The title of this new digital publication—The Pathless—is self-explanatory as it points to what J. Krishnamurti himself referred to as the core of his Teachings. In 1929, when he dissolved the Order of the Star in the East, which signalled his breakaway from all organized religions, he explained his action by declaring, ‘Truth is a pathless land.’ After five decades of teaching, when he was asked what the ‘core’ of his message was, he said it was the same as what he had said previously: ‘Man cannot come to it [truth] through any organization, through any creed, through any dogma, priest or ritual, not through any philosophical knowledge or psychological technique.’ This unwavering insight of his found expression in several ways. Many of you must be familiar with his approach to Vedantic thought, found in books such as *Tradition and Revolution* and *The Awakening of Intelligence*. Readers interested in his dialogues with Buddhist philosophers may refer to books such as *A Timeless Spring, The Way of Intelligence, Fire in the Mind, The Perfume of the Teachings*, and *The Last Talks*. The following excerpts are from *Can Humanity Change?*, which contains dialogues with Walpola Rahula, a Sri Lankan monk.

Walpola Rahula: What the Buddha taught twenty-five hundred years ago you teach today in a new idiom, a new style, in a new garb. When I read your books, I often write in the margin, comparing what you say with the Buddha; sometimes I even quote the chapter and verse of the text—not only Buddha’s original teaching, but also the idea of the late Buddhist philosophers; those too you put practically the same way. I was surprised how well and beautifully you expressed them....

To begin with, I want to say that there is fundamental agreement on these things, and there is no conflict between you and the Buddha. Of course you are not a Buddhist, as you say. Krishnamurti: No, sir.

WR: And I myself don’t know what I am. It does not matter. But in your teachings and the Buddha’s teaching, it is just that you say the same thing in a way that is fascinating today’s human beings, and for those of tomorrow. And now I would like to know what you think about all this.

K: May I say, sir, with due respect, why do you compare?

WR: This is because when I read your books as a Buddhist scholar, as one who has studied Buddhist texts I always see it is the same thing.

K: Yes, sir, but if I may ask, what is the necessity of comparing?

WR: There is no necessity at all.

K: If you were not a scholar of Buddhism and all the...
sutras, and the sayings of Buddha, if you had not gone very deeply into Buddhism, how would it strike you reading this, without the background of all that?

…Does knowledge condition human beings—knowledge of scriptures, knowledge of what the saints have said and so on, the whole gamut of so-called sacred books, does that help humanity at all?

…I am not doubting what you are saying, sir. But I would like to question whether knowledge in its actual sense has the liberating quality of the mind.

WR: I don’t think knowledge can liberate.

K: Knowledge can’t, but the quality, the strength, the sense of capacity, the sense of value that you derive from knowledge, the feeling that you know, the weight of knowledge—doesn’t that strengthen the self?

WR: Certainly.

K: Does knowledge actually condition the human being? Let’s put it that way? The word knowledge all of us surely take to mean accumulation of information, of experience, of various facts, theories, and principles, the past and the present, all that bundle we call knowledge. Does, then, the past help? Because knowledge is the past.

WR: All that past, all that knowledge, disappears the moment you see the truth.

K: But can a mind that is burdened with knowledge see truth? (pp.3-8)

WR: Sir, you know the word arahant in Buddhist terminology. An arahant is a person who has realized the truth, who is liberated, who is free. It is a very well-known term. And the disciples of the Buddha, and various people, often asked him what happens to an arahant after his death. Someone asked, ‘Does he exist after his death?’ And the Buddha said, ‘No.’ ‘Then can one say he does not exist?’ The Buddha said, ‘No.’ ‘Then he exists and does not exist?’ The Buddha said, ‘No’ ‘Then he does not exist, nor not exist?’ The Buddha said,

‘No, none of those terms “exist” or “does not exist”, “is” or “is not”, can be applied to that state.’ These are called the four kotis, or extremes. And all these terms, which are relative and dualistic, are used only within our knowledge, our experience, within empirical world. But this is beyond that world, therefore you can’t apply any of these words. This question was put repeatedly to the Buddha, and that was his answer. What do you say to this?

K: Sir, could we talk over together what is living and what is dying, and what is the state of the mind that is dead, or in the process of dying? Could my putting it that way help to answer the question?

WR: I don’t know.

K: You see, after all, the arahant is known also, I believe, in Hindu thought. Not that I have read any books about this, but I have discussed it with people. Human beings right throughout the world, as far as one can make out, are always inquiring into or having beliefs about death, asking if there life after death, whether there is a continuity. And if there is no continuity what is the point of living at all? Life is such a dreadful affair anyhow, with a lot of trouble, anxiety, fear; so if there is no reward for living properly, correctly, what is the point of being good, kind, noble, and so on? Could we approach your question from that point of view? Or do you want to ask what is the state of a mind that has no self whatsoever?

WR: That’s right, that is the state of an arahant.

K: That is what I want to get at. Could we go into it that way?

WR: I think that is a good approach, because an arahant has no self whatsoever.

K: Is that possible? I am not saying it is or is not, we are inquiring, we are inquiring, proceeding through exploring and finding out, not believing or disbelieving. So what is the self? The name, the form, the body, the organism. The name identifies itself with the body, certain characteristics identifying themselves with the ‘me’—I am strong, I am weak, I have got a good character, I am not bad. So the characteristic, the tendency is
identified by thought as the ‘me’. The experiences, the accumulated knowledge, as identified by thought as the ‘me’, and the ‘me’ is that which I possess—my property, my house, my furniture, my wife, my books. All that, the violence, the pleasure, the fear, the agonies, together with the name, the form, constitutes the self. So what is the root of the self? Is the root of the self the acquired experiences? I am inquiring—we are inquiring—into the very root of it, not the mere expressions of it. So the whole process of identification—my house, my name, my possessions, what I will be, the success, the power, the position, the prestige—the process of identification is the essence of the self. If there is no identification, is there the self? You understand sir? So can this identification, which is the movement of thought, come to an end? If thought didn’t say that is my furniture, identifying itself with that, because it gives it pleasure, position, security, there would be no identification. So the root of the self is the movement of thought.

K: So death is the ending of that movement. Or is death a continuity of that movement into the next life? You understand?
WR: Quite.
K: Why should the arahant, or the liberated man, wait until the end, till he reaches that which is called death? We realize the very root of the self is the movement of thought in time, in distance, from here to there, and all the conflicts, miseries, confusions created by thought are the self. So when thought comes to an end, that is a form of death while living.

Now, can thought come to an end? To bring that about, or wanting thought to end, we meditate, we practise, we are aware, we go through all the tortures of so-called meditation. (pp.33-35)

K: Sir, I hope you don’t think me impudent or irreverent to what the Buddha said. I personally haven’t read all these things. I don’t want to read anything about all this. They may be correct or not correct, they may be illusory or not illusory, they may have been put together by disciples, and what the
disciples do with their gurus is appalling—everything gets twisted. So I say, Look, I don’t want to start with somebody telling me what to do or what to think. I have no authority. I say, Look, as a human being who is suffering, going through agonies, sex, mischief, terror, and all the rest of it, in inquiring into all that I come to the point, which is thought. That’s all. I don’t have to know all the literature in the world, which will only condition further thinking. So forgive me for putting it this way: I brush all that aside. We have done this—I have met Christians, Benedictine monks, Jesuits, great scholars, always quoting, quoting, quoting, believing this is so, this is not so. You understand, sir? I hope you don’t think I am irreverent.

WR: Not at all. I fully agree with you, and that is my attitude as well. I am talking to examine it.

K: You see, I start only with what for me is a fact, what is a fact, not something according to some philosopher or religious teacher or priest—a fact—I suffer, I have fear, I have sexual demands. How am I to deal with all these tremendously complex things, which make up my life where I am so utterly miserable and unhappy? I start from there, not from what somebody else has said, that means nothing. Your follow, sir? Forgive me, I am not belittling the Buddha, I wouldn’t do that.

WR: That I know. I know you have the highest respect for the Buddha. We have the same attitude, and I want to examine it with you. That is why I put the question.

K: No, sir, not quite, forgive me for saying so, not quite. I start with something which is common to all of us. Not according to the Buddha, not according to the Christian God or some Hindu or some group; to me all that is totally irrelevant; they have no place because I suffer, and I want to find out if it can be ended, or must I carry on for the rest of my life with this agony, this brutality, this sexual perversions or sexual desires, you know, all the rest of it. So I see that the root of all this confusion, uncertainty, insecurity, travail, effort, the root of this is the self, the ‘me’. Now is it possible to be free of the ‘me’ which produces all this chaos, both outwardly, politically, religiously, economically and all the rest of it, and also inwardly, this constant struggle, constant battle, constant effort? So I am asking, can thought end? So that, thought has no future—that which ends then has a totally different beginning—not the beginning of the ‘me’, ending and picking up again later.

In what manner can thought end? That’s the problem. The Buddha must have talked about it. I don’t think Christianity, as far as I know, has touched this point. They said, give yourself to God, to Christ, abandon yourself to him. But the self goes

The following passage is from Fire in the Mind:

Pupul Jayakar: Take the Buddha. Whatever the Buddha consciousness was, or was manifesting through him, it has ceased to be in terms of manifesting.

Krishnamurti: I question it, I doubt it. Let’s be very careful. Let’s talk about the Buddha. You say the consciousness of that person, Buddha, ceased when he passed away. It had manifested through him...

I have met the Buddha. I have listened to him greatly. It has made a tremendous impression. In me, the whole truth of what he said is abiding. And he goes away. He has told me very carefully, ‘Be a light to yourself.’ So, that truth is with me, the seed is flowering in me. So even if he goes away, the seed is flowering. I may miss him, I may say, ‘I am sorry, he was a friend, I have lost a friend or somebody whom I really loved.’ But what is important is that the seed of truth, which has been planted by my alertness, awareness, intense listening, that seed will flower. (pp. 130-132)
on. They haven’t gone into this at all, only the Hindus and the Buddhists have done so, and perhaps some others. So can this thought end? (pp. 38-40)

\[...\]

K: I listen to a statement that thought is the root of the self; after a careful explanation of the movement of thought that identifies itself with the form, name, with this and that and the other thing. So after explaining this very carefully, it is said that thought is the very root of the self. Now how do you receive or listen to the truth of that fact, that thought is the root of the self? Is it an idea, a conclusion, or is it an absolute, irrevocable fact?

WR: If you ask me, it is a fact. I listen to it, receive it, I see it.

K: Are you listening as a Buddhist? Forgive me for putting it that way!

WR: I don’t know.

K: No, you must know.

WR: I am not identifying anything at all. I am not listening to you as a Buddhist or as a non-Buddhist.

K: I am asking you, sir, are you listening as a Buddhist, as a person who has read a great deal about the Buddha, and what the Buddha has said, and so comparing—just a minute—and so you have gone away from listening? So are you listening—I am not being personal, sir, forgive me—are you listening?

WR: Oh, you can be quite free with me—I won’t misunderstand you, and you won’t misunderstand me. I have no fear of that.

K: No. I don’t mind your misunderstanding me at all. I can correct it. (Laughter) Are you listening to the idea, to the words, and the implications of those words, or are you listening without any sense of verbal comprehension, which you have gone through quickly, and you say, Yes, I see the absolute truth of that?

WR: That is what I said.

K: Do you?

WR: Yes.

K: Sir, then it is finished. It is like seeing something tremendously dangerous, it is over, you don’t touch it. I wonder if you see that.

...When you say something to me, what the Buddha has said, I listen. I say, He is just quoting from what the Buddha has said, but he is not saying something I want to know. He is telling me about the Buddha, but I want to know what you think, not what Buddha thought, because then we are establishing a relationship between you and me, and not between you, Buddha and me. I wonder if you see that. (pp. 42-44)

\[...\]

Can I, as a human being living in this tremendously ugly, brutal, violent world, economically, socially, morally and all the rest of it, live without the self? I want to find out. And I want to find out not as an idea, I want to do it, it’s my passion. Then I begin to inquire: Why is there identification with the form, with the name—it is not very important whether you are K or W or Y. So you examine this very, very carefully not to identify yourself with anything, with sensation, with ideas, with a country, with an experience… I have got the key to it. The key is non-identification with sensation. (pp. 47-48).
If I had been in India when Buddha died...

The following statements by Krishnamurti about the Buddha appear in *The Perfume of the Teachings*, a book that contains the dialogues he held in 1977 in Ojai with the trustees of the Foundations of India, UK, USA, and Canada.

If I had been in India when Buddha died, I would want to know what the Buddha was like. I would go to people who had listened to him, I would want to find out. I have read the books, but I want to touch that which you, who have known him for some years, have touched when he was alive. (pp. 14-15)

You know South India? For miles and miles, when there were no trains, I would have walked all that way to find out what the disciples of Buddha said about what it felt like to be with him, what he was like, to feel what they felt. I don’t know what they felt, but I would have wanted to find out. (p.23)

Q: But aren’t you talking about two different things? You are talking about what a person is like, and you are talking about a man’s teachings.
K: I would want to know. If I had been a South Indian and heard about the Buddha, I would have come to you. I would want to know what he looked like, what he said, what he felt. You can’t say, ‘Sorry, it is too emotional, too personal’, too this and too that. He would say, ‘I have travelled all this way and you brush me off.’
Q: But isn’t the crux of it the degree of understanding we have of your teachings and not what you look like?
K: I am interested in everything about him. For God’s sake, get that.

Q: I don’t feel that pessimistic about it.
K: I am not pessimistic. Sir, if you loved a woman, you would tell me all about her. Your love would tell me, wouldn’t it?
Q: Of course.
K: That’s all I am asking.
Q: Yes.
K: If the dead Buddha’s disciple were here, that disciple who loved him would tell me everything. (pp. 24-25)

I have listened to the Buddha for a number of years. I know what he is saying, intellectually. I know more or less what he is driving at. And I don’t understand, or the thing which he wants to flower is not happening. I don’t take it as a crisis, as something I have to find out. I do not assume anything. I do not start with any conviction—that I am lazy, that I have no capacity, that my time is occupied with my children. I won’t make any assumptions. The thing is not happening. (p.116)

Hearing K is one thing. Or the Buddha—I would go and listen to him a great deal, if I had the opportunity, if I had the money, and so on. I would spend a great deal of time with him, listening to what he said, discussing. That is one category. But K is gone, dead, or whatever, or the Buddha is dead. So I want to understand what he said about certain things. (pp. 137-138)

I took the other day the example of the Buddha. Let’s now also make that point clear. I said, if I remember rightly: suppose some of you had heard him, or listened to him, or talked with him—and I have heard him once or twice—and I come to you, I want you to tell me much more deeply than I have understood, in discussion, in dialogue, in talking over together, what he said. There might have been a misunderstanding that I assumed I was the Buddha. I would never do that. If that is in your mind, please wipe it out. All that I said was: if a man from Seattle listened to these teachings, and had been listening for a number of years, and came here to the Centre wanting to know more about it, wanting to be more involved in it, he would want to have a dialogue with you, stay with you, have a quiet, peaceful time. (pp. 162-163)
VASANT VIHAR OPENS ITS DOORS
After a long period of lock-down, Vasanta Vihar resumed its activities slowly, first by opening The Study in August 2021 and keeping it functioning from 9.30 am to 4 pm, from Monday to Friday. Now it works on all days, including Sundays.

THE SUNDAY VIDEO SHOW
Video-screening of Krishnamurti’s talks and discussions for the public resumed on Sunday, 20 March. This programme is held on the first and third Sunday of every month, and announcements are made on our website and in newspapers. The first video was of a 65-minute talk (including a question and answer session) by Krishnamurti at the Pacem in Terris Society (Peace on Earth Society) of the United Nations, in New York, on 11 April 1985, a year before he passed away. Titled ‘Why can’t man live peacefully on earth?’, the talk was an apt choice, with the world teetering on the brink of a third world war.

THE WEEKEND RETREAT
Vasanta Vihar hosted 13 people for the weekend residential retreat, beginning on Friday, 25 March, and ending by Sunday evening. The participants, who were mostly first-timers. The theme ‘What is the purpose of life?’ seemed to a real question for most of them, and they appreciated the choice of the videos played and the reading material distributed. One of the videos was again the talk given by Krishnamurti at the IIT, Bombay, which raised a number of questions about the purpose of human existence:

For future retreats and other events, please visit www.jkrishnamurti.in.

SPECIAL INTERACTION
On Monday, 21 March, there was an interaction with a group of 30 students from Sri Venkateswara Engineering College, Sriperumbudur, near Chennai. ‘Why are you being educated?’ was the theme of Krishnamurti talk—the talk he gave at the Institute of Technology, Mumbai, on 7 February 1984, and the text of which is available in the book Why are you being educated?: Talks at Indian Universities. This was followed by a session in which the students asked questions, which were based mainly on what they had heard in the video.

REAL CRISIS: DIGITAL BOOKLET
History seems to be the story of man-made catastrophes, and these seem to occur regularly, repeatedly and unfailingly, always taking the world by shock and surprise, disproving all the predictions and promises of the pundits and experts. We never ask whether our present way of living itself is not the cause of the next global crisis. The question may never occur to us and, even if it does, we dare not face it. This is precisely the challenge J. Krishnamurti throws at us—make us aware of a number of fundamental questions, some of which are given here as excerpts from his talks and writings of nearly five decades, covering the years from 1934 to 1985.

This compilation is available in English as well as Hindi, Bengali, Odia, Telugu, Tamil, Malayalam, Kannada, Marathi and Gujarati and can be downloaded in PDF from www.jkrishnamurti.in.
WAR: DIGITAL BOOKLET

Every war ends with the hope that there would be lasting peace. In five thousand years of recorded history, there have been more than 5000 wars. Peace is always short-lived. One would think that after two world wars in the 20th century, with an estimated 100 million casualties, we would have learnt our lesson well enough to avert war and live in relative peace. If anything, this world is in far greater strife.

Why is it that despite our wanting to live in peace and harmony, we find ourselves in chaos, time after time? Is there a way out? J. Krishnamurti, one of the greatest religious teachers of all time, lays bare why we find ourselves caught in the pattern of conflict and war. ‘War’, he says, ‘is a spectacular and bloody projection of our everyday lives’. What Krishnamurti said and wrote for more than five decades is contained in this digital booklet of fifteen excerpts which provide a brief but clear glimpse into the causes of war and the way out of it.

Download the English version from www.jkrishnamurti.in.

MUMBAI CENTRE NEWS

The Centre held monthly online discussion sessions based on the book The Limits of Thought from May to December 2021. Monthly online sessions in Gujarati were held from December 2021, based on the video series The Real Revolution. The videos are available on our Gujarati YouTube channel with embedded Gujarati subtitles. In January 2022, a series of monthly online interactions were held with students from the various departments and colleges of University of Mumbai as well as from other educational institutions. There was a mix of undergraduate and post-graduate students and a few educators.

Workshop on Translation: A two-day online interactive workshop on translation was attended by Marathi and Gujarati translators.

Translations: Marathi translations of Freedom from the Known and You Are the World, published by K. B. Dhawale Publishers, are available as subsidized editions at ₹100 each.

Audio Books: The following titles are available as Audio books on Storytel.com: Freedom from the Known, The First and Last Freedom, Think on These Things, Education and the Significance of Life, and Commentaries on Living – Part II.