

On Falseness and Instinct: Differentiating the mental-emotional from the instinctual.

In a book of U.G. Krishnamurti's (<http://www.ugkrishnamurti.org>) collected conversations "*The Mystique of Enlightenment*" a particular paragraph speaks to our inner core and points to something we all experience but seldom acknowledge:

"I arrived at a point when I was twenty-one where I felt very strongly that all teachers -- Buddha, Jesus, Sri Ramakrishna, everybody -- kidded themselves, deluded themselves and deluded everybody. This, you see, could not be the thing at all -- "Where is the state that these people talk about and describe? That description seems to have no relation to me, to the way I am functioning. Everybody says "Don't get angry" --- I am angry all the time. I'm full of brutal activities inside, so that is false. What these people are telling me I should be is something false, and because it is false it will falsify me. I don't want to live the life of a false person. I am greedy, and non-greed is what they are talking about. There is something wrong somewhere. This greed is something real, something natural to me; what they are talking about is unnatural. So, something is wrong somewhere. But I am not ready to change myself, to falsify myself, for the sake of being in a state of non-greed; my greed is a reality to me." I lived in the midst of people who talked of these things everlastingly -- everybody was false, I can tell you. So, somehow, what you call 'existentialist nausea' (I didn't use those words at the time, but now I happen to know these terms), revulsion against everything sacred and everything holy, crept into my system and threw everything out: "No more slokas [mantra-like song or chant], no more religion, no more practices -- there isn't anything there; but what is here is something natural. I am a brute, I am a monster, I am full of violence -- this is reality. I am full of desire. Desirelessness, non-greed, non-anger -- those things have no meaning to me; they are false, and they are not only false, they are falsifying me." So I said to myself "I'm finished with the whole business," but it is not that simple, you see."

U.G. does not ask people to "follow in his footsteps", in the last line: "*it is not that simple, you see*" he states the fundamental point that all that thoughts and ideas can do is at best bring about questioning of the foundational assumptions and motivations that stir us. Other than this there is little that they can do, thought in itself has no way of breaking outside of its own bubble, it is stuck within itself till if eventually fades away or pops open and this is in nature's hand, not in the hands of the so-called "individual" which in itself is a construction of thought/ "me".

U.G. says "*I am a brute, I am a monster, I am full of violence -- this is reality. I am full of desire*" but he is speaking to an audience who would see the actions of the natural body as brutish and monstrous or perhaps very animalistic. The nature of the human-being is actually the nature of the human-animal but so few are prepared to see the human in this way and to really engage with what that entails. In fact far from being brutish, the human-animal is in perfect connection and at peace with the whole natural environment. However for the one looking at him, the modern-society person, he or she is a brute and a monster. This is expressed brilliantly in Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* and also in the character of Larry in "Of Mice and Men" by John Steinbeck. These characters are all descriptive of the misunderstood monster, the monster that simply is an adult-child acting naturally on its nature and in its own way, yet is an aberration to society and often is expelled from it as a result. If Jesus was

this, then it would have been why he was criminalized and prosecuted. This is why, for the very few natural people left in the world, there is so little hope of escaping the grips of the aggressors who wish to destroy everything that looks like it could connect human to nature and instead sanitize the human into an homo-spiritus, a religious creature, be it of tradition or of “science-rationality” that has no connection with mother earth.

U.G.’s point is simply that when we look into the true nature of our feelings where is the book of morality? Where is the moral compass? The highway to heaven? Do we have an innate sense of this or is it all added on later? Isn’t it all an indoctrination of society layered on top of what we naturally feel, and as such, when we succumb to feeling naturally, what we do without internal or external judgment? What is there of this society that is not clamped down on or sanitized or controlled or manipulated? There isn’t a shred left, even down to the pubic hair, which for some reason needs to be trimmed for society’s delectation! What we do to ourselves we do to the world....

"I remember being told by a medicine woman in the Amazon, "Do you know why they are really cutting down the rain forest? Because it is wet and dark and tangled and feminine."

— Alberto Villoldo

The nature of what we are is something that needs to be responded to at every level. If we take food as an example, instead of forever sticking to this or that diet there has to be an eventual move away from diets and direction in food in order to regain our own sense of food and what works for each of us. There is no prescription; no one size fits all, for as we know from one-size-fits-all, it doesn’t! The same is true for the movement or what we do in a day, or in relating to each other. There is no best exercise regimen or way of practising that is “good for you”, or worse than that, “good for everyone”, it’s all nonsense.

Also there is no person who is “the one” who can therefore supply all one’s needs. Why do we live in the rut of monogamous ideals that are totally contrary to the nature of the human? The warped masculine mind-set has created personal ownership of each other, enslavement to one another in the prison of society, a far cry from the child-like and feminine sanity of tribal culture and non-ownership in relating. There is no perfect relationship. While we may be able to spend a great deal of time around people who are like us that does not stimulate or create anything, rather it requires that our time is split between those who stimulate and those who are similar and those who help us be creative. Everything is required in relative balance to one another, just as staple-food without herbs/ spice/ salt and sourness is bland and unpalatable, not to mention one person’s meat is another person’s poison. We have to feel this in our own ways from within.

There are so many self-help guides and ways of attempting to get to what it is you “truly are” but this quality has never really left, it is just it is so deeply simple that it is constantly being overlooked and missed. It's the elephant in the room. The nature of instinctual sense is the purity of the sensory experience of the world without anything added on top.

How does one then deal with the age-old problem of *knowing* whether the illusions of the “self”/ mind have taken over the senses or is this really a feeling? Is there a way to differentiate the two? Some people consider this to be “head or heart” but actually this can be translated to mean “mental or emotional” and neither of those is the reality of pure-sense, which has neither mental-detachment nor romanticism/ altruism/ fantasy. In fact the nature of instinct is utterly intimate in an indescribable way and also deeply impersonal. The nature of felt-sense is not of personal ideas or of personal emotions it is impersonal and deeply felt. Thus we actually **NEVER KNOW**. We will never know, because while we are in the process of trying to be apart from our senses in order to be the adult-observer, the child-senses are just being felt naturally. We are always “at two with nature” as Woody Allen might say. Being at-one with nature means that the observing “me” has to die or dissolve. The main difficulty is that we “want to know”, we “need to find out” and we attempt to fathom the impossible mystery of life living through us.

Within us is the rainforest. We can attempt to cut it down as much as we like but it will grow back up again, life can't be stopped. Everything we know and are taught from all the so-called teachers and masters out there makes absolutely no difference to this, in fact not even to them, if they are honest within themselves. The only reality is what we feel and the possibility that as nature takes its course through us there will no longer be a cause for the observing “me” to come in and attempt to rule the roost. We have no requirement for “me”, it is a function of the physiology of the human that maladapted somehow and is now in a predicament that looks headlong towards its own annihilation. We fight each other like an index finger fighting its neighboring thumb...this is the state of the human.

U.G. explains that he had no part in his “calamity”, when the ideology of “self” died within his body and released the energy of contraction from every cell, this involved no action taken of the part of the “self” called U.G, it was the death of him. We might realize our total helplessness in the world and the fact that beyond senses there is absolutely nothing that can help. Sense doesn't help either; it is just what it is. There is nothing else but this, and so for many of us whose lives are built on a belief of far more, we look to the stars to attempt to find something, some freedom we already are. Sometimes the attempt to escape blinds us:-



"L'Homme au Chapeau Melon" by René Magritte in 1964.

David Nassim
9/3/2013