, and thoughts are always contradictory.

"Truth is not within the field of consciousness. If it were, it would be your truth or my truth, but not the truth", Krishnamurti points out.

Whatever we believe in, in our consciousness there is *not a single part* that is not created by thought. All fragments of our thoughts are related to each other directly or indirectly. *Thought can never see itself as a whole.*

If thought thinks it sees, it does not see! The only way to see the whole is that thought comes to an end, stops moving in time. Then seeing does not happen with thought.

For this to be, there has to be a certain kind of awareness and attention. Awareness is much more than concentration on something. In awareness there is no choice. Attention is 'stretching toward' something

more, but it is not thought or memory. Attention comes to absolute nothingness which is the summation of energy. It is beyond the human energy.

Then quite surprisingly Bohm asks K: "Have you gone through discovering all this or were you this way all your life?"

"I'm afraid so", K answers, referring to the latter option. "From childhood I was ill and not capable of receiving mentally. Nothing penetrated me deeply", K answers, but quickly adds: "But I'm not saying that I am unconditioned, it would be silly on my part to say it!"

Bohm asks how then does this perception beyond attention come about. Illness cannot, of course, be the answer, because many other children are ill and don't see this.

K thinks that *sensitive awareness* is needed here.

"One must be sensitive not only to one's desires, but to environment and to other people. In awareness the movement of thought comes to an end. From that choiceless awareness there is affection, care and sense of deep communication awakened."

But it is not enough. In attention there is the quality of love, communication that is not verbal. And even that is not enough. The consciousness must be empty of its content and then there is this sense of non-being, nothingness. There is in K's words "nothing created by thought, by circumstances, by temperament, imagination, tendency or capacity".

In nothingness there is no movement of thought, yet it has its own movement as energy. The movement we know is in time but this is something else, beyond our imagination.

Goodness has no relationship to thought or to evil. Evil will go on as long as there is thought.

"Could you put it like this; while thought is going on it would not be possible to consider a solution of the problems?" Bohm asks.

K is excited: "Exactly. It is a tremendous revelation. That is the beauty of this. I listen and it is revealed, because I have paid attention to you. I am full of this extraordinary statement. I don't know how it will operate. I don't know how I will live. I have seen this thing and it will operate. It will do something, I don't have to do anything. Before I was accustomed to doing something but now it operates, because truth has its own vitality."

Step out of your stable

Sixth conversation at Brockwood Park 28 June 1975

In the sixth discussion the two men talk about unawareness, ignorance and mistakes versus the action of truth being total and free from memory.

Bohm says there are two types of unawareness. First is the simple failure to be aware because we don't know enough or we are given wrong information. The analogy of this is a computer that is programmed wrongly and it makes mistakes although it operates according to its set rules.

The second type of unawareness is due to thought's *systematic tendency to suppress awareness*. We ignore something because we want to be comfortable and not disturb our mental equilibrium.

We are afraid that everything will go to pieces if we are aware of everything. To protect ourselves we 'stay in our own stable' and don't even want to see.

It is rather hard to distinguish whether doing something foolish is due to lack of right information or some subtle form of ignorance.

Truth cannot manifest itself where there is unawareness and ignorance. When truth operates thought is not present, because the action of mere memory is inherently twisted. But the action of perception is instantaneous and no memory is necessary. It perceives without the perceiver.

The action of truth is and must be total. In that state of *integrity* one sees the truth in the false.

Then Bohm tells that he had just read a 'quite interesting' biography of Krishnamurti, the book by Mary Lutyens called *The Years of Awakening*. It tells the story about the mental transformation beginning in the 1920's, which caused a fundamental change in Krishnamurti's perception about reality.

K doubts whether there was a moment of transformation in him. It was rather a long process that started in August 1922. Something very crucial happened, when his brother Nitya died in November 1925. He did not escape the suffering but "faced the actuality of death and that freed him from the reality of thought".

Remembering his life 50 years later, K says he was never actually conditioned by the theosophical beliefs pumped into him, he was "in the peripheral state repeating things which were told to him".

In the so called process K suffered from long periods of terrific pain but he says it must not be linked to the actual transformation process in the mind. However, physical pain brings about a certain quality of energy.

This young man discovered something new and that *new something* became part of human consciousness. When it was stated aloud, others could carry on with that newness in their own lives.

A totally new kind of energy was released. It was not the energy of thought. That energy comes about if one *does not escape* suffering through any means. His very suffering brings about a great energy. The energy of truth and the energy of reality are two unrelated things. The first is universal, the latter rather personal.

In talking about these energies K says his body becomes a little tense and he has to leave the room. After coming back he explains:

"You see, there is something much more than all this. Would you accept the word *mystery*? There is something which you cannot talk about. This does not mean that it doesn't exist. When you touch that mystery, things are totally different. Thought can never touch that."

Many people may disagree but in the world of thought and reality there is *no mystery*. Some of us have a desire to experience and create mysteries.

In science the original impulse was, according to Bohm, to penetrate into the mystery and reveal it but it has been diverted and scientists began to think they can finally explain everything. The essence of existence is and will be unexplained.

“I think to a certain extent the ego works on a sort of parody of this mystery, making itself so mysterious”, Bohm says.

The sense of mystery is almost gone for many reasons. Our illusion of knowing is one reason. We want to understand and explain everything, but it is impossible, because thoughts are limited and they are the only instrument for explanation. We still keep cherishing the idea that we can finally know everything.

As a child many of us have had a sense of mystery, but lose our contact to nature and seldom watch the stars at night or dive into the depths of the ocean.

Bohm says: “Anything in the field of reality can be explained. We can penetrate more deeply and broadly, but the essence is not explained.”

The truth about the mystery makes the mind completely silent. When the mind is aware and silent, the truth of that mystery is. That total silence opens the door to completely other dimension.

Meeting the mystery

Seventh conversation at Brockwood Park 18 July 1975

Bohm starts the next session quoting Einstein, who said the most beautiful thing we can experience is the mysterious. It is the source of all true art and science.

What is the state of mind that participates in something mysterious? What is the nature of that participation? What are the necessary things for that to happen?

K says that first one must have a very *sensitive body*. Also the mind must not be emotional, sentimental or neurotic. It must have a tendency to quick insight, immediate comprehension and not be satisfied with mere explanations.

In addition to this, there must be *psychological clarity*. Clarity is needed especially in seeing the nature of thought. Thought is used in seeing the mountain, the microphone and the 'me'.

These three differ in their nature. The mountain is independent of thinking; it is there although we don't think of it. So is the microphone, but unlike a mountain it is created by man, designed and made by thought.

The ego represents a third kind of product of thought. It is made by our thinking and unlike mountain and microphone, would *not* be if we did not think about it. It cannot be seen with eyes, but in our mind's world it is very real.

We think that the centre of ourselves is an objective reality, something separate and distinct, independent of thought. We have a strong gut feeling of the centre living and moving in time. The 'me' has been, is now something and will be something else.

In this stream of movement we exist. We attribute our experiences to this centre and hope for the best and are afraid of the worst. Thought not only creates, but also *defines* and *determines* the centre. It sustains the sense of the independent 'me' and is trapped in this idea.

After creating the centre, we cannot *avoid* attributing pain and suffering to it.

Thought cannot comprehend or be aware of the whole. It may pretend so, but the limited can never enter limitless. The ego lives in a small room and imagines what is outside.

Our tradition is long and unambiguous: the ego has an independent reality. It is handed down to us both verbally and verified by our own experience.

To Krishnamurti, this whole idea of ego is absurd and disastrous. He is one of the few who is so absolutely convinced about it. He thought that it is much easier for other people to understand this after he has had this insight.

He used the analogy that Columbus discovering America is easy to grasp, but according to Bohm this is too simplified a picture of how the change in our consciousness actually happens. Our own consciousness does not necessarily change because someone has undergone a change.

The mystery of life is something that cannot be shown or taught to another person. There is nobody who can make it be true for us. In science it is a different case, because we can learn from knowledge. Einstein made a discovery and others may modify it.

But the mystery of life is something we cannot get from anybody. We cannot analyse it. If we pick a flower and tear it to pieces, there is no flower anymore. To explore the mystery one must be free of desire, motives, will and suffering, the whole structure of ego.

Stream gone wrong

Eight conversation at Brockwood Park 25 July 1975

The eighth discussion starts with a written question from a friend of Bohm, American psychiatrist David Shainberg. He wants to know, is thought being aware of its own fragmentation, also fragmented?

To answer that we have to realise first that thought is fragmented and an *imitation* of this thing perceived. It reflects the content of memory and selects some things and leaves something essential out. It cannot reflect anything as it actually is.

We have given *colossal* importance to thinking and do not realise how mechanical and fundamentally limited it is. The total perception of this reveals the truth. This perception acts in reality. In perception, thought undergoes a change. That perception changes the brain cells.

Total perception is a big shock to the brain, something absolutely new. Thought has no means to deal with this insight. To avoid the shock it has developed different ways to prevent it from taking place. Desperately it holds to a fixed form, tries to stay in a groove in order to feel itself safe. It creates a world of its own, but it can never be safe or satisfied there.

Unfortunately, thought has *no* reason to suspect that its own creations are not a prime thing in life. It builds an imaginary structure that it calls the ego. This image is the geometric centre of its mental operations and that determines everything in our life. We think in terms of centres and watch the world through it.

There is an analogy in physics.

“One of the basic theories in physics has been that the world is made of atoms. Each atom is a centre which is connected to all other atoms. The opposite view is that there is a continuous field and no centre”, Bohm describes.

Physically we are forced to function from a centre, act in space and time, but psychologically there is only an image imitating to be a centre.

Then we make another mistake. We think that the centre is separate from our thinking. Doing this we divide consciousness into two: *here* is the observer I call the ‘me’ and *there* are all things I observe.

This leads us to make a third mistake. If I think I am separate from others, then they must be separate from me. Therefore my entire world is fragmented endlessly, shattered into fragments. Then, according to Bohm, I start to separate things that are not separate and put together things that are different.

“When something is going wrong in the stream of human thought, we attribute it to somebody, but it is going wrong in thought and it is in everybody. There is no such thing as my thought and your thought.”

We usually attribute the ‘right’ idea to our own centre and the ‘wrong’ idea to that of others. Therefore there is no compassion and we start to fight.

“To see that it is one thought process and you cannot attribute this to a particular person, that is compassion.”

Healing the damaged brain

Ninth conversation at Brockwood Park 6 August 1975

Bohm starts the next episode stating that as brain is a material process, it is constituted of matter and conditioned over the ages by heredity, tradition and environment. We have been “conditioned to *self-deception* that constitutes a subtle kind of brain damage”.

Damage is due to our brain being overloaded with thoughts, by the self, by fear and sorrow and also by tradition. Damaged brain cells will produce thought that is inherently *distorted*.

K says the distortion and damage is seen very clearly in the old cultures like India. Their beliefs are unshakeable. Tradition conditions the brain to a certain very fixed view of reality. The same structure is in the west, although the forms of beliefs are different.

These beliefs are sustained and nourished by the damaged brain. We don't recognize this damage and attribute it to something else. We blame either external circumstances or others. The brain begins to treat thought as a reality independent of thought not realising that it is observing itself.

Can the brain ever recover from this damage and heal itself? Maybe it can, but it has not happened for many reasons. We are first of all not even *interested* in this. Secondly, we don't really *see* the damage in the brain.

It may be that our brains are already *too much* damaged to be healed. One of the tricks of the damaged

brain is to say it *cannot* be healed and there is nothing that can be done socially, morally, artistically.

We won't know if we don't even give it a try. If the damage is very deep, perhaps it cannot be healed. But there may be a part of the brain and consciousness that is *not* touched and damaged by tradition and culture. K is absolutely certain that there *is*. The damaged brain has no access to the infinite.

"The very listening to that which is beyond thought heals the brain. Out of that there can be a new man and a new society."

The process revisited

Tenth conversation at Brockwood Park 27 September 1975

The next meeting continues with the issue of K's personal process. Bohm says he finds the analogy of Columbus finding America misleading, because it suggests that transformation would be easy. A better analogy perhaps would be that of Newton and Einstein in physics. Newton made discoveries and Einstein went further. Partly Einstein built on Newton's ideas, but also Einstein had to deny a great deal of what Newton had proposed.

Krishnamurti assures that he does *not know* what happened to him in the process. When he thought it over, his conclusion was that he cannot be sure about it and does not want to even speculate about it.

According to his own testimony, the so-called process was still taking place in the seventies, but only when K

felt completely relaxed and was in a quiet environment. He emphasized that he does not do anything to hinder or invite the process. K describes:

“I wake up in the middle of the night meditating. It is a peculiar form of meditation, because it is totally unimaginative, something pre-unmeditated. I can’t imagine such a state. It is something out of the ordinary, without being abnormal.”

This process brings with sensitivity. K says he can read other people’s thoughts but he does not want to do that because it is like reading private letters. Also he has done a great deal of healing.

In K’s process there was intense pain. Usually people try to escape and avoid pain, but K did not do this. He stayed with the pain and it was transformed to something else.

Then Bohm asks about the role of the so-called Masters. K tells that he was a rather vague, moronic, uncertain boy. He was told something and he repeated it like a child who was told fairytales. Theosophists made the Masters materialistic telling how they lived, what their names were and how they were dressed.

There is of course something ‘in the air’ and everybody can feel it. Constant killing and evil may somehow be recorded in the environment. But so is goodness. In an ancient temple there is quite a different atmosphere.

According to K, theosophists assigned goodness to the Masters and evil to those who are basically selfish. That is too simplified and misleading, if it is taken literally, although it is not mere speculation. If one is after truth, one must not create stories, but be ready to face the actualities. If we have had a glimpse of the truth and try

to resist or escape, that movement brings about suffering and starts to act like a poison, like a thorn in the flesh. It is poking at us all the time.

To stay with the suffering is what is needed. If we don't escape and just stay with what is, a miracle takes place. To resist and escape keeps us suffering endlessly.

Can wisdom be learnt?

Eleventh conversation at Brockwood Park 24 October 1975

The first issues in the eleventh discussion are the difference between wisdom and intelligence and can wisdom be learned.

Wisdom is possible only when one perceives the limitation of thought and sees it operating in a limited area. By definition, wise is a man who 'is able to take sound judgments', but that is only an outward manifestation of wisdom.

Without seeing the whole there can be no wisdom. Actually the word wisdom has the same root as video, to see. Seeing the whole is truth is the precondition for real wisdom.

To many people wisdom comes from accumulating a great deal of knowledge, but Bohm says quite the contrary: all limits come from thought and knowledge and they *prevent* wisdom.

"A thoughtful man is not a wise man, nor is he an intelligent man", K states, meaning something else than is usually meant with the word thoughtful.

Wisdom means the ability to deal with every step of the seeing and not act from memory or knowledge. Only those who perceive the truth can bring order in the world. Truth operating in the brain clears that brain. When it is clear, it can operate in order.

Bohm says that seeing the truth dissolves the mist of reality in the brain.

Eliminating desire

Twelfth conversation at Brockwood Park 18 May 1975

The last session in this series deals with self-delusion. The brain engages in self-deception, when we imagine we are something we are not. The root of it is the selfish and self-centred movement we have adopted.

We act from a centre inside of ourself, an imaginary mental creature, which is actively controlling our functions. This image seems to have a factual content and a practical function. Why has it become so important to act from this image centre?

To answer this, we have to understand desire. Desire works entirely through fancy and imagination. We seek comfort and consolation in images and symbols in trying to feel a little better.

Desire is the bedrock of the ego. When I desire, I am. Desire seems to be solid and firm, not easy to break up. It is a fast and violent process filling our consciousness.

Is it possible to eliminate desire? It is the ground on which all of our civilisation seems to be based.

How are we to explode this tremendous rock which is supporting the whole society?

It is in the very structure of our brain cells to desire to be happy, to get rid of fear, to go after what we want. How can the brain which is conditioned to desire uncondition itself and get rid of desire? What happens to the brain if there is no desire?

Firstly, it will have all the energy it has wasted on desire. This means that there is no self-deception, no striving, and no achievement. There is no content in consciousness.

If we do this and have a brain that has no desire, what is our relationship to the world of reality? We would affect the world in a profound way.

As long as there is desire, there is deception and therefore no solution to the problems of society or the individual. A man who is without desire affects the total consciousness of human beings.

The last ten minutes of the twelfth discussion are absolutely stunning. K asks most politely how Bohm reacted to the question: "Can the brain be totally without desire?"

"It is hard to remember because that question was put implicitly, but it sort of opens up the brain in some way", he answers dryly.

It is not in our tradition to put such a question, at least explicitly. We have tried to control it without succeeding. Our mind is in a state where it tries to find its place without succeeding. When seeking ends, the mind is what it is.

Then K tells us that the intensity of the movement without desire seems to affect his brain deeply, especially in the evenings and nights. There is something called 'otherness' in *Krishnamurti's Notebook*. It "purifies the brain".

In that state even a common word like compassion may have a tremendous vitality and sense of mystery. It feels timeless, never the same and is therefore an extraordinary mystery.

6. Are we willing to change?

The next year, in May 1976, the duo became a trio, when psychoanalyst David Shainberg joined the crew. An intense and enjoyable session of seven dialogues was held in four days in a cosy setting at Brockwood Park.

Passionately vibrant, Krishnamurti challenges Shainberg with difficult questions and pulls the answers from him without losing his grip. Bohm is excellent and takes care of the logicity in their dialogue. He easily follows K's reasoning and patiently explains K's sometimes unclear wording.

We are served with a charged and easy-to-follow package that inspires the listener to think about his life and the destiny of all of us in a fresh and thorough way. In seven hours they manage to address many issues, but actually there is one question: Can human beings change?

The whole series was published in a book *The Wholeness of Life* and is available on DVD titled *Transformation of Man* with a 10-minute introduction, absolutely worth watching.

It is thrilling to watch this series of deep, moving and personally challenging conversations. The intensity of the participants gives depth to the spoken words.

The introduction of the participants was recorded after the last meeting, so everybody knew what was discussed. Bohm and Shainberg told who they are and how they got involved in K and his teachings.

Bohm starts telling how he got acquainted with Krishnamurti. He says he has always been interested in what are called the deeper questions, the nature of time and space and matter, causality and what is behind all of this. He found that very few of his colleagues shared his interest.

David Shainberg tells he is a practicing psychiatrist in New York City and read K as early as the late forties. Especially of interest also to him was the question of the observer and the observed. In the medical school he tried to understand the difference between what K said and what western psychiatry and psychology were communicating. It only took some five years before he really started to use K's teachings in his work, greatly due to discussion with his friend David Bohm.

"In psychiatry all theories deal with fragmentation and the relationships between fragments. They do not have any understanding of the holistic action. Most theories analyse and break things down and break things into pieces which collaborate with the very problems that our patients present us with."

Krishnamurti's work has helped Shainberg to see that the relationship between the observer and the observed is very important in the very patient-doctor situation, and that the very theories about mind are part of the very problem.

Then K is asked, How can the viewer best share in the dialogues and get the most from this experience?

K's fine words about taking things *seriously* and his strong reference to sharing melted my mind when I first heard them in 1977, and still do light me up.

"I think it all depends *how serious you are*. How serious in the sense of how deeply you want to go into these questions, which is after all *your life*. We are not discussing theoretically some abstract hypotheses, we are dealing with *actual daily life of every human being*. We are dealing with the actual facts of fear, pleasure, sorrow, death and if there is anything *sacred* in life, because if you don't find something real, something that is *true*, life has very little meaning.

If you are really serious to go into these matters with care, with attention, with affection, then you can share a great deal. You have to do this right through your life, every day of your life. If you care to find out how to live properly, what is right relationship between human beings, then you will share completely what we discuss."

Life is more than me

First dialogue at Brockwood Park 17 May 1976

Krishnamurti begins the series by asking, What is the *most important* thing we can talk about together?

Shainberg says he was very impressed when K once conveyed that it is important to realise that *life comes first* and not thought and work. He has also noticed that most people live *second-hand lives*.

Bohm wants to discuss the question of wholeness of life. K suggests that they would talk about both, not speculating theoretically but very *practically* and *factually*.

We can easily see that most people are very fragmented and not whole, and that they are *not aware* of it. We assume that we look at the world holistically, but actually we see ourselves and our lives through a small hole and interpret everything according to our likings.

Many seem to feel that there is nothing wrong with being fragmented: it *is* what we *are*!

We become aware of our fragmentation when something goes wrong in our life. When we have unfulfilled or opposing desires and we don't get what we want and we feel dissatisfied. Or we may feel that the world is not what we want it to be and feel disappointed.

We are aware of our fragments only in patches, here and there. And we don't see the *root cause* of our fragmentation. Actually we do not see that there is a root cause.

If we feel and say that we are fragmented, it is because there is a centre inside us, an ego that is aware of the fragments. That very same centre is the *cause* of fragmentation and that same centre tries to bring about integration and wholeness.

Without the ego there would be no fragmentation, but our ego does not *see* it, because we have separated ourselves from our thinking.

The trouble begins when *one* fragment *claims* to be whole and makes itself more important than other fragments. When it wants to control or lead other fragments, there is conflict between fragments.

Besides this inward conflict there is outward conflict between us and other people. I may think I am important, but other people do not see my excellence and it bothers me. They often feel the same about me.

The whole world is broken into a trillion pieces and all these pieces think they are important. Our lives depend on these fragments.

We have two ways to realize what fragments are about. Either we do not see them at all or we see them only *intellectually*. We assume that fragmentation is due to outward facts, but fail to see that the root of it is in our thinking. Fragments are because we *make* and hold them.

The root of fragmentation is our desire for biological as well as psychological *security*. In order to *feel* safe I want to belong to some group, sect or organisation. That is, of course, only an illusion of safety, but I don't see it or I don't mind, because I want and must feel safe and secure.

The need for physical security is built into our body. We must have food, clothes and shelter. But that is *prevented* because we want to be *psychologically* secure and we belong to groups that fight with each other.

"If there were no nationalities, no ideological groups, we would have everything we want. That is prevented because I am a Hindu, you are an Arab, he is Russian", K argues.

The basic source of this process is *knowledge*. Knowledge is the past, but seems to be in the present. We are imposing this partial knowledge on the whole and hope that through knowledge we will overcome fragmentation. That is, of course, an illusion.

Knowledge has a place in driving a car or learning a language, but when it is used psychologically, it assumes to understand the whole. Of course we don't usually *explicitly* think that we understand the whole, but we *implicitly* assume so.

This is seen in our dealing with other people. We meet others with fixed thoughts about what I am and what is the other. We are very partially open to the new. Any human being is immensely beyond what we can really know about him or her. The image based on past experiences does not tell everything of that person.

Knowledge spills from practical things into the psychological field, because to us *psychological security* is *even more important* than biological security. We seek security in knowledge, ideas, pictures, images, conclusions. They don't *produce* but *prevent* biological security for us and our children. We are ready to kill others because what we think of him or her or them.

So the 'me' becomes the essence of my life: my position, my happiness, my house, my god, my wife. We build our lives on identification with ideas and become second hand people having no actual contact to reality.

Lost in concepts

Second dialogue at Brockwood Park 18 May 1976

The first session ended in a statement; we try to find our security in the 'me', but that is a delusion. The second meeting continues with this issue.

We take for granted that there is psychological security. If we fail to feel safe, we may collapse.

It is our fundamental longing to feel safe and know that life goes on, even after death.

Our security lies in the hope that some day we will reach what we want or dream to have. Empirically we know that these hopes for security are often false, because everything is in flux, changing. But we don't want to face the hard fact that there is no security in life, no permanency, no stability psychologically. In this way we build our existence on beliefs.

Bohm gives two examples.

"If I could really believe that after dying I would go to heaven and be quite sure of it, I could be very secure anywhere and not matter what happens. I don't have to worry, because this is temporary trouble and all is going to be good. Or if I am a Communist, I know that we are going through a lot of troubles but it is all worthwhile and in the end all will be right."

There is security in the anticipation that everything will be good in the future, in the projected belief or comforting concept. We are focusing on life to *become* good. This may seem a healthy *reaction* to having had so many disappointments and sufferings in the past.

These are vain and false hopes. We cannot count on our feelings, on our health, on money, on anyone, on anything. Anything might happen. We may any minute lose everything we have and sooner or later that will happen. There is *no security* in reality.

What is wrong with beliefs, hopes and ideals?

Firstly, they are an *escape* from reality. We are unable to act correctly if we are not living in reality. Secondly, because of them we are in constant *conflict*.

If we build our life on ideas and images, it is impossible to have healthy relationship to others. As long as there is a sense of self, we act fragmentarily.

Once again we are asked why ideas have become so fantastically real to us, more real than marbles and hills. Why do we keep on building our lives on something that is not real and which brings endless conflict and suffering into our lives?

Once again the answer is that we want to and *must* have a feeling of *order* in our lives. We must feel safe to be able to live.

To forget our uncertainty, we fill our days with various activities, keeping ourselves busy. In being occupied there is a mechanical order, but it will satisfy us only for a little while. Soon we get bored and go after entertainment.

The occupied brain tends to go into disorder and there is no way to prevent that. We may take a pill but the problem is waiting at the background to take us over.

The brain finds order in a mechanical process, in being occupied. But why don't we see that this mechanical order is essentially disorder, delusory and dangerous? We want to hold on to our beliefs and hope that others will leave us alone. But life *won't* leave us alone.

The only way out of this mechanical mindset is to *stop* it instantly. That means that the past meets the present and ends there. Then a totally different thing takes place.

As K puts it: "If I meet you with my memories, I don't meet you. You might have changed. If I am completely aware of this movement, then it stops and I meet you as though for the first time."

Still crazy after all these years

Third dialogue at Brockwood Park 18 May 1976

There have been various suggestions for solving the human problems, but the same old game is going on. Why do we human beings live the way we do? This opens the third meeting.

Looking at this panorama of horror many people become cynical and start to think that one person cannot do anything about it: human nature is like this and it cannot be changed.

Many things have been tried, but it has not been guided by an understanding of human nature. Marxists say that human nature can be improved, but only after the whole economic and political system has been altered.

But we will *not* succeed unless we see the root. The ego wants to change itself, it can't, and all attempts are doomed to fail.

So, we can try to find somebody to help us to bring balance to our life. The disorder creates the need for authority - or actually the impression that we need authority.

If we see this, we reject all authority and begin to become sane. We have now much more energy and can concentrate on finding out, investigating. If we don't turn to anyone, it gives us a tremendous sense of integrity.

As a human being we may realise that we are neurotic in the sense that we have conclusions and beliefs. Can we look at the nature of the belief *without the word* so

that thought is aware of itself? If thought can be so aware, it undergoes a radical change.

Thought is not a fixed thing; it is a process that can change in perception. The very observation changes the object in the same way as the quantum theory shows that observation through a microscope affects the object, that the object cannot be known without the act of observation affecting it. In psychotherapy the act of being with the patient changes both. In the same way the awareness of thoughts moving stops irrelevant thoughts.

To live you must leave

Fourth dialogue at Brockwood Park 19 May 1976

One reason why human beings have not changed may be that if we would actually transform our conditioning, we might find ourselves in a genuine insecurity, not an imagined one. If we reject society, society will reject us. The common logic goes: if you don't think like us, you are against us.

So we are really frightened of not belonging to a group or a herd. We would rather cling to the known misery than enter a world we don't know. Belonging to a group gives us safety. If we get transformed, we are left alone and empirically we don't want that.

To be free we must eliminate identification with a group and step out of confusion and disorder that belonging brings. Yet, we don't dare to liberate ourselves, because of fear of being alone. So we would rather stay in our little pond than face isolation.

In a primitive tribe the worst punishment was to be banished from the group. We are afraid of being thrown out of the group, afraid that we are not accepted by other people. That may be one more reason why we don't change.

Another reason is that we are heavily conditioned to accept things *as they are*. Because we feel uncertain, we accept an easy answer from another; believe what an authority tells us.

Religions have said that this world is transient and there is a better one, aspire to that. Communists said that there is no next world; let's make the best of this one. Whom do we choose to believe? On what grounds?

It seems that we don't fully realize our own role in this confusion. We tend to look at problems being *out there*, existing independently of us. We tend to attribute the chaos to something outside of ourselves.

Or the alternative is that we blame ourselves. In both cases we think that there is an 'I' separate from our thinking. It 'takes care of thinking'. Thought thinks and acts as if it is an independent agent and is not in charge of what it is doing.

We have divided our thinking into two entities: thinker and thinking. After having realized they both are part of our thinking process, a click happens in our mind. The question is then not, Why don't we change, it is, Why thinking does not stop but goes on endlessly?

If the movement of thought stops, there is no me, no fear, no sorrow left. Something new takes place, something we have never looked at, seen or experienced. When we remain totally with the fact, then we have an energy which is extraordinary.

Two rails never meet

Fifth dialogue at Brockwood Park 19 May 1976

Krishnamurti starts the fifth dialogue asking Shainberg, why do we divide consciousness and who invented the unconscious? To K, the division between the conscious and unconscious, hidden and open, is not real, it is only an invention of a fragmented mind.

Once the division is made, it becomes real and affects our thinking. Yet the most influential factor is not the line between the hidden and open part of our mind but the whole process of how our mind works.

All grown-up people have an image about themselves and it is that image that gets hurt. The value of everything depends on this self-image being right. If we never made any images, we would never get hurt. There would be nothing that could get hurt or be hurt. It would be like putting a pin in the air.

If I have an image of myself and others, my relationships are between two images, and they are not real. So there is no real relationship, because the image is the dominant factor. It may be active all the time, but when we pass a critical point, the image takes over. It is like being tied to a rope. As soon as we reach the limits of that rope we see that we are stuck.

If we have an image, we don't see the person actually. We see only a fragment and want to keep the person within the confines of that fragment. Society is doing this to every human being. Every culture around us is creating images about us.

Image-making is one of the contents of our consciousness and it may be the major machinery that is operating. It is possible to stop this process which destroys all relationship.

There is no possibility of real caring for somebody as long as the image-making process is going on. If it does not stop, we are going to destroy each other and this lovely earth where we are meant to live happily, look at heavens and be happy about it.

Our consciousness is filled with images. As long as this is the case, there will be no peace and no love in the world. If one remains with this fact and does not let thought interfere, there is a transformation in the mind.

Occupied by acute matters

Sixth dialogue at Brockwood Park 20 May 1976

In the sixth session K asks Bohm: What will change man? What will bring about a radical transformation in the total consciousness of man? What is the energy or the drive that is lacking?

Bohm advises us to start from daily relationship in the office, factory, golf course and at home, watch the images moving in our mind. We must realize right relationship is of the greatest importance.

Therefore, we are willing to give up certain wasting of our energy like drinking, smoking, endless chattering, crawling from pub to pub. If we don't have the energy, everything will go to pieces and we will create such havoc around us.

It must also be clear that *nobody can do it for us*. We have to do it by ourselves. Whatever somebody else does won't really affect our relationship.

Thirdly, our relationship must be free from image. Any form of image we have about others prevents the beauty of relationship. If we have an image, we either expect another to act according to our image or we try to change him.

Most of us are not serious. We want an easy life. We don't have time to listen to a serious talk even for two minutes. We have our plans and acute interests. If we are not in the mood to listen, we ask to come back when we have time.

The major part of consciousness is the self-image. We are mostly occupied by it. Our images are all centred on the self. All images are aimed to make the self feel right, correct. The self is regarded as all important. That gives it tremendous energy.

Now we are asked to be free of the self, to empty consciousness and stop image-making. If we ask *how* to do it, it is still the 'me' foremost asking for means to change itself.

The 'me' is the result of my past: my personal memories, experiences, and recollections. I *am* the past and from the past I project the future.

The whole point of image is that it *imitates* an actual fact. We get the feeling that I am factual in the same way as a mountain or a chair is a fact. It is not. Reality is only thought which is the past. There is no thinker without thought. If there is no experiencer there is no experience.

Sensing the sacred

Seventh dialogue at Brockwood Park 20 May 1976

In the last session K takes the lead.

“After this morning you have left me completely without any future, without any past, without any image. So I have been left with a sense of a blank wall. I have rejected all systems, all gurus and all systems of meditation, because I have understood the meaning of the meditator in the meditation. But I still have not solved the problem of sorrow, of what it means to love a human being and what is compassion. And you have not shown me what death is.”

If the self is only an image, what is it that dies in death? Ending of an image is nothing much, like turning off a television. Death must have much greater significance. Image-making is like a wave on the surface of this stream of human suffering, it is a very ‘shallow affair’.

There is this constant flow of image-making. When we die, image-making does not stop, but goes on manifesting in other people if we still have an image in the moment of death. These images don’t originate in one brain, but they are in some sense universal. They manifest in people as they are born, K says.

Death opens up or brings about a sense of enormous, endless energy which has no beginning and no end, a life that has infinite depth. The image-maker and the ‘thought-maker’ are blocking this energy.

Beyond our images there is this universal sorrow in which man has lived for millions of years. It is much more than pain or losing someone you loved. It is much

more than the sum of all the sorrow of different people. The individual sorrow is self-pity, but there is much deeper sorrow, which is universal. The perception of that sorrow is compassion.

Seeing this tremendous ignorance of man, this sorrow of man living like this, one wants to do something. That is the energy of compassion. A man in sorrow can never have that. To penetrate into this the mind must be completely silent. That silence is not the product of control nor brought about through will.

"In that silence there is the sense of something beyond time, thought, death. There is something beyond compassion. That is sacred and it cannot be examined. That may be the origin of everything, of man, matter and nature."

To come to this point one must empty the content of one's consciousness. To do that one must be burning to find out the truth, not be caught in words.

To talk about life and the sacred can be a process of just clever argumentation, expressing ideas and opinions or deeply penetrating meditation. To share this means to go beyond the words. Then there is no sharing, there is only being in that dimension.

The whole series and especially the last two discussions point to something immense that cannot be explained but can be felt.

7. All time is now

The highlight of the Krishnamurti-Bohm collaboration was 15 dialogues they had in 1980. They started in April at Ojai, California with eight discussions, continued with two discussions in June in England and another five in September.

Thirteen dialogues were published in a book *The Ending of Time* in 1985 and the two remaining dialogues posthumously in 1999 in the book "The Limits of Thought".

To get finely tuned to dialogues, read the cover text of the first edition. It says:

"This is the most important book we have had from Krishnamurti since the publication of his Notebook and his Journal...an in-depth and sustained discussion between a leading religious teacher and a leading physicist..."

...If the brain remains in the self-created darkness it wears itself out with the resulting conflict. Krishnamurti suggests that through insight it is possible for the brain to change physically and act in an orderly way which leads to a healing of the damage caused by many years of wrong function. This insight originates in an energy that is beyond time and beyond matter. Therefore what acts is the order of the whole universe, of the whole of being, in both its physical and mental aspects. Thus, it is not personal nor does it belong to mankind.

Mankind can change fundamentally, but it requires going from one's narrow and particular interests

toward the general, and ultimately moving still deeper to that purity of compassion, love and intelligence which originates in the ground beyond thought, beyond time and even beyond emptiness. This means giving one's mind, one's heart, one's whole being to the enquiry that has been carried on throughout these discussions."

Ending as a new beginning

First dialogue at Ojai 1 April 1980

Krishnamurti gets the ball rolling by asking, if mankind has taken a wrong turn. Bohm remembers having read that this happened five to six thousand years ago when man began to be able to plunder and take slaves. After that his main purpose of existence was to exploit others.

K clarifies that he actually meant the sense of *inward becoming*, which brings conflict into our consciousness. When we are not satisfied with what we are, we try to become something that we are *not*.

Bohm assumes it is *intrinsic* in the structure of thought to project a goal of becoming better, both outwardly and inwardly. Outward goals are not a problem but inward goals build an egotistic centre, which will inevitably cause conflict.

"Is it that one's brain is so accustomed to conflict that one rejects any other form of living?" Krishnamurti asks.

"After a while people come to the conclusion that conflict is inevitable and necessary", Bohm answers.

We need a certain sense of identity to function, but a wrong turn happened when the ego became dominant. If there were no becoming, the mind would simply be silent.

To K the cause of human confusion is that we introduced time as a means of becoming, evolving and loving more.

“To me the idea of tomorrow doesn’t exist psychologically; that means time as a movement inwardly or outwardly. I want to abolish psychological time. For me it is an enemy.”

What takes place, if there is no movement as time?

If one’s brain has been trained, accustomed for centuries to go north and it suddenly realizes that going north means everlasting conflict. As the brain realizes that, the quality of the brain changes.”

Bohm adds that the key point is the direction of movement.

“When the movement is fixed in direction, inwardly, it will come to conflict. But outwardly we need a fixed direction.”

Krishnamurti seldom spoke about his own experiences. Now he tells how one night in Rishi Valley he woke up and “the source of all energy had been reached”.

“I hesitate to say this, because it sounds extravagant and rather childish. There was literally no division at all, no sense of the world and me, only this sense of tremendous source of energy. It had an extraordinary effect on the brain, also physically.”

Krishnamurti says he wanted for sixty years to see other people to reach it. It would “solve all our

political and religious problems, because it is pure energy from the very beginning of time”.

“Suppose you have come to that point and your brain is throbbing with it, how would you help me to come to that?”

The brain has evolved in time and can only live and think in time. It is accustomed to this idea of becoming. Time is dominating the brain functions and as long as this is the case, there is no end to conflict. Can the brain realize that there is no such thing as time?

“To deny time is a tremendous activity of having no problems. Any problem that arises, any question is immediately solved.”

Bohm asks if that is sustained, does it last?

“It is sustained; otherwise there is no point in it. It is not sporadic, intermittent”, K answers.

But has the brain the capacity to see what it is doing now? There seems to be no end to conflict. Is the brain totally caught in time or can it change?

K asks, What is the factor that will make the brain see that the way it has worked is not correct but totally mischievous?

“People have tried fasting, no sex, austerity, poverty, chastity in the real sense, purity. None have succeeded”, K says.

“To go further one has to deny the very notion of time in the sense of looking forward to the future and all the past”, Bohm answers.

“That is just it. Time is the enemy: *meet* it and *go beyond* it”, K comments.

Bohm clarifies: "To deny its independent existence. We have the impression that time exists independently of us. We are in the stream of time and therefore it would seem absurd for us to deny it because that is what we are."

There is one way to handle problems.

"Can we face any psychological problem, resolve it immediately as it arises? Not deceive myself, not resist it, but face it and end it? K asks.

Bohm answers that in psychological problems it is the *only* way. Otherwise we get caught in the very source of the problem.

"Any action which is not immediate has already brought in time. The ending of time is immediate."

When feeling something is out of order psychologically, we bring in the notion of time and thoughts of becoming and that creates endless problems.

"Man took a wrong turn when we got caught in psychological knowledge which is dominated by time. He lives in time, because he has attempted to produce knowledge of the nature of the mind", Bohm explains.

"Psychological experience is in time", K adds. "What is existence if there is no psychological knowledge, no sense of the 'me'? To come to that point most people would say, 'What a horror this is'."

Bohm answers that there seems to be nothing and it is either frightening or all right. To this K says: "Because there is nothing, there is everything."

All that is energy. It is no thing, but cosmic energy. Many religions have had this idea. It is seen as the source of all energy.

“Then is one just walking in emptiness? There is nothing and everything is energy?”, K asks. “This body and that energy are not different, but the thing inside says that ‘I am totally different from that’. Why has it done so? Is it because outwardly I identify with a house and that has moved inwardly?”

The form has no independent existence, there is only an outward shape floating in this energy.

“Do you realize what we have said, sir?” K asks Bohm. “Is this the end of the journey? Has mankind journeyed through millennia to come to this: that I am nothing and therefore I am everything and all energy?”

Bohm thinks it cannot be the end, on the contrary, it might be a *beginning*.

“The ending is the beginning. The ending of time is a new beginning. Let’s call it the ending of time”, K says.

Towards the ground

Second dialogue at Ojai 2 April 1980

The first session goes very deep, to the ending of time. The second dives even deeper, to unimaginable dimensions.

K starts by asking, What happens when the ‘me’ as time has come to an end? He wonders why we have not said: *let’s end conflict!* On the contrary, conflict has been *encouraged*. We think it helps us to progress and in a certain area it may do so.

Ending all conflict would mean that every issue is solved instantly and time is totally abolished.

We need no becoming, no hope, no wanting, no belief, and no promises from anyone. When the 'I' comes to an end, out of the ashes comes new growth and creation.

K puts forward the term the *particular mind* meaning a mind that belongs to an individual. This is what we call the self, a person with certain individual features, properties and qualities.

That is an integral part of what he calls the *universal mind*, common to all human beings. We are born with those features and share them with other people, apart from superficial differences in tendencies. The basics are the same: fear, sorrow, desires, will and conflict.

But that is not the end of the story. Beyond universal mind there *is something* that is almost impossible to give a name to. After a long search they decide to call it *the ground*.

K says that "in the universal order there is disorder, where man is concerned" and he asks, why has "that immense energy allowed man to move away in the wrong direction"?

Bohm assumes that "it is part of the order of the universe that this particular mechanism can go wrong, but it is not disorder in the universe, but at a much lower level".

"The possibility of creation is also the possibility of disorder. If man had the possibility of being creative, there would also be the possibility of a mistake. It could not be fixed like a machine and always operate in perfect order."

To come to the ground there must be the ending of time as desire and thought. Then there is absolutely nothing, not a thing from reality, only emptiness full of

energy. The ground is even *beyond that emptiness*. Our mind can never capture this absolute. Our mind can never perceive this absolute. It has no cause. It is immensity.

“There is nothing beyond it”, K says. “It is the beginning and the ending of *everything*. Everything is dying, *except that...*”

Bohm says at the end that “the Christian idea of heaven as perfection may seem rather boring because there is nothing to do”. The mood changes from sublime to something else as K remembers a joke of a man going to heaven to Saint Peter for last judgment.

Insight transforms thought

Third dialogue at Ojai 8 April 1980

Bohm starts the third discussion stating that in science there is an attempt to make material universe the ground of our existence. Not only physicists, but also geneticists and biologists have tried to reduce everything to the behaviour of matter – atoms, genes, DNA. The more they study, the more they feel it has no meaning.

“One of the difficulties of modern life is the sense that it doesn’t mean anything.”

Religious people have felt that the ground of our existence is beyond matter, but science began to deny this and many people no longer blindly believe in the religious meanings. Yet people want life to have a purpose or meaning beyond their daily activities.

People had felt that god was the ground who was *not* indifferent to mankind and that gave them tremendous energy. Also in the eastern traditions of mysticism this infinite has ultimate significance.

This raises a question whether the ground is indifferent to mankind in the same way as the universe is indifferent to us. It does not perhaps care whether or not man survives.

How would it be shown that the ground exists? Could one *prove* it scientifically, rationally or *sense* it and communicate it? K answers:

“You must *do* it, not just verbally talk about it. The ground has certain demands: absolute silence, absolute emptiness, which means no sense of egotism in any form. Am I willing to let go my egotism because I want to prove it, show it, and find out if what you are saying is actually true?”

‘Willing’ not in the sense of exercising will, it is being ready to find that the ground exists, to have no belief, just being in a state of absolute observation.

“I think if ten people do it, any scientist will accept it. But there are no ten people”, K notes.

“We have to do the thing publicly so that it becomes a real fact”, Bohm adds.

Our whole background is against all this. It gives us the notion of what makes sense and what does not.

Bohm suggests that the nature of time must be seen. Krishnamurti says that to realize if the ground exists, we must start ‘at the schoolboy level’.

First: *no belief*. See that you have a belief and it gives you a sense of security. That belief may be an illusion.

Second: *see the facts without prejudices*. The fact is what actually happens, not what we think of it.

We *think* we are rational and see the world as it is. We *think* we can *know* what is happening. We *think* we are different from others.

Actually, we are irrational, don't see or know the facts and are not fundamentally different psychologically. We live in a make-believe world.

All this happened after we took the wrong turning and thought became all important to us. We enthroned thought as the *only means of operation* and made it supreme, the king, the equivalent of truth.

To reach the ground we *must* be terribly rational, but we are *irrational* in our life. The irrationality is brought about by thought creating this idea of me as separate from everybody else. If we cannot find the cause of irrationality and wipe it out, we cannot reach the ground which is totally rational.

Thought is now the dominant factor in our life. By definition, thinking is the movement of memory, which consists of experience and knowledge stored up in our brain. When memory operates, we become irrational.

Yet, thought can also be the instrument of insight. Then memory is used but action is not based on memory. Thought being limited and divisive can never be rational without insight.

Insight is not the product of thought. Insight may use thought to explain, but it acts and in that action no thought is needed. Every response must be viewed with insight. Insight wipes away everything that is not true. Then we are not observing using time.

“You could say that time is a theory which everybody adopts for psychological purposes”, says Bohm.

Insight being free of time makes thought rational. When there is insight, there is only action. Because insight is rational, action is rational.

Old maps mislead us

Fourth dialogue at Ojai 10 April 1980

Breaking the pattern of ego-centred activity is the topic in the fourth discussion. There is something fundamental in human nature that resists change. We resist seeing the necessity of radical change almost purposely, but not consciously.

Thought is deceiving itself and does not wish to see the full meaninglessness of the conflict we live in. Our egotistic attitude and actions appear to change a bit here and there, but the centre has remained the same.

Philosophers and religious people have emphasized striving, struggling, controlling, making effort. Our mind is held in this pattern. We are used to it. We are in prison and resist seeing it. We hope that our struggle will finally produce something better, but everything happens in a very limited area.

There are different things that keep us in this pattern. Even if we are abstractly convinced that this pattern makes no sense, we have a thousand ways of preceding it.

We stick to our old patterns and don't let go. In a real emergency we may drop the self-enclosed pattern and

cooperate, but after the crisis we quickly return to life as usual.

We are willing to change, on one condition: there must be a reward big enough. We will climb the highest mountain if we get something out of it. This is how our mind works. We want to be rewarded or we act to avoid punishment.

The difficulty is that we see this only abstractly. Our thoughts make an abstraction from outward events and make them into inward ideas. To move away from this circle we have to look at it differently.

We are conditioned to a pattern that does not work. To break it we must discard all the knowledge, experiences and explanations. When we do that, our mind changes. We have walked that path for millennia, but now we stop, because that has not freed us from egocentrism.

When we have an insight, the mind breaks the old pattern. Then we listen without resistance, refuse to enter into the game of words. Insight is passion; it won't let us sit still. Like a river flows with great volume of water, in the same way passion makes us move.

Knowledge *cannot* solve our psychological problems. It can only make them worse by giving them continuance.

When in trouble we turn to others, but instead of helping us their advice makes us dull, dependent and more helpless.

Out of the shock a new mind

Fifth dialogue at Ojai 12 April 1980

The ground can be a comforting concept or an actual fact to us. It cannot be investigated with a mind that is disciplined in knowledge or be touched as long as there is any form of illusion, deception or desire. We cannot under any circumstances come upon it through manipulation of thought.

Is there a way to comprehend it or is this impossible? Somebody on the other side of the bank tells me there is no boat nor bridge to cross and I cannot swim.

"Suppose I want you, who say that there is the ground, to prove it to me", K starts.

"I have only this mind that has been conditioned by knowledge. How can I move away from all that, feel this thing, touch it, and comprehend it? I want to have this passion that will explode me out of this enclosure."

If I try to find a way I apparently fail to see that the centre is an illusion. An illusion cannot be related to something that is true. This insignificant little thing wants to have a relationship with that immensity. Impossible.

We have inside us a million years of experience and it tells us to go after 'the ground'. In trying to do that we may realize that there is no relationship between us and the ground. We cannot 'go there', there is no way.

"That is a tremendous shock to me. You have knocked me out", K says.

"It is a shock to discover that your brain, your mind, examination, your knowledge is valueless. All that you have gathered through the centuries is absolutely worthless. I must be very clear that I don't translate it into an idea, a concept, but receive the *full blow* of it!"

If it is an idea, it does not fundamentally affect the way we live, feel and think.

"I have finished with that kind of game. The purpose of investigating the mind is not to blast each other off the earth with guns!" K says.

The idea does not change the centre and so everything I do has no meaning. All the work I have done is valueless. If I drop all that, my mind *is* the ground. From there I create society.

Knowledge has not freed us from illusion; it has crippled us from seeing the truth.

"I want to clear up all the illusions that hold, not some. I have got rid of my illusion about nationalism, illusion about belief, about this and that. At the end of it I realize that my mind is illusion. To me, who has lived for a thousand years, it is something enormous to find it is worthless", K roars.

Bohm asks what K means when he says that he has lived a thousand or a million years, does it mean that all the experiences of mankind is me. He answers:

"I feel it. It is not an idea, a conclusion; it is part of me like a finger is part of me. It is not sympathy or empathy, it is not a thing that I have desired, it is an irrevocable fact to me."

Why don't we all see this?

“Because we are caught in this self-centred narrow little cell, and refuse to look beyond”, K says almost furiously.

“Your brain is not yours; it is the brain of mankind. You go to the most primitive villager in India and he will tell you all about his problems. It is exactly the same thing, only he is wearing different trousers. We are too clever, we don’t see a simple fact, we refuse to see it. Out of this something totally new is born. It is a *new mind*.”

Mutation in the brain cells

Sixth dialogue at Ojai 15 April 1980

In the sixth discussion Bohm asks, whether insight can actually change the brain cells? K points out that the brain functions now in one direction only: using memory, experience, knowledge. Most people are satisfied with that, partly because they don’t know of anything else.

Looking at the state of the world it seems obvious that a change has not happened, but is urgently needed. We cannot rely on the society or environment to change us and changing the contents of consciousness is no actual change. It will only lead to continuation of the problem in a new form.

What is there to change in the brain, what will change it and how?

K says that the brain cannot change itself; a flash of insight is needed. Insight is not a material process, but yet it can change the material process, which is thinking.

For Bohm it is difficult to imagine how something non-material could affect the material. In science, one-sided action is not possible; there is always interaction both ways.

K gives an example. Love is independent of hate. When there is hate, the other cannot exist. Additionally, violence and peace are two entirely different factors. Where there is violence, peace cannot be.

“Hate has a cause, love has not. Thought has a cause, insight has not. So the action of insight has an extraordinary effect on the material process”, K says.

“Insight is an energy which illuminates the activity of the brain. In that illumination the brain itself begins to act differently.”

Thought acts in the darkness of ignorance and the flash of insight enlightens it. Existence of light dispels the centre of darkness.

Then we may ask, why we don't have insight? Instead of looking for explanations, we might dig deeper and see the whole process in action. Insight stops the causal responses and we no longer react to hate with hate, violence with violence. Then we are free from reactive and time bound behaviour.

Dispelling darkness

Seventh dialogue at Ojai 17 April 1980

Human beings are still behaving with animal instincts. Feelings of hatred have become entangled and sustained with thought. The whole society is organized

under the assumption that fear, pleasure and pain are going to rule us if we do not control them.

Thought has operated in darkness and dispelling that darkness allows a new action in the brain. Man will then function rationally rather than by rules and reason. There is a freely flowing movement.

As long as the centre is creating darkness, there *must* be disorder. This procedure has created our society. Because of darkness, we don't realize the state we are in. We respond to hatred with hatred or we control our feelings. The third way is to escape to dreams and hope.

There are two ways to see the source of darkness: one way is to think it is far away in the past and has been gathered ever since into our mind. We once made a mistake and here we are.

Bohm suggests another way. We can think that darkness is timeless and is due to the fact that we are *continually* taking the wrong turn. The self is creating darkness and breeding division all the time, from moment to moment. The self could at *any time* leave darkness, but it does not do that.

If I realize that actually there is no such division as light and darkness, but that it is my thought that produces them, it is a shock to me. Insight breaks the pattern and there is no more division between god and man. All divisions are born out of darkness and all religions maintain these beliefs.

"In that ground there is no darkness as darkness, no light as light. It is not born of will, time or thought. It is non-divisive movement, timeless and therefore deathless", K lists.

On this level the death of an individual has no meaning.

"When the mind is partaking in that movement then the mind is that movement", Bohm says. This means that the division between life and death is abolished and clarity has broken the spell of darkness. Then we have removed the fear of death, one of the greatest factors of life. "

In darkness I can invent a lot of images: that there is light, god, beauty. Caught in a dark room I can invent a lot of pictures, but it does not bring light in.

A mind living in darkness is in constant movement. The brain cells are wearing out, decaying because of conflict and strain. The rate of decay can be greatly slowed down if the brain cells are no longer thinking in terms of psychological time. This direct perception would bring order to the brain. Then the brain has, according to K, undergone 'a surgical operation' and there is no death to it, because it does not live in the field of time.

Immensity calling

Eighth dialogue at Ojai 19 April 1980

The last discussion in Ojai raises the question how a man who has dispelled darkness in himself lives in the world. Of course, he does not participate in the process of becoming. His mind is still, but not static. A mind being nothing is empty of all psychological knowledge and is acting from insight.

He lives in society physically, but is out of it mentally. He obeys the laws and earns a livelihood, but does not identify with or conform to divisions made by humans.

Various religions have described a man who has been saved, who is illuminated: how he walks, looks, talks. K describes such a man "a single tree in a field".

What can such a man do for another? Not much. He can talk and write, but there is no guarantee that it has an effect. It depends how the other takes it. Will he listen, worship or kill him?

K asks, what would happen, if there were ten or fifteen 'enlightened' ones?

Bohm answers: "There would be something revolutionary, the whole framework would change. Even if ten or fifteen people were undivided, they would exert a force that has never been seen in our history."

Those people would be intelligent enough not to provoke society and society would not react before it is too late.

Yet, the wise person has another task beyond trivial and small business. He is doing something totally different to affect the consciousness of man. There is a more direct action at a much greater level than one can possibly conceive. The insight has direct action at a much greater level and this affects the consciousness of people living in darkness.

"Somehow he makes possible an activity of the ground in the whole of consciousness of mankind which would not have been possible without him", Bohm puts it.

He may look similar to others but there is something going on that does not show. And he is saying something totally different. His insight comes from the ground. The ground is in some sense using him, *employing* him.

Doing nothing might be the essential kind of doing. According to Bohm he is “supremely active in doing nothing” and makes possible the action of the ground. There is an analogy in chemistry. A catalyst makes possible a certain action without itself taking part but by being what it is.

Bohm sees “a general view which people are developing now that the universe has no meaning, that it moves any old way without any meaning. K disagrees about the insignificance of the universe.

“None of them have meaning for the man who is *here*, but the man who is *there* says it is full of meaning, not invented by thought.”

Whatever the man with insight says is translated into some illusory stuff. We are offered the whole universe, but mind reduces it or does not even look at it. If the whole of mankind were to see this immensity, we would, in K’s words, have ‘a paradise on earth’ and a new kind of organism.

“To reduce this immensity to some few words seems so stupid. People are looking at it with eyes that are so accustomed to this pettiness that they either reduce it or put it in a temple and it is completely lost.”

To divert the course of destruction somebody must listen to that immensity calling.

Old brain cannot create a new mind

Ninth dialogue at Brockwood Park 1 June 1980

The next two sessions were at Brockwood Park in June

1980 dealing with senility and cosmic order. Also participating was the principal of the Krishnamurti School in India, Giddu Narayan.

Krishnamurti expresses his concern about the state of the human brain. It seems to be deteriorating.

"We have a highly cultivated civilization and yet at the same time barbarous, great selfishness clothed in spiritual garbs. Our brain is divisive and destructive. We do not know if it is capable of revival or will it slowly and steadily decline."

The human brain is a development of thousands of years. It is old and does not belong to any individual. It bears the history of man, although we mistakenly think of it as being something personal and subjective.

The brain functions in narrow patterns. K asks, what would break down this forming of patterns, and is it after so many shocks even *capable* of renewing? The fundamental change cannot be done from outside, but the brain does not seem to have enough energy to break all patterns and move out of its own prison.

The brain is in constant occupation. Keeping busy doing something gives energy to the brain. Yet it is working mechanically in a routine, becomes dull and begins to shrink.

Bohm says that science has shown that a brain is similar to a muscle. We must exercise to keep it fit. Yet, moving in a pattern the brain is moving in a way that does not use its full capacity. To this K says sarcastically:

"People who have spent years and years in meditation are the dumbest people on earth."

Bohm adds that when people were living close to nature it was impossible to live in a routine.

The shrinking of the brain starts when we begin to gather psychological knowledge about the self and our relationships to others. Routine in that area is much more dangerous for the brain than routine in work.

It is known that large parts of the brain deal with movement of the body, muscles and various organs. That part does not shrink, but the part that deals with rational thought shrinks if it is not used. There may, of course, be other functions that are unknown or very little is known about them.

K argues that we use our brain very partially. The degeneration of the brain cells may also come from the wrong way of using the brain. Bohm says there is little evidence of this from the scientists, but adds that brain science does not know very much about this.

“Brain specialists are examining things outside and not using themselves as guinea pigs”, K points out.

“Any occupation with oneself apart from purely *physical* activity brings about shrinkage of the brain, but it can be stopped and renewed. The Freudians, the Jungians and the latest psychologists are all *helping* to make the brain shrink.”

We must reject the tradition to analyse and introspect and focus our attention on *direct perception* and *immediate action*. The past perceives and twists the present, making the brain senile. Our illusions are very vital.

The sense of individuality is the root of the problem and if we see the fallacy of this, something happens in our brain cells. They stop moving.

"You may disagree, you may say, "Prove it!" I say this is not a matter of proof, it is a matter of *action*. *Do it*, find out, test it!"

The occupied brain is unable to listen or act properly. A flash of insight frees the brain from the past. There is silence and that brings about a sense of limitless state.

Cosmos is in meditation

Tenth dialogue at Brockwood Park 7 June 1980

Is there cosmic order, something which man has not made nor can ever possibly conceive? The brain is so contradictory and bruised that it cannot find any order within or without.

Nature is in order, but consciousness is not. We accept living in disorder, because that is all we know.

If we give up the past, the 'me' has no existence, we *have* nothing, we *are* nothing. Yet we do not feel that we cling to the past, but think that we are reaching for the future.

"As long as we have our roots in the past, there cannot be order. If we give up the past, there is nothing to reach for. People dangle a carrot in front of us and we follow it. If there were no carrots, there would be nothing to go for", Krishnamurti says.

Being totally new to it, the brain is not willing to face this extraordinary state: to exist in a state of nothingness. That is appallingly frightening.

The brain could possibly do this, unless it was damaged. Many factors are causing damage. One is

strong *sustained emotions* like hatred, anger, violence, excessive excitation, fear and emphasis on sustained pleasure. Drugs damage the brain, too.

The damaged brain is healed when there is insight. It wipes away the past. When there is no becoming, no being something, *the cosmos is in meditation*, in a state of infinity.

When the past is cleaned up and consciousness is empty of its content as anger, jealousy, beliefs, dogmas, attachments, the universe is no more governed by its past. It is in order, free and creative. K adds:

"The actual feeling of having no tomorrow is the healthiest way of living."

Thought has entangled the brain in time and when that entanglement is freed, the universe is the mind. That is order.

From a little pond to the ocean

Eleventh dialogue at Brockwood Park 14 September 1980

Three months later Krishnamurti and Bohm met again in Brockwood Park to continue the series of dialogues for five more times in one week. For some unknown reason, the first two discussions were not in the first edition of the book, but were published later in the revised edition in 2014.

First K reminds us what they talked about in the earlier meetings and feels there are three basic questions at hand:

"Is there an original source, a ground from which nature, human beings and the whole universe sprang? Is it bound by time? Is it in itself complete order, beyond which there is nothing more?

Bohm says that science as it is constituted cannot answer to these.

"Implicitly science has been concerned with trying to come to this ground, but to attempt it by studying matter to the greatest depth is not enough."

Seeing the disorder in the world and in ourselves, a thoughtful man must feel the urge to do something, but one individual living orderly of course cannot create a good society.

Our own house must be in order, but we don't have the courage and the vitality to do even that. Without insight into the root of conflict there will be no change.

We could start our own investigation by seeing first what we are tied to: a belief, person, idea, habit, experience. All dependence must inevitably create disorder. Total insight into attachment penetrates into the centre of darkness and dark clouds in the mind vanish in one moment.

Society is a machine that is destructive in itself. Having realized this, any sane human intelligence wants to do something, not just sit back and talk about it. Sadly, most people feel doing something consists of solving particular problems and not tackling the whole.

The solution to problems does not resolve the question of source. We are dealing with a little pond and do not see the great stream.

To bring order our mind must be free from measurement. Almost an instinctive reaction of seeing disorder is to try to correct it. That is a fundamental mistake. All effort is still disorder.

This is a very different view than what we have been taught to do. Any attempt to control is wrong and the source of disorder. An insight into this liberates the mind from a massive burden.

Insight comes from looking at any problem with pure observation, without any pressure, without any motive. We think that if we don't control the mind, it will go wild. On the contrary, the measurement is 'wild-ing' and causes confusion in us.

Through the right kind of meditation the mind can find a state where there is something which is not man-made.

All man-made things are limited: religions, science, worship, prayers, anxieties, sorrow and suffering, attachment and detachment, loneliness, revolutions. And man also invented a concept of god and gave him the power of the absolute.

Because we are caught in thought we block the tremendous potential that the human mind has to go beyond its limits; limits created by the illusion that we are individuals.

A thorn in thought

Twelfth dialogue at Brockwood Park 16 September 1980

Bohm says people divide themselves roughly into two groups. One group feels the most important thing is the daily activity we do. The other group thinks the universal is the ground. The first view is practical and the second more philosophical. People tend to give primary value to one or the other.

Krishnamurti says that the essence of everything is beyond both the particular and the general mind. We are not either-or but both. Thought has created both and it is moving between these two all the time. The movement is in time, or *in moving it creates* time. Thought gathers knowledge and experiences. If there is no gathering, there is no time.

Time is needed in making progress physically, but in the psyche there is nothing else progressing or growing but images.

The images we have gathered mind are limited. There can always be more *of* it or more *to* it. Having 'more' is a real thorn. It arouses desire and will, and then we are stuck into gaining, achieving, comparing, advancing. So we are caught by living in time.

It may be difficult to see what the harm in wanting more is. What could be wrong with having a better self or better life? The harm and wrong is not in *having*, but in the *wanting* something we do not have. It actually means that we are always living in shortage.

The worst harm is that desire *divides* inside and outside. If I am a Muslim and you a Jew, we are separate and in conflict. We may get used to it or tolerate it, but it is all the time waiting in us to explode. We may perhaps avoid it, if we never meet, but we cannot live in a vacuum – or it is not right to call it living.

Additional harm is that the self is preventing me from being free. I have tied myself to a short rope, living inside my little territory of fears and hopes, pleasures and sorrows, likes and dislikes, preferences and prejudices.

There is no real love in the world of images. Love is not something we can gather and store. There is love or there is none. If we love our images, we actually love ourselves, not the person or thing.

Knocked by knowledge

Thirteenth dialogue at Brockwood Park 18 September 1980

The session starts with Krishnamurti asking, What makes the mind always follow a certain pattern? If it lets go of one pattern, it picks up another.

There are many possible answers, some right and some not. It is very important to see why we disregard our own flowering, and fall into this groove. Psychological knowledge stupefies the brain so that it can't see what it is doing. K asks:

"We are strangely intelligent, capable, or skilled in other directions, but here, where the root of all trouble is, why don't we comprehend what is happening? "

It takes considerable effort first of all to see this and then to get rid of it. If I am nationalistic or have a strong conviction or belief, I am blind in that area. Nothing convinces me.

Knowledge about nation or god seems to have tremendous value beyond other values. It holds the mind, and the mind refuses to let go. There are a lot of feelings and meanings invested in these beliefs. They are all-important to us.

"The general difficulty is that knowledge is not just sitting there as a form of information but it is extremely active, meeting and shaping every moment according to past knowledge", Bohm says.

We regard knowledge as something passive which we know and could use if we want to or put aside if we don't need it. It is not so. Knowledge actively prevents the truth from entering our mind.

I may see the logic and reason for change, yet it is not a *burning flame* that demands action but rather only a lame idea to think about.

The capacity to *listen* may be far more important than any explanation. When we listen completely the wall is broken down, the wall of opinions. K argues that it may be as simple as that.

To diligently attend means that our mind is empty. We must have a certain emptiness from which there will be a different perception.

The universe as the body of the mind

Fourteenth dialogue at Brockwood Park 20 September 1980

New theme: Krishnamurti starts the session asking, What is materialism? Bohm says that all matter seems to go by the law of action and reaction. Every action has a corresponding reaction. All human beings react physically and reactions are sustained by thought. So reactions are materialistic responses.

Is it possible for the mind to go beyond reaction? Physically we must of course react, otherwise we are paralyzed or dead, but reacting psychologically is also a form of paralysis.

Action and reaction seems to be an endless movement. Can reaction end? Or there may be a movement that has no beginning and no end. It is a movement not in time or in space. To understand that we must be free of thought.

That movement is not determined as a series of successions from the past. It is active, not still, but in that energy there is stillness. It is not a movement of causation. That silent movement with its unending newness is total order of the universe.

It is important to see that this emptiness is within the brain itself and not something thought conceives as being empty. Whichever it is, thought wants to do something about it. It thinks it can be helpful, make a contribution.

In this movement there are no things and no time. It is easy to deceive oneself and indulge in imagination. In this timeless energy there is no centre reacting. It is not determined as a series of successions from the past. It has no causation.

This tremendous energy is active. It can be never still, but it has stillness in it. So it is both still and moving, a movement emerging from stillness.

"When it is completely still there is a movement out of it", K says and adds joyfully: "It sounds crazy!"

Bohm says that this is somewhat similar to what Aristotle called the unmoved mover referring to god, but K says abruptly that he is *not* talking about god nor does he want to create an intellectual concept about this.

This movement is eternally new. It is in order, or: it *is* order. Yet, the order of thought is of time and there is a contradiction inherent in it. When it is rational, it is in order, but in contradiction this order is broken down.

Our daily life is a series of reactions and struggling to bring order within disorder. Trying to do that is sustaining disorder.

Some people think it is enough to be happy within those limits, discovering new thoughts, enjoying new art and science, accepting the human conditioning and making the best of it.

We are happy until we meet a conflict. Our fears come true and we suffer sooner or later. Then we have a chance to realize that we are in prison and although the prison may be pleasant, there is no freedom and we suffer. The pain demands that we get over it or go beyond.

The urge for freedom is either a reaction to pain or deep insight into the whole structure of our mind. Every form of escape is only a reaction, another form of idiocy.

When the mind has emptied itself, it is no longer separate from the universe. Then they are one. So the material universe is like the body of the absolute mind.

Refuse to have problems!

Fifteenth dialogue at Brockwood Park 27 September 1980

The last dialogue deals with getting over our problems, all of them. We have been able to solve very difficult technological problems, but our essential human problems such as sorrow, fear and violence have *never* been solved.

We are drowning in our problems of communication, knowledge, relationship, freedom, heaven and hell. Our existence has become a vast, complex problem and we have never been free of problems.

There seems to be something extraordinarily wrong here. It seems that our education and deep rooted tradition is to accept things as they are although we see that they are not right.

Krishnamurti asks: "Is it possible to have no human problems? Personally I *refuse* to have problems."

It seems almost impossible to *think* and *work together*, to have a same outlook, to give up our opinions and self-interest. Each person has his own opinion and is contradicted by others. In the United Nations they are not working together. In India they are not working together. No people in any country feel or work together. How are we to face and break this pattern?

We can give many answers, but explanations don't solve the issue. A new factor is needed. Krishnamurti suggests that it is *attention*.

"Where there is attention, there is no problem. In attention there is no centre from which I attend", K says.

Attention is not concentration. It is not a struggle to be attentive. To find out what attention actually is we must understand inattention; through negation come to the positive.

In our lack of attention we identify ourselves with many things, pleasant and unpleasant. There is indolence, negligence, self-concern, self-contradiction.

The attempt to *become* means there is no attention. Psychological becoming breeds inattention. Becoming is a curse outwardly and inwardly. A poor man wants to be rich and a rich man still richer.

Though it brings a great deal of pain and sometimes pleasure, this sense of becoming and fulfilling has made our life what it is. We expect a reward, we are afraid of not getting it and try to avoid pain and being punished. We are caught in that vicious circle.

We realize this, but cannot stop. This illusion is so strong and has been nurtured by religions and tradition and our family. We refuse to let that burden go.

We may say we want to change but we also wish not to change. Our minds are diseased, so corrupt, so confused that although someone points all the dangers of it, we refuse to see this.

"I am sure there is a way of communicating which is not verbal, another element which breaks through all the inability to listen and break the walls that human beings have built for themselves."

Love is the element that is lacking and which may break through this clever, analytical approach. Attention, perception, intelligence and love are essential in life. Love is not something isolated. It is not yours or mine. It is not personal. It is common ground for all of us.

"That word has become corrupted, loaded, dirty. I am chary beyond words of that word, which is why I say it is rather a risky word", K says.

A fragmentary mind invents this illusion of love being personal. The same holds true for grief and intelligence. The illusion is common to us all. And the earth is not English or French, or in chemistry sodium is not my sodium.

Our minds refuse to see this because we are conditioned to feel so terribly personal.

"If love is common, why are we blind to this obvious fact?" K asks. "How do you convey that love is universal and not personal to a man who has lived completely in the narrow groove of personal achievement?"

Bohm suggests that to realize this one should first question that our personality is something unique, very special and different from all others. We are basically human, of the same quality.

K specifies: "Suppose I have a brother to whom I have a great affection. I want him to see that this flame can be awakened in him. I have tried to communicate all this with him verbally and by gesture, but he refuses to listen, so he is left where he was. The whole structure of thought holds him."

Krishnamurti cries out almost in pain: "*We must solve this. It has not been solved. The way we are living is so wrong. We have not changed it. We are seeking after that but the weight of our body, brain, tradition draws us back. So it is a constant battle. This whole way of living is so wrong.*"

"We seem to have taken a wrong turn and entered into a valley where there is no escape, but that is too depressing and appalling."

Bohm asks if K sees some possibility of a real change in human nature.

"*Of course.* Otherwise everything would be meaningless; we'd be monkeys, machines. That faculty to radical transformation is attributed to some outside agency. We look to that and get lost in that. If we don't look to anybody and are completely free from all that, that solitude is common to all of us."

All fundamental things are universal. When the mind goes deep, it comes into something universal or absolute. To go profoundly into the mind requires not only courage, but the sense of constant pursuing the same stream.

Mind can go from the particular to the general and from the general to the universal.

Some would say all of this is very abstract and has nothing to do with daily life. K totally disagrees.

"This is the *most practical* thing." Constant killing and conflicts are not practical! "The particular is the most dangerous, because you get to the particular by abstracting", Bohm points out.

"People feel they want something that really affects their daily life and all these vapid generalities don't interest them. It is true that it must work in daily life, but daily life does not contain the solution to its problems."

In solving the concrete issues arising in daily life, we get lost in ideas, in thinking and talking without end. There is no attention, no intelligence, no compassion, no end to human problems. The ending of time comes when we give ourselves to find out what is true.

From the particular move to the general, from there still deeper. There is the purity of what is called love, compassion, and intelligence. That means giving your mind, heart and whole to this.

8. The potent powers of our mind

David Bohm and David Shainberg arranged many meetings where Krishnamurti held discussions with scientists. Some were successes but not all.

Bohm was present but not very active in three discussions in June 1978 with two Buddhist scholars Walpola Rahula and Irmgard Schloegl. Once again he could clarify some seeming differences.

Why we compare?

First discussion at Brockwood Park 22 June 1978

Doctor Rahula starts the first session saying that K is teaching quite the same that Buddha taught 2500 years earlier, but in different idioms. He lists identical points in the teachings: existence of god, suffering, desire, reality, authorities and awareness. Rahula finds nothing in K's teachings that is different from what the Buddha preached.

K is very frank but not grumpy, asking: "Why do you compare? What is the necessity of comparing? Does the gamut of so-called sacred books help man at all? Has knowledge the liberating quality of the mind?"

Rahula says that knowledge conditions man, but it is not completely unnecessary, because man need a boat to cross the river.

"All knowledge disappears the moment you see the truth."

But can knowledge ever free the mind or does it prevent the liberation by strengthening the ego?

"Can the mind burdened with knowledge see truth? Most minds are filled and crippled with knowledge. Why should one accumulate knowledge and then abandon it?" K asks.

All religious traditions are caught up in evolution of the self and so they are strengthening the self, not freeing us. They condition us to live in ideas and illusions.

Bohm asks whether Rahula accepts that he is conditioned. He says he accepts it. Bohm asks *how* one knows that? There are two options: either by observing people we come to the conclusion that all human beings are conditioned or one sees it directly in oneself.

If we base our acceptance on outward observation, it is merely a conclusion and not a fact. But if we directly see our own conditioning, we can understand that we are not different from our own conditioning.

What follows is incoherent verbalization of concepts and their content, jumping from one theme to another. Rahula thinks what K is saying also conditions men but K does not believe that is happening. Sincere enquiring cannot condition mind, only conceptualization does so. Why do we make everything into a concept? Because we are not able to keep ourselves in facts.

Thinking dualistically is to K the sordid invention of philosophers and intellectuals. When we are not able to deal with facts, we invent an idea. That is one form of escape, running away.

Our minds are full of words and with words we look at everything. If we can look without the past remembrance, we don't need an idea of becoming something else.

The idea of evolution from bad to good which religions have adopted leads us to live in a corridor of opposites. To zen scholar Schloegl 'this channel of opposites is a humanizing factor'. K does of course not agree and gives a familiar example:

When we notice that are greedy, we want to get rid of greed. To do that takes time. This means that everything becomes relative, because we invent in our mind an opposite to what is actually happening.

"The question is after all how to be free of greed now, not eventually. I am not interested what happens in next life or tomorrow. I want to be free of sorrow and pain now. Can I look at them, condemning without words?" K asks.

"Can I look at that tree, woman, man or heaven without the word? If someone comes along and wants to help me in looking, then I am lost."

Within me, without me

Second discussion at Brockwood Park 23 June 1978

In the second session Rahula wants to ask three questions to Krishnamurti, but only one is dealt with. He wants to know, what happens to a liberated man when he dies? When this was asked from Buddha, he answered that it is not possible to answer in dualistic terms.

K answers by asking: What is living?, and Is there a state of a mind that is dead or dying?

First K wants to investigate: What is the self, the 'me'? It consists of everything we identify ourselves with: the name, the body, experiences, fears, pain, characters, joys, inspiration, troubles, furniture, property and beliefs.

"Can identification end? Identification is the movement of thought and death is the ending of that movement or continuation of it in the next life."

A liberated man does not wait until death collects him, but he dies to everything known while living. So it is irrelevant to think over what happens in death. What is essential is what we do while living, with our lives. Are we ready to let conditioning go or not, and do we think it is possible or even desired? Is there a state of mind without the 'me'?

Bohm asks, how do we listen to that question? Do we listen through our previous ideas and what we know or do we listen openly?

"It seems there is a tendency to listen through the word. Identification is going on while one thinks one is listening."

Identification makes thought do all the wrong things. When the self is not and we don't identify ourselves with anything, it means death while living. There are sensations of course, blood circulating, breathing, brain working, but no sense of 'me'.

"Is that love? Do we love a woman or man, child, sky, stone or a stray cat when we are not identifying? I am asking this as another human being."

We must see that the 'me' is born of identification. We must see it as we see a dangerous animal.

The fact is that we are taught to identify with our family, friends, country, god, experiences, hurts, hopes, dreams, kings and queens. All this we call the self. To die to all that dependence means that our mind is in a totally different state.

Free will or no choice?

Third discussion at Brockwood Park 23 June 1978

The third discussion starts with speculations about free will and choice. Is there free will at all? Why do we think it is so important? Apart from material things in reality, why do we choose at all?

K wants to investigate if there is action that is not based on ideals, desire or will. Most of our actions have a motive. Identification is usually behind a motive. Bohm wants to ask why human beings identify. K takes a simple example:

We see a beautiful lake. The joy of seeing it awakens thinking. We identify with the sensation. We perhaps want to build a house there. A pleasurable feeling has become a memory and does not give up even if we wanted to do so. If we don't get the house we get disappointed.

"Thought seems to have fallen into a trap because it innocently remembered pleasure and made it important. Doing so, the brain starts to act irrationally", Bohm explains.

Can this process of identification be stopped? How can you look at yourself without a motive? Only by seeing the facts without time and thought.

In these three discussions it becomes clear how difficult it is to talk about things when you 'know'. Instead of actual facts we start to talk about words and concepts out of context. K tries persistently to keep Buddha away, but does not succeed. What actually matters is what we are. To understand *what is* we don't need interpreters but a straight view.

The brain is more than a computer

Discussion at Ojai 1 April 1981

Krishnamurti often talked about the threat of computers to the human mind. He said he had discussed this with several experts and they all were more or less certain that since computers can perform many similar functions as thought, they will 'outstrip man'.

Bohm joined K and computer specialist Asit Chandmal and they had a dialogue in Ojai on April 1981. It was published in the book *Questioning Krishnamurti* in 1996.

K starts by asking, What will happen to man after computers learn how to solve economic and social problems, correct itself and perhaps discover new things?

Bohm does not believe that computers can ever solve economic or political problems, simply because these are so tightly connected to psychological problems.

The computer is programmed according to certain assumptions and it can do many things but not everything which thought is doing.

“The human brain is able to change the assumptions when we find they are not working.”

Chandmal insists that the human brain has limitations but Bohm questions that. People may work in terms of fixed assumptions but there is no reason why they must do so, except out of habit or tradition. When one sees that an assumption is not working, you can see the contradiction and change the assumption.

Computers are effective in mechanical tasks and formal logic, but there will always be new situations where any set of assumptions fail to be consistent.

“The computer is a sort of tremendous simplification of the human brain. The human brain is infinite, the computer is finite.”

K brings the words insight and intelligence into the discussion. Neither of them is mechanical. Chandmal says that they both are very rare. There are not many Einsteins or Beethovens in the world.

“I think the rarity is irrelevant”, Bohm argues. “People tend to be caught in the mechanical, but the fact that it is rare does not make it less significant.”

People have made fixed assumptions about the world and think they are true. Intelligence does not make such assumptions but reads between the lines. It gathers information but does not put it into fixed categories as thought does and computer does.

“It seems to me that man ‘became a computer’ and then made another computer”, Bohm says.

Human beings have the capacity for insight, but a computer is programmed by a limited human mind. It is vital to find and use that capacity of insight. The wrong question to ask would be if we personally have an insight or not. The right question is: does the mechanical process of thinking ever stop? It may stop when one is tired or because of lack of oxygen, but that is not insight.

In finding insight it is essential to observe the state of our mind when we ask that question. If we want insight just to solve our problems, we are on the wrong track. We must be in a state of not-knowing, not-wanting, not-expecting and focus on understanding only.

We want to understand or feel the contours, the smell of insight. Our mind can be free of the mechanical. The computer cannot.

Insight is perception without an analytical process. With logic we cannot come to insight. If we start with logic, we start with the fixed assumptions that are fundamentally wrong. When we start from insight, we start from something new. Insight changes the basis on which we reason.

Master of own time

Discussion at Brockwood Park 12 February 1982

English physicist and molecular biologist, Professor Maurice Wilkins, attended the scientist sessions, but also has one discussion with Krishnamurti and Bohm in February 1982 about thinking together and mastering one's inward time.

Wilkins was a colleague of Bohm from London University, a Nobel Prize laureate in 1962 for his work on determining the structure of DNA.

Krishnamurti starts by stating that it is quite difficult for people to *think together*, not about something specific but have the capacity to go into something deeply. People stick to their opinions and that prevents them from co-operating. It is difficult to examine freely, if everybody is quite certain about his view.

"If we wanted to have peace in the world, we would have the two sides ready to discuss without fixed opinions", Bohm says.

It is not only politicians who don't think together. Wilkins argues that ordinary citizens must overcome their sense of helplessness and stop blaming the leaders. Hierarchical society conditions us to feel helpless.

Bohm thinks it is not the right order to begin from others. K agrees and wonders why we *miss passion*. Why are we so lukewarm? We want power and pleasure, but perhaps never had passion for doing correct and good things.

K tells that he had just been in India. People there seek solutions but can't find them because seeking does not solve the problems. The approach to the problem is utterly important. First, we must see that the problem is *not* out there but we *are* the problem of the world.

The vast majority of people are concerned with *immediacy*. They want bread first. And the leisure class uses their leisure to amuse and entertain themselves.

"There is a door open for me to escape from all this horror - not escape, but to understand this whole business. How will you help me?" K asks.

Deep understanding of time is necessary. Could we be masters of our inward time? Inward time is the interval between thinking and doing. If we could shorten it or make it disappear totally, 'what is' would become all important and we could give our whole energy to it.

K questions the whole issue of thought dominating my life.

"When I love I don't have to think. Love is comprehensive in the sense whole. Thought destroys the quality and beauty of relationship'.

All religions have turned love to mean something we feel for a particular object, idea or symbol. But that is not real love, it is a sensation only. As long as there is a self, there is no love.

To love somebody wanting nothing from her or him is marvellous. That is freedom. To be free we must die every day to everything we have gathered. If we can't do this, we are slaves and not masters of our time.

Sustaining selfishness

First discussion at Ojai 16 April 1982

In April 1982 K and Bohm sat with biologist Rupert Sheldrake and psychiatrist John Hidley and had four sessions about the nature of the mind. K begins on a heavy note:

"Self-centred activity is the very source of disorder. The egotistic attitude towards life, the sense of individual, emphasis on individual happiness and salvation is the origin of all disorder inside and outside."

Hidley is not sure. He admits that it creates the symptoms but is it justified to say that it is the source.

"Psychiatrists and psychologists look at this that the problem is to have an *adequate* self, defining normality so that the self is functioning *sufficiently*."

To K that means furthering more misery. Bohm feels that their purpose is that a properly organized self could get together with other properly organized selves and make an orderly society.

As a biologist Sheldrake thinks that the context is broader. There is disorder in nature, too. Animals are suffering and there are conflicts between forces of nature, between animals, even in the plant world when they compete for light.

Bohm opposes. The phenomena described are not disorder or at least they are different from disorder in consciousness. Hidley has seen there is suffering in all people in different amounts, but it is not obvious that it is necessary.

K questions: Must human beings inevitably live in agony and suffer? Physical suffering is obvious, but we can forget it if we don't give it continuity in thought.

Sheldrake insists that we inherit the pecking order and selfish activity from animals.

"There has always been wars and conflicts and there always will be. The most we could do is to try to minimize the effects or make them livable with."

K wants to enquire: Is it possible to change this conditioning? It means we have to change ourselves, not the society as communists tried to do.

Bohm clarifies that K talks about a fundamental change and not just a superficial transfer of the object of aggression.

Then K asks Hidley what he, as a psychiatrist, tries to do: free people from conditioning or accept and modify it? When he answers: to modify, K wants to know why. Hidley explains:

“Conditioning is seen as biological and therefore fixed. A person is born with a certain temperament. It is not clear to therapists that the problem can be dealt with as a whole but as particulars.”

Psychologists are concerned with solving individual problems, they do not think about human suffering as a whole and they feel there is nothing wrong with that.

But K puts more pressure on Hidley: “So you are emphasizing his particular suffering and so *sustaining* it. You are *helping* me to be more selfish, self-concerned, self-committed!”

Hidley says that he can help the patient to be less self-concerned but admits that he leaves the self intact.

Bohm points out that people generally try to improve the self and that a certain amount of self-centredness is normal.

To K this means that we are only *modifying selfishness* and that is very irrational and impractical. Hearing this most people shut their ears and don't want to listen.

There may be few that want to investigate this deeper and find out if there is a way out of selfish outlook.

The first thing is to make *the relationship with life* right. If that is not right, how can we find out something that is immensely beyond all this?

We must be honest and not be satisfied with explanations or knowledge about ourselves. We must go beyond the 'me' and not depend on anybody. To do that we must explore dependence.

We depend because we want security and we think we get it from ideas, principles, faith, dogmas, house, furniture and wife or husband. If we don't find security in one sect we continue seeking.

From animal to human

Second discussion at Ojai 17 April 1982

In the next session Hidley asks Bohm about his comment about biological conditioning and psychological security.

"In the higher animals there is some memory, but in man memory becomes very significant. Animals forget bad experiences, but people may have quarrels between two groups for hundreds of years. Memory by itself would not cause any trouble, but it produces fear, anger and all sorts of disturbances. Most animals cannot form an image of the other animals, but man can remember an insult and revenge the vendetta in families over many centuries."

Biological facts are not a serious problem, but when we begin to think about bad incidents, it is very difficult to stop.

The purpose of thinking is to give us security and avoid suffering. We are looking for thoughts that would give us good feelings, but some memories are very disturbing and haunt us. Then we decide that it is more important to feel better than to find out what is true. We adopt a wrong way of feeling good and try to force our mind into a comfortable mood.

We know it does not work. There is no working way to force our feelings. Our thoughts take the place of reality and there is a good deal of self-deception there.

One threat to our mental mood is the feeling of being hurt. Psychological hurts cause us to do all kinds of neurotic actions. We are hurt because we have an image of ourselves as being a great human, but somebody tells us that we are idiots. We have invested many feelings and emotions in our image. It feels very real but it is only a symbol. A symbol is never actual.

The essence of our image is identification with something greater. We identify with our nation, family, house, furniture, gods, ideas, ideologies, beliefs, roots. We build this image, because inwardly we feel insufficient.

In doing this we build a wall around ourselves and feel lonely and isolated. We are not satisfied and we want more. So we start the process of becoming something or being more. That means escaping from 'what is' through time.

Sheldrake says that identification is a biological fact. Deer go in flocks and bees have hives. We are social animals, too, and we must protect members of our families and rush to defend them. It is our reciprocal obligation to help others.

K asks to stretch it further to communities and nations and see what happens: "We are killing each other in the name of security. That is damned stupid!"

Sheldrake defends his standpoint by saying that we have *not* killed each other. There are more people than ever been before. K does not buy this. To him isolation is something that prevents security.

Clear the confused mind!

Third discussion at Ojai 17 April 1982

The third meeting is about the need for security. We can see that identification and isolation are destroying us, but yet we continue. The way we seek security is not working.

The ego is unstable. That may be one reason why there is in us this anxiety for security. The self is in a state of movement and when we feel uncertain and impermanent, we invent something permanent. We create the idea of God.

K is almost harsh: "To be secure is really a *disgusting* desire. To be secure in what? About what? Personally I never thought about security. I need food, clothes and shelter, but I don't want security."

The demand for security rises because our existence is based on dualistic division: we think we are different from the content of our consciousness.

Many people disagree because they have *not gone* into it.

We create the division when we try to act upon fear, anger, violence, desire or suffering. We create the conflict and keep it up by thinking. All these disturbances *block* our mind and *shrink* us.

When we are afraid or in deep sorrow we *cannot* think or act *rationally*. We have no tools to clear up the chaos we made. We try to do something because we don't realize that we *are* the chaos!

"To realize that is total attention. Then the chaos in consciousness does not exist anymore. It is only inattention that creates the problems", K says.

"I listen not only with the sensual ear but with the other ear. In attention there is no centre."

We do not listen because we like our dependencies more than we want to use the chance to be free.

Healthy mind is whole

Fourth discussion at Ojai 18 April 1982

Krishnamurti starts the fourth discussion by pointing out the difference between analysis and observation. In analysis there is an analyser observing something that he thinks is separate from him. The division is made by thought and thought continues creating conflict. If this is understood deeply, psychological problems end.

Then there are no separate individuals. We have established a right kind of relationship to all people.

Sheldrake says it is easy to have a good relationship with people we know, but 'how about the enemies like Russians whom we have never met'.

K asks, Who is an enemy to us? One who disagrees with us, with whom we have definitive ideological differences? This kind of phrasing is tribalism!

"We are human beings, not labels! We represent all humanity. We are like the rest. If hundreds of us all over the world really had a non-tribalistic attitude towards life, we would be acting like a light in the midst of darkness. But we don't."

In spite of the mess in the world nobody seems to want to go deeply into all of this. We feel we don't have time for this, but we have time for everything we regard as important. We say this is too difficult, not practical, as though all that we are doing is practical. Is fighting or endless entertaining oneself very practical?

Even in a neurotic world it is possible to have a healthy, whole and holy mind. To have that the mind must be free, not attached, not confused, groping, floundering, demanding, asking.

"We are so superficial and it seems to satisfy us. We are *educated to be cruel* to each other", K says.

"A healthy mind is without any conflict. Then it is a holistic mind. And then there is a possibility of that which is sacred to be."

9. Future in the now

The last published sessions between K and Bohm took place in June 1983 in England. They discussed the future of humanity. This time Bohm takes the role of a curious questioner rather than an investigator. He asks questions as if on behalf of those who don't understand or believe what K is saying.

That does not bother K. He keeps his course and answers patiently. There is no reason for us to suspect that K and Bohm disagree in the conclusions. They think alike about the problem and its solution.

The discussions were videotaped in colour and stereo sound. For reasons unknown to me, the little book *The Future of Humanity – two Dialogues between J Krishnamurti/David Bohm* was published after K's death in 1986.

In a short foreword, Bohm writes that the two dialogues are *profoundly affected* by the 15 sessions held three years earlier and provide important *additional insights* into the human problems and make reading the book easier and therefore it might serve as an introduction to *The Ending of Time*.

The starting point for their discussions was the question of the future of humanity. To Bohm it is “of *vital concern*, because modern science and technology has opened up immense possibilities of destruction.

The ultimate origin of this situation is in the generally confused mentality of mankind, which has not changed basically throughout the whole of recorded history. It

was essential to inquire deeply into the root of this difficulty if there is ever to be a possibility that humanity will be diverted from its present very dangerous course."

Once again it is stated that the problem is not in the world, it is in us, in our brain that is heavily conditioned. We have not been ready and able to '*change the irrational and self-destructive programme in which the brain seems to be helplessly caught up*'.

Krishnamurti does not, however, regard our limitations as inevitable. He says that mind is essentially free of distorting bias, and *insight arising in proper undirected attention* can change the cells of the brain and remove the destructive conditioning. It is "crucially important to give to this question the *same intensity of energy* that we generally give to other vital activities of life".

Bohm is quite optimistic about the possibility of profound change in human beings by insight:

"Modern research into the brain and nervous system gives considerable support to Krishnamurti's statement that insight may change the brain cells. It is well known that there are substances in the body, the hormones and the neurotransmitters, that fundamentally affect the entire functioning of the brain and nervous system. These substances respond, from moment to moment, to what a person knows, thinks, and to what all this means to him.

The brain cells and their functioning are profoundly affected by knowledge and thought, especially when these give rise to strong feelings and passions. It is thus quite plausible that insight, which must arise in a state of great mental energy and passion, could change the brain cells in an even more profound way."

Life is a live broadcast

First discussion at Brockwood Park 11 June 1983

Krishnamurti starts the dialogue by saying that the world has become tremendously dangerous. Terrorists, wars, national and racial divisions, religious separation, economic and ecological crisis make the future look very grim, depressing, dangerous and uncertain to both the present and the coming generations.

To find the solution, according to Bohm, we must stand back from our personal problems and urgent needs and take a much wider view.

We must first understand that our future is in the now, in the way we are living. Our big mistake is to think in terms of evolution. In the material world there is of course growing and becoming, progress or decay, being more or less. The species have evolved to what they are now and an acorn will grow into an oak. Physically the movement in time is a valid and natural process.

Psychological progress is something we made up, invented. It is real only because we think it is real. Our psyche is our past, a recollection of things we have experienced and adopted. So our future is determined by our past. We can do some modifications, choose differently, but it all happens in an area limited by our past. We can of course learn more and something new, but it is still restricted. We can never know everything.

We need knowledge in practical matters, but in the area of the psyche it is misleading. Thought stays in the same small circle, creating its own world. It divides the world in parts and concludes that they are separate.

It is quite all right and usually harmless to divide the material world. I am different from a tree or a table. My body is unique; otherwise it would be difficult to recognize that I am me. The difficulties start when I identify myself to some ideas or experiences and make them important. When I feel that I am better than you, I start a dangerous process leading to undesired effects.

Thought is necessary in science, art, culture, technology, communication, travel, medicine and surgery, but the sense of separation it creates is an illusion that has created a colossal mess in the world. We are so used to live in conflict that we don't even think of living without conflict. Is it even possible to live without conflict?

It is when there is no image, no psychological attributes of self, no judgments, conclusions, opinions, just to perceive the totality of this movement instantly without words, reactions or memories entering into our perception.

Only then we can have peace on earth. Thought will never bring about peace. When we operate from memory we are not very different from a computer.

Intelligence is free from programming; it has nothing to do with memory and experience. To understand intelligence, we must be free from suffering. As long as suffering, fear and pursuit of pleasure exist, there cannot be love and intelligence.

To be free from suffering means the ending of me. It is not my suffering; suffering is common to all mankind. We have not ended it because we treat it as personal. Suffering is part of our common consciousness. I am the world, I am my brother's keeper.

Many religions have said this, but they don't live it in their hearts. Religions have prevented us from understanding "I am the world" because they all have their particular beliefs and gods.

People are living in the world of dreams and that is not related to the world of being awake. But we cannot be compassionate if we are caught in belief systems and ideologies.

Terminate the tyranny of thought!

Second discussion at Brockwood Park 11 June 1983

Most psychologists according to Krishnamurti are not really concerned with the future of mankind; they rather only try to conform individuals to the present society. We must actually dissipate the conditioning in our consciousness, not modify it when it is not good enough. Psychological evolution will not lead to changed consciousness.

To change consciousness, it is important to separate the brain and the mind. Materialists say that mind is just a function of the brain. Another view is that they are two different things.

To K they are two different things but there is a contact between them. We can see by observing the activity of our own brain that it is like a computer that has been programmed and remembers. It is conditioned by past generations, by the society, by the newspapers and all the activities from the outside. It is made to conform to a certain pattern, lives entirely on the past, modifies itself in the present and goes on.

Some of the conditioning is useful and necessary, but the conditioning that determines the psyche may be even harmful. Giving importance to the self is creating great damage in the world.

The constant assertion of the self conditions the brain to an illusion that the self is real. Seeing the consequences of the illusion that the self is real raises the question: can the conditioning be dissipated physically and chemically, neurophysiologically?

At first sight it seems unlikely. Not too much seems to have happened in us. We really don't know the right answer. We can and must do what we feel is *the right thing to do*. There is no other way.

We must first understand that the fundamental change does not happen in time. The scientists who are trying to do it physically and chemically are still caught in time.

Secondly, we must see that the brain is acting in time. It is conditioned and not free to enquire in an unbiased way. And it must be free; otherwise it is caught in its own ideas.

The mind is *not* subject to the conditioning of the brain. The mind is *not* located inside the body or in the brain.

To change the brain, insight is needed. Insight is an activity of the mind, not the brain. Insight changes the brain cells. Then the brain is an instrument of the mind.

The conditioning occupies all capacities of the brain. It is operating in a very small area, running on its own programme like a computer. The brain should really be responding to the mind, but it cannot unless it is free from thought.

There can be no compassion as long as that conditioned programme dominates the brain. Compassion and intelligence come from beyond the brain. They can only exist when the brain is quiet.

That quietness is the natural outcome of understanding one's own conditioning. Then the mind can function through the brain.

Meditation is needed for the brain to be aware of the mind. The word generally means that there is a meditator meditating, but meditation really takes place when the brain is quiet.

All conscious doing is the activity of thought. If I consciously meditate I am making the brain conform to a series of patterns. Conscious activity to control thought is not freedom. There must be attention without the attempt to be present. In attention the self is not. Attention is undirected.

The programmed brain has no space and silence, because it is concerned with itself. When it is quiet there is insight and intelligence.

Practically everything mankind is doing or has tried to do is based on thought. But thought can never change the brain cells. Our instrument of action is worn out. In fact, it was never adequate.

Seeing the truth that thought has created terrible chaos in its activity, both externally and inwardly, we must seriously ask: is there an ending to all this?

If thought cannot end it, what will? What is the new instrument that will put an end to all this misery?

Is there a way to communicate this subtle and very complex issue to a person that is steeped in tradition?

Scientists and politicians won't listen to this, nor will the idealists, the totalitarians or the deeply dogmatic religious people listen. The rich man won't listen and the poor man wants bread first. They all have come to some conclusions. And all this must affect mankind.

The new instrument is intelligence. It is working in the mind but affects the brain. When the brain is quiet, the self is not. Then there is beauty, silence, space and intelligence born out of immense compassion.

10. The world is for all

To liberate the human mind is an ambitious mission. Many thinkers have wanted this to happen and have in different ways expressed ways to actualize it.

To Krishnamurti, freedom means to eliminate the vicious circle of our psychological conditioning, which manifests itself in a thousand different ways: fear and hate, desire and sorrow.

Mental freedom cannot come through will, living simply or believing in an idea. There should be no motive behind it, yet exploring our motives might give us a glimpse of what is keeping us in the prison of our thoughts. However it is not important to know *what* we are attached to, but to see *that* we *are* attached.

Krishnamurti wanted us to be free from *all* our mental cages, not just those that are most unpleasant. He spent over 60 years of his life in trying to get us to be free. Yet two days before his death he felt that *no-one* had succeeded.

Was there something *wrong* with his message? Did he admit his failure when he said this? Some say yes, but it is better not to make hasty conclusions about his statement. He was old, very ill and under heavy medication when he uttered this.

There is still a lot to do with human nature and maybe we will never manage to change. Maybe we will never manage to change our human nature. We are still

capable of doing cruel things to each other and although we hope for peace and happiness, wars and conflicts are still raging all over the world. We are not free.

Perhaps Krishnamurti underestimated the force of conditioning and could not get his message through so that all our mental chaos would be cleaned. But he surely managed to influence thousands of people and offered a thrilling possibility for us to see life in a new light.

To Krishnamurti the root reason to the miserable state of the world was crystal clear and he pointed it out in his dialogues with David Bohm, in his public talks and in his books more clearly than anyone has ever done. He saw something that we have not seen.

Nobody, not even Krishnamurti, can help us realize the facts about ourselves if we don't *want* to see. And if we don't passionately want to see, we will *never* see it.

I am afraid that the trouble with us is that we *don't want* to see. Perhaps there is only one exit out of this man-made confusion and suffering. Krishnamurti saw it, said it, but it is not his fault that change has not happened!

For over thirty years I have tried to understand what is wrong with us, why are we like this. I don't think we are unintelligent or lazy. It seems that we are drastically misled. The heavy weight of culture and tradition blocks our insight. Perhaps we don't see, because we *think* we see.

There is an answer to this question that has bothered us for centuries. The modern world view is based on individuality and selfishness. It encourages us to seek

our own happiness and fulfilment and the price of it is very high.

Our big mistake may be the assumption that we are individuals. We do share the same world; cosmos does not belong to anyone. We are the world and the world is us.

If we continue to see the world and act through our inward filters, we will never be free. But if we realize that the limits of our thinking are not actual, then we enter a state full of insight and intelligence. In that state life stops being a problem and a human being lives in a direct communion to what Krishnamurti aptly calls 'what is'.

If you cannot answer, change the question

What is left of a person who is stripped from the essence of his identity, thought and images?

Krishnamurti says: *truth* and *love*.

A world dominated by thinking is self-centred and broken up which will destroy the world slowly or quickly. This thinking dominated world lacks genuine care for other people and a sense of responsibility. It is cold, crooked and calculating, an unsafe and frightening place for a human being.

In their meetings, these two brilliant minds of our species penetrated through consciousness into an area where there are no images, words or explanations.

We happen to live in the embrace of that magnificence but do not see nor feel it except in short flashes, in ecstatic moments of our life.

Inspired by these two excellent guides we searched in this book for an answer to the question: Can a human brain be changed so that it does not live in concepts, beliefs and make-beliefs, but in facts and actuality?

To answer this question, we must understand how our brain and mind works. Our brain is imposing wrong answers on us, because we keep asking the wrong questions. If we ask the right question, we will be free.

Krishnamurti and Bohm say that when the brain is silent, something truly extraordinary happens. The old brain lives in a stuffy prison where the light of life enters only in fleeting moments, as a hint of something that we long for. That brain is programmed to seek solutions from an area where there are only ineffective substitutes.

When one deeply understands that there is no escape from reality for the obvious reason that it pervades everything, the neurotic movement of thinking stops and the structure and function of the brain changes. When images are gone, only the actual is left.

Why is this so difficult to understand?

Why don't we discard the illusions that make our lives a misery?

Why do we accept brutalities, conflicts, intellectual and spiritual self-deception, the idiocy of isms?

Why do we want to go faster, although our way of life is leading us to global catastrophe? Why don't we take the map and change direction now?

Is it that we don't see or that we don't care?

We use a wrong instrument and keep hammering the wrong nails. We try to change the world, but the world is not the problem. It is our brain we have to change, stop trying and let silence take over.

We still think that our brain is or has the answer, but it does not. On the contrary, the brain is the essence of the problem, because it sustains the issue.

We have totally misunderstood the role of thinking. We keep playing the wrong notes and hope to get the melody right.

As Krishnamurti points out, thought can *never* realize what is true. Thought has a place in daily life, in learning and expression, but when it enters the psychological area it breeds disorder, self-deception and conflict.

Clarity is necessary

Krishnamurti and Bohm show a solution that may be the only way out of this destructive confusion we create together. Nobody knows if we will manage to face this challenge and find a way to solve our common and colossal problems before it is too late.

The key concepts in their dialogues are intelligence, insight, the ground, order, truth, mind, reality and actuality. They give new meanings to these terms. The point is not to explain but to understand or see.

The conditioning of our consciousness makes it impossible to see things as they are. We think we see, but in fact we don't. The fatal division between me and you is the deep source of conflicts and separation between people. It has severely damaged the brain.

Healing starts when thought stops.

In an interview by Evelyne Blau, Bohm describes how his own states of mind changed in his dialogues with Krishnamurti.

“I had no feeling, but clarity. I said to him, I have no feeling and he said, ‘Yes, that’s right’, which surprised me, because I had previously thought that anything intense must have a lot of feeling. When I went out, I had a sense of some presence in the sky, felt something universal.”

Bohm says that the sense of space was present in their discussions and the change in the state of his consciousness happened also in Switzerland, but “it went away by the time he got back home”.

Krishnamurti advised Bohm in his scientific work to *begin from the unknown*. This applies to life in general, too. The insights we get when starting from not-knowing are very important in dissolving the rigid compartments of thought and in finding fresh views to old issues.

The energy beyond matter is something we can’t get a grip on. It can be called the truth and truth acts on the material basis of thought and consciousness, changing it to orderly form. So thought ceases to create disorder and leaves the mind empty for something deeper.

We may feel that we lack sufficient energy to break through our conditioning. Bohm regards this as an excuse and it reveals misunderstanding of the nature of the energy needed. The very process of ego wastes energy. To avoid the waste we must see what is essential and universal. The universal belongs to everybody and covers everything.

“If you see yourself as a particular being, you protect that being and your energies will be dissipated.”

The observations we make of reality are mainly reflections of our own mind. They are very shallow, and many of them are delusions. When seeing things as they are thought loses its power and an enormous amount of energy is released.

“The minute you see that the whole content of your consciousness is only a show, the brain quiets and is in another state. It is no longer trapped and it sees everything differently. This perception transforms everything and there is no turning back.”

So it all comes back to where it all started. When the observer really is the observed, there is no me and you and there is now becoming something else.

11. “It ends”

‘The future of humanity’ was an apt topic to end the long series of dialogues. Although there are in the archives seven recordings titled ‘Ojai small group table talks’ with K and Bohm in Ojai 1984, starting 24th February till 3rd of March, they have remained unpublished.

Mary Cadogan, who was the secretary of Krishnamurti Foundation for three decades and who edited the book *The Ending of Time*, suggested to both that still one more session of dialogues should be arranged. Bohm agreed, but Krishnamurti refused, referring to Bohm’s health.

There are various speculations and gossip about what had happened, but no way to find out the truth. Krishnamurti briefly explained to Cadogan the reason for his refusal: “You know what happened at Ojai.”

“Yes, David was ill”, she answered. The topic was never again raised.

In Bohm’s biography Peat tells that in spring 1984 Bohm flew to Ojai to meet Krishnamurti and attended the seven table talks with several other people, but felt weak and stressed.

So that was it. No more dialogues.

However, I find it very difficult to imagine that there could be something they *had not covered* in their dialogues. And that is what Krishnamurti felt, too.

The memoirs of Mary Zimbalist offer a robust documentation of friendship and deep respect between Krishnamurti and Bohm. Zimbalist spent two decades of her life closer to K than anybody. She tells how much K appreciated the chance to talk about topics he loved with a person that could passionately share the mutual interest.

Most of the people near Krishnamurti saw the significance of Bohm, but not all. To some his pedantry was intellectual nit-picking that did not help in the transformation.

Many people near Bohm thought that an exceptionally talented scientist wasted his time with this Asian mystic.

The two men came from totally different worlds and their lives were almost opposites. Their paths crossed leaving a legacy that has a monumental meaning to all those who have grasped that our old roads lead to a dead end and disaster.

Professor Renée Weber met both men many times. In her book *Dialogues with Scientists and Sages – the search for unity* Weber tells about these meetings with them.

One of four discussions with David Bohm gives an enlightening insight into meaning as a bridge between mind and matter. We react to meanings that we give to things, not what they actually are.

Matter as such has no meaning, but observing it makes it important or insignificant. So basically it is the context that matters. If we see that matter and meaning are part of the same system and indissolubly connected, there is no separation between them and either everything is full of meaning or nothing has any meaning. So the meaning is not in the object but in the *observation*.

The real meaning of everything is in the connection we have to it. This brings us back to the insight from which the dialogues started: the observer *is* the observed.

Some months later Weber met Krishnamurti in Switzerland. It was June 1985 and the last year of Saanen gatherings. Weber describes that Krishnamurti looked 'remarkably well although he has just passed his 90th birthday, his face – once famous for its almost preternatural beauty - shows age, but is compelling still, intelligent eyes, silky silver hair and sculptured head'.

After hearing the theme and content of Weber's book project Krishnamurti most politely but very sternly refused to give an interview and answer Weber's questions.

Instead, he spent over two hours describing passionately the sorrow that every human being lives in. He evoked the vision of a species bending its talents to probe its stellar origins in the remote past while its very continuity in the present and future lies in doubt.

In this struggle humanity is together but feels separate. Krishnamurti regards scientists as responsible for 'fuelling the war-machine' and cooperating with corrupt governments. He uses the analogy of cancer to describe the human distress.

“If my son or brother has just died, I am not going to want to discuss the Big Bang with you. I am in pain and interested in this, not that.”

That is why Krishnamurti has no interest in discussing science or knowledge. They are trapped in the past, but truth lies in the living present, in this moment, in the eternal now.

Krishnamurti gave over a thousand talks around the world. His last public talk took place in Madras in January 1986 six weeks before his passing. Over 60 years of public speaking ended with two words that had no self-centred sentimentality in them: “It ends.”

Krishnamurti died in California 17th February 1986 at the age of 90.

David Bohm retired in 1987 but continued working in the university although he had severe health problems. His book with F David Peat, *Science, order and creativity* was published in the very same year and posthumously with professor B.J. Hiley, a book called *The Undivided Universe*.

He also held eleven so-called Bohm seminars in Ojai during 1986-92. The seminar of 1991 had to be cancelled due to his health. They were weekend seminars with about 50 participants. The content of the 1990 seminar was published as a seminal book called *Thought as a System*.

Worth mentioning is also the book *Unfolding Meaning*, an edited transcript of a dialogue weekend in Cotswold Hills of England with a group of 44 people of various backgrounds. Also a book with photographer Mark Edwards called *Changing Consciousness* witnesses the brilliance of Bohm’s view.

On October 27th 1992 he phoned from his study to his wife telling her that he would take a taxi home. After a heart attack he died in the taxi near home. It is not known what he talked about with the taxi driver, but the last words to his wife were: "I feel I'm on the edge of something."

Death is also the topic in the last dictation of the book *Krishnamurti to himself – his last journal* on March 30th 1984. After seeing a dead leaf he wonders, why we human beings can't *die naturally* and as beautifully as that leaf.

"As one looked at that dead leaf with all its beauty and colour, maybe one would very deeply comprehend, be aware of, what one's own death must be, not at the very end but *at the very beginning*. Death isn't some horrific thing, something to be avoided, something to be postponed, but something to be with day in and day out. And out of that comes an extraordinary *sense of immensity*."

We consider death the end of our mundane life, but it can also be an opening to the immensity of life. Seeing the sorrow of mankind and feeling the urgent need to act rightly, we have two alternatives: to react or to act.

Reacting means that the terror of thought continues. Acting means that the movement of ego stops and the mind is free to live and love without limits of thought. The energy of reaction is partial. It has a centre that is in endless conflict with other centres, whereas the energy of action is holistic.

The right action is not a matter of choice between two possibilities. We either see the world as it is or as we think it is. When you actually see, you are free.

Sources

Chapter 1

Krishnamurti, J: *Freedom from the Known*, Victor Gollanz 1969.

Krishnamurti, J: *The Awakening of Intelligence*, Victor Gollanz 1973.

Bohm, David: *Wholeness and the Implicate Order*, Routledge & Kegan Paul 1980.

Chapter 3

Blau, Evelyn: *Krishnamurti 100 years*. A joost Elffers Book 1995. s. 157–8.

Peat, F David: *Infinite Potential. The Life and Times of David Bohm*. Helix Books 1997.

Bohm, David: *Quantum Theory*, Prentice-Hall 1951.

Bohm, David & Peat, F David: *Science, Order and Creativity*, Routledge 1987.

Krishnamurti, J: *The First and Last Freedom*, Harper & Brothers 1954.

Krishnamurti, J: The mind must be totally empty to see something new, Twelve Public Meetings volume 1 and 2, London, UK, 1961. Krishnamurti Foundation of America 1961.

Krishnamurti, J: *Krishnamurti's Notebook*, Victor Gollanz 1976.

Krishnamurti, J: *Krishnamurti's Journal*, Victor Gollanz 1982.

Zimbalist Mary: In the Presence of Krishnamurti,
www.inthepresenceofk.org.

Chapter 4

Krishnamurti, J: Thought, stillness and time. Six Small Group Discussions, Gstaad, Switzerland, 1965, Krishnamurti Foundation of America 1965.

Chapter 5

Krishnamurti, J. & David Bohm: *On Intelligence*, 7 October 1972. Krishnamurti Foundation Trust Ltd. 1972.

Krishnamurti, J.: *The Awakening of Intelligence*, Victor Gollanz 1973.

Krishnamurti, J: Truth & Actuality. Victor Gollanz 1975.

Krishnamurti, J & Bohm, David: *The Limits of Thought*. Discussions. Routledge 1999.

Krishnamurti, J: Truth, actuality, and the limits of thought, Conversations with David Bohm, Brockwood Park, UK, Gstaad, Switzerland, 1975. Krishnamurti Foundation Trust Ltd 1975.

Lutyens, Mary: *The Years of Awakening*, John Murray 1975.

Chapter 6

Krishnamurti, J: The Transformation of Man. Seven discussions with David Bohm and David Shainberg. Krishnamurti Foundation Trust Ltd. 1976.

Krishnamurti, J: *Wholeness of life*, Victor Gollanz 1978.

Chapter 7

Krishnamurti, J. & Bohm, David: *The Ending of Time*. Victor Gollanz 1985.

Krishnamurti, J: *The Ending of Time. 15 conversations with David Bohm*. Krishnamurti Foundation Trust Ltd. 1980.

Krishnamurti, J: The Ending of Time. Where Philosophy and Physics Meet. HarperOne 2014.

Chapter 8

Krishnamurti, J.: *Can humanity change? In dialogue with Buddhist scholars.* Krishnamurti Foundation Trust Ltd. 1978.

Krishnamurti, J: *The Anatomy of Insight.* In discussion with David Bohm and Asit Chandmal. Krishnamurti Foundation of America 1981.

Krishnamurti, J: *Questioning Krishnamurti,* Thorsons 1996.

Krishnamurti, J: *Conversation with David Bohm and Maurice Wilkins.* Krishnamurti Foundation Trust Ltd. 1982.

Krishnamurti, J: *The Nature of the Mind.* Krishnamurti Foundation of America 1984.

Chapter 9

Krishnamurti, J: *The Future of Humanity. Conversations with Dr. David Bohm.* Krishnamurti Foundation Trust Ltd. 1983.

Chapter 11

Cadogan, Mary: *The Legacy of David Bohm Conference,* 21 November 2009. Cd.

Weber, Renée: *Dialogues with scientists and sages – The Search for Unity.* Routledge & Kegan Paul 1986.

Bohm, David & B.J. Hiley: *Undivided Universe.* Routledge 1993.

Krishnamurti, J: *Krishnamurti to Himself – his last Journal.* Victor Gollanz 1987.

Summary of published discussions between Krishnamurti and David Bohm

1965 Thought, stillness and time

Six Small Group Discussions in Switzerland

Also present: Saral Bohm, Margo Laborde, Robin Monro, Alain Naudé, and Mary Zimbalist.

15.8. 1. Is thought detrimental? (63 min)

Why does one seek pleasure? The function of thought and the line between illusory and necessary thinking. Thought is detrimental. Start from the facts and remain with them. Our life is built on images and illusions. Silence and clarity. Let the fresh air in.

18.8. 2. Am I aware of the process of thinking? (60 min)

Humming noise of consciousness. Is there self-progress? Any form of division within oneself is a source of conflict. Can the brain be quiet?

21.8. 3. What will make me see that thought breeds frustration? (78 min)

What is the function of thought? Can the mind see the fact that thought will always breed frustration? Function is necessary, but function with status, position and power must breed frustration. If there is no thought, what happens? The very perception of the limitation of thought is the act of opening the door, rather than thought opening the door. The word is of the past.

24.8. 4. From where do attachment and detachment come? (65 min)

The relationship of the brain to the totality of the mind. Can the intellect, fragment, ever sustain observation without any distortion. Can one be completely harmonious? Automatic reactions and awareness. Fear of not being.

25.8. 5. A complete stillness (65 min)

Time is most destructive thing. A flame, no heat, the perfume is missing. Inattention and attention. Observing without the word. Is love a matter of culture, a thing of pleasure and therefore dependency?

29.8. 6. When the mind is completely quiet, how can there be time? (85min)

Time in science. How to expose the deep layers in consciousness? Comparison is the process of fear. Working with intensity.

1972 Discussion

Published in *The Awakening of Intelligence* 1973.

7.10. On Intelligence

The noisy brain is not intelligent (79 min)

Thought is of the order of time; intelligence is of a different order. Brain the instrument of intelligence. Thought dominates the world. The awakening of intelligence. Matter, thought, intelligence have a common source, are of one energy. Security and survival: thought cannot consider death properly. Insight is the perception of the whole.

1975 Truth, actuality and the limits of thought

12 conversations, three (1, 3 and 4) published in *Truth and Actuality* 1977, five in *The Limits of Thought* 1999 and five in mp3 audio.

18.5. 1. What is truth and what is reality? (70 min)

Reality is something reflected in consciousness, always conditioned. Actuality consists of facts only. Illusions are real, but not true. Two kinds of energy. Meditation is seeing the facts as they are.

24.5. 2. Seeing 'what is' is action (122 min)

Can we live in the present? In separation love cannot exist. Living in the field of reality will not free me. When the mind is empty, when the mind is nothing, not a thing, in that there is perception.

31.5. 3. Thought cannot bring about an insight (81 min)

The action of reasoned thought is different from insight. Is there non-verbal thinking? The energy and force of insight. Reality is every-thing; truth is no-thing-ness. The mind must be an empty house. We need truth and actuality, but our minds are occupied with reality. We seek security in reality; in nothingness there is complete security. A mind rooted in nothingness operates in the field of reality with intelligence.

14.6. 4. Desire, goodness and beauty (87 min)

Why has desire become such an extraordinarily important thing in life? Is the energy of nothingness different from the energy of things? Is nothingness a theory or truth? In dying to the reality only then there is nothingness.

22.6. 5. Attention implies that there is no centre (126 min)

Consciousness in constant movement has never found an energy which is not contradictory. Thought can never see the futility of its own movement. In attention there is no centre. Thought is merely a very small part of the operation of the brain. Order and disorder.

28.6. 6. Perceiving without the perceiver (139 min)

Can thought naturally cease? Perceiving without the perceiver. Facing the truth of death. Krishnamurti's process. Kundalini. Do not escape suffering. Truth is a pathless land. The mysterious. Knowledge is becoming the curse.

18.7. 7. If thought cannot achieve, why should it suffer? (101 min)

How does science investigate the mysterious? Can consciousness filled with things of thought empty itself? Thought cannot be aware of the whole. Clarity and time. Krishnamurti's early years.

25.7. 8. What is the substance of thought? (105 min)

Why thought is fragmented? Total perception is truth. It acts in the field of reality. That action is not the product of thought.

6.8. 9. Is there in the brain anything untouched by culture? (110 min)

Can a total perception heal the brain? What benefit has culture? Does speech arise before thought? Is it possible to say something without the operation of thought? Is there in the brain anything untouched by culture? Is attention conscious process? Is love the factor of profound change? The damaged brain will produce further damage.

27.9. 10. Truth does not belong to an individual (75 min)

Krishnamurti's process and his early years. Suffering. The Indian tradition says that a manifestation of goodness happens very rarely. Truth does not belong to an individual. To stay with truth.

4.10. 11. What is wisdom which is not a movement of thought (110 min)

Wisdom, intelligence and truth. If there is attention is there choice? Why has man divided perception? Is wisdom the movement of thought? Truth operating in one brain clears that brain.

11.10. 12. Can the brain free itself from all self-delusion? (85 min)

Can there be only sensation, thought and no desire? No desire means a total revolution and that will affect the consciousness of man. A movement that keeps the brain uncontaminated.

1976 Transformation of Man

Seven discussions with Doctor **David Shainberg**, published on DVD with a 10-minute introduction and in the book *The Wholeness of Life* 1978.

17.5. 1. Are we aware that we are fragmented? (72 min)

Life comes first. There can be no awareness of the wholeness of life if one is fragmented? A fragment is creating more fragments, conflict, confusion, sorrow. Can I be free of the desire to be psychologically secure?

18.5. 2. A mechanical way of living leads to disorder (61 min)

There is no psychological security. Is it an abstract idea or an actual fact? Our security lies in an image, a picture, a conclusion, an ideal. The brain needs order and finds it in mechanical process because it is trained from childhood to do so. When the past meets the present and I am aware of this moment, then it stops.

18.5. 3. Can I completely change at the very root? (62 min)

Authority exists because human beings are in disorder. In the rejection of authority I become sane and I have more energy. What is correct action in life? One can find that out if there is no disorder in me. 'Me' is the disorder. However 'real' the 'me' is, it is the source of disorder.

19.5. 4. In aloneness you can be completely secure (69 min)

To be alone implies total freedom. That is total order. Can we step out of the stream of confusion, disorder, sorrow, hope, travail, and despair? Our whole society is based on thought. When the movement of thought comes to an end, there is total action. When you are faced with fact, there is no fear.

19.5. 5. Your image prevents relationship with others (58 min)

The process of fragmentation is a state of mind that says there is the unconscious and the conscious. Every human being has an image of himself of which he is not aware. What is the machinery of making images? As long as we have images there is not going to be peace and love in the world.

20.5. 6. Any image prevents the beauty of relationship (68 min)

What will bring about a transformation in our consciousness? Right relationship begins with the realization of the responsibility I have. My consciousness is the consciousness of the world.

20.5. 7. Life is sacred (57 min)

What it means to love somebody? Without compassion, human beings are destroying themselves. Is compassion the result of the ending of the universal sorrow? Out of an insight into the universal sorrow of mankind is compassion. A real, penetrating meditation brings insight.

21.5. Introduction

1978 Dialogues with Buddhist scholars

Participants: Walpola Rahula, Irmgard Schloegel, Giddu Narayan

22.6. 1. Are you not saying what the Buddha said? (99 min)

All knowledge conditions us and prevents us from seeing the truth. To look at a fact without a word with all its intimations is seeing the fact.

23.6. 2. Is there a state of mind without the self? (94 min)

Life after death and the point of living. The identification process is the essence of the self. To live with death.

23.6. 3. Does free will exist? (115 min)

Apart from material things, why is there choice? Duality in identification. Does the word create thought and thought create words? Total action and seeing someone as a whole being.

1980 The Ending of Time

Fifteen dialogues published in the book *The Ending of Time*. Giddu Narayan was present in dialogues 9 and 10.

1.4. 1. The roots of psychological conflict (82 min)

Has humanity taken a wrong turn? What is the root of inward conflict of humanity? When I am trying to become something it is a constant battle. Can the brain itself see that it is caught in time and moving in that direction conflict is eternal, endless? Can the mind realise, resolve a psychological problem immediately? Has mankind journeyed through millennia to come to this: that I am nothing and therefore I am everything and all energy?

2.4. 2. Cleansing the mind of the accumulation of time (79 min)

Time is the enemy of man. Is there a beginning which is not enmeshed in time? Nothingness is everything and so it is total energy. It is undiluted pure, uncorrupted energy. Is there something beyond that? Has man ever been free from the 'I'? That emptiness can only exist when there is death of the particular.

8.4. 3. Why we give supreme importance to thought? (84 min)

Is the ground of existence indifferent to mankind as the physical universe appears to be? Is there something more than the merely physical? Theories are inwardly of no use at all.

10.4. 4. Breaking the pattern of ego-centred activity (79 min)

What will make a human being change, deeply, fundamentally, radically? Will I as a human being give up my egocentric activity completely and discard all knowledge I have acquired? What happens when I meet something completely solid, immovable, and absolutely true? Psychological knowledge has made us dull.

12.4. 5. The ground of being and the mind of man (71 min)

Why has having ideas become so important? What is the difference between a religious and a philosophic mind? What is the human mind's relationship to the ground?

15.4. 6. Can insight bring about a mutation of the brain cells? (95 min)

Insight is not dependent on the material process of thought. Where there is violence, peace cannot exist. Insight has no cause. The material process acts in darkness. This flash of insight enlightens the whole field and dispels darkness.

17.4. 7. Death has very little meaning (96 min)

Is there a totally different way of approaching the whole turmoil of life? The centre is creating darkness and disorder. The man who is living in darkness can move away at any time to the other. What happens to a mind that has no conflict?

19.4. 8. Can insight be awakened in another? (77 min)

What is the relationship to society of a man who has insight? What is his action with regard to war and the whole world? What is the significance of mankind in the universe? We reduce immensity to our pettiness and put it in a temple. To divert the course of man's destruction somebody must listen.

1.6. 9. Senility and the brain cells (90 min)

Is the human brain deteriorating? The brain is not a particular brain; it doesn't belong to anyone. Can the brain have enough energy to break all patterns and move out of it? Psychological knowledge is a factor of the shrinking of the brain? An insight into the nature of time breaks down the very brain cells. The brain cells must bring about a change in themselves. Meditation is insight.

7.6. 10. Cosmic order (69 min)

An order which is not man-made. Can the brain be free from the impositions, pressures, bruises, all the trivialities of existence? Time is my whole existence. We take refuge in the past, which cannot be changed. Why does the brain accept this way of living, why doesn't it break it down? As long as my roots are in the past there can be no order. If the universe is not of time, can the mind which has been entangled in time, unravel itself and be the universe?

14.9. 11. The liberation of insight (73 min)

Can insight wipe away the whole movement of being tied, attached, dependent and lonely? Measurement exists only where there is disorder. We live in a man-made world and are the result of man-made minds. What is the relationship between love and hatred?

16.9. 12. The intelligence of love (60 min)

Thought is the outcome of psychological accumulation. Why do all human beings have the urge to become? In accumulation man has sought psychological security, and that security with its accumulation is the factor of human division. Perception without any motive and direction is intelligence and love.

18.9. 13. The ending of 'psychological' knowledge (55 min)

Why are our minds always operating in a certain direction? What shall I as a human being do realizing that knowledge is naturally, inevitably forming that in which we live? How am I to break down a groove I have formed? Pure observation is love. A serious man comes to the fundamental question: what will make this wall totally disappear?

20.9. 14. The mind in the universe (51 min)

Thought is a material process. Only the insight into the nature of reaction ends psychological reaction. There is absolute stillness and in or from that stillness there is a movement which is everlastingly new. Freedom is not a reaction. There is the universal mind, and the human mind can be of that when there is freedom.

27.9. 15. Can problems be solved and fragmentation end? (70 min)

Why have human beings not been able to resolve problems of life? What prevent the solution of these problems completely? Is love common to all of us? From the particular move to the general, from the general move away still deeper. There is purity of thing called compassion, love and intelligence. Give your mind and heart to this.

1981 Asit Chandmal

1.4. Is the brain different from a computer? (120 min)

Discussion with Asit Chandmal

The anatomy of insight and the differences between brain and computer.

1982 Maurice Wilkins

12.2. The difficulty of thinking together (56 min)

Discussion with Maurice Wilkins

What prevents us from thinking together? Love without thought. Awareness of unity. Fear of death.

1982 The Nature of the mind

Four discussions with biologist Rupert Sheldrake and psychiatrist John Hidley

16.4. 1. Roots of psychological disorder (58 min)

What is psychological disorder and what is required for fundamental psychological change? The self is the beginning of all disorder. My own individualistic activity has created this society. Is it possible to be free of my conditioning? If my relationship with life is not "right" I cannot find out that which is immensely beyond time, thought and measure. Knowledge will not transform me.

17.4. 2. Psychological suffering (58 min)

What is security? Why do we want to identify with something? Is there a learning about oneself which is not constant accumulation?

17.4. 3. The need for security (59 min)

Why do we want security? It is a messy consciousness. There is no part of it that is clear. Inattention creates the problems. If I know how to read myself I don't need anybody to tell me. You must be free from your prejudice, your previous experience to examine.

18.4. 4. What is a healthy mind? (55 min)

What is analysis and what is observation? Attention implies a great deal of care, affection, love; it is attention with all your being. Is there such thing as an enemy? I am mankind. You are the rest of mankind, and therefore you have a terrible responsibility for that, in that. Is there anything sacred in life? What is a healthy mind?

1983 The future of humanity

Two discussions published in the book of the same name and in new edition of The Ending of Time.

11.6. Is there an action not touched by thought? (82 min)

What is the future of man? We are the result of thought.

Thought will never solve our problems.

20.6. Is there evolution of consciousness? (67 min)

Can the consciousness of mankind be changed through time?

Is the action of perception itself intelligence?