

On Creativity

J. Krishnamurti

Ninth Talk in Bombay

March 1948

Today's meeting was convened specially for the benefit of educationists and teachers, although it was open for all. It was presided over by a member of the New Education Fellowship, who welcomed the distinguished guest on behalf of his institution and thanked him for doing the honour. He then requested Sjt. Krishnamurti to give them the benefit of his advice in the matter of education.

Sjt. Krishnamurti: Mr. Chairman and friends. I have been sent many questions. I propose to answer as many of them as possible this evening. All these questions have been re-formed, but the substance has been kept. There are some questions which have been repeated and we thought it would be better to re-form them and we have about 15 or 16 questions here. But, before I answer them, I would like to say something. Throughout the world it is becoming more and more important that the educator needs education. It is not a question of educating the children at all, but the educator needs it much more than the pupil. Because, after all the pupil is merely like a tender plant that needs guiding, helping: But, if the helper is himself incapable, narrow, bigoted, nationalistic and all the rest of it, naturally, his product will be what he is. So, the importance is not so much the technique of what to teach, which is of secondary importance, but what is of primary importance it seems to me, is the intelligence of the educator. You know throughout the world education has failed because it has produced two colossal and most destructive wars in history and since it has failed, merely to substitute one system for another seems to me utterly futile, whereas if there is a possibility of changing the thought, the feelings, the attitude of the teacher, then perhaps there can be a new culture, a new civilization. Because this civilization certainly is going to be destroyed completely. It is obvious. This coming war will probably settle the Western civilization as we know it. Perhaps, we shall also be profoundly affected by it in this country also. But, out of all this chaos and misery and confusion and strife, surely the function of the teacher, whether he is merely government employee or a religious is teacher or a teacher of mere information, is responsible, is colossal, extraordinarily great and those who merely fatten on education as a means of livelihood seems to me to have no place in modern structure of society, if he is to create a new order. So, our problem is not so much the child, the boy or the girl, but the teacher, the educator, who needs much more education than the pupil. And to educate the educator is much more difficult than to educate the child, because the educator is already set, fixed. He merely functions in a routine, because he is really not concerned in the thought process, in the cultivation of intelligence. He is merely imparting information and a man who merely imparts information when the whole world is crashing about his years, surely he is not an educator. Do you mean to say, it is a means of livelihood? And such a means of livelihood, of exploiting the children for his own good seems to me so utterly empty of the word education. So, in answering all these questions the principal point is the educator and not the child. You can give the right environment, necessary tools, and all the rest of it. But, what is important is to find what all this existence means. Why are we educating, why are we living, why are we striving, why are there wars, why is there communal strife between man and man? Without studying it and without bringing our intelligence into operation, which is the function of a real teacher? The teacher who does not demand anything for himself, who does not use teaching as a means of acquiring position, power, authority: a teacher who is really teaching, not for profit, not along a certain line, a teacher who is giving, growing and cultivating intelligence, because he himself is cultivating intelligence in himself. Such a teacher surely has the primary place in civilization. Because, after all, all great civilizations have been found on the teachers, not on engineers, not on technicians. They are absolutely necessary, but those who kept the moral, the ethical intelligence has the primary importance and they can have a moral integrity, a freedom from power, position, authority, only when they don't ask anything for themselves, when they are beyond and above society and not in the control of governments, when they are free from the compulsion of social action,

which is always an action according to a pattern. So, surely, a teacher must be beyond the limits of society and its demands, so as to be able to create a new culture, a new civilization, a new structure, but we merely concern with the technique of how to educate a boy or a girl, It seems to me so utterly futile, without the intelligence of the teacher, and now mostly in the world we are concerned with learning a technique and imparting that technique to a child, the thing, and not with the cultivation of intelligence, which will help him to deal with in life. So, in answering any of these questions, I hope you will bear with me if I don't go into any particular detail, but deal primarily with, not technique, but with the right approach to the problem.

Question: What part can education play in the present world crisis?

Answer: First of all, to understand what part education can play in the world crisis, we must understand how the present crisis has come into being. Without understanding that, merely to build on the same values, on the same grounds, on the same foundation, will bring about further wars, further disasters. So, we must first investigate how the present crisis has come into being. And, in understanding what are the causes, you will inevitably understand what kind of education to bring about. Obviously, the present crisis is the result of wrong values, of wrong values with regard to man's relationship to property, to people and to ideas, which is property, which has become nationalistic, economic frontiers, expansion of sensate value and therefore the predominance of those values, which necessarily creates this poison of nationalism, sovereign separate governments and the patriotic spirit, which excludes cooperation between man and man for the benefit of man and his relationship with people, which creates society. And, if his relationship is wrong, inevitably the structure of society is bound to collapse and is relationship to ideas, which has become the justification of an ideology, whether of the left or of the right, whether the means employed is right or wrong, in order to achieve an end. Obviously, all these are the causes of the present disaster, mutual distrust, lack of goodwill, the justification of achieving an end through wrong means and justifying the wrong means for the right end, the sacrificing of the present for a future ideal: all these are obviously the cause of the present disaster. Of course, it will take an awfully long time to go into these in detail. But, one can see at a glance how this chaos, this degradation, has come into being. Surely, obviously, these are based on wrong values and the dependence on authority, on leaders. Surely, leaders and authority are the deteriorating factors in a culture. The moment you depend on another, there is no self-confidence, and where there is no self-confidence, self-dependence, obviously there must be brought about a conformity, and eventually leading to totalitarian states of dictatorships, whether it is in the small school or big universities. So, realising all these things, realising what are the causes of war, of this present catastrophe, the present moral and social crises, when one sees what the results are, naturally the causes are perceived. Surely, then the function of education is to create new values, not merely implant them in the mind of the pupil, which merely conditions the pupil, and not gives them intelligence. But, when the educator himself has not seen the causes of this present catastrophe, how can he implant, how can he give intelligence, how can he prevent the future civilization, the future generation from not following the same steps leading ultimately to further catastrophe. So, is it not important for the educator not merely to implant certain ideals, which is merely information, but to give all his thoughts, all his care, all his affection, the right environment, the right atmosphere, so that when the child or the boy grows up into maturity, he is capable of dealing with any problem, any human problem, that confronts him. So, the present crisis and education are intimately related, realising the world crisis is the outcome of wrong education. Which all the educators, at least in Europe and in America, are seeing. They want to transform and they can only transform it in emphasising the educator, in educating the educator and not merely creating a new pattern, a new system of action.

Question: Have ideals any place in education?

Answer: Certainly not. Ideals and the idealist in education prevent the comprehension of the present. This is an enormous problem and we are going, trying to deal with it say in 5 or 10 minutes, a problem upon which our whole structure is based., viz., that we have ideals and on those ideals we educate. Now, are ideals necessary for education? Don't ideals actually prevent right education, which is the understanding of the child as he is and not what he should be. If I want to understand a child, I must not have an ideal of what he should be. To understand him, I must study him as he is. But, to put him into a framework of an

ideal is to merely force him to a certain pattern, whether it suits him or not; and the result is he is always in contradiction to the ideal or he so conforms himself to the ideal that he ceases to be a human being, he merely acts as an automaton without intelligence. So, is not an ideal an actual hindrance to the understanding of the child? If you, as a parent, really want to understand the child, do you look at the child through the screen of an ideal? Or do you merely study him, because you have love in your heart? You watch him, you observe him, you watch his moods, his idiosyncrasies. Because there is love, you study him. It is only when you have no love, you have an ideal. You watch yourselves, what is yours, and you will notice this. When there is no love, you have this enormous examples and ideals, through which you are forcing, compelling the child. But, when you have love, you study him, you observe him and give him freedom to be what he is and guide help, not to the ideal, to the pattern of a certain action but to bring him up himself what he is. In which question there arises the problem: If he is a so-called bad boy, if I may use that word to define quickly and strongly a certain point and you want to change him into not being bad, surely you don't have to have an ideal. If a boy is a liar, you don't have to have the ideal of truth. You study why he is telling a lie. For various reasons. Because, probably he is frightened and we need not go into the various reasons of his lying. But, obviously when he is telling a lie, to make him to conform to a pattern of truth, which is your ideal, obviously does not help him to free himself from the causes of lying. You have to study him, you have to observe and because it takes such a long time to observe, needs patience, needs care, needs love and because we have not got it, we force him into a pattern of action, which we call an ideal. Obviously, an ideal is a very cheap escape. The ideal school, the ideal teacher who is practising the ideals is obviously incapable of dealing with the child. You don't have to accept automatically what I am saying or deny it. Just observe. After all, the function of education is obviously to turn out an integrated individual, an integrated individual who deals when he comes across life intelligently, wholly not partially, not as a technician, nor as an idealist. And, there cannot be an integrated individual if he is merely pursuing a pattern of action. Which is idealistic. Obviously, sirs and ladies, when you observe that the teachers who become idealists, who are pursuing a pattern of action, the so-called ideal, they are pretty useless. They are incapable, they have hard hearts and dry minds. Because it demands a much greater observation, great affection, to study, to observe the child, the boy, rather than force him into pattern of action, of an ideal and I think mere examples which is another form of an ideal is also a deterrent to intelligence. Probably, what I am saying is contrary to all that you believe. You have to think over it, because this is not a matter of denial or acceptance. One has to go into it very, very carefully. I am not being dogmatic; only as I have to answer so many questions, I have to be very brief and concise, but the implications of an ideal are obvious, that where there is an ideal which the teacher is pursuing, then he is incapable of understanding the child. To him the ideal is far more important than the child, the present. He has a certain end in view which he thinks is the right and he is forcing the child to conform to that ideal. Surely, that is not education. Is it? That is like turning out motor cars. You have the pattern and you put the child through the mould, with the result we create human beings who are merely technicians, who have no relationship to humanity, to another, but are out for themselves, for their gaining: politically, socially or in the family and it is one of the calamities of modern education that the so-called ideals, which are the end in view, have prevented, have brought about this present catastrophe, whether it is an ideology of the extreme left or of the right, when it has become a pattern of action, which is another form of an ideal. Obviously, it is much easier to follow than to observe, than to care, then to love the children and humanity.

Question: Is education in creativeness possible, or is creativeness purely accidental and therefore nothing can be done to facilitate its emergence?

Answer: The question is, put differently, by learning a technique, will you be creative, i.e., by practice, by learning a technique, say the practice of piano, violin, by learning the technique of painting, will you be a painter, will you be a musician, will you be an artist? Does creativeness come into being through technique or is creativeness independent of technique? You may learn all there is to know about painting, learn it, go to a school and learn about the depth of colour, the technique of how to hold the brush and all the rest of it, will that make you a creative painter? But, if you are creative, then anything that you do will have its own technique. I had been once to a great artist in Paris, of the first order, first rank. He did not learn a

technique. He was a great artist. He began with it. He wanted to say something and he said it in clay and then marvelled. Most of us learn the technique, but have very little to say. So we neglect, we overlook the capacity to find out for ourselves, but we have all the instruments of discovery without finding it for ourselves. So, the problem is how to be creative, which brings its own technique. After all, when you want to write a poem, what happens. You write it; and if you have a technique so much the better. But, if you have no technique, it does not matter. You write it. And the delight is in writing. After all, when you write a love letter, you are not bothered about the technique, you write it with all your being. But, when there is no love in your heart, you search out a technique, how to put words together. Sirs, you love. But, you miss the point. We think we will be able to live happily, creatively by learning a technique and it is the technique that is destroying creativeness, which does not mean that you must not have a technique. After all, when you want to write a poem beautifully, you must know the metre, the rhythm and all the rest of it. But, if you want to write it for yourself and not publish it, then it does not matter. You write. It is only when you want to communicate to another, proper technique is necessary, the right technique, so that there will be no misunderstanding. But, surely, to be creative is quite a different problem and that demands an extraordinary investigation into oneself. It is not a question of gift. Talent is not creativeness. One can be creative without having a talent. So, what do we mean by creativeness? Surely, a state of being in which conflict has completely ceased, a state of being in which there is no problem, a state of being in which there is no contradiction. Contradiction, problem, conflict, are the outcome of the emphasis on the me, the my, achieving my success, my family my country. When that is absent, then thought itself ceases and there is a state of being in which creativeness can take place, i.e., put it differently, when the mind ceases to create there is creation. And the mind creates as long as it has a problem, as long as it is the originator of problems and a mind that is chained to a problem through various causes, one of the causes being your belief or greed and so on, as long as it is tethered to the creation of its own problem therefore, it can never be free and therefore only in that freedom from its own problems and creations, can there be creation. Sir, to go into it fully and really deeply, one has to go into the whole problem of consciousness and I say that everyone of us can be creative in the right sense of the word, not merely producing poems and statues or creating children. Surely, to be creative means to be in that state in which truth can come into being and truth can only come into being when there is complete cessation of the thought process when the mind is utterly still, not compelled, not forced into a certain action or pattern of action, when the mind is still because it is no longer any problem or because it has understood all the problems as they arise, when the mind becomes absolutely still, not compelled, then in that state truth can come into being. That state is creation and creation is not for the few or the talent of the few or the gift of the few, but that state can be discovered by each one who gives his mind and heart to search out the problem.

Question: Is not the imparting of sex experience necessary part of education? Is it not the only rational solution to the troubles of adolescence?

Answer: Sir, to understand sex demands intelligence, not the ideal of something or other and it is an extremely difficult subject, like every other human problem and the educator if he himself has not understood it, that problem, how can he educate somebody else? If he is himself in the net, in the turmoil, in the extraordinary complex problem of sex, himself caught in it, how can he teach another? And why is it a problem to him, because himself obviously is uncreative. Sex merely then becomes a tool of pleasure, an experience which gives momentary joy, momentary absence of his own self; therefore it becomes a problem, whereas to be free from it, one has to investigate the various hindrances that are preventing his being creative. Obviously, one of the factors is imitation, social compulsion, to be something in society, following of an ideal is obviously a form of compulsion, a form of imitation; Therefore, there is no creative thinking. After all, when you are really, creatively thinking, have feeling strongly, sex plays very little importance. It is only when you are not alert to the whole significance of existence, to the movement of birds, to the trees, to smiles, to the whole movement, to the joy of living, whether you are rich or poor, then sex becomes a problem. And also there are other things involved in this question. Which is: can the experience be imparted to an adolescent child, because he is powerless. He wants to know what it is all about. And again, it depends on the teacher or the mother or the parents. Generally, they are so ashamed of it themselves. They are so shy; so absurd the whole thing is. They are such dirty minds. You should watch yourself sirs, how you look

at people, how you look at men and women. And you think you are capable of telling people, adolescent people, what it is all about. And there is the other problem which is: when our whole emphasis is laid on sensate value, i.e., values of the senses, then radio, cinema, magazines, sensations, play an important part. Pick up any magazine or newspaper; all the advertisements are attracting you, creating sensation. On the one side, you encourage all these, encourage sensation, sex, sensuality; on the other side, you say: you must not. You must become holy, keep an ideal of celibacy. It is all non-sense. You create in the mind contradiction and in contradiction, you are incapable of understanding anything. But, whereas if you deal with the problem directly, which is an obvious biological thing, without all the imputations, all the traditions, ugliness behind it, then you can be helpful by your own understanding of it. That creation is not mere sexual act, but creation is far more significant, profound; and there can only be creation, as I explained in the previous question, when the mind is not consumed with its own gratification. Sirs, when one loves, love is chaste and when there is no love, sex becomes a problem and it becomes an ugly habit. So, our difficulty in all these questions is that we ourselves, the educators, have become so dull, so weary. Life has been too much with us. We want to be comforted, we want to be loved. So, in ourselves being insufficient, ourselves being poor, how can we, who are the educators, give right education. It is, obviously, the problem is first as I said, the teacher, the educator, and not merely be concerned with the education of the pupil. Sir, our own hearts and minds must be cleansed, to be really capable of educating others. You may say: this is a very goody, goody stuff, without any practical information; but if the instrument that is teaching is itself crooked, how can it impart right information, right knowledge, right wisdom, right understanding?

Question: Is not State education a calamity? If it is, how to raise the funds required?

Answer: Obviously, State education is a calamity, which the governments won't agree. They don't want people who think, they want people as automatons. Because, then they can be told what to do. So, our education is, specially in the hands of governments, becoming more and more a means of what to think and not how to think. Because, if you are to think independently from the system, you would be a danger. Therefore, it is a function of the government not to make you think, but merely the acceptors, who accept what is told. So, obviously, as you examine throughout the world, every government is stepping into education. Education and food are the only means of controlling man now. And what do governments care as long as you are perfect machines to turn out merchandise and bullets whether it is the government of the left or of the right. There are few private schools in England and other places. But, they are all being watched carefully, investigated, controlled, because government does not want free institutions, because they may turn out a couple of pacifists, people who think contrary to the regime, to the system. So, right education is obviously a danger to government. And it is the function of government to see that right education is not imparted. There are about 80,000 pacifists in England. Are they not a danger to government if they increase? Therefore, control them from childhood. Don't let them think in terms of non-war, non-country, non-systems or a different ideology. Therefore, governments, supervision and therefore the control of education through the Educational Minister. Sir, this is what is happening in the world, whether you like it or not; which means you, who are the citizens, who are responsible for government, you don't want freedom. You don't want a new state of being, a new culture, a new structure of society. If you have something new, it may be revolutionary, may be destructive of what is. Therefore, you say: well, please let there be a government who will control education. Because you want things as they are. You want a little modification here and there, but you don't want a revolution in thought and the moment there is revolution in thought, government steps in, puts you in prison or liquidates you quickly behind doors. You are forgotten. Because, sir, the more and more a country is organized, more and more there is authority and external compulsion, because man himself has no inward regard, inward light, understanding. Then, he merely becomes a tool of the authority, whether it is totalitarian or so-called democratic. Because, both the totalitarian and the so-called democratic in moments of crisis, forget their democracy and make men conform to a pattern of action. Now, the second part of the question is. how to raise funds for a school which is not controlled by the government? Sir, surely that is not the problem. Is it? The moment you have funds, you are ruined. Look at all the schools that start in the most idealistic way. Look at the headmasters. They go fat on it. But, if you start a little school round the corner of your street, as I know several schools that have been started that way

and are still working. Because they are prepared for it. But, they have got the enthusiasm, the feeling, for it. One of our difficulties is: we want to transform the whole of mankind day after tomorrow, or affect the masses as you call it. Who are the masses? You and I. The poor humanity: you and I. And if you and I really felt, really thought about these problems, not just superficially for an afternoon to while away your time. Then, you and I would see that a right school is started anywhere, round the corner or in your own house, because then you are interested in your children and the children about you. Then, money will come, sir. Don't bother about money. Money is the least important thing. Leave it, money to the idealists, who want to start an ideal school. But, if you and I, becoming aware of the whole problem of human existence, what it means, why we live, why we suffer, why we go through all these tortures, and we want to understand it and help the child to understand, then we will start a school without funds, without beating drums and collecting lakhs. Because, the moment you have money, what happens? Don't you know it? What happens, sir? You have your own private ends. You have to watch over it; who is using it, whether you or your secretary or the committee. And all the rubbish, idiotic stuff begins. If you have little and real clarity of thought and feeling behind it, then you will create a school. But, in creating the school, obviously you will be opposed by the government or the interference of government. And do you think governments are going to stand it, if you teach your children not to be nationalistic, not to salute the flag, because nationalism is a factor which brings war about, if you teach them not to be communal and the various other things, help them to understand this whole problem of existence? Do you think your society would for a minute, stand it if you really turn out revolutionaries, not more revolution in the sense of killing, but real revolutionaries in thought and feeling? So, sirs, as parents and teachers, you are responsible, whether you merely comply to the dictates of government and therefore merely learn a technique, which merely gives you certain capacity to earn money and not be concerned with right living and right livelihood and if you are merely concerned with carrying on the present social structure, as it is; then obviously, you will have to follow the government. But, if you see that governments inevitably are built on violence and the product of violence and through wrong means a right and cannot possibly be achieved and if you are interested in really educating your children, obviously you will start a school just round the corner, in your backyard, in your little room. Because, sirs, I don't think many of us realise to what an abyss, to what a degradation, we have come. If there is a third war, that will be the end of things. You may escape: but your problem will be the fourth world war. Because, we have not solved this problem of man's antagonism to man. And you can only solve it through right means which is right education, not through an ideal of non-war, but understanding the causes of war, which is our attitude towards life, our attitude towards our fellow-beings. Without a change of heart, without having goodwill, mere organisations are not going to bring about peace, which is shown over and over again, the League of Nations and the UNO. And to rely on governments, outward organisations, to transform each one of us is to look in vain. What we have to do to transform ourselves is to become aware of our own actions, thoughts and feelings in everyday life. So, don't bother about raising funds. But, now you won't be bothered. You won't be bothered now, for a few minutes, when you are pressed into a corner, as at this meeting. Afterwards you will slip back to your daily routine and you will go back to your teachings and professions, because you have got to earn money. So, there will be very few who will be serious. And it is those of you that are serious that will bring about a revolution in thought. Sir, revolution in thought must begin first, not revolution in blood. If there is right revolution in thought, there will be no blood. But, if there is no right thinking, true thinking, there is going to be blood, more and more of it, nothing but blood. Because the wrong means is not going to produce the right end. Because the end is in the means.

Question: What have you to say about military drill in education?

Answer: So, it all depends on what you want the human being to be. If you want him to be a marvellous, efficient cannon-fodder, then military drill is marvellous. If you want to regiment him, if you want to regiment his mind, his feelings, discipline him, then military drill is a very good way to do it. If you want to make him irresponsible to society, then military operations, military drill, conditioning him in a certain way, is very good instrument. It all depends on what you want your sons and daughters to be. Surely, if you want him to live, sir, military drill is the wrong way to proceed. But, if you like death, then military drill is excellent. And as modern civilization is seeking death, then military, with its generals, soldiers, lawyers and all the rest of it, is very good. Then, you will have death, sure death. But, if you want peace, if you want

right relationship between man and man, whether he is a Christian, Hindu or Mussalman or Buddhist, all these labels being hindrances to right relationship, then military education is an absolute hindrance. Sir, it is surely the function of a general to prepare for war. It is the function of a soldier to maintain war and if life is meant to be a constant battle between yourself and your neighbour, then please have more generals. Then, let us all become soldiers, which is what is happening. Conscription has been thought in England for generations. It has been fighting conscription for generations, centuries, while the rest of Europe was being conscripted. And now she has given in. From that I mean England. She is a part of the whole world structure. It is an indication of what is happening. In this country, because it is so huge, conscription is not possible immediately: but it will come when you are all thoroughly organized. Then war, more wars, more blood-shed, more misery. Is that what we are living for, constant battle within ourselves and with others? Surely, sir, to discover truth, reality, the bliss of the unknowable, there must be freedom, freedom from strife, freedom from the strife between yourself and in yourself. After all, when a man is not in strife within himself, then he is not outwardly in strife. The inward strife when projected outward becomes the world chaos. After all, war is a spectacular result of our everyday living and without the alteration of that daily existence, merely the multiplication of soldiers, drills and saluting of flags and all the rubbish that goes with it inevitably is going to prolong destruction, misery, chaos. I was told by anthropologists that 2,000 or 3,000 years ago, a politician made a statement and said 'he hoped this would be the last war'. And we are still at it. I think we want arms. We want all the fun of the military instruments, the decorations, the uniforms, the salutes, the drinks, the murder. Because our life everyday life is that. We are destroying others through our greed, through our exploitation. The richer you get the more exploiting you are. We like all this. You want also to be the rich. So, as long as those three professions, the soldier, the police, and the lawyer, take dominance in society, that society is bound to be doomed and that is what is happening in India as well as the world over. These three professions are becoming stronger and stronger. I don't think you know what is going on about you and in yourself. What catastrophes we are preparing. All that we want to do is to live a day as rapidly and as stupidly and as disintegratingly as possible and we leave for the governments and for the politicians, for the cunning people to direct our lives. So, it all depends on what you want life to be. If life is meant to be a series of conflicts, then military expression is inevitable. If life is meant to be lived happily, with thought, with care, with affection, then military, then the soldier, the police, the lawyer is a hindrance. But, the lawyer, the police and the military are not going to give up their professions, no more than you are going to give up your exploiting ways, whether psychologically or outwardly. So, sir, it is very important to find out for yourself what is the purpose of living, not learning it from somebody else, but to discover it for yourself, which is by becoming aware of your daily actions, of your daily feelings and thoughts. When you so become aware, it will reveal the true purpose.

Question: What is the place of art in education?

Answer: I don't quite know what you mean by art. Do you mean by hanging pictures in your school room or do you mean helping the child to draw a picture, according to a pattern because you have learnt a little technique or do you mean by teaching the child to be sensitive not to you as the teacher, to what you say, but to be sensitive to life, sensitive to the miseries, to the confusions, to the sorrows, or do you want merely to instruct him how to paint or do you want him to be under the influence of beauty, not of any particular picture or of any statue, but beauty, Sir in modern civilization, beauty, apparently is on the skin, how you dress, how you paint your face, you comb your hair, how you walk. We are discussing art, whether beauty is surface, or is it a matter of loving. When it is a matter of love, whether it is surface or inward, whether it is outward or understanding the inward process of thought. And, as our society structure is constructed, we are more concerned with the outward expression, the looks, with the sari; It does not matter what you are within, but present a respectable appearance, put on rouge, lip-stick. It does not matter what you are inside. So, we are more concerned with the technique rather than living, and more expression rather than love. Therefore, we use ourselves as a means of covering up our inner ugliness, our inward confusion. We listen to music to escape from our own sorrow. In other words, we become the spectators and not the players. To be a painter, you must know yourself and to know yourself is extremely difficult; but to learn a technique of painting is comparatively easy. So, when we talk about art in education, I don't know exactly what you mean. Obviously, you mean the outward superficial environmental results and influences. They have their place

but obviously when the outer is emphasised, the inner beauty, the inner confusion, the inner understanding, is denied and without inward beauty, how can there be the outward expression of it? And to cultivate inward beauty, you must first be aware of the inward confusion, the inward ugliness, because beauty does not come into being by itself. You must understand both the ugly and the confused and the sensitive and it is only when there is order out of confusion there is beauty.

Question: Whom would you call a perfect teacher?

Answer: Obviously, not the teacher who has an ideal, obviously not the teacher who is making profit out of teaching or who has built up an organisation, obviously not the teacher who is the instrument of the politician, obviously not the man who is bound to a belief, to a country; but a perfect teacher is one surely who does not ask anything for himself, who is not caught up in politics, in power, in position. He does not ask anything for himself, because inwardly he is rich. His wisdom does not lie in books; his wisdom lies in experiencing and experiencing is not possible if he is seeking an end. Experiencing is not possible to him for whom the result is far more important than the means; to him who wants to show that he has turned out so many pupils who have passed brilliant exams: how many pupils have come out of it first class, M.As., B.As., or whatever it is. Obviously, as most of us want a result, we don't care what means are employed and therefore we can never be perfect teachers. Surely, sir, a teacher who is perfect must be beyond and above the control of society. He must teach and not be told what to teach, which means, he must have no position in society. He must have no authority in society, because the moment he has authority, he is part of society; and society is always disintegrating and a teacher who is part of a society can never be the perfect teacher. He must be out of it, which means, he cannot ask anything for himself; which means, society must be so enlightened that it must support him in his needs. But, we don't want such enlightened society, nor such teachers. If we had such teachers, then the present society would be in danger. Religion is not organized belief. Religion is the search of truth, which is of no country, which is of no organized religion, and which does not lie in any temple, church, or mosque and without the search of truth, no society can exist and if it exists it is bound to bring about disaster. Surely, the teacher is not merely the giver of information, but the teacher is one who points the way to wisdom and the pointer to wisdom is not the guru. Truth is far more important than the teacher. Therefore you, who are the seeker of truth, have to be both the pupil and the teacher. In other words, you have to become the perfect teacher to create a new society and to create a new teacher, to bring a new teacher into being, you have to understand yourself. Wisdom begins with self-knowledge and without self-knowledge, more information leads to destruction. Without self-knowledge, aeroplane becomes the most destructive instrument in life; but with self-knowledge, it is a means of human help. So, a teacher is obviously one who is not within the clutches of society, who does not play power politics or seek position or authority. In himself he has discovered that which is eternal and therefore he is capable of imparting that knowledge which will help another to discover his own means to enlightenment.

Question: What is the place of discipline in education?

Answer: I should say, none. Just a minute. I will explain it further. What is the purpose of discipline? What do you mean by discipline? You, being the teacher, when you discipline, what happens? You are forcing, compelling, compulsion, however nice, however kind, you are compelling, which means conformity, which means imitation, which means fear. And, without discipline, you will say, how can a large school be run? It cannot. Therefore, large schools cease to be educational institutions. It is a profitable institution, for the boss or for the government, for the head-master or the owner or for the State. Sir, if you love your child, do you discipline it? Do you compel it? Do you force him to a habit into a pattern of thought? You watch him, don't you? You try to understand him, you try to discover what are the motives, the urges, the drives, that are behind him or her and by understanding him, you bring about the right environment, the amount of right sleep, the right food, the amount of right play. All that is implied, when you love a child; but we don't love children. Because we have no love in our own hearts. We just breed children. And naturally, when you have many of them, you must discipline them and discipline becomes an easy way out of the difficulty. After all, discipline means resistance. You create resistance against that which you are disciplining against. Do you think resistance will bring about understanding, thought, affection? Discipline can only build walls

about you. Disciplines are always exclusive whereas understanding is inclusive. Understanding comes when you investigate, when you enquire, when you search out, which means, care, consideration, thought, affection. Therefore, in a school, a large school, such things are not possible. Only in a small school. But, small schools are not profitable to the private owners or to government, but since you, who are the owners of government, since you are not interested, since you are not really interested in your children, what does it matter? If you really love your children, not just as a means of toys, as playthings to amuse you for a little while and a nuisance after it; if you have loved your children, would you have allowed all these things to go on? Wouldn't you want to know what they ate, where they slept, what they did all along? Whether they are beaten, whether they are crushed, whether they are destroyed? which means an enquiry, consideration of another, whether it is your child or another's. But, we have no consideration, neither for your children, for your wife or husband. So, how can you have consideration for the effects of discipline? So, sirs, the matter lies in your hands, not in the hands of governments and systems. If all of us really care, really, truly care for children, we would have a new society tomorrow; but we really do not care. We have no time. We have time for Puja, we have time for earning money, we have time for clubs, we have time for amusements, but no time for thought or the care for the child. I am not being rhetoric. This is a fact, and we don't want to face the fact. Because, to face the fact means, you have to give up all those amusements or distractions and do you mean to say you are going to give them up? Certainly not. So, you throw them into the schools, and the teacher no more cares for the child than you. Why should they? He is there for his job, for his money and so it goes on; and we come for an evening to discuss education. It is really a marvellous world we have got. It is such a phoney, superficial world, so ugly behind, if you look behind the curtain and we are decorating the curtain and hoping that everything will be right behind the curtain. Sir, I don't think you realise how serious things are? Neither the educator nor the parents. It is obvious; the catastrophe that is going on in this country. You don't want to strip it all bare and begin again, anew. You want to do patchwork reform and that is why all these questions arise. Sir, you have to start anew. There can be no patchwork reform. Because the building is crumbling, the walls are giving way, there is fire destroying. You must leave the building and start anew in a different place, with different values, with different foundations. But, the man who is making profit out of education, either the State or the individual, will go on. Because he does not see the destruction, the deterioration, the degradation. But, those who really see the whole catastrophe, not just in a few spots, the world over, have to strip themselves of everything and start anew. I don't mean stripping the outward knowledge, the technical knowledge. I know it can never be stripped, but strip themselves inwardly, see themselves as they are, their ugliness, their brutality, their ruthlessness, their deceptions, their dishonesty, their utter lack of love, and start it all anew and become honest, clear, simple, direct. Surely, then only, there is a possibility of a new world and a new order. Peace does not come through patchwork reform. Peace does not come through mere adjustment of things as they are. Peace comes only when we understand what is, beyond the superficial. Peace can only come into being when the wave of destruction is stopped, which is the wave of our own action. Sir, how can we have love. Not through the pursuit of the ideal of love, but when there is no hatred, when there is no greed, when there is consideration, when there is generosity. But a man who is occupied with exploitation, with greed, with envy, can never know love, and when there is love, systems become of very little importance. When there is love, there is care, there is consideration, not only of the children, but of every human being.