THE CONDITIONED AND THE UNCONDITIONED MIND - J. KRISHNAMURTI'S PERSPECTIVE

G. VEDAPARAYANA

Mind or consciousness is one of the dominant issues of philosophical inquiry. Thinkers of the East as well as of the West have given consciousness tremendous importance in their understanding of the life-world. A plethora of knowledge about mind has been accumulationg in biology, psychology and philosophy. But the problem of mind is still an enigma ; a clear and complete picture of mind has yet to emerge despite constant debates about and researches into mind. J. Krishnamurti is one of the contemporary thinkers who has offered incisive and instructive insights into mind. His account of mind may be said to be comprehensive and complete. His discoveries in the field of consciousness are more profound than those of the physicist in the field of matter. This paper is an attempt at presenting a detailed exposition of Krishnamurti's analysis and understanding of mind or consciousness. The paper comprises four parts. Part one presents in brief some of the influential conceptions of consciousness in the field of philosophy, viz., the Advaitic, the Yogacara-Vijnanvada, the phenomenological and the Marxian. Part two embodies Krishnamurti's analysis and understanding of the conditioned consciousness. Part three deals with Krishnamurti's radical transformation of the conditioned consciousness; it also gives in brief the essential features of the unconditioned mind, according to Krishnamurti. And in the fourth and concluding part an attempt is made to compare Krishnamurti with Advaita, Yogacara-Vijñānavada, Phenomenology and Marxism.

Indian Philosophical Quarterly XXX No 4
Oct. 2003

I

According to Advaita there are four states of consciousness - the waking (*jāgrat*), the dream (*svapna*), the sleep (*suṣupti*) and the metaphysical awakening. (*Turiya*) The first three are the conditioned states (avasthatraya) while the fourth (*caturtha*) is the absolutely unconditioned. In the waking state, consciousness is associated with the mind and the senses ; it is intentional, directed outside (*bahiṣprajñāh*) and cognises the external, gross object of forms, sounds, etc. ; the objective world of duality and multiplicity is its field of activity and the out turned sense organs are the channels of its experience and knowledge. In the state of dream, the intentional consciousness in association with the mind or the intellect is internalised (*antaḥprajñāḥ*) and is aware of the subtle objects (*praviviktabhuj*) which are the impressions of the waking experience. Consciousness here creates its own world of diversity without the help of the body and the senses which are gone to sleep; its projects from itself, without the external aid, all kinds of wierd objects like chariots, roads, tanks, streams, lotus pools, pleasures, pains etc. In sleep where the mind is absent and the senses inactive consciousness is non-intentional, without content and alone; it knows neither the objects nor distinctions, nor relations whatsoever. Consciousness in this state is pure awareness (*prajñā*) which is neither the knowing subject nor the object known but the witness self (*sakṣin*) to which the world of objects, gross as well as subtle, are totally absent. And in the fourth state, namely, ***Turiya,*** consciousness is neither external awareness (*ñā'bahiḥprajñā*) as in the waking state nor internal awareness (*ñā'ntaḥprajñā*) as in dream ; nor is it awareness in between the both (*no'bhayatahprajñā*); it is not even a substantial mass (*na' prajñānaghana*) as in sleep ; it is neither the cogniser of all things at the same time (*na prajñā*) nor non-cognitive as what is inert (*na' prajñā*). Consciousness here is unseen (*aḍṛṣta*) beyond empirical usages (*avyavahārya*), ungraspable (*agrāhya*), without any distinctive mark (*alakṣan*) and beyond the reach of thought (*acintya*) and word (*avyapadeśya*). It is the unchanging essence of knowledge (*ēkātmapratyayasāraṃ*) and the cessation of the pluralistic universe (*prapañcopaśanaṃ*). It is peace (*śāntaṃ*), auspicious (*śivaṃ*) and non-

dual (*advaita*).[1] It is totally different from the preceding three states of consciousness coverd (*āvarana*) by nescience (*avidyā*). It is regarded as the supreme Consciousness the attainment of which marks the ultimate liberation (*mokṣa*) from the cycle of birth and death (*saṃsāra*). "It is the end which is final and complete. It is transcendence of all finitude ; hence it is designated as *turiyan or brāhmaṇyam padam* (the fourth or the Brahman state)".[2]

Refuting the Sarvastivadin's realist position that there are discrete and momentary things - in themselves, namely, the ultimately real elements of existence (*dharmas*), the Yogacara-Vijñānavadins hold that the belief in the objects existing externally and independent of consciousness is false. They maintain that the objects are unreal like dreams, mirages or sky-lotuses and exist only as subjective facts, as ideas in the mind. Vasubandhu contends that "all existence has its centre and being in mind"[3] and the apprehension of objects such as trees, houses, mountains etc., are only the projections (*parikalpita*) of consciousness. Consciousness is the implicate of the unreal (*śūnya*) objective knowledge, like the space is of the spatial distinctions. The apprehension of the unreal objects as real is due to the reality of consciousness. "The object may well be unreal, but for the appearance of the unreal, for something to be mistaken for the real consciousness must be real".[4] All objectivity and the distinctions thereof are 'within' consciousness only. They are only a *vāsana*, an impression or an illusion created by consciousness. The objects as substances and attributes are a mere superimposition on the states of consciousness. Consciousness is the 'unity' of which the subject and the object are its abstractions. Indeed there can be no relation between the subject and the objects, the inner and the outer in case they are really distinct. The subject - object distinctions and relations are purely mental and therefore unreal. "The external appearance of the object is transcendental illusion because of which consciousness is bifurcated into subject - object duality".[5] The Yogacara-Vijñānavadins also hold that the ultimate consciousness manifests itself in three stratifications which form the basis for the illusion of objectivity. The three strata are : the store - house consciousness (*ālayavijñāna*), the thought consciousness (*manovijñāna*), and the

consciousness of things (*viṣayavijñāna* or *pravṛthivijñāna*). The store-house consciousness is the repository, the potential state of the phenomena, both subjective and objective ; it is rather a stream of things in their seed (bija) form or in the form of impressions (vāsanas) ; the *ālaya* is a realm of possibilities and "co-terminus with the phenomenal existence".[6] The *manovijñāna* is the process of intellection (*manaṇa*) which categorises or synthesizes the indeterminate realm of possibilities of the ālaya; it is the mental activity of nourishing on the false notion of the 'I' and the 'mine.' And the *viṣayavijñāna* is the fully actualised state of the contents of the *ālaya*. It gives us the kinds of objectivity corresponding to the six types of consciousness, viz, the form (*rūpa*) of the eye-consciousness, the sound of the ear-consciousness, etc.[7]

Phenomenologically, Edmund Husserl and Jean-Paul Sartre have extensively dealt with consciousness. Acccording to Husserl consciousness is both transcendental and intentional in character. Transcendentally, consciousness is a pure Ego from which the whole 'factual' world-natural as well as psychological - is "disconnected" or "bracketed" through the method of phenomenological reduction. As a phenomenological residum, consciousness is a new region of Being which "in itself has a being of its own which in its absolute uniqueness of nature remains unaffected by the phenomennological disconnection".[8] Consciousness is a radically modified and livingly active subjectivity which is never reducted to objectivity; it is a definite and unique form of reflexion which is never reflected upon. Intentionally, consciousness is "consciousness of something",[9] turned towards an 'object' of 'experience' ; it is an act of relation oriented with meaning.

According to Sartre, consciousness is a non-substantial absolute, which is totally 'empty' within itself ; consciousness is lucid and translucent within itself. "Consciousness has no content"[10], physical or psychic ; the entire natural and psychological world is outside it ; nothing is given or hidden in it, either the ego or the unconscious. Consciousness is what it appears to be ; it is a phenomenon without a noumennon ; it is a single and 'unitary' being without depth or inner core, the 'I' or the "me' ; its existence is no more than its apperance and it "exists only to the degree to which it

appears".[11] At the same time, consciousness, according to Sartre, is not an independently existing being like the Husserlian consciousness as the transcendental Ego. To Sartre consciousness cannot exist except as an intentional being ; in its immediacy consciousness is "consciousness of something".[12] Consciousness of nothing ceases to be consciousness. Consciousness is a revealing intuition of something other than itself, it is "born supported" by a being which is not it".[13]

The distinctive quality of the Sartrian consciousness is that it is a being of 'absolute' freedom ; consciousness is freedom in the sense that it is a plenum of nothingness as against the plenum of being, the world of objects. Consciousness, which is the same as human existence, is a being of autonomous choice and self-determination; "determination of itself by itself is its essential character."[14] On ultimate analysis, Sartre depicts consciousness as unhappy consciousness since it is a useless passion to be god. Consciousness can never attain the status of god since god implies the impossible union of the two self-contradictory beings - the being of consciousness and the being of objects, the for-itself and the in-itself - in one and the same beings. Thus Sartre condemns consciousness to sorrow without remedy. He says, "Human reality by nature is an unhappy consciousness with no possibility of surpassing its unhappy state".[15]

According to the materialism of Marx and Engels, consciousness is "a property of the brain to reflect the objective material world".[16] Consciousness is man's reflection on the inner side of the material object in the light of the laws relationg to the object. Consciousness is man's "ability of abstract thinking which is reflection of the inner essential properties of the natural objects".[17] In other words, consciousness is the product of human labour and the means of production ; it arises in our attempt to modify the natural object into a tool and adapt it to a specific purpose.

So consciousness is not something independent of or opposed to matter but belongs to and predetermined by the material world. Consciousness is not an abstract idea or an *apriori* reason but concrete knowledge which is a historical product evolved by the people's materialist intercourse. Consciousness is not a transcendental, pure substance but the knowledge that man has developed in the realm of science, philosophy, politics, law,

religion and morality. Consciousness is linguistic in character and evolved along with language. Thus consciousness, according to Marx and Engels, is human through and through ; it is as old as the human race itself and would take on ever new forms depending upon the progress in thinking and ever changing human relations. "Consciousness (*das Bewusstein*) can never be anything else than conscios being (*das bewusste sein*) and the being of man in their actual life-process".[18] Consciousness is not individualistic but social in character ; from its sensuous level as the contact of the brain and the senses with immediate environment to its reflective level of formulation of a theory, consciousness is conditioned by the material and social life. "Consciousness is therefore from the very beginning a social product and remains so as long as man exists at all".[19]

II

Jiddu Krishnamurti (K. henceforth) distinguishes between two radically different kinds of mind - the totally conditioned and the absolutely free. He calls the former consciousness and the latter Intelligence. To him consciousness is the reality which is put together by thought ; he equates consciousness with reality since reality is "anything that thought operates on, or fabricates, or reflects about";[20] The term "reality" comes from "res" which means thing ; and the root meaning of the term "thing" is "to condition, to set the conditions or determine".[21] Accordingly, consciousness as reality is anything that thought thinks about, reasonably or unreasonably, factually or fictitiously ; consciousness is 'thing' in the sense that it is conditioned or determined by thought which is itself conditioned.

To K, Intelligence, unlike consciousness, is Truth which transcends thought. Intelligence as Truth is neither dependent upon nor conditioned by thought. Thought can never touch Truth since thought is 'thing' ; the term "true" comes from the Latin "versus" which means "that which is" and "cannot be conditioned or dependent on things".[22] K calls the free mind not only Intelligence or Truth but also Consciousness. But this consciousness has a dimension altogether different from that of the conditioned mind or the consciousness as the reality.

Basically, consciousness, according to K, is the brain which has evolved physically and psychologically through time. Time implies the past.

So the brain has evolved by accumulationg the past physically and psychologically. It has grown by gathering tha past for security at the physical and psychological levels. And the gathering of the past takes place through the brain's perceptual activity, the activity of challenge and response. So the brain is the product of its own sensory process through which it accumulates the past. And consciousness is precisely the brain evolved through the perceptual process of gathering the past. K says, "My consciousness is my mind, is my brain cells, is the result of my sensory perceptions".[23]

Consciousness is not only the brain which is the product of the perceptual activity of gathering the past ; consciousness is also the perceptual activity of the brain conditioned by the past. The activity of the brain is not only to gather the past but also to respond to the challenge on the background of the past. So, as a product, consciousness is precisely the brain conditioned by the past or memory ; and as an activity, consciousness is the response [24] of the brain conditioned by the past. Consciousness thus has the brain, the biological organism and its memory as its foundation. There can be no consciousness which is not of the activity of the brain filled with memory.

Although K equates consciousness with the brain, he at the same time, holds that consciousness is not whole of the brain ; he observes that consciousness is confined to a part of the brain ; only a little portion of the brain functions as consciousness ; only that part of the brain through which the past or the thought operates is consciousness ; the remaining part of the brain is dormat or 'unconscious' and inactive ; consciousness is the movement of the past, the activity of thought through a little part of the brain.

To K consciousness is the same as experience. Consciousness is experience since the brain is the result of the past which is experience. The past is experience gathered by the brain through time. So consciousness is experience which is in relation with the challenge. K says, "My consciousness is the sum total of human experience, plus my particular contact with the persent"[25] Consciousness is not only the totality of human experience but also the process or the activity of experience ; consciousness

is the activity of the challenge and response on the background of the past. "This response to challenge is experience".[26] So to be conscious is to experience and to experience is to be consciousness. Both as a product and as a process, consciousness is not different from experience.

To K consciousness is the same as knowledge ; consciousness is knowledge since knowledge, like consciousness, is (the product of) the past ; knowledge is (the result of) experience ; it is memory accumulated through time, through the process of stimulus and response. K says, "Knowledge is the residue of experience, the gathering of the past. Knowledge, consciousness is always the past".[27] Consciousness is not only the product of knowledge but also the process of knowing ; to be conscious is to know and to know is to be conscious. Consciousness is confined to the realm of knowledge, the known ; it is always a movement from the known to the known. "The mind is the warehouse of the known, the residue of the known".[28] The moment the mind or consciousness experiences anything it translates that experience in terms of the known and reduces it to the past by naming and recording it. Knowledge or the known is never complete. So consciousness is always limited or incomplete. The unknown or the unlimited is totally outside the field of the known ; the process of knowing and not-knowing are entirely different from each other.

To K, consciousness is not different from thought ; consciousness is not only (the product) the thought but also the activity of thought. Just as consciousness, thought is not different from experience or the past ; thought is the same as knowledge or memory gathered by the brain through time. Thought, like consciousness, is the memory stored up in the brain cells. Both consciousness and thought are (the product of) the past. And as an activity, thought is nothing but the response of the brain from the background or the memory. Thought is the reaction of past to the present ; thought, like consciousness, is the movement of the past which is the same as experience or knowledge. Both as a product and as a process, consciousness is the same as thought. To be conscious is to think and to think is to be conscious. As K puts it, "So long as the mind is not thinking consciously or unconsciously, there is no consciousness".[29]

Thus K treats consciousness the same as the brain, experience, knowledge and thought ; he uses the terms "brain", "experience" and so

on synonymously ; to him, all of them mean one and the same thing, namely, the mind conditioned by the past ; they indicate the mind which is not only the product of memory but also the mind which operates on the background of memory. But at the same time, besides equating consciousness with the brain, experience and so on, K also speaks about consciousness as the brain which is programmed to operate in the circle of experience, knowledge, memory, thought and action. He says, "First experience ; that experience may have been from the beginning of man, which we have inherited, that experience gives knowledge which is stored up in the brain ; from knowledge there is memory and from that memory thought. From thought you act. From that action you learn more. So you repeat the cycle".[30]

The fact that consciousness is the brain filled with the memory implies that consciousness is not without the content. The past, the experience, the knowledge or the thought which the brain has gathered through time constistutes the content of consciousness. Consciousness as we know it to be is not independent of its content. Consciousness and its content are not different ; consciousness is not a container of its contert ;the content itself is consciousness. Just as there is no valley without the hills, the trees, the birds and so on, there is no consciousness without its content. Bereft of the content, consciousness as we know ceases to be consciousness.[31] Consciousness 'is' its content. K says "The content of consciousness is consciousness. Without the content, there is no consciousness. Content is consciousness. The two are not separate".[32]

The content of consciousness, namely, the past, is of two kinds - factual and psychological. The factual content comprises the academic, the scientific and technological knowledge of the world of objects ; it includes the knowledge essential for our biological survival and well-being. Whereas the psychological content comprises the whole network of "innumerable thoughts and feeling, influences and responses."[33] K calls it inward knowledge which includes our accumulated beliefs, aspirations, desires, attachments, ambitions, fears, anxiety, uncertainty, depression, pleasure, pain and sorrow. As against the factual knowledge which is well-reasoned, objective and sane, the psychological knowledge is irrational, twisted and a muddle of confusion and contradiction. So K says that the content of consciousness is "a messy conglomeration of irrational knowledge and

some which is correct".[34]

According to K, the psychological content constitutes the self or the psyche of the individual. The individual "ego" or the "I" is the same as the psychological content of consciousness. I am my consciousness and my consciousness is "me". "That whole content of that consciousness is the 'me'. That 'me' is not different from my consciousness",[35] says K. At the same time K, holds that consciousness is not individualistic but common to human race as a whole. My consciousness is not mine but what I have inherited from humankind. Consciousness is shared by all human beings. Besides the superficial - the biological, the intellectual, the professional differences, the psychological human beings are the same all over the world ; the psychological content of humanity has been the same all through the ages - self-centred, divisive, conflicting, lonely, confused, envious, violent, unhappy and so on. Psychologically, consciousness is the story of humankind. K says, "My brain is the brain of time. The brain is not my brain. It is the brain of humanity in which the hereditary principle is involved[36] ; it is consciousness of humanity, because man suffers, he is proud, cruel, anxious, unkind. This is the common ground of the man. There is no individual at all for me".[37]

According to K, consciousness is not what it appears to be but has, as it were, "an enormous length, depth and volume".[38] Having a heritage of its own and evolved through millennia consciousness has many layers and operates at different levels. But basically the state of consciousness may be likened to that of an iceberg; a major part of consciousness is 'concealed' as the unconscious and only a little part of it appears to be conscious and active. But the parts of consciousness are interconnected ; they are mutually dependent and interacting. The so-called unconscious remains inactive so long as the conscious part is busy ; but it becomes active and props up the moment the conscious part remains inactive ; it sends its intimations to the conscious part when the latter is silent or goes to sleep. So the parts of consciousness are not watertight compartments without communication. The division between them is illusory. So K says that consciousness is "one whole"[39] and a unitary process constituting "the totality of our being".[40] Moreover, there can be no two different states of consciousness, since the content of consciousness, whether conscious

or unconscious, is the same, namely, the past. Consciousness at both the levels is the recording or the projection of something that is past. Consciousness essentially is a process of the known ; there is nothing really unknown, unrecorded or unprojected in it. K says, "There is in fact only one state, not two states such as the conscious and the unconscious, though you may divide it as the conscious and the unconscious. But that consciousness is always of the past never of the present. You are conscious only of the things that are over".[41]

Consciousness, according to K, is a material process, which is 'abstract' in character. Consciousness is abstract since we connot perceive it through our sense organs. So consciousness is matter which is subtle in nature. Consciousness is matter since consciousness is the brain which is matter; the brain is made up of hydrogen, carbon and other molecules ; it operates as electrical circuits through chemical reactions. Consciousness is a material process also because consciousness is the same as the brain which has physically and psychologically evolved in time. All that has evolved through time is matter. Consciousness is a material process for yet another reason, namely, it has evolved by accumulating memory which is also matter ; memory is matter since, like the brain, it evolves in time and gets stored up in the brain cells. K says, "Memory is matter, otherwise it cannot hold and leave a mark on the brain-cells which are also matter".[42]

The psychological content, namely, the memory is a muddle since it is made up of several irreconcilable, opposing and fragmentary desires, aspirations and intentions. The memory generates energy out of its own muddle ; the divison, contradiction and coflict creates the energy and consciousness is precisely this energy ; consciousness sustains by generating its energy out of itself, out of its content, and continues itself endlessly. K says, "Actually, the content is creating its own energy. Look, I am in cotradiction and that contradiction gives me vitality".[43] Being a material process consciousness is a process of energy ; but the energy is dissipating and destructive since it is in contradiction and conflict within itself.

K compares consciousness to the computer which is also a material process and operates on mechaincal energy. The computer is made of silicon molecules and works on the electrical circuits of chips. Like

consciousness, the computer works according to its accumulated memory; its responses, however quick or spectacular they may be, are determined by its content, namely, the memory; they are the reactions, the effects of its programme, namely, the memory. Like the computer consciousness is programmed in different ways. Just as different computers are programmed differently to produce different results human being has been programmed according to a particular religion, nation, race and so on. "For centuries he has been programmed - to believe, to have faith, to follow certain rituals, certain dogmas; programmed to be nationalistic and to go to war".[44]

Although consciousness is the product of the past consciousness is not a permanent or substantial entity ; consciousness is an impermanent process ; there is nothing abiding and lasting in it. Consciousness or thought is in a state of perpetual flux ; its content is transient and ever changing depending upon its environment. But, unable to bear its own impermanency, consciousness invents a 'permanent entity' called the 'thinker' ; thought divides itself as the thinker and the thought ; the thinker operates at different levels, in deffernt forms like the observer, the censor or the supreme self (*Ātman*). But the thinker in all its garbs is the same as the thought ; the thinker is not a separate entity but only a projection, an extension of thought. "Thought has created the thinker. If thought did not exist there would be no thinker".[45] The thinker is the refuge of thought ; the thinker is only a modified continuity of thought. The content of the thinker in not different from thought, namely, the past ; it is made up of experience, knowledge, or memory which is in movement. The thinker is as much conditioned as thought is. There is nothing sacred about the thinker. Even the Super Consciousness is (a fabrication of) the thinker, a part of thought. "The *ātman* is the aeroplane invented by thought"[46], says K. Thought plays all kinds of tricks upon itself in order to continue itself endlessly ; it disguises itself as the thinker and place at different levels of permanency. "But this permanency is born of impermanency and so there is within it the seeds of impermanency. There is only one fact : impermanency",[47] observes K.

As it has been mentioned at the very outset, consciousness, according to K, is temporal in character ; consciousness is the same as the brain put together through time which is the past. Consciousness is the brain which is old or traditional in character ; it is the memory accumulated in the brain

- cells ; it has evolved through millions of years of human experience, knowledge or thought. K says, "That consciousness is the result of time, evolution, growth. It is expandable and contractable".[48] Consciousness is temporal also because it is a 'manifested' energy which is the same as matter, and all manifested energy or matter is time. K says, "Time is matter. Time is manifested energy. The very manifestation is a process of time".[49]

Being (the product of) time, consciousness is a process, an activity in time. It always operates within the field of time - the past, the persent and the future. Consciousness is what *has been* ; to it 'to be' is to 'have been'; it is a continuity from the past to the future in contact with the present ; it is a movement of the past towards the future through the present ; in the present consciousness is swinging like a pendulum from the past to the future ; its present is what is hedged about by the past and the future ; consciousness uses the present, the 'what is' only as a lever to pass over to the future. Being a swift momentum of the past consciousness slurs over the actual 'present', the timeless 'now' which is outside its field. "Our minds are the product of many yesterdays and the present is merely the passage of the past to the future".[50] Similarly the future is only the extension of the past ; it is a modified continuity of the past only.

Consciousness is a process of desire ; it is, as K puts it, "an agglomeration of desire";[51] being the products of the past, the responses of consciousness are inadequate and these inadequate responeses are the process of desire. K says, "Desire is the inadequate respone to challenge".[52] Being inadequate, the responeses are the sources of disturbance or conflict. "Conflict arises when the response is not adequate to the challenge".[53] Inadequate response gives rise to conflict since there is in it the meeting of the opposites, namely, the past, the ever old and the challenge, the ever new ; inadequate responese meets the challenge, the unnamable, by naming it and the very terming gives rise to conflict. This conflict in consciousness is precisely desire. Desire is the movement of consciousness in conflict. To put it in other words, consciousness is the conflict caused by the inadequate response. K observes, "This disturbance is the consciousness of desire ; the focusing of disturbance, caused by pain or pleasure, is self-consciousness. Self-consciousness is desire. We are conscious when there is the disturbance of inadequate response to challenge".[54]

Consciousness is of the nature of fear since it is confined to the realm of the known ; fear is the fear of the known ; fear is not in abstraction and isolation but in relationship to something known. Even the fear of the so-called unknown. like death, is in fact, the fear of losing what we have known - people, ideas or things. There is no such thing as the fear of the unknown, the unrelated. K says, "My fear is not of death but of losing my association with things belonging to me. My fear is always in relation to the known, not to the unknown".[55] Consciousness is a process of fear also because it is insecure within itself ; consciousness is insecure since it is neither independent, permanent nor complete within itself. On the contrary, consciousness is conditioned by its content, namely, the past which is incomplete and impermanent ; it is limited and transient since it is put together by thought which is finite and ever changing. And anything that is not independent, stable and complete should be a cause of insecurity. The dependency, impermancy and incompleteness of consciousness are the source of its insecurity which is the same as fear. So fear is inherent in consciousness. Fear may be hidden so long as consciousness is busy with its routine. But fear props up the moment consciousness encounters a challenge. K says, "You may not he afraid of anything now, sitting here. But obviously in your consciousness there is fear. In the unconscious, or in the conscious, there is this terrible thing called anxiety, pain, grief, suffering and fear".[56]

Fear is intrinsic to consciousness also because it is a process of avoiding the true nature, the essence of our being, namely 'nothingness' or inner solitude. Nothingness means not a thing. Nothingness 'is' in the negation of consciousness, everything that thought has conceived. "To be absolutely nothing means a total contradiction of everything you have learnt, everything that thought has put together. To be not a thing".[57] There is absolute security and fearlessness only in being absolutely 'nothing'. But consciousness can never comprehend the nothing. The nothingness is the 'unknown' whereas thought is the known. The two can never meet. Yet thought desires to know the unknown. In the process, thought merely verbalises the unknown and accumulates ideas, knowledge or belief about the unknown. Unable to actually realise the unknown, and being afraid of being nothing, thought accumulates 'things' of all kinds as a source of

security. But being transitory, the things of thought, including knowledge, belief, god, etc. are the source of insecurity. Security through something is the greatest insecurity and hence fear. "Fear exists as long as there is accumulation of the known which creates the fear of losing".[58]

Being the process of knowing, consciousness can know the unknown, the nothingness only by terming it; but knowing the unknown by giving it a name is only a verbal recognition and not its actual realization; in verbalisation the word takes the place of direct perception; the word covers up the unknown and renders it the source of fear; the very naming of the unnamable generates fear. So more the thought tries to capture the nothing, the further it moves away from the nothing; in its effort to know the unknown consciousness merely strengthnes itself; it only gathers more and more content, more and more words which perpetuate fear. As K puts it, "As thought cannot know the unknown, it is afraid of it. There will be fear as long as thought desires to experience, to understand the unknown... Whatever thought does with regard to inner solitude is an escape, an avoidance of what is. In avoiding what is, thought creates its own conditioning which prevents the experiencing of the new, the unknown. Fear is the only response of thought to the unknown; thought may call it by different terms, but is still fear".[59]

Thus, consciousness, according to K, is a part of the brain which is the product of time and evoluation. Consciousness is its content, namely, the past or memory; it is put together by thought and the result of experience, the process of challenge and response. Like the computer, consciousness is the process of the known, programmed by memory; it operates in the cycle of knowledge, memory, thought and action. Consciousness is a material energy which has its own momentum. Besides the factual content which is sane and utilitarian, the psychological content of consciousness, namely, the self or the psyche is irrational and insane; it is limited and incomplete within itself; it is full of division, fragmentation and conflict; it comprises desire, distrubance, fear, anxiety, confusion and so on. Consciousness is in great turmoil and fast deteriorating. Constitutive of the individual self and being common to humankind as a whole, consciousness is at the root of all human problems and misery. Consciousness, as K puts it, is "creating great damage in the world because it is separative and

therefore it is constantly in conflict not only within itself but within the society, within the family and so on."[60] K also holds that consciousness is responsible for the human problems like hunger, poverty, division, disintegration, conflict, violence and war. The crises of all kinds in the world are due to the consciousness in crisis. Therefore there is an urgent need to deeply change the consciousness. K says, "Unless human beings radically transform this consciousness, we are going to end up in bloody wars".[61]

III

K does not condemn the human being to the conditioned consciousness. Nor does he confine the human brain or the mind to the consciousness as we know it to be. He holds that the conditioned consciousness belongs only to the superficial layers, a limited part of the brain. He revolts against the whole idea that there is nothing beyond the inherited consciousness, the consciousness in crisis. He contends that there is an unconditionally and absolutely free mind which happens to be in the total ending or the radical transformation of the limited consciousness. K says, "I realise that thought and thinker are very limited and I do not stop there. To do so would be a purely materialistic philosophy".[62]

Ending of consciousness is possible when consciousness is aware of itself without choice. Awareness is to be devoid of choice, for choice arises out of consciousness; choice is the movement of thought; there is no choice without the past. Awareness is observation in which consciousness observes its nature and structure without the observer. Awareness is to be without the observer since the observer is the residue, the refuge of consciousness only; the observer is the thinker 'who' is thought itself; the thinker is only a modified continuity of thought or consciousness. Awareness is alert passivity wherein consciousness 'holds' the totality of content without any remnant. In awareness consciousness perceives the actuality, the 'what is' of itself and realizers its truth. "Awareness is a state of being in which truth can come into being, the truth of 'what is'."[63]

Radical transformation of consciousness happens to be only when consciousness directly faces the fact of its being totally conditioned ; it takes place when consciousness comprehends the fact of its being totally

limited ; an unequivocal and absolute observation of the fact of its nature and structure brings about a radical transformation in consciousness. K says, "Facts, if one observes carefully, in themselves bring about a change".[64] But consciousness always avoids the 'understanding' the fact of itself by verbalising, justifying or condemning it ; it prevaricates the fact through the process of agreeing or disagreeing, affirming or denying ; it deviates itself form the 'what is' of itself by interpreting, comparing or concluding it ; it distorts the fact by suppressing, modifying or resisting it ; consciousness does not realise but only moulds the fact by identifying or recognising it according to its own conditioning. All these activities - verbalising, justifying, condemning and so on - are only the movements of consciousness in a modified form. Instead of bringing about a real change in consciousness they merely manifest it in several different ways. They are the subtle means through which consciousness chooses to continue itself endlessly. So tranformation takes place only when consciousness 'sees' the fact of its being as a whole and remains there without any movement. K asks, "The question is : can the conditioned brain awaken to its own conditioning and so perceive its own limitation and stay there for a moment".[65]

As it has already been mentioned, consciousness is a divisive process; it divides itself as the thinker and thought, the observer and observed, or the experience and experienced; the divisive process is a process of becoming; consciousness continues and sustains itself by dividing itself as the observer and observed; it functions in the same pattern of division even in its effort to transform itself; it deludes itself into the division of itself as the one who changes and as something to be changed; it tries to chamge itself by operating upon itself; but any attempt on its part to change itself divides itself and creates the thinker and results in its becoming or continuity. The duality is a barrier to the wholistic perception; it generates conflict which fritters away the wholistic energy required for the undivided attention of consciousness by itself; conflict is the noise, the friction which precludes the quiescence of consciousness; it is only in the absolute quietitude of consciousness that the fact of consciousness can fully flower and reveal its truth, namely, Nothing.[66] The quietitude or the silence brings about a highly creative action in which the observer 'is' the observed. The action releases immense, creative energy which shatters the whole nature and structure of consciousness. K says, "Then the observer is the observed.

Then a totally different action takes place, a totally different chemical action takes place."[67]

Awareness or observation is not a technique, a method or a system, either spiritual or psychoanalytic; a method implies a path, a pattern or a formula which consciousness mechanically follows in order to transform itself; but a method cannot bring about a radical transformation in consciousness, since the method is the product of thought only; method merely moulds consciousness according to some knowledge or some pre-conceived idea which is part of consciousness itself. Moreover, a method or a path implies practice which involves time; time implies gradual change; gradual change means not the ending of consciousness but its continuity in a modified form. Therefore method is a barrier to the awareness in which consciousness radiacally transforms itself by observing, perceiveiving the fact of itself without any knowledge, an idea or an experience which is the continuity of consciousness. So adopting a method, however noble, ancient or latest it may be, as a means of transforming consciousness, results in the perpetuation of consciousness; it merely breeds the illustion of bringing about a deep change in consciousness; indeed, the method is a creation of consciousness for its own continutiy; it is an outcome of the desire of consciousness to become further and not to end itself here and now without any time; it is only a means of achieving the self-projected goal through which consciousness continues itself by distracting itself from the fact of itself; a method never allows consciousness to inquire into the nature of itself; it does not allow consciousness to remain 'with (the fact of) itself in which alone there is a radical transformation. K says, "To practice a method is to cultivate another set of time binding memories; but realisation is possible only when the mind is no longer in bondage, in time".[68]

Awareness therefore is entirely different from method; awareness is instantaneous understanding of the 'what is' without knowledge, time, choice, motive, resistance, an idea or an end in view; it is an internse feeling in which consciousness is one with itself without any division. Awareness is attention wherein consciousness remains 'with' itself, without escaping from the fact of itself. Awareness, as K puts it, is the absolute rationality, intelligence, insight or perception which brings about a mutation in the brain itself. K says, "There is this perception of insight and the brain

cells themselves change".[69]

The ending of the conditioned consciousnessa marks the emergence of the Mind which of "free of all depedence and limitation";[70] the free mind is absolutely unconditioned and devoid of all the content, namely, the psychological past, memory, knowledge, experience or thought. The free mind is acausal, beyond all causal determination - physical or psychological; it is therefore a timeless or an eternal mind which is without beginning and end. K calls the free mind Intelligence. The intelligent mind, unlike the conditioned consciousness, is 'anonymous' and beyound all identification and recognition. K says, "Intelligence has no heritage. Consciousness has heritage"[71]. The intelligent mind is 'alone' which means all one; it is one with 'everything' without attachment or detachment. K calls the intelligent mind the unknown; it is beyond all knowledge - conceptualisation and verbalisation. K calls the free mind also Emptiness or Nothingness ; the Emptiness is not void, a vacuum but a wholistic energy which is boundless and immeasurable ; the Nothingness is Truth which is not an abstraction, but the mind 'that which is'. Truth consists in being true to 'that which is'.

The conditioned mind is completely secure within itself ; it does not seek security in possessions - things, ideas or people ; its security is not in anything objective or outward but is in itself, in beings Nothing. Nothingness means absolute security ; security through something is the greatest insecurity, for it involves time, the source of impermanence and sorrow ; time is a limitation and all limitation leads to insecurity. In Eternity alone is true security. Eternity is Emptiness which is beyond consciousness with all its accretions, namely, memories.

The free mind is an orderly mind. Its order is not of the order of thought which is limited and therefore the source of conflict and coufusion. The order of the free mind is infinite and unlimited ; it is of the absolute order of the Cosmos. Its order is intrinsic and not invented and imposed by thought ; it is totally devoid of division, friction or disharmony. Being orderly, the free mind is a stable mind ; its stability is not static or rigid but "the movement of stillness"[72] which consists in its being one with the Cosmos - the timeless mevement of the supreme order.

The intelligent mind is a perceptive mind; it does not experience but

perceives the 'what is' ; consciousness experiences the 'what is' through knowledge, thought and time. Whereas, the perceptive mind 'sees' the 'what is' from moment to moment without knowledge, thought and time. Perception is not experience. Experienced is continuous whereas perception is momentary, without beginning and end. The first perception is the last perception; there is a total gap between two moments of perception; the one is not the continuity of the other. "Perception", as K puts it, "is like the light of a candle which has been put out and relit. The new light is not the old, though the candle is the same".[73] The perceptive mind 'sees' clearly the truth or the falsity of the 'what is' and dies to it completely; it does not reduce the moment of perception to memory by verbalising it ; it does not translate it in terms of thought and form the continuity, the causal chain of the moments.

To K, intelligence is the same as love ; the intelligent mind is a compassionate mind. Compassion or love is neither sensual nor reomantic, neither attachment nor detachment but "transformation from moment to moment".[74] Love is not circumstantial but absolute ; to it far is a near. Love is not an abstraction but action in the flowering of goodness in relationship ; it is an unconditional care and concern for everything, for the whole world without expecting anything in return. The goodness is absolute and not relative to the emotions like hatred, envy, and jealousy. The goodness in love is virtue which knows no evil. K declares, "When there is love you can do what you will. Then there is no sin, then there is no conflict"[75]. K contends that intelligent love is the only panacea for humanity. Life-world is full of crises- hunger, poverty, injustice, ecological degradation, conflict, violence and war. The crises are due to the consciousness in crisis. Love is the absence of consciousness in crisis which means the absence of all human problems. "If these is love there are no social problems,"[76] observes K.

Awareness demolishes thought at the psychological level but leaves the factual thought or knowledge in tact. For the free mind only two things are significant - intelligence and biological survival. Intelligence uses the factual thought strictly for biological survival. It guides the latter in a proper direction and comfines it to the physical realm ; it does not allow thought to enter the 'psychological' world of emptiness, the only foundation for

harmonious human relations and peaceful co-existence of humanity. In freedom thought works 'through' intelligence, just as the sound of the drum is produced out of emptiness. In freedom thought functions in the world with sanity, without going berserk. It promotes a sustainable development of our civilisation. Intelligence is the only way of living a meaningful life. Bereft of intelligence life is absurd, full of problems. Intelligence is bliss or joy which knows no sorrow ; it is not touched by any of the human emotions or qualities which the conditioned consciousness is heir to. K says, "Therefore there are only two things left : the highest form of intelligence and survival which is entirely different from animal survival. Man is not merely the animal because he is able to think, disign and construct".[77]

IV

In conclusion it may be held that Krishnamurti's exposition of the conditioned and the unconditioned mind is similar to as well as different from the conceptions of consciousness presented in the first part of this paper.

Firstly, Krishnamurti's conception of the conditioned consciousness may be said to be analogous to the Advaitic conception of consciousness in the state of waking and dream. To both K and Advaita, the conditioned consciousness is intentional and sensual ; it is in association with thought, senses and the objects thereof. But the difference between K and Advaita is that K takes the brain filled with memory as the basis of the conditioned consciousness. Whereas Advaita does not take the physical organisms into account in dealing with the nature of the empirical consciousness.

It may also be held that K's notion of the unconditioned Mind or Intelligence is the same as the Advaitic supreme Consciousness. Both are absolutely free and mark the cessation of suffering ; they imply a mind which is undivided, beyond experience, thought and word. But the difference between K and Advaita in this regard is that the Advaitic supreme Consciousness is most often depicted as the product of the intellect, thought and knowledge by the Advaitins. K says that the *Ātman* is aeroplane invented by thought. Unlike the Advaitins, K deals with Intelligence as its actual realisation. His understanding of the nature and limitations of the intellect, thought and knowledge are quite clear. To him, knowledge, however sacred

or ancient it may be, is antithetical to Intelligence. Knowledge conditions the mind or consciousness. It is in the total ending of knowledge that there is Intelligence. Intellect and Intelligence do not go together. Truth is when thought is not.

Secondly, the Krishnamurtian conditioned mind may appear to be similar to the Yogacara-vijnanavadin's conception of the three strata of Intelligence- the ālayavijñāna, manovijñāna and viṣayavijñāna. And K's notion of Intelligence may converge with the latter's notion of pure consciousness (pariniṣpanna). But again the difference between K and the yogācāra-Vijñānavādins is that the latter do not take the brain, the neurological basis into consideration in their dealings with the mind or consciousness at various levels; they are more doctrinal and speculative than actual and realistic.

Thirdly, Husserl's conception of consciousness as that which includes everything we experience, as inner perception and as an intentional act appears to resemble K's conception of the conditioned consciousness. But it may be said that Husserl's account of consciousness is not as incisive as that of K's in unravelling the depth of human personality. Also Husserl's conception of consciousness as the pure, transcendental Ego might be compared with K's notion of Intelligent. But the difference is that the Husserlian pure consciousness is more epistemological than 'spiritual'; whereas K's Intelligence is deeply 'religious' and morally perfect. To Husserl, the Ego is the residuum of phenomenological reduction of "bracketing" the world. But Husserl is not at all clear as to how the reduction takes place. Whereas K is extremely clear in his account of choiceless awareness as a 'process' of radically transforming the conditioned consciousness. And to him, Intelligence is not egotistic in any sense of the term.

Fourthly, K's exposition of the conditioned and the unconditioned mind seems to have much in common with Sartre's phenomenological ontology of consciousness and freedom. But there are fundamental differences between the two. To Sartre consciousness *per se* is empty, non-substantial and without content ; consciousness is the same as nothingness and freedom. There is no consciousness which is unfree or conditioned. Whereas

K distinguishes between the conditioned and the free mind. The latter takes place in the ending of the former ; and the ending happens to be in the observation of the former without choice, the inalienable essence of the Sartrian consciousness. Sartre persumes consciousness to be free and unconditioned; freedom is the ontological stuff consciousness. Whereas K holds that consciousness as we know it to be is conditioned for millennia. Freedom happens to be in the radical transformation of the conditioned consciousness. And the Sartrian consciousness as freedom is condemned to be anguishing, sorrowful and unhappy. Whereas K's notion of freedom implies a mind which is devoid of all the emotions like fear, anxiety, violence, conflict and sorrow. Unlike the Sartrian freedom, K's free mind connot even choose to manifest itself through these destructive thoughts and feelings, since it is totally cleansed of their network. Unlike the Sartrian freedom which is morally ambiguous and often relapses into bad faith, K's free mind is morally perfect since it is full of pure compassion or love devoid of the self, the ego, even in its objective sense as being in the world, to put it in Sartre's own terms.

And fifthly, K's description of the conditioned consciousness is very much akin to the Marxian conception of consciousness. To both Marx and K, consciousness is a material process having the brain as its neuro-physiological basis; both admit that consciousness is a social product, a product of time and environment; consciousness evolves through language, knowledge and ideas. Both subscribe to the view that everything we experience goes into the making up of our consciousness. But the radical difference between K and Marx is that to the latter there is no consciousness other than the phenomenon of matter. Whereas K holds thath there is an unconditionally and absolutely free consciousness of mind which 'transcends' the material realm of time, environment, thought and knowledge. While Marx holds that consciousness can be changed only by changing the social structure, K maintains that the world can be changed only by radically changing consciousness. K contends that the inner determines the outer while Marx believes in the opposite. Both are seriously concerned about the radical transformation of the world but their approaches to the transformation are quite opposed to each other.

Above all, the uniqueness of K lies in his direct perception of the life-

world; his insights into the mind are not only incisive but original to the core. They are not the outcome of the study of the systems of philosophy. On the contrary, they are the offspring of his study of the book of life and the observation of the functioning of the mind. K examines the mind and life, not as a professional philosopher or as a psychologist or as a neurologist but as a common man who is seriously concerned about the crises in the mind and the world. His discoveries in the field of mind have profound implications for living a meaningful life and for the establishment of sane society.

NOTES

1. Mahadevan, T.M.P., *Gaudpāda - A Study in Early Advaita* Madras University, Chennai, 1960, pp.101-2.
2. ----------' *Ibid.*, p. 187.
3. Sarma, T.R., *Vijñaptimatratāsiddhi (Vimsatika).* (With Introduction, Translation and Commentary), Eastern Book Linkers, Delhi, 1993, p. 17.
4. Coward, Harold, (Ed.) *Studies in Indian Thought* (Collected Papers of Prof. T.R.V. Murti), Motilal Banarasidass, Delhi, 1983, p. 301.
5. Sarma, T.R., *Op.cit.*, p.21.
6. Coward, Harold, *Op.cit.*, pp. 291, 303
7. ----------' *Ibid.*, p. 303.
8. Husserl, Edmund, *Ideas - General Introduction to Pure Phenomenology.* Trans. Boyce Gibbson, George Allen & Unwin, Newyork, 1931, p. 113.
9. ----------' *Ibid.*, p. 120.
10. Sartre, J.P., *Being and Nothingness*, 9th Print, Trans. Hazel E. Barnes, Washington Square Press, New York, p. 11
11. ----------' *Ibid.*, p. 17.

12. ----------' *Ibid.*, p. 12.

13. ----------' *Ibid.*, p. 23.

14. ----------' *Ibid.*, p. 16.

15. ----------' *Ibid.*, p. 140.

16. A Team of Editors, *Fundamentals of Marxist and Leninist Philosophy*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1985, p. 115.

17. ----------' *Ibid.*, p. 117.

18. Marx & Engels, *German Ideology*, Progess Publishers, Moscow, 1976, p.42.

19. ----------' *Ibid.*, pp. 49-50.

20. Krishnamurti, J., *Truth and Actuality*, Krishnamurti Foundation India (KFI), Chennai, p. 15.

21. ----------' *Ibid.*, p. 18.

22. ----------' *Ibid.*, pp. 19,21.

23. ----------' *Commentaries on Living*. Third Series, B.I. Publications, Bombay, 1960, p. 334.

24. The responses of the brain are of two kinds : 1) the natural responses which are not of the past and 2) the responses conditioned by the past at the physical and the psychological levels. The former are purely neurological and protective chemical reactions which are in-built in the brain itself. The responses of the brain to the stimulus like shock, pain etc., belong to this category. Whereas tl.e latter kind of responses are based on memory ; the responses of the brain at th physical level are conditioned by the factual memory which is sane and utilitarian ; and the responses at the psychological level are conditioned by the speculative memory which is irrational and harmful.

25. Krishnamurti, J., *The First and Last Freedom*, Krishnamurti Foundation India (KFI), Chennai, 1954, p. 138.

26. ----------' *Commentaries on Living*, First Series, B.I. Publications, Bombay, 1972, pp. 224-5.

27. ----------' *Ibid.*, p. 223.

28. ----------' *The First and Last Freedom*, p. 153.

29. ----------' *Ibid.*, p. 115.

30. ----------' *The Network of Thought*, Krishnamurti Foundation India (KFI), Chennai, 1985, p. 15.

31. Even the brain as we know, like the consciousness as we know, is its past; it cannot function without the past ; that portion of the brain which is conditioned by the past is not different from the past ; it is never independent of its content, namely, the past ; it is dormant or inactive without the past; it function by operating outwardly and inwardly, during waking and sleep, through the past only; and the brain as we know is its functioning only.

32. Krishnamurti, J., *Truth and Actuality*, p. 101.

33. ----------' *The First and Last Freedom*, p. 238.

34. ----------' *Truth and Actuality*, p. 22.

35. Krishnamurti, J., & Bohm David *The Future of Humanity*, (A Conversation), Krishnamurti Foundation India, Chennai, p. 1993, pp. 11.

36. K also holds that consciousness is global in the sense that it belongs not only to the human beings but encompasses the whole of life ; all living organisms - the trees, the birds, the animals and the insects - are the beings of consciousness. They do have the same feelings as we have. The basic content of consciousness, namely, the throuble or the travail is common to all the living beings and pervades the totality of life. K also says that consciousness is limited although globle. see, Pupul Jayakar, *Fire in the Mind*, p. 23.

37. Krishnamurti, J., *The way of Intelligence*, Krishnamurti Foundation India, Chennai, p. 1985, p.41

38. ----------' *Ibid.*, p. 18.

39. ----------' *The Network of Thought*, p.10.

40. ----------' *The Way of Intelligence*, p. 166.

41 ----------' *The First and Last Freedom*, p. 223.

42. ----------' *Truth and Actuality*, p. 101.

43. ----------' *Ibid.*, p. 24.

44. ----------' *The Network of Thought*, p.8-9.

45. ----------' *Tradition and Revolution*, Krishnamurti Foundation India, Chennai, p. 1974, p.246

46. ----------' *Ibid.*, p. 157.

47. ----------' *Commentaries on Living*, Third Series, p. 253.

48. ----------' *Commentaries on Living*, Second Series B.I. Publications, 1972, p. 334.

49. Jayakar, Pupul, *Fire in the Mind*, Penguin Books, 1995, p. 253.

50. Krishnamurti, J., *The First and Last Freedom*, p. 131.

51. ----------' *Commentaries on Living*, Second Series, p. 119.

52. ----------' *Commentaries on Living, First Series*, p. 173.

53. ----------' *Ibid.*

54. ----------' *Ibid.*

55. ----------' *The First and Last Freedom*, p. 89.

56. ----------' *Meeting Life*, Krishnamurti Foundation India, Chennai, p. 1991, p.185

57. ----------' *Ibid.*, p. 188.

58. ----------' *The First and Last Freedom*, p. 84.

59. ----------' *Commentaries on Living*, Second Series, p. 10.

60. ----------' *The Future of Humanity*, p. 55.

61. ----------' *The Way of Intelligence*, p. 69.

62. ----------' *Tradition and Revolution*, p. 249.

63. ----------' *Reflections on the Self* (Ed.) Raymond Martin, Bluejay Books, New Delhi, 1997, p. 171.

64. Jayakar, Pupul, *Fire in the Mind*, p. 221.

65. ----------' *Ibid.*, p. 219.

66. K observes that Nothing remains when a fact is observed unconditionally and in its totality, see, *Fire in the Mind*, p. 225.

67. Krishnamurti, J., *Reflections on the Self*, p. 37.

68. ----------' *Commentaries on Living Third Series*, p. 285.

69. Jayakar, Pupul, *Fire in the Mind*, p. 350.

70. Krishnamurti, J., *The Ending of Time*, Krishnamurti & Bohm, David, Foundation India, Chennai, p. 1992, p. 243.

71. Jayakar, Pupul, *Fire in the Mind*, p. 324.

72. Krishnamurti, J., *The Ending of Time*, p.241.

73. ----------' *The Penguin Krishnamurti Reader*, ed., Mary Lutyens, Penguin Books, London, 1930, p. 115.

74. ----------' *The First and Last Freedom*, p. 288.

75. ----------' *On Fredom*, Victor Gollanez, London, 1992, p. 112.

76. ----------' *The First and Last Freedom*, p. 284.

77. Jayakar, Pupul, *Fire in the Mind*, p. 324.