

Life without goals: finding out what we want.

U.G Krishnamurti (<http://www.ugkrishnamurti.org>) often pointed out the situation of the absolute sameness of the so-called materialistic goal versus the so-called spiritual goal. He stated clearly that the “self” or “I” is on exactly the same quest when it looks for materialistic ends to suffering as when the “self” identifies a spiritual goal or a way out of suffering.

U.G’s point is that the mechanism of seeing the world is identical in both, there is the exact same equation going on in the process of “me”, i.e. “if I go here or do such-and-such or spend time working on this, or do that, that will equal achievement of my goal”. Even the process of identifying “doing-nothing” as an idealism can then take the form of “doing non-doing” which is an absolute contradiction.

The problem is not about the particular form which the goal takes, the problem is the “self”, which is exactly the same in the case of the so-called capitalist as well as the so-called spiritual-capitalist. The process of trying to amass enough wealth is exactly the same as the spiritual path to “gain” enlightenment. There is always a believed improvement, for the capitalist it is perceived as having and getting more, and for the spiritual person (which includes all altruism or the “love and light” brigade!) it is about having less material things and gaining more “experience” or “understanding” or “wisdom” or “love” or very often power over others. It is all the same game, just played on a different monopoly board. One can play at buying hotels on Park Lane, or saving the starving in Africa, or going to India and focusing on enlightenment, or one can try to be a hermit living in the woods to feel superior to everyone. The point is that it’s all the same. All of these ideologies are founded on the “self” and as a result there has been no movement away from this equation or looking out of the box.

It seems so easy to say that the materialist-capitalist “knows what he/she wants” but actually do they? Similarly, does the spiritual person really know what he or she actually wants or is trying to get? U.G often asked people “what do you want?” This is a very important point, what do we actually want? We are so sure that we don’t want this, as it is, and we are sure we want something else. The materialist says he wants a house, then when he gets it he doesn’t want that, he wants something else. The spiritualist says he wants a spiritual experience but when he has it does that help him? While they all encounter something different from what they have previously experienced the effects just last for a short period and they will then revert to previous patterns/pathology and the craving for “something else” comes back. So what do we actually want?

It seems very important that if we don’t want something we must have a sense of it, one must know that “this”, whatever *this* is, is something that has been seen, understood and sensed and we then decide “no this isn’t for me”. But actually... what is it that we *don’t want*? Can we define what it is we *don’t want* in order to move onto something else? The problem about the movement from one thing to another, whether it be material items or spiritual practice, is not that it is a seeking for something but actually that it’s seeking for no reason at all. In fact there is no knowledge of what we are looking for, we’re just in the process of “seeking”. The sheer madness of the “self” is that there is no idea *why* seeking started, neither is there any idea why seeking continues or what one is seeking for.

U.G expresses his disdain for the fact that seekers often fool themselves into thinking that they are “beyond” the materialism of the world, they may even suggest they are “beyond” seeking and yet in every way are still doing just that in their life. The nature of the “self” is totally narrow, therefore whatever one puts into the stream of “self” will always look the same, rather like the same can of soup with billions of different labels, one of them being “non-duality”.

So apart from this, apart from the process of seeking...what's left?

Ultimately the process of seeking is a holding-back of a tide of energy, the natural energy of the human is physiology *without psychology*. U.G explains that it is the “psyche” or “mind” or “self” which is obscuring the simple functioning of the body. The body doesn't need a “me” in order to function. Let's say the “self” 0.1% of the total body energy, everything is being filtered through this narrow window, whereas there is a latent 99.9% of energy impeded by focusing on just the 0.1%. It's like an elephant believing it is hidden when standing behind a lamp-post! The revolution occurs when there is a breaking down of the “self” and then the dam is released and the energy rushes open, just as it was until we were about 3 years old, then there is again the freedom of the child or what U.G calls the natural state.

So when psychology dies what is left is simply physiology, or the function of the body based on pure instinctual senses. This is the natural animal expression of the human. When the human-animal is again the foundation of the picture, without “self” getting in the way, this doesn't destroy the memory. The memory is recorded images of what happened, but is no longer what happened to “me”, it is simply what happened. Hence when there is no process of “me” this doesn't stop us remembering all the things that occurred in the past, nor does it stop the process of analysis of something. However it would totally destroy the foundation of any goal or ambition to seek for something, so abstractions of this nature die with the “me”, for this seeking *is* the “me”. U.G explains that there are no more questions on the level of seeking, just on how to do day-to-day activities or mechanical/functional processes.

The nature of “seeking” began physiologically, likely when the early human stood and become more detached from the earth. All other animals have more connection to the earth, even a flying bird, in that a bird is literally lying face-down as it flies. The human has only the feet connection with earth and it is the upward movement of energy to the head that causes this malfunction in the brain. This begins a chain reaction of events, such as the sense of separation, causing an adrenalin rush of contraction that would normally occur in a situation of real danger. However in humans this reaction occurs without there being any immediate danger, only imagined danger. This was the physiological distortion that originally formed the human “psyche” which is actually just a body of energy caught in a short-circuit of contraction due to the nature of the complexity of the human brain. These contractions then habitually repeat ad infinitum and so for several decades the human is stuck in this pattern. This happens to most humans, with the possible exception of those living in a close-to-animal state in the jungles of Amazonia. These precious few humans are the last of our kind who are not influenced by this dis-ease.

This is also why the nature of seeking has no “real” beginning. There is no intellectual/cognitive/psychological foundation to the original question “why?”. The original question “why?” occurs because of a malfunction or dis-eased situation based simply on the physiological function of the human body as it adapts to the environment it is in. So “self” is entirely created by nature, it is the breaking down of the species of human, in a sense the beginning of the end of the human. However, even if this were not the reason and it was being influenced by aliens or humans were being infected by a viral pathogen, whatever the reason the human physiology had to be the origin of the dis-ease that formed the idea of the “me” and so formed psychology which is an add-on to the human. Animals have no psyche, neither do very young children.

The physiological state of natural-state of the human is hidden within the prison of the contraction of “me”, which UG calls a “strangle-hold”, it is like a strangulation of the human, here brilliantly represented in this Spiderman movie clip:- <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kWuFaawgw8Y> and it’s hard to get off once it’s on! The human version of this is the abstractions of the mind which can create the “smart-phone” and so-called brilliant technology, but actually all these things are just part of the whole human civilization searching for something without knowing what that is, or why we are seeking it.

Outside of “me” is the function of the human body, or instinct, or senses. Senses just function without the requirement for “me”. U.G points out that behind the white noise of “self” there is just the senses happening and responding absolutely perfectly and appropriately to the environment. Life is just the senses happening for no reason, there is just sense and nothing but sense. However, this doesn't form a path of “trying to be in the senses”, as U.G point out about “mindfulness meditation”:-

“To describe that state as a meditative state full of awareness is romantic hogwash. Awareness! What a fantastic gimmick used to fool themselves and others. You can't be aware of every step, you only becomes self-conscious and awkward if you do. I once knew a man who was a harbour pilot. He had been reading about “passive awareness” and attempted to put it into practice. For the first time he nearly wrecked the ship he was guiding. Walking is automatic, but if you try to be aware of every step, you will go crazy. So don't invent meditative steps. Things are bad enough. The meditative state is worse.”

The nature of sense is about being-sense and when this occurs spontaneously there is nothing but the senses. This is what U.G is pointing out, so again there is nothing that can be “done” or “achieved”, it’s what there is behind the constant stream of “me” which is the main focus of everyday life.

The main point here is that if we want things to be “better” we have to have some reference point in order for this to happen, we have to be sure of somewhere in order to have an opinion about it. If we are unable to actually experience sensorily what is actually happening right now we logically can't reject this for something else. The main issue is that for as long as the seeking continues then nothing is really experienced, or sensing is only a very small part of what is going on. It is a bit like living in a suit of armour and therefore being able to sense anything. The suit makes one feel partially “safe”, which is what happens in a state of fearful-contraction, but if

this state perpetuates, as it does for humans in a stuck pattern, then one cannot feel anything. Like a rabbit caught in headlights one cannot move because all the blood has rushed into the interior to protect the vital organs of the body and therefore the limbs stop functioning. For a rabbit this is a short time of contraction, but for the human this kind of contraction can go on for 50 to 70 years or more.

Life lived without goals is one lived within sense. It is after all only sens-able. (sorry!) The de-psychologied, de-mystified state of expression is very clear to U.G., when explaining that even the strangest of psychic senses and clairvoyant abilities are simply part of the normal-natural energy that have been lost to most of us simply because we cannot feel any longer. He points out that the animal kingdom is the most psychic-clairvoyant place there is, it's nothing special, it's part of the one-energy of the universe, part and parcel of its innate simple-function, and has nothing to do with the connotations and interpretations bestowed upon it by some humans who distort those images they see. Senses we didn't even know we had are there, if we can simply see that what we are running towards is just as much of an illusion as what we are running from. We have long forgotten what began our process of seeking for goals and ambitions, so we have no idea what might fix it. If we had never heard of god or enlightenment, or non-duality or gurus, there would never have been a possibility of "liberation". As it is, these are but of course part and parcel of the dualism of the state of "me", which always has a beginning and an end, life and death, a front and a back, whereas in reality these are one single energy. There is only liberation when we realize at the deepest core that there is actually no need to seek for it.

David Nassim
12/1/2013