bulletin

Krishnamurti
Foundation of
America

No. 18
Summer
1973

SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY
1897

Crowd gathers to hear Krishnamurti at Libbey Park, Ojai, California.

PLANS FOR AN EDUCATIONAL CENTER IN THE UNITED STATES

In view of the deep interest in education expressed by Krishnamurti throughout his more than 40 years of speaking, it has been decided that a study begin for the establishment of an Educational Center in the United States to be located in Ojai.

Ojai in America, like Saanen and Brockwood Park in Europe, would be a place where those interested in hearing Krishnamurti would gather each year for his public talks; where educators and scientists might come to discuss with him in smaller groups; where a book, tape and film library could be housed; where the Foundation offices would be located; and where a school could be started, administered by people highly qualified in educational skills, who have a deep interest in what Krishnamurti is saying and who seriously want to apply it in their lives.

To properly undertake such a project, a careful study must be made with respect to the physical and financial needs. This work has now been started. As the plans develop, more detailed information will appear in future Bulletins.

FREEDOM AND DISCIPLINE

Extract from Krishnamurti's latest book, THE IMPOSSIBLE QUESTION (Harper & Row)

In understanding freedom one understands also what discipline is. This may seem rather contradictory because we generally think freedom means freedom from all discipline. What is the quality of mind that is highly disciplined? Freedom cannot exist without discipline; which does not mean that you must first be disciplined and then you will have freedom. Freedom and discipline go together, they are not two separate things. So what does "discipline" mean? According to the dictionary, the meaning of the word "discipline" is "to learn" — not a mind that forces itself into a certain pattern of action according to an ideology or a belief. A mind that is capable of learning is entirely different from a mind which is capable only of conforming. A mind that is learning, that is observing, seeing actually "what is," is not interpreting "what is" according to its own desires, its own conditioning, its own particular pleasures.

Discipline does not mean suppression and control, nor is it adjustment to a pattern or an ideology; it means a mind that sees "what is" and learns from "what is." Such a mind has to be extraordinarily alert, aware. In the ordinary sense "to discipline oneself" implies that there is an entity that is disciplining itself according to something. There is a dualistic process: I say to myself, "I must get up early in the morning and not be lazy," or "I must not be angry." That involves a dualistic process. There is the one who with his will tries to control what he should do, as opposed to what he actually does. In that state there is conflict.

The discipline laid down by parents, by society, by religious organisations means conformity. And there is revolt against conformity — the parent wanting one to do certain things, and the revolt against that, and so on. It is a life based on obedience and conformity; and there is the opposite of it, denying conformity and to do what one likes. So we are going to find out what the quality of the mind is that does not conform, does not imitate, follow and obey, yet has a quality in itself which is highly disciplined — "disciplined" in the sense of constantly learning.

Discipline is learning, not conforming. Conformity implies comparing myself with another, measuring myself as to what I am or think I should be, against the hero, the saint, and so on. Where there is conformity there must be comparison — please see this. Find out whether you can live without comparison, which means not to conform. We are conditioned from childhood to compare — "You must be like your brother, or your great-aunt," "You must be like the saint," or "Follow Mao." We compare in our education; in schools there is the giving of marks and the passing of examinations. We do not know what it means to live without comparison and without competition, therefore non-aggressively, non-competitively, non-violently. Comparing yourself with another is a form of aggression and a form of violence. Violence is not only killing or hitting somebody, it is in this comparative spirit, "I must be like somebody else," or "I must perfect myself." Find out for yourself how to live a life without comparing, and you will see what an extraordinary thing happens. If you really become aware, choicelessly, you will see what it means to live without comparison, never using the words "I will be."

We are slaves to the verb "to be" which implies: "I will be somebody sometime in the future." Comparison and conformity go together; they breed nothing but suppression, conflict and endless pain. So it is important to find a way of daily living in which there is no comparison. Do it, and you will see what an extraordinary thing it is: it frees you from so many burdens. The awareness of that brings about a quality of mind that is highly sensitive and therefore disciplined, constantly learning — not what it wants to learn, or what is pleasurable, gratifying to learn, but *learning.* So you become aware of inward conditioning resulting from authority, conformity to a pattern, to tradition, to propaganda, to what other people have said, and of your own accumulated experience and that of the race and the family. All of that has become the authority. Where there is authority, the mind can never be free to discover whatever there is to be discovered — something timeless, entirely new.

INSIGHT INTO MEASURE, IN THE EAST AND THE WEST

By D.J. Bohm, *Professor, Department of Physics, Birkbeck College, University of London; Trustee, Krishnamurti Foundation London.*

Most people who are at all observant are now aware of an intense and pervasive fragmentation of the entire fabric of human life, both social and individual. Such an awareness tends to give rise to the urge to end this fragmentation so that man may live in wholeness and integrity, as he perhaps once did before the current disruptive phase of human development began. In the search for this sort of release from fragmentation, many people are turning to other cultures and other forms of society, hoping that these may provide an approach superior to the one that is now dominant. Particularly in the West, more and more people are beginning to feel that perhaps in the East (especially in India) such a superior approach still survives, in the sense that religion and philosophy emphasise wholeness, and imply the futility of a way of life based on seeing everything as analysed into separate parts. It may thus seem natural to suggest that we drop our fragmentary Western approach and adopt instead the Eastern way. This way generally includes not only a view of the self and the world that denies division and fragmentation, but also, techniques of meditation aimed to lead the whole process of mental operation non-verbally to the quiet state of smooth and orderly flow needed to end fragmentation at its very source, i.e. the chaotic, turbulent and generally confused state of mind in which we ordinarily tend to live most of the time.

To understand more deeply what is involved in these questions, it is useful to go into the difference between Eastern and Western notions of measure. For these have been of crucial significance in the development of the different general attitudes to life that have come about over the centuries in these two parts of the world.

Now, in the West, the notion of measure has, from very early times, played a key role in determining the general self-world view, and the modes of living implicit in such a view. Thus, among the ancient Greeks, from whom we derive a large part of our fundamental notions, to keep everything in its right measure was regarded as one of the essentials of a good life (e.g. Greek tragedies generally portrayed man's suffering

as a consequence of his going beyond the proper measure of things). In this regard, measure was not looked on in its modern sense as being primarily some sort of comparison to an object with an external standard or unit (e.g. so many inches or pounds). Rather, this latter procedure was regarded as a kind of outward display or appearance of a deeper "inner" measure or proportion, which played an essential role in everything. When something went beyond its proper measure, this meant not merely that it was not conforming to some external standard of what was right, but much more, that it was inwardly out of harmony, so that it was bound to lose its integrity, and break up into fragments. One can obtain some insight into this way of thinking by considering the earlier meanings of certain words. Thus, the Latin "mederi" meaning "to cure" (the root of the word "medicine") is based on a root meaning "to measure." This reflects the view that physical health is to be regarded as the outcome of a state of right inward measure, or proportion, in all parts and processes of the body. Similarly, the word "moderation," which describes one of the prime ancient notions of virtue, is based on the same root; and this shows that such virtue was regarded as the outcome of a right inner measure underlying man's social actions and behaviour. And again, the word "meditation," which is based on the same root, implies a kind of weighing, pondering, or measuring, of the whole process of thought, which could bring the inner activities of the mind to a state of harmonious measure. So, physically, socially and mentally, awareness of the inner proportion or measure of things was seen as the essential key to a healthy, happy, harmonious life.

In this connection, it is instructive to call to mind ancient Greek notions of measure in music and in the visual arts. These notions emphasised that a grasp of measure was necessary for the understanding of harmony in music (e.g. measure as rhythm, right proportion in intensity of sound, right proportion in tonality, etc.). Likewise, in the visual arts, right measure was seen as essential to overall harmony and beauty (e.g. consider the "Golden Mean"). All of this indicates how far the notion of measure went beyond that of comparison with an external standard, to point to a universal sort of inner proportion, perceived both through the senses and through the mind.

As time went on, however, this notion of measure gradually began to change, to lose its subtlety, and to become relatively gross and mechanical. Probably this was because man's notions of measure became more

and more routinised and habitual, both with regard to its outward display in measurements relative to an external unit and to its inner significance as a universal sort of proportion relevant to physical health, social order, and mental harmony. Men began to learn such notions of measure mechanically, by conforming to the teachings of their elders or their masters, and not creatively through an inner feeling and understanding of the deeper meaning of the measure or proportion which they were learning. So measure gradually came to be taught as a sort of rule that was to be imposed from outside on the human being, who in turn imposed the corresponding measure physically, socially and mentally, in every context in which he was working. As a result, the prevailing notions of measure were no longer seen as forms of insight. Rather, they appeared to be "absolute truths about reality as it is," which men seemed always to have known, and whose origin was often explained mythologically as binding injunctions of the Gods, which it would be both dangerous and wicked to question. Thought about measure thus tended to fall mainly into the domain of unconscious habit, and as a result, the forms induced in perception by this thought were now seen as directly observed objective realities, which were essentially independent of how they were thought about.

Even by the time of the ancient Greeks, this process had gone a long way, and as men realised this, they began to question the notion of measure. Thus, Protagoras said: "Man is the measure of all things," thus emphasising that measure is not a reality external to man, existing independently of him. But many who were in the habit of looking at everything externally also applied this way of looking to what Protagoras said. Thus, they concluded that measure was something arbitrary, and subject to the capricious choice or taste of each individual. In this way, they of course overlooked the fact that measure is a form of insight that has to fit the overall reality in which man lives, as demonstrated by the clarity of perception and harmony of action to which it leads. Such insight can arise properly only when a man works with seriousness and honesty, putting truth and factuality first, rather than his own whims or desires.

The general rigidification and objectification of the notion of measure continued to develop, until in modern times, the very word "measure" has come to denote mainly a process of comparison of something with

an external standard. While the original meaning still survives in some contexts (e.g. art and mathematics) it is generally felt as having only a secondary sort of significance.

Now, in the East, the notion of measure has not played nearly so fundamental a role. Rather, in the prevailing philosophy in the Orient, the immeasurable (i.e. that which cannot be named, described, or understood through any form of reason) is regarded as the primary reality. Thus, in Sanskrit (which has an origin common to the Indo-European language group) there is a word "matra" meaning "measure," in the musical sense, which is close to the Greek "metron." But then there is another word "maya" obtained from the same root, which means "illusion." This is an extraordinarily significant point. Whereas, to Western society, as it derives from the Greeks, measure, with all that this word implies, is the very essence of reality, or at least, the key to this essence, in the East, measure has come to be regarded as being in some way false and deceitful. Indeed, the entire measurable structure and order of forms and proportions that present themselves to ordinary perception are regarded as a sort of veil, covering the true reality, which cannot be perceived by the senses, and of which nothing can be said or thought.

It is clear that the different ways the two societies have developed fit in with their different attitudes to measure. Thus, in the West, society has mainly emphasised the development of science and technology (dependent on measure) while in the East, the main emphasis has gone to religion and philosophy (which are directed ultimately toward the immeasurable).

If one considers this question carefully, one can see that in a certain sense, the East was right to see the immeasurable as the primary reality. For as has already been indicated, measure is an insight created by man. A reality which is beyond man and prior to him cannot depend on such insight. Indeed, the attempt to suppose that measure exists prior to man and independently of him leads, as has been seen, to the "objectification" of man's insight, so that it becomes rigidified and unable to change, eventually bringing about falseness and deception in our overall apprehension of the self and the world.

On the other hand, it would clearly be wrong to accept the notion that

measure is inherently incapable of being anything else but a false and deceitful veil of illusion, covering the true nature of reality. Rather, one may perhaps say that whatever can be assimilated within the field of measure is real, but of a dependent conditional sort of reality. What it depends on is ultimately the immeasurable totality. But this totality is not separate from the field of measure. Rather, the immeasurable overlaps and includes the measurable. Or to put it in another way, all that can be measured has its origin, its sustenance, and its ultimate dissolution in the immeasurable and undefinable which is the creative source of everything. Nevertheless, an adequate understanding of the measurable aspect of reality as a whole is evidently necessary for clear perception and right action in every phase of life.

One may speculate that perhaps in very early times, the men who were wise enough to see that the immeasurable is the primary and independent source of all reality were also wise enough to see that measure is insight into a secondary and dependent aspect of this reality, which is capable of helping to bring about order and harmony in our lives. What they may have said is perhaps that when measure is identified with "the whole of reality as it is" *this* is illusion. But then, when men learned this by conforming to the teachings of tradition, the meaning became largely habitual and mechanical. In the way indicated earlier, the subtlety was lost, and men began to say simply: "measure is illusion." Thus, both in the East and in the West, true insight may have been turned into something false and misleading, by the procedure of learning mechanically through conformity to existent teachings, rather than through a creative and original grasp of the insights implicit in such teachings.

It is of course impossible to go back to a state of wholeness that may have been present before the split between East and West developed (if only because we know little, if anything, about this state). Rather, what is needed is to learn afresh, to observe, and to discover for ourselves the meaning of fragmentation and wholeness. Of course, we have to be cognisant of the teachings of the past, both Western and Eastern. But to imitate these teachings or to try to conform to them would have little value. However, to develop new insight into fragmentation and wholeness requires a creative work, even more difficult than that needed to make fundamental new discoveries in science, or great and original works of art. It might in this context be said that the

one who is similar to Einstein in creativity is not the one who imitates Einstein's ideas, nor even the one who applies these ideas in new ways. Rather, it is the one who learns from Einstein, and then goes on to do something original, who is able to assimilate what is valid in Einstein's work, and yet goes beyond this work in qualitatively new ways. So what we have to do with regard to the great wisdom from the whole of the past, both in the East and in the West, is to assimilate it and to go on to new and original insight relevant to our present condition of life.

In doing this, it is important that we be clear on the role of techniques, such as those used in various forms of meditation. In a way, techniques of meditation can be looked on as measures (actions ordered by knowledge and reason) which are taken by man to try to reach the immeasurable, i.e. a state of mind in which he ceases to sense a separation between himself and the whole of reality. But clearly, there is a contradiction in such a notion. For the immeasurable is, if anything, just that which cannot be brought within limits determined by man's knowledge and reason.

To be sure, in certain specifiable contexts, technical measures, understood in a right spirit can lead us to do things, from which we can derive insight, if we are observant. But such possibilities are limited. Thus, it would be a contradiction in terms to think of formulating techniques for making fundamental new discoveries in science or creative and original works of art. For the very essence of such action is a certain freedom from dependence on others, who would be needed as guides. How can this freedom be transmitted in an activity in which conformity to someone else's knowledge or pattern of behaviour is the main source of energy? And if techniques cannot teach creativity and originality in art and science, how much less is it possible for them to enable us to "discover the immeasurable"?

Actually, there are no direct and positive things that man can do to get in touch with the immeasurable. For this must be immensely beyond anything that man can grasp with his mind or accomplish with his hands or his instruments. What man *can* do is to give his full attention and creative energies to bring clarity and order into the whole of the field of measure. This involves, of course, not only the outward display of measure in terms of external units, but also, inward measure or propor-

tion, as health of the body, moderation in action, and meditation, which gives insight into the operation of thought. This latter is particularly important because fragmentation has its root in the kind of thought that goes beyond its proper limits of harmony, by confusing its own content with a reality that would be independent of thought. In the West, this confusion has arisen, largely in the routine and mechanical application of measure, in such a way that everything is treated as broken up into separate parts, because the measurable limits of each part are seen as independently existent realities. In the East, a correspondingly routine and mechanical approach through acceptance of the authority of other people's ideas and techniques has rather generally led to a fragmentation between the everyday measurable aspects of reality and some special immeasurable domain that would be totally different (as well as between the methods imposed by the authority and the spontaneously creative responses of the individual who tries to conform to these methods).

To end this general fragmentation requires intelligent insight, not only into the world as a whole, but also, into how the instrument of thought is working. In particular what is needed is not the *measurement* of thought, to determine whether it has gone beyond its proper limits or not. Rather, there has to be a kind of observation from moment to moment, of how thought as a whole tends continually to carry measurement into contexts in which it is not relevant. This requires a creative act of perception through the senses and through the mind, that contains its own spontaneous discipline, not dependent on the authority of another or on the imposition of a technique for its order or its sustenance. Through meditation involving such perception and such spontaneous discipline, thought will come to work in a proper order, and the whole field of the measurable will then be harmonious, so that it can move in parallel with the immeasurable.

When such harmony prevails, man can then not only have insight into the meaning of fragmentation and wholeness, but what is much more significant, he can realise the truth of this insight in every phase and aspect of his life.

This requires, however, that he give his full creative energies to the enquiry into the whole field of measure, and that he drop his demands

(generally implicit and unexpressed) for some sort of guidance in this enquiry. To do this may perhaps be extremely difficult and arduous. But since everything turns on this, it is surely worthy of the serious attention and utmost consideration of each one of us.

Copyright © Krishnamurti Foundation Trust Limited (London) 1973

KRISHNAMURTI SPEAKING SCHEDULES — 1973 and 1974.

SAANEN GATHERING, SAANEN, SWITZERLAND — 1973

Talks: July 15, 17, 19, 22, 24, 26, 29 — 10:30 a.m.
Discussions: July 31 to August 7 — 10:30 a.m.

BROCKWOOD PARK, HAMPSHIRE, ENGLAND — 1973

Talks: September 1, 2, 8, 9 — 11:30 a.m.
Discussions: September 4, 5 — 11:30 a.m.

UNITED STATES — 1974

Santa Monica, Calif.: March 16, 17, 23, 24 — 11:00 a.m.
New York City: April 20, 21, 27, 28 — 11:00 a.m.

The Santa Monica talks will take place at the Santa Monica Auditorium, the New York talks at Carnegie Hall. Announcements with more details will be mailed to you later.

SPECIAL NOTES

The phonograph records THOUGHT BREEDS FEAR, THIS LIGHT IN ONESELF, and MIND IN MEDITATION are now available in cassettes at a cost of $6 each, as shown on the enclosed list.

Foundations

U.S.A. : Krishnamurti Foundation of America
P. O. Box 216, Ojai, California 93023

ENGLAND : Krishnamurti Foundation
24 Southend Road, Beckenham, Kent BR3 1SD

INDIA : Krishnamurti Foundation India
Rishi Valley School, Rishi Valley P. O. Chittoor District
Andhra Pradesh, India

PUERTO RICO : Fundacion Krishnamurti Hispanoamericana,
Apartado de Correos 3423, San Juan,
Puerto Rico 00936, U.S.A.

Associated Committees

AUSTRALIA : Mr. H. S. English and Mr. R. Bennett,
Krishnamurti Books, c/o P. O. Box 308,
Manly, N.S.W. 2095

BELGIUM : Comte and Comtesse Hugues van der Straten Ponthoz,
Mr. R. Linssen,
145 Avenue des Dames Blanches, Brussels 15

BRAZIL : Instituicao Cultural Krishnamurti,
Avenida Presidente Vargas, 418 — Sala 1. 109,
Rio de Janeiro — Estado Da Guanabara

DENMARK : Krishnamurti Komiteen,
Krogholmgaardsvej 31, 2950 Trørød pr Vedbaek

FINLAND : Miss Karpio and Miss Puolanne,
Krishnamurti — Kirjat, Pihlajatie 32 A 8, 00270 Helsinki 27

FRANCE : Mde. Annette Duche,
c/o Lydie Banzet, 24 Rue Masson, 78 Maisons-Laffitte

GERMANY and AUSTRIA E. M. Krauss, Gerhardstr. 18, D-23, Kiel

GREECE : Dr. I. Demetriades-Bacha,
40 Ekklision Str. No. 26, Nea Smyrni, Athens

ICELAND : Mr. S. Halldorsson, Bakkastig 1, Reykjavik

INDONESIA : Mr. M. Dalidd, 14 Djalan Sinkep, Malang

ISRAEL : Mr. I. Woolfson, 19 Yardai Hasirah Road, Katamen, Jerusalem

ITALY : (To be notified)

NETHERLANDS : Stichting Krishnamurti Nederland,
Meetings, secretary, treasurer: Karel van Gelderlaan 16A
Oosterbeek 6120
Bookorders, Bulletin: Weikamperweg 93, Hoenderloo 6736

NEW ZEALAND : Mr. Ray Falla, Box 22451, High St. P. O. Christchurch

NORWAY : Krishnamurti Biblioteket, Uranienborgvn 11c, Oslo

SOUTH AFRICA : The Misses Shepherd, 24, Kildare Road, Durban

SWEDEN : Krishnamurti Center,
Reginsvagen 4, 161 41 Stockholm Bromma

SWITZERLAND : Mr. and Mrs. Edgar Graf (German and Italian speaking),
6986 Novaggio
Mr. A. Schweizer (French speaking),
Furstensteinerstrasse 62, 4053 Bale