

Jiddu Krishnamurti

*Nothingness is supreme
intelligence*

Five Public Meetings at Brockwood Park - 1983

Table of Contents

<i>A Dialogue on Death</i>	1
<i>How Does One Enquire into the Source of All Life?</i>	14
<i>Can We Live without the Burden of a Thousand Yesterdays?</i>	33
<i>What Will Bring About Change in the Brain?</i>	46
<i>Why Are We Frightened To Be Nothing?</i>	61

A Dialogue on Death

Conversation with Pupul Jayakar at Brockwood Park

Sunday, June 7, 1981

P: Krishnaji, one of the questions which I feel lie at the very depth of the human mind is the coming to be and the ceasing to be. Life and death. It is around these two, the wonder of birth and the fear of death, that the whole of man's life really... all his urges, his demands, his desires, his fears, his anxieties, rest between these two poles.

K: Birth and death.

PJ: Birth and death. At one level, we understand birth and death, but, I think, only the superficial mind understands, and unless we understand at depth the whole problem of existence, which is held between these two, the whole problem that lies in the ending of anything: the fear, the anxiety, the darkneses and the shadows which surround that one word.

K: Why do you use the word 'problem'? Why do you make that interval between birth and death a problem? Why do you call it a problem?

PJ: In itself, birth and death are facts, but the mind can never leave them alone. The mind clings to one and rejects the other.

K: No, but I am just asking...

PJ: And therefore the problem.

K: Why do you use the word 'problem', that's what I'm asking.

PJ: Problem is because of the shadows which surround one word, which is, the joy and splendour of what we see as life and the demand to hold to it at any cost and to evade that which means an ending.

K: I understand that.

PJ: That is a problem. Out of it arises sorrow, out of it arises fear, out of it...

K: ...all the misery.

PJ: ...all the demands.

K: So what is the question?

PJ: So, how do we explore, how can we be free of these darkneses that surround the word? How can our mind look at death with a simplicity and observe it for what it is? But we can never observe it.

K: So, are you merely considering what is death, or that great period between life and death? Are you including the whole process of living, with all its complexity, misery, confusion, uncertainty, all that, and the ending? Are you concerned - I am just using the word 'concerned' - to find out what death means and what this long process of struggle, conflict, misery, etc. - to which we cling, and avoid the other - or are you asking, the whole movement of it?

PJ: You see, there is a whole movement of existence, in which life and death are. But if you take it and make

the scope so wide, I don't think you can get to... the anguish and the sorrow of ending.

K: I see.

PJ: And I want to investigate into the sorrow of ending, because...

K: Is that all, or are you inquiring - just a minute, if one may ask - sorrow of ending, ending sorrow, or are you inquiring into the whole process of living, dying, in which is included sorrow, fear and all the rest of it?

PJ: In that one sentence I feel what you say is correct, it is the whole movement of living and dying, which is existence. You talk of the ending of sorrow.

K: Yes.

PJ: The ending of sorrow. I talk of that fear and anguish, which is the sorrow of ending.

K: Ah, quite, quite, quite, quite.

PJ: You see, the two are slightly different.

K: Yes, I understand. The sorrow of ending.

PJ: There is a sorrow, such anguish of something which is, and something ceasing to be, something which is so marvellous, beautiful, fills one's life, and the knowledge which lurks behind, that that must end.

K: Now, what is ending? What do you mean, 'ending'? What is ending?

PJ: Ending is that: 'that which is' ceases to be available to our senses. That which exists, sustains, ceases to be, eternally. That word 'eternally'.

K: What is this? I don't quite understand it.

PJ: Sir, something is, and, in the very nature of its 'isness', the ending of that, the disappearance of that, for eternity! The word 'eternity'...

K: Why do you use that word 'eternity'?

PJ: Because there is an absoluteness in it.

K: The ending.

PJ: In ending. There is no tomorrow in ending.

K: Now, just a minute. Ending what?

PJ: Ending that which sustains. The sorrow is the ending of that.

K: The ending of sorrow and the ending... what? - is not eternity?

PJ: No, the sorrow of something which is so marvellous, ending.

K: Wait a minute - is it so marvellous?

PJ: Let me come down to something which is more direct.

K: Yes.

PJ: You are. You are, and that you should not be is great anguish.

K: Yes. You are...

PJ: Not 'you are' in general... You are!

K: Just a minute, what do you mean, 'you are'?

PJ: You, Krishnamurti, is.

K: All right.

PJ: And in that word, in that statement itself, is the tremendous anguish of Krishnamurti ceasing to be.

K: I understand. The anguish of K ending, or K in himself ending? You follow what I'm saying?

PJ: How do you distinguish the two?

K: Death is inevitable to this person. Right?

PJ: Yes.

K: He is going to end some day.

PJ: Yes.

K: To him it doesn't matter.

PJ: Yes.

K: There is no fear, no anguish, but you look at that person and say, 'Oh my God, he's going to die.'

PJ: Yes.

K: So the - if I may use that word 'anguish' as you used the word - is your anguish.

PJ: Is my anguish.

K: Yes. Now, why?

PJ: Isn't it?

K: Why should it be?

PJ: It is.

K: No, don't...

PJ: Why do you ask why?

K: No, I am interested, I want to know why... Someone dies, whatever he is, beautiful, ugly, all that, a human existence contained in that person. And he dies, which is inevitable. And I look at that person, I've lived with that person, I love that person, and that person dies. I am in anguish. Right?

PJ: Yes.

K: Why? Why am I in a terrible state - anguish, tears, desperate loneliness - why am I in sorrow? We are not discussing this intellectually.

PJ: No.

K: No. I am talking about it much more seriously. Why should I? I have lost that person. He has been dear to me, companion, all the rest of it, and he comes to an end. I think it is really important to understand the ending. The ending. Because there is something totally new when there is an ending, to everything.

PJ: That is why I asked: you cannot ask the why of it.

K: No, why is merely put as an inquiry.

PJ: But isn't it inevitable? He that was the perfume of my existence, ceases.

K: Yes, I loved him.

PJ: Yes.

K: He was my companion - sexually, and all the rest of it - in whom I felt full, rich.

PJ: Yes.

K: And that person comes to an end. Right?

PJ: Isn't it sorrow?

K: It is. My son dies, or my brother dies, it is a tremendous sorrow.

PJ: Yes.

K: I shed tears, and anxiety, and the mind then says, 'I must find comfort', and invents the idea that I will meet him next life, and all that stuff begins. Now, I am asking myself why man carries this sorrow with him. I know it is sorrowful, I know it is devastating. It is as though the whole existence has been uprooted. It's like a marvellous tree torn down in an instant, cut down in an instant. That has happened. I think I am in sorrow because I have never really understood, deeply, what is ending. I have lived forty, fifty, eighty years. During that period I have never realised the meaning of ending.

PJ: I understand.

K: The ending, putting an end to something which I hold dear. Say, for instance, totally ending belief, totally ending attachment. The ending of it; not... the ending of it in order to continue in another direction.

PJ: What makes the mind incapable...

K: ...of ending.

PJ: Of ending. It is a question which...

K: It's fear, of course. For example - I am just taking a very ordinary example which is common to all of us - to end completely, without any motive and direction, attachment, with all its complexity, with all its implications, to have no attachment to anything, to your experience, to your memory, to your knowledge. That's what's going to happen when death comes! After all, ending to knowledge - and that is what one is clinging to - the knowledge that that person dies. I have lived with him, I have cherished him, I have looked after him, we have been tremendously... - all that - the beauty and the conflict and all that's involved. And to end totally, absolutely, to the memory of all that. That is death. Right? That is what is going to happen when my son, brother, wife, husband, dies.

PJ: You have often said, 'Living, enter the house of death'.

K: Yes.

PJ: You have used that phrase. What is exactly meant by it?

K: Yes, I have done it.

PJ: What is meant by it?

K: Meant by that: to invite death while living. Not commit suicide, I am not talking of that, or take a pill and exit. I am talking of ending. I think it is very important, that. The word itself contains a depth of meaning: the ending of something. The ending of memory - I am taking that as a simple example. The memory of an experience which I have cherished, hold on to, something that has given me a great delight, a sense of depth and wellbeing. And to that memory I cling. And I am living in that memory, though I do ordinary work and go to the office or whatever it is, but that memory is so endearing, so extraordinarily vital, I hold on to that. And therefore I never find out what it means to end. I think there is a great deal in that, at least I feel, there is a great deal in the sense of ending, every day, everything that you have psychologically gathered.

PJ: Attachment... you can end.

K: That is the ending, that is death!

PJ: That is not death.

K: What would you call death? The organism coming to an end?

PJ: Death...

K: Or the image that I have built about you?

PJ: You see, when you reduce it to that, I would say the image which I have built about you. But it is much more than that.

K: What is much more? There is of course much more than that, but I am just inquiring into it.

PJ: Much more than that.

K: That is, I have lived with you, cherished you, and all the rest of it, and the image of you is deeply rooted in me.

PJ: Yes.

K: And - I am not talking about... - you die, and that image gathers greater strength, naturally.

PJ: Yes.

K: I put flowers to it, give poetic words to it, and all that. But it is the image that is living. And I am talking about the ending of that image.

PJ: Sir...

K: Because I cannot... the mind cannot enter into a totally new dimension if there is a shadow of memory of anything. Because 'that' is timeless, 'that' is eternal. And, if the mind is to enter into 'that', it must not have any element of time in it. I think this is logical, rational. And what is it we object to?

PJ: But life is not... is not lived...

K: Of course not.

PJ: ...on the logical and rational...

K: Of course not. It is not.

PJ: I mean, logic and rational...

K: Of course, it is not, but the ending of everything that you have gathered psychologically, which is time. And to understand that which is everlasting, without time, the mind must be free of all that. That's all I am

saying. And therefore there must be ending.

PJ: Therefore then there is no exploration into ending?

K: Oh yes.

PJ: What is the exploration into ending?

K: No. What is ending? Ending to continuity.

PJ: That is really the...

K: The continuity of a particular thought, a particular direction, a particular desire. It is these that give life a continuity. The birth and the dying, in that great interval there is a deep continuity, like a river. The volume of water makes the river marvellous, I mean, like the Ganga, like the Rhine, and so on, the great rivers of the world, the Amazon, and so on. But we live on the surface of this vast river of our life. And to see the beauty of that. And we cannot see it if we are always on the surface of it. And the ending of it is the continuity of the surface. I don't know if you follow.

PJ: Ending of it is the continuity of the surface?

K: No.

PJ: The ending of it is the ending of the surface.

K: Ending of the surface.

PJ: What dies?

K: All that I have accumulated, both outwardly and inwardly. I have built a good business which brings me a lot of money, I have good taste, a nice house, nice wife and children, beautiful garden. And, all my life, I have given a continuity to that. To end that.

PJ: Sir, may I... you don't mind if I explore a little bit? You mean to tell me that the death of the body of Krishnamurti, the consciousness of Krishnamurti will end? Please, I am putting a great deal of weight in this.

K: There are two things you have said: the consciousness of K, and the ending of the body.

PJ: The ending of the body.

K: The body will end, that is obvious. Using it untimely, accident, disease, and so on - that will end. So, what is the consciousness of that person?

PJ: This enormous, unending, abounding compassion - suppose I take that, put it in those words.

K: Yes. I wouldn't call that 'consciousness'.

PJ: I am using the word 'consciousness' because it is associated with the body of Krishnamurti.

K: Yes, but it's not...

PJ: Because it is associated with the body of Krishnamurti, I can't think of another word. I can say 'the mind of Krishnamurti', I can say 'the consciousness'.

K: Keep to the word 'consciousness', if you don't mind, and let's look at it. The consciousness of a human being is its content.

PJ: Yes.

K: Right? The content is the whole movement of thought. The learning the language, the career, specialisation, beliefs, dogmas, rituals, suffering, pain, anxiety, loneliness, desperate sense of fear, all that is the movement of thought.

PJ: Yes.

K: If the movement of thought ends, consciousness, as we know it, is not.

PJ: But thought, as a movement in consciousness as we know it, does not exist in the mind of Krishnamurti. Let us say it. Yet, there is a state of being which manifests itself when I am in contact with him, or when I... It manifests itself. Therefore, whether you use... don't reduce it to thought.

K: No, one is very careful in pointing out something. Consciousness, as we know it, is the movement of thought - ugly, noble, all that.

PJ: Yes, yes, yes.

K: It is movement of thought, it is movement of time.

PJ: Yes. Yes, I see that.

K: See that very clearly.

PJ: Yes.

K: That is, the human consciousness, as we know it, is that.

PJ: Yes.

K: When thought, after investigating, etc., etc., comes to an end - not in the material world, in psychological world - thought comes to an end, consciousness, as we know it, is not!

PJ: Sir, you can use any other word.

K: I am sticking to that word.

PJ: But there is the state of being which manifests itself as Krishnamurti.

K: Yes, yes...

PJ: Now, what word shall I use?

K: You are perfectly right, I am not asking you to change words. But... You, say for example, through meditation - the real meditation, not the phoney stuff that's going on in the world, the real meditation - you come to a point that is absolute.

PJ: Yes.

K: And I see this, I feel it. To me that is an extraordinary state. The contact... through you, I feel this immensity. And my whole urge, striving, says that I must capture, have, or whatever word you use. Right? But you have it. Not 'you' have it - it is there. It's not you, Pupulji, having it - it is there. It is not yours or mine - it is there!

PJ: But it is there because of you.

K: Ah!

PJ: You see, sir?

K: Ah, it is there not because of me - it is there!

PJ: Where?

K: All right. It has no place.

PJ: I can only accept it up to a point. No, sir, I won't accept it.

K: First of all, it is not yours or mine. Right?

PJ: I only know that it is manifest in the person of Krishnamurti.

K: Of X. Yes.

PJ: Therefore, when you say it has no place, I cannot accept it.

K: Naturally.

PJ: It has a place...

K: Because you have identified K with 'that'.

PJ: But K is 'that'.

K: Yes, maybe, but K says it has nothing to do whatsoever with K or with anybody - it is there. Beauty is not yours or mine, it is there, in the tree, in the flower - you follow? - it is there.

PJ: But, sir, the healing and the compassion which is in K is not out there.

K: Ah, no, of course not.

PJ: So the healing and the compassion of K, that's what I am talking about.

K: But 'that' is not K, this.

PJ: But it is manifest and it will cease to be manifest, that's what I am asking, saying.

K: Ah, I understand. I get it.

PJ: Please see this, sir.

K: Of course, of course. I understand what you are trying to say. I question that.

PJ: What do you mean you question that?

K: It may manifest through X. 'That' which is manifested or which is manifesting, doesn't belong to X.

PJ: May not belong to...

K: It has nothing to do with K, X.

PJ: I'm prepared to accept that also, that it does not belong to K. But K and 'that' are inseparable.

K: Yes, all right, but, you see, when you identify 'that' with the person...

PJ: I can't...

K: ...not separate. You see, we are entering into a very delicate thing.

PJ: Yes, I want to go slowly into it.

K: Quite.

PJ: You see, take the Buddha, whatever the Buddha consciousness was, or was manifesting through him, it has ceased to be. It has ceased to be, in terms of manifesting.

K: I question it. I doubt if... Not... Let's be very careful. You say - let's talk about the Buddha rather than me - you say the consciousness of that person, Buddha, ceased when he passed away. Right? It manifested through him.

PJ: It manifested through him, yes.

K: And he was 'that'.

PJ: He was 'that', yes.

K: And when he died, you say 'that' disappeared.

PJ: No, I have no knowledge of saying that it disappeared. I only say it could no longer be contacted. See this, Krishnaji.

K: Naturally not.

PJ: Why do you say 'naturally not'?

K: Because - meditation, all that - he was illumined and therefore it came to him.

PJ: Yes, yes.

K: Therefore he and 'that' were... there was no division.

PJ: Yes.

K: I, his disciple, said, 'My God, he is dead. And with his death that whole thing is over'.

PJ: Is over.

K: I say it is not. That which is good can never be over. As evil - if I can use that word without too much darkness involved in that word - evil continues in the world. Right? That evil is totally different from that which is good. So, the good manifests... the good will always exist, has always existed as - not the opposite of it - the evil in itself has continued.

PJ: But we are moving away, sir.

K: I know, I know.

PJ: Slightly we are moving away.

K: I am not quite sure, it doesn't matter. Go ahead.

PJ: You say that it does not disappear with the...

K: Good can never disappear.

PJ: I am talking of that great illumined compassion of the being. But now I can contact it.

K: Yes. But you can contact it even if that person is not. That is the whole point. It has nothing to do with the person.

PJ: What you say about being a light to yourself, is it involved with the contacting of that without the person? What is involved in that, when you say it can be contacted without a person?

K: Not contacted, it's an ugly word. It can be perceived, lived, it can be... it is there for you to reach out and hold. And to reach out and to receive it you must... thought, as consciousness which we know, has to come to an end. Because thought is really the enemy of 'that'. Thought is the enemy of compassion, obviously. Right? And to have this flame, it demands not a great sacrifice, this and that, but awakened intelligence which sees the movement of thought, and the very awareness of it ends thought. That is what real meditation is. Right?

PJ: What significance then has death?

K: None. No, no. It has no meaning because you are living with death all the time. Because you are ending everything all the time. I don't think we see the importance or the beauty of ending. We see the continuity with its waves of beauty and with its... all the superficiality.

PJ: Sir, I drive away tomorrow. Do I cut myself completely from you?

K: No, not from me. You cut yourself away from 'that', from that eternity with all its compassion and so on, if it is no longer... a memory. You understand? That's simple, isn't it? I meet the Buddha. I have listened to him very greatly. He has made a tremendous impression. In me, the whole truth of what he said is abiding. And he goes away. He has told me, very carefully, 'Be a light to yourself'. So that truth is with me, it is the seed that is flowering in me. So if he goes away, the seed is flowering. I may miss him. I say, 'I am sorry, he was a friend, I have lost a friend, or somebody whom I really loved. But what is important is that seed of truth which has been planted by my alertness, awareness, intense listening. That seed will flower. Otherwise what is the point of somebody having it? If X has this extraordinary illumination - if we can use that word - the sense of immensity, compassion, love, and all that, if it is only he, that person has it, and he dies, what is the point - what?

PJ: Sir, may I ask one question? What is the reason for his being? What is the reason then for his being?

K: What is the reason for his being, for his existence?

PJ: Yes.

K: To manifest 'that'. To be embodiment of 'that', to be... you know, all that. Why should there be any reason? A flower has no reason. Beauty has no reason, it exists. But if I try to find a reason, the flower is not. I am not mystifying all this, putting it all in a fog, which becomes mysterious, it's not that. As I have said, it is there for anyone to reach and to hold it. And so death, Pupulji, is something... like birth, which must be an extraordinary event to the mother, and perhaps to the father, but the birth and death are so far apart - you follow? And all the travail of that continuity is the misery of man. And if that continuity can end each day, you are living with death. Which then is a total renewal of something which has no continuity. That is why I think it is important to understand the meaning of that word 'ending'. Totally ending to experience, or that which has been experienced and remains in the mind as memory. Could we go - we've got some more time - could we go into the question whether a human being can live - apart from physical knowledge, driving a car, writing a letter, and all that knowledge - can he live without time and knowledge? You follow what I am saying?

PJ: Isn't what we said so far, that is, living with ending, in the very nature of this question?

K: Yes. That's why I brought it in.

PJ: That is, when the mind is capable of living with ending, it is capable of living with the ending of time and the ending of knowledge.

K: Yes, that's it. I mean, this may be just a lot of words.

PJ: No, but, sir, doesn't it involve... One of the things is: you can do nothing about it, but you can observe it and listen. And in... Now I am getting to a little more... if I may.

K: Go ahead.

PJ: There is the stream of knowledge.

K: There is the stream of knowledge, yes.

PJ: Stream of knowledge. When I say: can I be free, or not free, or hold it, or give it up, it is one element of that stream of knowledge making that statement.

K: Of course, of course.

PJ: Therefore...

K: ...it has no meaning.

PJ: It has no meaning. Now, the stream of man's knowledge throws up - because of challenge or whatever, it throws up. The only thing possible is an awakensess where that throwing up subsides.

K: And perceiving it, it subsides. Quite. The flowering of that and dying of it.

PJ: Subsiding. Is there anything else really for man to do but to be awake to this rising and subsiding?

K: Are you saying, to really understand... to have that goodness - let's call it for the moment - you can't do anything? Is that what you are saying?

PJ: You can't do anything.

K: I am not entirely sure of that.

PJ: That is what I want to know. Tell me.

K: Isn't that a rather ultimate statement: 'I cannot do anything'?

PJ: No, sir. Either I can do...

K: Let's find out.

PJ: You see, either I can do - then the next question has to be...

K: ...what can I do?

PJ: What can I do.

K: I understand.

PJ: If I say I cannot do...

K: What makes you say: 'I cannot'?

PJ: Because...

K: No, investigate it together, help me, let's investigate. What makes you say, 'I can do nothing about it'? About what?

PJ: About this rising out of the stream of knowledge.

K: No, no.

PJ: Yes, that is what we are talking about. There is a stream of knowledge.

K: Yes, there is a stream - that's all. Either it expresses itself...

PJ: Either I am a separate entity to that stream of knowledge...

K: Which you are not.

PJ: In investigating, I see...

K: You are not.

PJ: ...that one is not.

K: That's simple enough.

PJ: Now, if I am the stream of knowledge then the throwing up of that stream...

K: I understand. I understand that. If you make a statement that I am that stream of knowledge, and I cannot do anything about it because it's playing with words.

PJ: I understand that, once you verbalise it, it can become a...

K: Yes.

PJ: But what is possible? What is... What is the state of mind?

K: That's better.

PJ: What is the state of mind...

K: ...that...

PJ: ...that is so sensitive, that it is sensitive to the arising as well as the ending? You see, there has to...

K: Ah, why do you use... If it is sensitive, it is never arising nor ending. That's why I must be little careful about it.

PJ: That is why I say, we don't know that state. I really don't know that state where it is so sensitive that there is no arising. The fact is that there is arising.

K: Arising. Just a minute. Can't you do something about the arising? Not try to change it, try to modify it or rationalise, escape, all that. Can you not see the arising of anger and be aware of that, let it flower and end? I am using the word 'flower' in the sense not to get violent about it, hit somebody. See anger arising, see it needs a violent expression of that anger, and watch the whole movement of that anger, let it flower. As it flowers it dies, like a flower, in the morning it's born and dies in the evening.

PJ: This, I have never understood. The mind which is capable of observing, how does anger arise at all? You see, how can it observe an arising?

K: Wait, wait, wait. It may be that the mind has not understood the whole movement of violence.

PJ: No, but I want to ask you this is something which has always puzzled me. How does one observe - observe - without the observer?

K: Ah, now you are introducing something else.

PJ: Because otherwise...

K: Of course.

PJ: ...you are caught. To observe with the observer...

K: Of course. I am talking generally of a human mind which has separated itself as the observer and the observed.

PJ: Yes, then you can observe the anger arising.

K: Wait, wait. So, what happens? The mind can do something.

PJ: Yes, you can observe anger arising, you can watch its manifestations and not interfere with the manifestations.

K: Let it wither away.

PJ: And then let it subside.

K: Yes, subside. That you can do. That is all I am talking about.

PJ: That is right. That can be done. And that is what the mind... a mind which we call awake, that is what the mind does.

K: Yes. That's all I am saying. It can do something - you follow? - not say, 'I can't do anything'. The mind that says, 'I cannot do anything' is motionless. Right? It is only the mind that says 'I can do something', is acting. It's only the mind that says, 'I cannot do anything', therefore it is absolutely quiet. But that is... you follow? It is like asking a schoolboy, say, 'Be quiet'. Poor chap, he doesn't even know what it means. He is full of vitality, jumping, talking, yelling, crying. To him that is life. So have we, in this dialogue, seen the meaning of death? The extraordinary beauty of ending something? Even, ending to learning, ending the demand for experience, ending everything that you have been struggling, wanting, holding. I think, in that, there is tremendous beauty. That is why I think death has an extraordinary beauty and vitality. Is that enough?

PJ: Do you think there can be a learning of the mind, in the mind, to face the ultimate death?

K: What is there to learn, Pupul? It's very interesting. There is nothing to learn, except ordinary things. What is there to learn?

PJ: No, but the mind... This statement of yours... the mind must receive it without agitation.

K: Yes, yes. Without...

PJ: Without agitation. To receive a statement like that without agitation is the only way that, when death comes, there will perhaps be no agitation.

K: That's it. That's right. That's right. Not...

PJ: I am using the word 'agitation'.

K: I understand. Shall we stop? Right, it's over.

Conversation with Pupul Jayakar at Brockwood Park

Sunday, June 7, 1981

How Does One Enquire into the Source of All Life?

First Conversation with Pupul Jayakar at Brockwood Park

Monday, June 21, 1982

Krishnamurti: What would be the greatest interest to you, to ask something that not only appeals to the West but also to the Indian mind that has thought about these things perhaps much longer than the Western world - considering both the West and the East, what do you think would be the greatest significance and lasting, not just passing significance but something that is enduring, that is worthwhile?

Pupul Jayakar: Sir, most of our lives are so futile.

K: Yes.

PJ: And unless one discovers within oneself - I want to use a right word - perhaps the capacity to leap out of the futility.

K: To...?

PJ: Leap out of the futility. For the mind to have the creative spring so that it can move whatever it does. It is not what it does that is important but the need for something which is new, which is not tainted, so that it doesn't matter what the circumstances are, you seem to go beyond circumstances, and that only happens when the mind is not dependent on anything and it has some space, some perception. And I have been wondering, perhaps it's a difficult question but it's a question on which I have been pondering for the last few months, and that is: what is the ground of the creative?

K: I wonder what you mean by creative. I mean an artist says he is creative, a poet, a thinker, or some new discovery by a scientist. Would you call all that creative activity?

PJ: Perhaps.

K: But it is limited. They might not acknowledge it.

PJ: Sir, why do you bring in the word 'limited'.

K: Don't let's use 'limited' - partial.

PJ: Even that. Why do I bring in - I don't know the other.

K: No, it is partial because it is not relative to their daily life.

PJ: Again...

K: No, one may be a great scientist, and may lead a very, very mediocre life. And the scientist may discover extraordinary things and call that creative.

PJ: But you see that's why I did not speak of 'a creative action'...

K: ...but creative mind.

PJ: ...but a ground, a mind, a perception which rests in the creative.

K: I think we should make it a little more clearer, the question, if you don't mind.

PJ: You have never answered any questions on the ground of manifestation, for instance. Let us take it at the simplest level, this coming to be, of anything.

K: Of birth, of anything.

PJ: Of birth.

K: Whether it is a baby, or a new tree, or a bird.

PJ: What is involved?

K: Are you asking what is the source of all life, both the manifest and not manifest?

PJ: Yes. I would like to probe, if it is possible to probe, into what you have said just now - the unmanifest and... the manifest and pre-manifest. I won't even use 'unmanifest'. That instant before manifestation is.

K: Or birth is.

PJ: That's one instant.

K: Are we discussing this subject in a technological, scientific verbiage, or are we probing - probing into something which you and I don't know? Just a minute, I want to make it clear. Because after all the birth of a baby is - we know that, how it comes into being.

PJ: But one may know how it comes into being but one still does not know...

K: What?

PJ: ...the quality of life which pervades it. Knowing that a baby is born because...

K: ...through various processes.

PJ: ... it doesn't give you experience of birth, sir. The actuality of birth is very different from the description of birth.

K: Yes.

PJ: It is the same with everything.

K: The description is not the thing, or the explanation is not the actual.

PJ: But you cannot live through life without going into this coming into existence.

K: I don't quite follow what you are trying to convey. I am not being obstreperous but I don't quite follow. If you have talked about what is the origin of all life, what is the beginning of all existence, not go back and back and back - you follow what I mean? - but try to discover, or come upon something which is the beginning of all things. I mean various religious people have said, god - god is the origin of everything. But that is just a word, that doesn't convey the mind that investigates what is the origin. You follow what I'm saying?

PJ: Yes.

K: Now, are we discussing that, having a dialogue about that - to delve very, very deeply into the origin of all life, without any belief, without any dogma, and so on? Or are we having a dialogue theoretically, kind of moving between the actual and not the actual, and trying to probe into something with thought? I don't know if I am clear, making...

PJ: I understand what you are saying. You see, sir, we have narrowed the word 'creative' to mean, as you

said, painting, writing a book, or discovering something in science, but basically the whole meaning of a tree, a human being, the earth, the sky...

K: Man has asked this question.

PJ: Of course he has asked this question.

K: He has asked, what is the meaning of all this, and what is the origin of all this.

PJ: Where does it arise?

K: What is the ground from which this all this arises? That is what you are asking - is that it?

PJ: Yes.

K: What is the source of all existence, all life, all action? Right? Now how does one enquire into that? What is our approach to it? How do we come to investigate into something that demands an extraordinary freedom, an extraordinary sense of non-conditioned mind - if I can use it, doesn't it? A freedom - perhaps that very word 'freedom' is love - it requires that quality of mind that is both practical, sensitive, and has this quality of great compassion.

PJ: I can't start with that because I don't know what it...

K: No, how do we come to that point and from there move?

PJ: So, if you put it that way then I am stumped.

K: You are stuck.

PJ: Because I can't move.

K: No, I am just asking. I don't say it must be there. Isn't that the process of enquiry?

PJ: I say, this question arises in my mind and I would like to move with this question into it. If I say that the mind must be free and therefore it is love, then alone it can... then what do I do?

K: You can't do anything. But how do you enquire into something that man has asked for millions of years, and give it a name and be satisfied with it. But we are not doing that. We are saying, how does a mind enquire into something that must be extraordinary, that must have a quality of not only universal, cosmic - if I can use that word - how does my mind... one's mind go into such a question? Into something of supreme order. How does one's enquiry begin - where? If you enquire with thought, that doesn't lead very far.

PJ: No. No, no, I'm not... You asked how does the enquiry begin.

K: Yes. What is the manner, what is the approach of a mind that wants to enquire into something that it doesn't know, or aware - something that demands an extraordinary quality of deep subtlety, deep capacity of order, and so on. Where do I begin?

PJ: Obviously by being aware of the disorder within oneself. First of all.

K: That is, I begin, I am after all, the manifest. I am a human being born. I know the process of being born, how a child is brought into being - we are not talking of that. Now I enquire into myself. Where do I begin? Let's go step by step. It may take a little time, but where do I begin?

PJ: I begin by what is around me, what is within me.

K: Yes.

PJ: Obviously sir. There can be no other starting point of enquiry.

K: So, the world outside; the world inside. What is the criterion by which I... which measures the outer and the inner? What is the measurement? I am using, not 'judgement', I am using purposively the word 'measurement'.

PJ: But is it necessary to measure?

K: If I enquire into myself in a monastery, I can deceive myself enormously. But if I have a measure - just let me use that for a moment - of what is actually happening in the world outside of me, to observe all that without any bias, and to relate what is happening to what is happening inwardly, so that I see that's one movement, not two separate movements.

PJ: Sir, I am not in a monastery.

K: No, that's why I'm saying...

PJ: I am in the midst of life.

K: That's right.

PJ: And being in the midst of life I see action at various levels, connected with me, disconnected with me. I also see the responses within me to action, all the capacity which I may have over the years been able to even remain without reacting. I see all that. And I move into that - I move with it - it is not into it, but with it.

K: You are it.

PJ: Yes, that's why I say...

K: Don't say 'I move with it'.

PJ: Yes. I am it.

K: You are this.

PJ: You see, it is easier with the interior movement to say 'I am it'; it is much more difficult with an exterior thing to see, if you tell me that I am all the wars which are taking place, that is very difficult for me to see.

K: No, we are responsible for all the wars that are taking place.

PJ: Yes...

K: In the deeper sense of the word.

PJ: Yes, but that is a distant thing for me. You must understand. That is a distant - that responsibility is a distant responsibility. I say yes, perhaps if I take it to its ultimate I am responsible. But I can't link it in the same way with which I link to a response within me.

K: Quite.

PJ: Naturally a response within me is a living response, which has much more vitality.

K: My next question, would it deviate from what we are discussing: why don't you feel total responsibility? For the wars, the brutality, the terrible things that are happening in the world, why doesn't one feel totally responsible?

PJ: How is one totally responsible? By being born?

K: No, not involved.

PJ: No, by being born?

K: No.

PJ: Then you... then is question of we feel guilty.

K: No, as a living grown-up human being all my tradition, all my way of living, way of thinking, acting - as a nationalist, this or that - has contributed to this, to the present state of the world.

PJ: Sir, you are making it so difficult. A man commits a sadistic murder. I can't say that I am responsible for that sadistic murder.

K: Of course not.

PJ: So you know, when you take it to that extent it is impossible for me to feel the reality of it.

K: Let's leave that for the moment. I have asked that question. Leave that.

PJ: Let's leave that. But let's go into this... let's probe into the ground of existence which is the 'is-ness' of life.

K: Is-ness - the verb, 'is'. So, what?

PJ: So the only way to probe is to move into oneself, whatever that means.

K: All right. Let's take for the moment that word, go, or move, or enter into the whole complex of oneself.

PJ: Yes.

K: Enter into it, not as an observer from the outside - I am all that.

PJ: Yes. It is not even that I state what I am.

K: Yes.

PJ: I don't state. Let me discover - uncover.

K: Uncover rather than discover.

PJ: Uncover what I am. And in uncovering what I am, I comprehend that one is uncovering the whole existence of man. That is possible to see.

K: That is fairly simple.

PJ: Yes. So in this journey of uncovering, I mean the superficial things are swept clean, so we won't go into that.

K: No, those are fairly simple.

PJ: But once the superficial, the room has been swept...

K: Isn't that important too? Who sweeps the room? What does it mean, having swept the room, what it is? You follow what I am asking? Is the sweeping, or cleansing, or uncovering, completely moving away from all the superficial reactions, superficial conditioning, and trying to enter into the nature, or the movement that conditions the mind.

PJ: Obviously, sir, you can't say that you have swept the room and it is over - dust gathers again.

K: Yes.

PJ: So sweeping is a movement which is part of living. You can't... But the grosser elements can certainly be eliminated. The subtler things survive in corners in which you have not been able to get to. But the more obvious things, it is possible to sweep away.

K: Yes. Obvious things can be...

PJ: Yes.

K: No, we must be a little more...

PJ: Let's go into it.

K: What are the obvious things?

PJ: You know, for instance, Krishnaji, ambition, or envy.

K: Yes, hatred.

PJ: Or hatred.

K: No but, you know, Pupulji, really, to be free of hatred, to wipe it - no, just go into it a little bit - to be free of hatred means something extraordinary. To be free of all sense of aggression, all sense of - there is no enemy. The enemy is you.

PJ: But hatred is a different thing from the quality of aggression. Let me put it... let's go into it a little, sir.

K: Aggression is related to hatred because an aggressive nation, or aggressive person, inevitably hurts the other.

PJ: No, but...

K: And that hurt breeds hatred. It is part of the same movement.

PJ: Yes, that is why I say that there are the coarser things and then the subtler things. Hatred, anyone who has known hatred knows that hatred is a very powerful thing and a very destructive thing. But aggression may be to some extent part of one's nature even. It may be that you are... the make-up of your...

K: ...from the animal and so on.

PJ: No, the whole being - as a human being you are more assertive than another. And to be assertive is not hatred.

K: All right. All right. Move. Let's move.

PJ: It's the subtler - that's why I made the distinction of the grosser things which are possible to sweep clean.

K: But how does one know what is gross and what is subtle? What is the mind that says, this is...

PJ: That's why I think the only way to move into this is to see that nothing is trivial.

K: That no reaction is...

PJ: ...is trivial.

K: Not only trivial, has its source in one's conditioning.

PJ: You know, sir, I saw recently the casting of a tremendous metal cauldron, about seven feet diameter. The

slightest flaw, it didn't matter how slight it was, would have cracked the cauldron. And it is exactly like that. It doesn't matter how slight, how subtle, it still cracks the investigation.

K: I understand that. Are you saying to me that it needs a great training, great discipline, a sense of tremendous control, like the potter who did a marvellous thing, it needs great attention, energy, and very, very subtle hands and so on?

PJ: Doesn't it?

K: Oh, yes it does.

PJ: This is where I think one takes the word 'free' from you.

K: Free?

PJ: Yes. And takes it to mean a certain flabbiness of the spirit.

K: Oh no. No.

PJ: Please, let us pursue this. It's a very important...

K: It is not flabbiness of spirit. Good lord!

PJ: Because it may mean that I don't accept authority, I don't think it necessary to do something. I can live a futile life, I can live a trivial life. It doesn't matter...

K: The very word 'freedom', Pupunji, as far as I understand it from looking at several dictionaries, means, the very word is 'affection, love'.

PJ: And a tremendous discipline. Let me use the word 'discipline', I'm using it...

K: I know you are using the word 'discipline', but I am not sure...

PJ: When I am using the word discipline, I am speaking of it as the demand for a watchfulness that the trivial does not creep in.

K: Yes, but is watchfulness, which is awareness - if we both use the same word - does it need training, does it need discipline?

PJ: It doesn't need...

K: Let's understand the meaning of that word 'discipline'.

PJ: No, no, you see discipline - if I say that I must sit in the morning, cross my legs and look at the wall and fix my eyes and see that my mind has no thought. That is one kind of discipline. But the mind awakening to the fact that it must be aware of every movement within itself is also a discipline.

K: I wonder how you are using that word, because discipline, isn't it generally used as training, conformity, imitation, restraint?

PJ: But, no sir, there is diligence in... without diligence nothing is possible. And so you may discard the word 'discipline'; you put in the word 'diligence'.

K: Wait a minute, wait a minute. Let's go slowly. To be diligent, that means to be aware of what you are doing, what you are thinking. To be aware of your reactions, and from those reactions observe the action taking place, and in that observation, in that awareness, is the action controlled, put in a certain framework?

PJ: No obviously...

K: You see, what I am objecting to is, if I may, subject to discussion, what I am objecting to is the word 'discipline' altogether.

PJ: But sir, you have become, if I may say so, allergic to that word.

K: No, I am not allergic. I have got an allergy but I am not allergic to the word.

PJ: Because you use it to mean putting it into a framework.

K: Yes, but wait a minute. And I also mean the very act of learning is its own discipline.

PJ: Yes. Yes. But how does the act of learning come to be? You see, take it one step back, further back. From what does the need for observation arise?

K: All right. Need?

PJ: Why should I observe?

K: For the very simple reason, whether it is possible for a human mind to change something, to change himself, to change the world which is entering into such a catastrophic area.

PJ: Yes, but if I start with that premise...

K: No, not premise, it is so.

PJ: All right. If I start there, or if I start with sorrow, which is very often the real ground from which one starts.

K: It is very complex, yes.

PJ: The ground is really sorrow. I think we have moved away. So let's go back to this question...

K: What we started out with was: the origin, the ground of all life. Then to enquire into that you have to enquire into oneself, because you are the expression of all that.

PJ: Yes, yes.

K: You are life. Now the origin of that we are trying to discuss. Right?

PJ: Yes, the origin. The state from which that arises.

K: I can only do that by understanding myself.

PJ: Yes, yes.

K: Let's use simple words - understanding myself. Myself is so terribly complex, how do I approach - I am just now asking - how do I approach a problem that is complex, that is not to be easily diagnosed, easily say, "This is right", "This is wrong", "This should be", "That should not be", it is like a living, complex, messy, disordered entity.

PJ: But is it not because one starts with an attention, which is looking for an ordered entity that one, finding disorder, gets caught up.

K: Oh no, I am not looking for disorder.

PJ: In which case if you are looking without concern as to for what you are looking.

K: No, no, we are missing something. I said the world is in disorder. I observe it. And the world, I see I am also in disorder. I begin with that.

PJ: Yes.

K: I am in disorder. Human beings have lived and created such disorder in themselves, and therefore outwardly. Leave that for the moment there. Now, how do I comprehend, be aware, the origin of disorder? You follow what I am saying? Because I can begin to understand the origin of disorder I can move more and more and more deeply into something which may be total chaos, but is orderly. You follow what I mean?

PJ: Isn't it by being as simple as possible about it.

K: Yes, that is what I am trying to be. I am in disorder.

PJ: I have certain instruments of enquiry. I have my eyes, my ears, my senses.

K: Yes, yes. You don't enquire with your ears, or with your eyes.

PJ: Don't you? Don't you enquire with your eyes and your ears?

K: A little bit, yes. I enquire, when I look around, when I read...

PJ: And when you look at yourself.

K: Now, can I look at myself with my eyes, my optic eyes, or - I can see myself in a mirror, but I can't see the complexity of myself with my eyes. I must be aware sensitively, without any choice into this condition.

PJ: Why do you say, sir, that you cannot be aware with your eyes?

K: Again, what do you mean 'with your eyes'? The inward eye?

PJ: No. But there is a way of looking out, and there is a way of looking in.

K: Looking in. All right. Looking in with your eyes?

PJ: Looking in, listening in.

K: Yes. Now we must be a little careful here, because it's misleading.

PJ: Yes, let's go into it. Is there any other way?

K: Yes, I think there is.

PJ: Let's go into the other way. But first of all let's go into the way, whatever it is. Is the eye, ear, not part of the other way?

K: Breathing, hearing, seeing, feeling. Those are actually sensory responses. Right? Actually I see that colour. I hear noise. I taste something, and so on. These are sensory responses.

PJ: Yes, but is there not a seeing of anger, the action of anger, and listening to a reaction of anger?

K: Do you listen with your ears, or do you observe anger?

PJ: How do you observe anger?

K: By when you are angry, to look at the cause and effect of anger.

PJ: When you are angry you can't.

K: So later on you...

PJ: You see the nature of the mind which has been in a state of anger. But you see the nature of the mind -

the word you use is you 'see' the nature of the mind.

K: All right, I won't...

PJ: It is very important, Krishnaji.

K: I understand what you are saying, that the very act of listening, the act of feeling, inwardly, is it that you see it with your eyes, hear with sensory ears?

PJ: You see if you put it that way then you never get to the point because the sensory ear is so used to listening out, that it can never comprehend what is, if you take that and try and push it in, you will never get to it.

K: But would it help if we talked about perception?

PJ: No, sir. I say it would help if you talked about the seeing, listening with the eye and ear, because there is a seeing, listening, with the eye and ear.

K: Now wait a minute. I hear you making that statement. From that hearing I have understood the words and see the meaning of what you are seeing. Right? Right?

PJ: Yes.

K: The verbal communication has taken place. But the deeper significance...

PJ: But it is also taking place. While I am listening to you and seeing you I am also listening and seeing my own mind, the ground of the mind.

K: No.

PJ: Then what is taking place? What is taking place?

K: Listening.

PJ: There is listening. I am not saying, who is listening.

K: No, listening.

PJ: There is listening.

K: But, just a minute, Pupunji, one must be clear on this point. There is no - we must, a little more carefully.

PJ: No, sir, but in an act where you are totally attentive, take an act where you are totally attentive, what is the state of that act of being totally attentive?

K: What is the state of action that is born out of complete attention?

PJ: Complete attention.

K: I think it is clear. I will answer it. First to answer that question we must understand what we mean by complete action, attention. Attention. It's not concentration.

PJ: No, sir...

K: No, no, I want to be clear on this.

PJ: No, of course it's not.

K: Of course not. So attention means there is no centre from which you are attending.

PJ: No, of course not.

K: No, don't say, "Of course not", see what is implied in it.

PJ: You see, sir, I would like to ask you one thing: are we still dusting the periphery?

K: No. No, I don't want to...

PJ: If you are not dusting the peripheral...

K: The peripheral argument and enquiry has very little meaning.

PJ: Then when you ask that question, unless I can understand what attention is I can't even take the first step.

K: No, so I just want to be clear. Attention means - what does it mean? - I attend completely.

PJ: To see, to attend completely is for the 'I' not to be there.

K: Yes. That is the real thing. When there is attention there is no 'I'. It isn't, 'I am attending'. There is only that state of mind which is wholly attentive.

PJ: So that all the senses...

K: Yes, the whole body, the whole...

PJ: ...being is awake, if I may say so.

K: Yes. You can use that word.

PJ: And if you are in that state where the being is awake then you can listen, observe.

K: Yes, yes.

PJ: Now can we proceed from there? You don't want to proceed from there.

K: We go wandering off. I want to enquire into myself. Right? Because myself is life. In enquiring about what I am, I may, if my enquiry is correct, accurate, not distorted, I may come... the ground, the beginning of all life may be discovered - may be uncovered.

PJ: If you are starting from there then I will say the first step you will find that 'I' is there.

K: Yes, yes. First step: see clearly, hear clearly.

PJ: But the 'I' is there.

K: Yes, of course.

PJ: So there is the observer and the observed.

K: Of course.

PJ: Now, seeing that, it is also to...

K: Now wait a minute, Pupul, don't move away from that. I know there is the observer and the observed. Is that so? I am enquiring. I have taken it for granted...

PJ: No, first, obviously, sir, when I first started enquiry I started from the observer.

K: Yes, I start with the observer.

PJ: Now I ask - or you have asked and therefore that thought is in my mind, that is there the observer?

K: Is there an observer different from the observed?

PJ: Yes. Now, having that statement within me I look for the observer.

K: Yes, yes, who is the observer.

PJ: And look for the observer.

K: Yes, enquire into the nature of the observer. Go slowly into that. Because if I understand the observer - if there is an understanding of the observer, then perhaps the observer may see the falseness of this division between the observer and the observed.

PJ: Who will see?

K: Not 'who will see', but the perception of what is true. Perception, not who sees - perceiving.

PJ: No. So the seeing of what is the truth of the observer will end the state of division.

K: Of division, yes. Yes, that's is what I have said a thousand times.

PJ: End the state of division.

K: Yes, yes.

PJ: And it is not one process, one act, that I end the process of division. You might say it happened once and you have seen everything. But it doesn't happen that way.

K: No. That's generally stated that way.

PJ: Yes. For that instant it is so.

K: No... Go ahead, what are you trying to say?

PJ: What I am saying is, diligence - we used that word - diligence or discipline is to have that enquiry alive within one.

K: Yes. And that does not, I am saying, that does not need training.

PJ: No, I am not talking of training. You brought it in.

K: When you used previously the word 'discipline' - just now you used it.

PJ: No, no, but I am using the word 'discipline' without yet bringing in the word 'training'. I say discipline is that I cannot expect to have an understanding of this unless the mind is awake to this and is diligent about being awake to this.

K: Yes. All right I won't bring in anything. I'll - go ahead.

PJ: You can't deny that.

K: No, no, it has to be diligent, it has to be watchful, it has to be attentive, subtle, hesitant, it has to be all that.

PJ: It has to observe, and rest in observation, find a new home for itself in observation.

K: Pupul we are wandering off again, perhaps I am wandering off. I said I am enquiring into myself.

PJ: Well that's enquiring.

K: How do I enquire into myself except through my reactions - the way I think, the way I act, the way I respond to the environment, my relationship to another.

PJ: Yes. And I find, if I am starting from there, I find that as I first observe myself - the responses, the reactions, all rapid, confused, continuous...

K: I know, contradictory and so on.

PJ: ...contradictory, but in the very observing some space comes into this.

K: Some space, some order. That means...

PJ: This is just the beginning, sir. This is just the beginning.

K: I know, I know. Yes. We are sticking at the beginning.

PJ: That's what I am asking.

K: I am bored with the beginning. Sorry!

PJ: So let us proceed further.

K: Pupul, I would like to ask a question. Is it necessary to go through all this? To watch my reactions, to watch my responses, to observe diligently my relationship with another, intimate or not? Must I go through all this? Or...

PJ: You see, sir, I'll say something now. The fact is one has gone through all this. The fact is the history of...

K: You may have gone through it because you have accepted that pattern.

PJ: No.

K: Just hold a minute, hold a minute, hold on a minute. You see we have all done that: the thinkers, the sannyasis, the monks and...

PJ: And Krishnamurti.

K: I am not sure.

PJ: That's the point.

K: I am not sure. Just a minute. I want to discuss this point very seriously because that is...

PJ: You either have in the last thirty years jumped yourself...

K: Wait a minute, let's see it for a moment. We have accepted this pattern of examination, analysis and investigating these reactions, paying attention to them, watching, self-reclected and so on, so on, so on. There is something in it which rings a false note. At least to me.

PJ: You mean to say a person caught in the whole confusion of existence...

K: He won't even listen to all this.

PJ: There has to be space in order to even listen. How does that space arise?

K: Because either you have suffered and you say, "I must find out", or you suffer and say, "God exists, I love him and I am comforted by that".

PJ: No, so you have still not answered me. You say, is it necessary to go through all this.

K: I am asking that. I think it may not be.

PJ: Then show me how. You can't make...

K: Wait, I will show it in a minute. Let's go into the... If as long as you accept this analytical process, which we will call for the moment the analytical process of enquiry - watching diligently your reaction, all that - we use one word for that, this analytical self-introspective, this constant watching, watching, watching, watching.

PJ: It is not analytical.

K: All right, put it out. Constantly watching, constantly enquiring - you follow? I feel, as I say, that man has done that thousands of..

PJ: He has not, sir.

K: Oh yes he has.

PJ: He has not. He has done something quite different.

K: What has he done different?

PJ: He has looked at his mind and tried to suppress.

K: That's part of the pattern: suppress, escape, substitute, transcend, that's all within that framework.

PJ: It is not the same thing as to observe without trying to do anything about the observation.

K: No, I am asking, Pupul, we are not meeting my question, if I may point out, perhaps I may be wrong. You are not answering my question: must I go through all this?

PJ: You say the word 'must' - must I is a very...

K: All right, I won't use 'must'. Is it necessary, is it imperative, is it essential that I must go through this?

PJ: No, but are you trying to say that out of the middle of chaos you can leap to a state of total non-chaos?

K: No, I won't put it that way. You see you are trying to catch... No, I won't put it that way.

PJ: Then what are you saying? Either you are saying...

K: No, wait a minute, I am saying very clearly, I am saying humanity has gone through this process, some diligently, some sacrifice everything and so on. This has been the pattern of our existence. Some have done it. Right? Right? Enquired, analysed, searched, introspective examination, diligently watching every action and so on and so on. At the end he may be just a dead entity, with some concept, illusory concept.

PJ: He may not be.

K: I said, may not be. And very few, very, very few have gone out of it.

PJ: So I say he may not be. But when you say, is it necessary, then you have to...

K: I know, I know, if it is not necessary then show me the other. That's what you are saying. I'll show it to you. But first step out of this.

PJ: You see, sir...

K: Wait, wait, wait. I'll show it to you.

PJ: But look what you are asking.

K: I know, I know I am asking that.

PJ: If I step out of the other, it's already there.

K: Of course. Step out. That's what I am saying. Don't take time to go through all this.

PJ: No but what is meant by 'step out of it'?

K: I'll tell you what I mean. I recognise - just let me talk a little - I recognise very clearly, perceive, whatever word you use, that this process of introspective observation, diligence and so on, so on, man has tried a great deal, for a million years, in different ways. And somehow his mind is not clear at the end of it, he has got some fixations, he has got some ideas and so on. Somehow this quality of movement is very, very shallow. Now if you listen to that, that it is very shallow to do all this, and you see the truth that it is shallow, which means your disordered mind is now quiet, listening to find out. Right? Your confused traditional mind says, I am accustomed to this diligent observation of all my activities, and that it is really very, very superficial. If you see the truth of that superficiality you are out of it. It's like putting away something utterly meaningless.

Now wait a minute, let me put it round the other way. My mind is disorderly, my life is disorderly. You come along and say, "Be diligent, watchful of your actions, of your thoughts, of your relationship - diligent - be utterly watchful all the time". And I say, "That is impossible because my mind won't allow to be diligent all the time. It is not diligent, it is negligent." And I struggle between these two: being diligent and negligent. And I see man has done this.

PJ: But you mean to say, Krishnaji, a mind which is not capable of observing...

K: No, I am saying a mind that is willing to listen. I am not talking of attention.

PJ: But please listen to me, sir. You think a mind can be in that state of listening.

K: No, that is very simple.

PJ: Is it?

K: Yes. I say just listen to a story that I am telling you - you are interested. Your mind is quiet, you are eager to see what the story is about and so on.

PJ: I am sorry, sir, it doesn't happen that way, no.

K: No? Just a minute, just a minute. Just a minute, don't say no, Pupulji.

PJ: You see, Krishnaji...

K: I asked you - just a minute - I asked you, Pupulji, to listen to what I am saying.

PJ: I listened.

K: Wait, wait, wait - listen. I am going to explain what I mean by listening. Not only with the sensory ear, but with the ear that has no movement, that is really listening, that is not translating, that is not comparing, that is not trying to find - listening. I am listening to what you say so completely, then if you are so listening, a man comes along and says, "Don't go through all this diligent process, it is false, it's superficial". If you hear that, the truth of it, what takes place? What actually takes place when you see something really true?

Now is this diligent process, is it... it is time consuming - right? I have not time. My life is so short. I have got so many problems, and you are adding another - be diligent. And I say please, I am worn out with problems, and you have introduced to me another problem. And I say, please, just - you have problems, I know you have got many problems which are all interrelated. Forget that for the moment and listen to me. That's all.

PJ: Sir, if that were so, if that were so - listen, sir.

K: I'm listening.

PJ: If I could listen - and I do listen - to music in that way...

K: Ah, music is different.

PJ: But to listen - if I listen to music in that way it should change me totally. It does not.

K: No. Of course not.

PJ: Then?

K: We are moving to something else.

PJ: You are talking of a mind which is already - I am using the word in inverted commas, so - a mind which is mature already, listening to a state like that.

K: No. You see Pupul, I am not sure we have not made our minds so immature that we are incapable of listening to anything.

PJ: But how, you see Krishnaji, you start by making things impossible.

K: Of course! See the truth. Something impossible, and you have to...

PJ: But that kind of energy which is needed to deal with an impossible thing.

K: That's what it is. This has been possible, this diligent affair. I say it is so trivial.

PJ: I'll ask you, what is the mind which can deal with an impossible statement like that? What is the nature of that mind?

K: That which is utterly impossible is non-existent. We are thinking everything is possible.

PJ: No.

K: I am getting...

PJ: You see, it's the way you are getting to, sir. You are saying, what you've said just now, is non-existent. So with a non-existent mind - listen.

K: No. Look, Pupulji, if you and I, both of us agree - just a minute - even temporarily, that this diligent process has really led nowhere. It has led to various activities which may be beneficial and so on, but the enquiry which sees that I must go to the very source of things - not through this way obviously.

PJ: Obviously, that I would accept.

K: That's all. No, if you accept that is not through diligent awareness...

PJ: But, sir, even to come to a point when I see it cannot come to it through this...

K: Therefore, what has happened to your mind? You have then put this aside.

PJ: Yes.

K: Now what is happening to a mind that says, this is too trivial, too superficial, out, put it out, what is then the quality of your mind?

PJ: I know what you are trying to say, sir.

K: You answer my question. What is the quality of a mind which has been caught in the process of diligent enquiry, this time consuming diligence, when it sees that it has no deep fundamental value - value in the sense that this diligent process will lead, or help to comprehend, come upon, or uncover, the origin? This process is not, because it is time consuming - the other way may have no time at all.

PJ: But look at the danger in what you are saying. The danger in what you are saying is, that I will not be concerned with sweeping the room.

K: No, no. I am enquiring into myself. That very enquiry demands that the mind and the heart, the whole existence is orderly.

PJ: You start with the impossible.

K: Of course I start with the impossible, Pupulji, otherwise what is possible - you have done all the possible.

PJ: No, no, sir...

K: No, you have done everything that is possible. One has fasted, sacrificed, done everything to find the origin of things. That has been possible. And the possibility has led nowhere. It has led to certain benefits, social benefits and so on, and also it has led to a great deal of misery of mankind. So if you tell me that, that this diligent process is time consuming and therefore time-binding, and as long as you are doing this you are just scratching the surface - the surface may be most extraordinary, very nice and pleasant and ennobling and all that, but it is just on the surface. If you grant that, not only grant but actually see it, feel it, it is in your blood that this is false, you have already stepped out of something - that is, the ordinary into something extraordinary. And we are not willing to do that. We want to go through all this. We treat it like learning a language. Learning a language is a disciplinary action, diligent attention and so on and so on, so on. We carry the same mentality into the other. That's what I object to.

PJ: But I put aside the other.

K: Ah, it is not a game we are playing.

PJ: No, I am not playing a game. You put aside the other.

K: Which means - careful Pupul...

PJ: Which means even the seeing, listening is at an end - if I may put it this way.

K: Which means what? The movement of diligence has stopped. Of course. If that is false it has gone. So what has happened to my mind? My mind has been caught in the diligent enquiry and so on and so on, which is time-binding, and now it says, "By Jove, I see this to be utterly superficial". And what is the state of the mind which has put away something which man has carried for a million years? What is that state of mind? Right? It is a fresh mind. Right? It is a totally new mind. And such a mind is necessary to enquire - not enquire - necessary to uncover the origin.

If I talked like this to a very disciplinarian, religious man, he wouldn't even bother to listen. He would say, "No, it is all nonsense you are talking about". But you, in our dialogue, say "Let's go into it", and so you have put yourself in a position of listening, find out. But if you keep on repeating this diligent process you are

still like everybody else.

Now, such a mind, first of all, such a mind has no bondage. Right? It has no bondage to time, which is, this diligent process is to become something, is to clarify, to understand, to go beyond. So this mind has no beyond, it is not becoming something. Would you go as far as that?

PJ: See, the moment movement ends...

K: No, I am asking you would you go so far as to see the fact such a mind can not have any kind of dependence, attachment and so on, it is...

PJ: Yes, that I see, because... as movement ends...

K: The movement of becoming.

PJ: ...all this which you have talked about is the movement of becoming.

K: That's right. Which is the perpetuation of the self in a different form, in a different network of words. You see if you tell me this, and I start out to uncover the source - and to me that is a passion, I want to find out, I am not just playing a game, and to me it is utterly necessary - if - when that uncovering of the origin of all life, when there is that uncovering of it and it is there, my life, my actions, everything is different. Must be. But the other diligent process, my god, I will die at the end of it. You see that's why I feel the understanding of that as a time consuming factor which is so destructive. Time consuming is necessary to learn to technique but this is not a technique to be learnt. (Pause)

PJ: Sir, you have the mind of a... the whole... you have really an antique mind.

K: What?

PJ: You have really an antique mind, mind of great antiquity.

K: Antique in the sense...

PJ ...of containing the whole of human...

K: After all, you see, Pupul, that is why it is important to understand, I am the world. You understand? I am the world.

PJ: No one else can make that kind of statement which you are making.

K: One must make it, otherwise where are you when you see all this destruction, brutality, wars, killing, which has never stopped? A man who loved - loved - he wouldn't be British, or Argentine or Israel, or Arab, or something - he couldn't kill another. So I see this process has been going on for thousands and thousands of years, everybody trying to become something. And all the diligent workers are helping man to become something - illumination, enlightenment, is to achieve enlightenment. It is so absurd!

PJ: You see, sir, with you...

K: Not 'with me'.

PJ: Just listen, sir. The whole movement of the dormant has ended.

K: That is diligence is ended. Becoming has ended.

PJ: The whole thing which is dormant in...

K: I think, Pupulji, don't let's make this into some elite - only for the few - the elite can only have this kind

of mind. I refuse to accept that. That means back and into the old division of the elite and the non-elite. Any person who gives attention, who wants to hear, who really says I must find the source of life - passionate about it, not just casual, then he will listen - not to me, he will listen. It is in the air.

You see, like Buddha is supposed to have achieved enlightenment. Just think of such a statement! Sitting under a tree, meditating, fasting, striving - you follow? And ultimately one day it happened to him. That's too utterly meaningless. That means you are allowing time to be the factor of enlightenment, time the factor of deep profound understanding.

Do we stop? Twenty to six.

First Conversation with Pupul Jayakar at Brockwood Park

Monday, June 21, 1982

Can We Live without the Burden of a Thousand Yesterdays?

Second Conversation with Pupul Jayakar at Brockwood Park

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

Pupul Jayakar: Sir, I was wondering whether one could discuss the wonder and nature of birth in the human mind, not birth as having a baby, but a mind that is jaded, old, incapable of perception, can it renew itself, or totally have a new perception? I think that is a problem with many of us. As one grows older one finds that the quickness of the mind, the capacity to perceive, and take in deeply, perhaps dims.

Krishnamurti: Are you asking, is it possible to keep the mind very young, and yet ancient?

PJ: Yes. You used the word 'ancient', I also would like to go into the nature of what is meant by the word 'ancient'. If we could go into the nature of that first because you have used it, and I have heard you use it several times. Obviously it is not that ancient quality is unrelated to time as yesterday.

K: Yes, let's go into it.

PJ: What is the nature of the ancient?

K: After all, human brain, as far as one understands, and if you have listened to some of the television, the scientists talking about the quality of the brain and the brain works and so on, it has its own protective nature, protective chemical reaction when there is a shock, when there is a pain and so on. We are after all, or our brains are very, very ancient, very, very old. It has evolved from the ape, the human... the ape standing up, and so on till now. It has evolved through time through tremendous experiences, acquired a great deal of knowledge, both the outward knowledge as well as inward knowledge, and so it is really very, very, very, ancient. And it is not as far as I can understand, as far as I can see, it is not a personal brain, it is not my brain and your brain. It can't be.

PJ: But obviously your brain and my brain have a different quality of the ancient in them.

K: Wait. Don't let's talk of mine or yours for the moment.

PJ: By making a statement...

K: I am just exploring the beginning, laying a few bricks. If that is granted, that we are very old, very ancient, in that sense, and that our brains are not individualistic brains, we may have reduced it, we may think it is individual - it is personal, it is my brain - but it can't have evolved through time as my brain.

PJ: No, obviously.

K: I mean absurd to think that. No, it may be obvious but most of us think it is a personal brain, it is my brain. Therefore from that is born the whole individualistic concept. Leave that for the moment.

Now are we saying such an ancient mind - brain or mind, for the moment leave the mind alone, let's look at the brain - such an ancient brain, which has been so conditioned, and has lost, or it may be very, very deeply embedded in the unconscious, in the deep down, that it is becoming very, very coarse, superficial, artificial and vulgar. You follow what I mean?

PJ: But an ancient mind, as you just now said, is the result of evolution in time.

K: In time, of course. Evolution means time.

PJ: In time. Now the search which has gone on for centuries...

K: Since the beginning of time man must have asked.

PJ: ...has been whether it is possible to free this of that, because with time also is inbuilt with this ageing quality, is built in with the sense of the ancient.

K: Yes. I understand that question.

PJ: So are you talking - when you say it is necessary to have an ancient mind - are you talking of a brain which has also inbuilt in it...

K: ...the quality of its own deterioration. Of course.

PJ: Why is that necessary? It is so.

K: No, it is so because experience, knowledge has limited it, has conditioned it, has narrowed it down. Right? The more we acquire knowledge, the more there is the limitation of itself.

PJ: No, you seem to be implying two things. One is the sense of the ancient, and the weight of the past, which gives it a sense of being very old.

K: It is old.

PJ: Because it has experienced for millions of years...

K: Which has conditioned it, which has narrowed it down - limited.

PJ: But the ancient you are talking about, are you talking about that which it has experienced through time?

K: We will go into that for the moment. First let us see how ancient it is in the normal sense of that word. And how it has in its own million years of experience has limited itself. Therefore there is the quality of its deterioration. And the modern world, living in the modern world, with all the noise, with all the terrible shocks, and the agonies of war and so on, has made it still more limited, more in conflict. Because the very limitation brings its own conflict.

PJ: Sir, there is a mind, which because the sense of these million years, gives to it a density and weight.

K: Yes, yes, quite.

PJ: Then there is a mind which is brittle.

K: Which is?

PJ: Brittle, which is easily corroded.

K: No, the mind and the brain, let's for the moment - which are you talking about?

PJ: I am talking of the brain.

K: Brain, don't use the word 'mind'.

PJ: All right, I'll use the word 'brain'. The brain has a certain weight to it, and a density to it, which...

K: Yes, a coarseness to it, a heaviness to it - quite.

PJ: A heaviness to it. Now is that what you mean by the ancient?

K: What?

PJ: Is that what you mean by the ancient?

K: Not quite. I just want to go into it a little bit slowly. If we admit that the brain is, by its own evolution, has conditioned itself, and therefore it has the inherent quality of its own destruction, and whether that quality can ever be stopped, in the sense of its deterioration, can the brain cells renew themselves in spite of its conditioning? Do you follow what I am saying? In spite of its agonies, failures, miseries, all the complex modern world in which we live, whether that brain can renew itself so as to achieve its originality, not originality in the sense of individuality, but originality in its origin.

PJ: Would you say that a baby, the brain cells of the baby are original in that sense?

K: No. Of course not. Of course not.

PJ: So what is meant by an original... originality of the brain cells?

K: Let's go into it a little bit. What is - the word 'original', what does it mean? Unique, special.

PJ: No, it has a quality of 'for the first time'.

K: Pristine quality.

PJ: Yes.

K: Original means that. Untouched, uncontaminated by knowledge.

PJ: Yes.

K: Can it - that's the question - can such a brain which has been conditioned for a million, or two million years, reach that, or wipe away its conditioning and reach that quality of the pristine freshness of the brain? I don't know, it may be a wrong question altogether.

PJ: But it is, I think scientifically they would say that the brain cells are dying all the time.

K: All the time.

PJ: Therefore the number of brain cells available...

K: And also are renewing itself. Apparently certain cells die and certain cells are reborn. It is not dying all the time so that the brain goes to pieces, dies.

PJ: No, but the very fact of ageing is that the renewal does not keep pace.

K: Yes, that's it. Yes. That's the whole point, isn't it, really - is it possible for a brain that has been conditioned, and therefore, as you put it, the built-in quality of its own deterioration, can that quality stop, end, disappear?

PJ: Yes.

K: That is, can the brain keep young, young in the sense fresh, alive, has a quality of its originality.

PJ: Yes. How would you...

K: ...proceed from that. I think we have to go into the question, what is consciousness? Right? Because that's part of our brain, part of our whole being, which is our consciousness. Right? What is consciousness? Not only being conscious of things, outwardly and inwardly, but the whole content of consciousness. Because without the content there is no consciousness, as we know it. So can the content, which makes up this

consciousness, can that content end by itself so that there is a totally different dimension to consciousness? You follow? Because the brain or the mind has this quality of consciousness. Right? That is consciousness. The content is the consciousness.

PJ: Yes, that is so.

K: That is so. The content is pleasure, belief, excitement, sensation, reactions, faith, agony, pleasure, suffering, affection, and so on, it's the whole of that, is consciousness. And as long as the content, which is all this, exists, it must, because of its conflict, its confusion within consciousness, must wear itself out. And that's why the brain becomes old - in the sense old, ageing, dies. There is no freshness to it.

PJ: Now, sir, is the content of consciousness identical with the brain cells?

K: Yes. Of course.

PJ: Then as the content of consciousness, because of its very nature wears itself out...

K: ...through conflict. No, no - be careful.

PJ: Yes, I understand that. That very process is wearing out the brain cells.

K: Is conflict - the disturbance, the shocks, the pressures, the...

PJ: So the physical and the psychological are really the same thing really there.

K: Yes. And psychological, that's right. Physical reactions, psychological reactions, they are both reactions.

PJ: Because the brain is physical. The content of consciousness is psychological.

K: Which is also a process of the physical. Of course.

PJ: Yes.

K: So it is psychological as well as the physical, with all their reactions bring about the thought of pain, the thought of agony, the thought of pleasure, the thought of achievement, ambition and so on, so on, and belief, faith, is all this.

PJ: Which creates disturbance and... But the nature of the brain cells is to continually die.

K: Yes. They carry on. The tradition carries on.

PJ: It is inbuilt, that also is inbuilt.

K: Of course.

PJ: Therefore...

K: And also its own protection, its own reaction, chemical reactions, from what one hears, the cells with their reactions, they produce their own chemicals to protect itself.

PJ: But so is time inbuilt.

K: Of course, after all that is the product of time.

PJ: Time is inbuilt in the brain cells.

K: Now the question really is whether all this consciousness with its content can end, in the sense conflict totally end.

PJ: But with conflict totally ending will time end?

K: Yes. After all that is what the sannyasis, the monks, the real thoughtful people have enquired whether time has a stop. Right? Of course, they have all asked this question.

PJ: Yes but you are talking of time now as the psychological process of conflict.

K: Conflict, yes.

PJ: Not time as duration, or the watch, or...

K: No, no, no. So what is it that we are trying to find out, or rather investigate together?

PJ: What is it that will bring this quality of birth into the mind?

K: Quality of birth in the sense... No, let's be clear what you mean by 'birth'. A new, a fresh element enter into it.

PJ: Continual - I won't use the word 'continual'.

K: No, you can't.

PJ: Let me cut out 'continual'. But a being born and with the freshness of birth, and purity of birth...

K: No, wait a minute - careful. 'Birth' you mean what - a baby is born, and his brain already has the quality of its father, mother, and also the tradition, it is gradually - bring all that out.

PJ: But 'birth' also has that quality of the new. Birth is, it was not, and it is.

K: Ah, you are using 'birth' in the sense - just let me clear - the old being born. The ancient mind, the ancient brain, which is neither yours nor mine, it is the universal brain, is reborn in a baby.

PJ: It is reborn in a baby.

K: And the baby as it matures, the brain is the common brain.

PJ: But what is reborn in a mind which is free? Is it the ancient reborn?

K: No, let's be clear, Pupulji. First, is it possible to be free of this conditioning of the brain, which has brought about its own decay, and whether that consciousness can totally end all its conflict. Then out of that comes the new birth. I don't know if you follow what I am saying. As long as my brain - sorry, my hay fever - as long as one's brain, that is one's consciousness, is in conflict, there can be no new element enter into it. That's obvious. Would you grant that? Not verbally, but see the fact, that as long as I am fighting, fighting, fighting, struggling to become something.

PJ: I think one sees that.

K: All right. Now if one sees that, not merely verbally, but actually inwardly sees it, then the question arises whether it is possible to end it - end what I mean, end suffering, end fear.

PJ: You see, Krishnaji, the danger comes in that you can end it without renewal. Please listen. There is a possibility of ending all these things and yet diminishing.

K: Ah, no, we mean two different things by the word 'ending'.

PJ: Ending what?

K: Ending that which is.

PJ: Ending that which is.

K: Which is my consciousness - all the thoughts that I have had, all the complexities that have been accumulated through time, the ending of that. So we will have to be clear what we mean by ending. Either you end it by deliberate act of will, or deliberate ideal, purpose, by a superior goal.

PJ: You see, Krishnaji, when actually ending happens, which is the coming to a stop, the real standing still of the mind, it happens without any reason.

K: Yes. Sometimes, sometimes - let's go slowly.

PJ: Sometimes it happens without reason. It is not due to any single thing.

K: Volition.

PJ: So is it that you throw yourself to chance?

K: No, no, no. Let's be clear first, Pupulji, what do we mean by 'ending'. Is the ending - does the ending create its own opposite?

PJ: No because...

K: Careful, let me... We generally mean that. I end this in order to get that.

PJ: No, I am not talking of that ending.

K: So I mean by ending, the total perception of that which is, total perception of my consciousness, the whole, the complete perception of that consciousness which is insight, that insight has not a motive, a remembrance, it is immediate perception, and the ending of it is... there is something beyond which is not touched by thought. That is what I mean by ending.

PJ: Is it that the million years which you call the ancient...

K: No, that's part of the ancient brain, naturally.

PJ: No. Is it that the totality of that million years sees itself?

K: Yes, that's all. That is the real problem.

Pupul, let's make it a little more simple, or a little more definite. We do see, don't we, see the point that our consciousness has been cultivated through time? Right?

PJ: Yes, that's easy.

K: Just a minute. And any reaction to the ending of that is furthering another series of reactions. Which is, if I desire to end it, then that very desire creates another object to be gained.

PJ: Yes.

K: So is there a possibility of perceiving without the movement of the future? You understand what I am saying? The ending has no future, only ending. But if the brain says, I cannot end that way because I need a future to survive. I don't know if I am conveying it.

PJ: Yes, because inbuilt in it is the future.

K: Yes, of course. So is there an ending, the psychological demand, conflicts, ending of all that, ending without the thought of what will happen if I end? I don't know if I am conveying anything. Because, look, I can give up something if you guarantee me something else. I will give up suffering if you will guarantee me

that I will be happy with the ending of it. Or there is some extraordinary reward awaiting for me. Because my whole brain is constructed as part of that consciousness - reward and punishment. Punishment is the ending, and the reward is the gaining. Now as long as these two elements exist in the brain, the future, the continuation of the present will go on, modified and so on. Right? So can these two principles, reward and punishment, end? When suffering ends the brain is not seeking a future existence in paradise.

PJ: But even if it is not seeking a future in paradise, suffering itself corrodes the brain. Suffering itself corrodes the brain.

K: Yes. But you see, Pupulji, this is very important to understand that the brain is seeking constantly security, it must have security. That's why tradition, remembrance, the past has extraordinary significance. Right? It needs security. The baby needs security. Our brains need security - security being food, clothes and shelter. Security is faith in god, faith in some ideal, faith in a future better society - all these are contributory causes which makes the brain say, I must have deep security otherwise I can't function. Right? So physically there is no security, because it is going to die, it knows it is going to die. Psychologically it has no security, actually. Am I going too fast?

PJ: No, it is not that. With all this...

K: Part of my consciousness.

PJ: ...I still say that there is one central demand.

K: Which is to survive.

PJ: No, sir.

K: What is the central demand?

PJ: The central demand is to have a mind... to have a brain which gives the flavour of a new existence.

K: Ah, now - wait, wait, who demands it? Just a minute. Who actually wants such a brain? Not the vast majority of people. No. They say, please stay things as they are.

PJ: No but we are not talking about the vast majority. I am discussing with you, or 'X' is discussing with you.

K: Let's be clear.

PJ: So it is basically that - there are many ways of getting security. There are many ways of getting security.

K: I question - no - I question whether there is security in the sense we want security.

PJ: So the brain will never understand...

K: Oh yes it will.

PJ: The brain will never understand because inbuilt in its very...

K: No, but that's why I am saying perception is important.

PJ: Perception of what?

K: Perception of actually what is, first. Move from there slowly, slowly.

PJ: Perception of 'what is' includes the creative things it has done, the stupid things it has done, what it considers worthwhile, what it considers not worthwhile, so the perception of all these and the ending of all this.

K: No, no, just a minute, careful, Pupul, let's go slowly, if you don't mind. Perception of what is actually going on. Right? Both physically, outwardly, and inwardly. What is going on around me and psychologically, inwardly what is happening. That is 'what is'.

PJ: Yes.

K: Now, the question is: can 'what is' be transformed? Right? Which is my consciousness, which is part of the brain.

PJ: But in the emptying of that consciousness, an emptying of that consciousness...

K: No, by you asking that question, is that possible? You understand? Is it possible to empty, or to wipe away the whole of the past? The past is the time, the whole of my past, whole of the content of my consciousness is the past, which may project the future, but it still has its roots in the past. Right? Now is it possible to empty these things? Really this is a tremendous question, not just an ideological or intellectual question. Is it psychologically possible not to have the burden of a thousand yesterdays? The ending of that is the beginning of the new, is the new.

PJ: You used a phrase just now: is it possible not to have the burden of a thousand yesterdays. Is the problem in the burden, or in the thousand yesterdays?

K: The thousand yesterdays is the burden. You can't separate the two.

PJ: No, no, no.

K: How do you separate the two?

PJ: Because the thousand yesterdays is a fact.

K: Is a fact. Oh, you mean in that sense. But I am talking of...

PJ: The burden is when I have given a special content to many of these experiences which I have had, but the thousand yesterdays are...

K: Just a minute. Would there be a thousand yesterdays if there was no remembrance of those thousand years of sorrow, or whatever it is, can I separate - I can separate by the calendar.

PJ: Yes you can, sir. You can separate a thousand yesterdays from the burden of the thousand yesterdays.

K: Show me how. Let's be clear first what we mean. When we say a thousand yesterdays, by the encyclopaedia, or by a book, or by a calendar, I can say Egypt was four thousand...

PJ: No, but let us take one's own life.

K: Yes, one's own life, which is forty, fifty or eighty, ninety, or whatever it is, or twenty.

PJ: Now you can separate the thousand yesterdays of one's own life from the pain, sorrow, burdens, all that which is the burden of the thousand yesterdays.

K: Yes.

PJ: So you can cut away the...

K: ...what?

PJ: The pain and the sorrow and the...

K: Can you?

PJ: Why not?

K: Cut away - what do you mean 'cut away'?

PJ: Perceive. You just now said it. Perceive what is.

K: But it is not a cutting away in the sense - you see cutting away implies two parts.

PJ: You see this is where the difficulty comes in. Can I cut away the fact of my thirty years, fifty, sixty years? No, I can't do that. My body is sixty five years old.

K: Of course. I never said that. I can't commit suicide. I have lived eighty seven years - am I eighty seven, yes, or eighty eight, what am I, eighty seven - I have lived for eighty seven years, of course it exists, but I am talking about the remembrances - that. Of course I am talking about that. I am saying a thousand yesterdays exist.

PJ: They can be cut away. You can divide.

K: Ah, I can't divide. My body has not existed for a thousand yesterdays. I mean thousand yesterdays in the sense...

PJ: You are talking of the ancient mind of man.

K: I can't cut it away. This whole brain, and all the material processes of the organism is part of that.

PJ: Then what do I do with the ancient mind? With the ancient mind, not - you see, sir, one has understood what one has to do with the superficial yesterdays, with the burden of the superficial yesterdays.

K: Do you know what that means? Have I really wiped, or ended a thousand yesterdays, with all its superficialities, its pettiness, its narrowness, its brutalities, cruelty, its ambition and so on, which are all superficial - can I wipe all that away, can that all end? I can say, I can cut away - but who is the knife, which is the knife which is the entity that is cutting it? It is part of that.

PJ: No, but I am not cutting away one pain.

K: I am cutting away the whole thing.

PJ: If I were to discriminate and say, "I will cut away this, and not this".

K: No, that is too silly.

PJ: But when I say I am cutting away, I am cutting away the whole burden.

K: Now wait a minute, Pupulji, I understand. Don't say, if I may say, "I" cutting away.

PJ: I am not cutting away.

K: Let's be clear on that.

PJ: Let's cut, remove the 'I'.

K: You see I do object - if you don't mind, cutting away doesn't mean - you see when you cut something there are two parts.

PJ: Yes, what I am trying to get at is - you see this is where a lot of confusion takes place.

K: I know, verbal confusion takes place - semantic.

PJ: You cannot cut away the eighty seven years, or the sixty five years, sixty six years.

K: Of course not. You are not eighty seven!

PJ: I am sixty six. But you can cut away - cut - that word is wrong.

K: Don't use that word.

PJ: You were using the word, seeing of 'what is'.

K: The ending of 'what is', that is totally different.

PJ: Why do you want to draw a distinction between the ending of 'what is' and cutting away?

K: Ending, to me, means there is no continuation of something that has been.

PJ: What is in cutting away?

K: Cutting away implies - you know, when I cut a piece of wood there are two parts of the same thing.

PJ: Well I think it is a semantic thing.

K: Semantic. But I am asking: is it first of all possible to completely end the whole content of my consciousness, of human consciousness which has grown through millennia. And that content is all this confusion, vulgarity, coarseness, and pettiness, and triviality of a stupid life.

PJ: But it is also the goodness.

K: Oh yes, that's all included. Now wait a minute, I must be very... Goodness is something entirely different. Goodness has no opposite. Goodness is not the outcome of that which is not good. The ending of that which is not good is goodness. That's a different matter.

Now is it possible to end all this conflict? If there is no ending to conflict - conflict can be modified...

PJ: No, sir. There is an ending to conflict.

K: Why do you say that?

PJ: There is an ending to conflict.

K: Is there? Or a forgetfulness of that which has caused conflict, or really end it, so that...

PJ: Do you mean to say, sir, the very fact of ending of conflict is the birth of the new?

K: Yes. You understand the implications of conflict, the depth of it, not the superficiality that I am no longer British, or French, or I don't belong to this country, or to that country, or that religion, or that race. Those are all very superficial things. I am talking of the deep embedded...

PJ: You are talking of conflict as separation from another, the sense of separateness.

K: Separateness. That is the real thing. Isolation. Which inevitably breeds conflict. Is that possible? What does it mean? Because the brain is completely... There is no conflict. Now wait a minute. Problems may arise - you follow? - but those problems are dealt with immediately - ended. Problem means conflict.

PJ: Why should problems arise?

K: The word, the common usage according to the dictionary, a problem is something thrown at you, which is a challenge. Problem means that. Something you have to face. We resolve the problem intellectually, or physically and so on and so on, which is still creating further problems. Like the politicians, what they are doing. You conquer, and the results of that conquering is some other factors which brings you another

series of problems. You keep this problem going all the time.

I am saying there is no problem. Physically or psychologically there is no problem; if I can't live at Brockwood for a few months, all right, I won't live at Brockwood, if nobody feeds me, all right - you follow? There is no problem. If a new thing arises, either my brain is incapable of solving it and therefore it becomes a problem...

PJ: You mean to say, sir...

K: That's the whole point of it.

PJ: ...for the birth of the new...

K: That's it, you are getting it. Must be. And therefore the birth of the new is the most ancient. You follow?

PJ: Can we go into that a little? Would you say a little about it?

K: After all that is the ground beyond which there is no other ground. That is the origin beyond which there is no other origin. (Pause)

You see, Pupilji, this is really a problem - not a problem - this is really a question whether the brain can ever be free from its own bondage. After all, ending something is not total freedom. Right? I can end, say for example, my hurts - if I have hurts - I can end it very simply. But the images that I have created about myself, those images get hurt, and the maker of the images is the problem. Right? So it leads more and more to something else, which is: to live a life without a single image, and therefore there is no hurt and no fear, and if there is no fear there is no sense of safety, god, comfort and all the rest of it.

Would you say the most ancient, of which - no I won't even say that - which is the origin of all life. It must be ancient of ancient, beyond all thought of old or new. That is the origin of all life. When the mind, which includes the brain, when that mind reaches that point of that ground which is totally original, new, uncontaminated - is that possible? Meditation has been one of the means to reach it. Silencing the mind has been the way that one hopes will help, will bring about that coming to it. You see we are all making efforts to come to it. That's what I am saying. It requires no effort. The very word 'effort' means conflict. You see that which has no conflict cannot be approached through conflict. Of course not.

PJ: In this sense, does it really mean that there is no partial approach at all in your teaching?

K: Impossible. How can there be? If I approach it through various parts, which the Hindus have said - Karma Yoga and all the rest of it, it is just partial. You can't approach it.

That is the real problem.

PJ: What do you do? You are an ordinary human being.

K: No, you can't do anything. First of all, you can't do anything. You can only do physical activities. Psychologically you cannot do anything.

PJ: What do you mean physical activities?

K: Creating a garden, building houses, technological, blah blah blah.

PJ: But the physical is going on. Physical is going on.

K: It is going on.

PJ: So what does one do?

K: But if there is no psychological fears there will be no division of countries and so on, so on - there would be no division. You follow?

PJ: Yes, but the fact is that there is psychological fear.

K: That's just it. Therefore you will never get, a brain which has lived in psychological isolation, which means conflict, can never possibly come to that ground. That ground which is the origin of all life. Obviously not. How can my petty mind, worrying about my beastly little self come to it?

PJ: That is more futile, sir, then the whole of life's more futile if after doing everything you haven't taken the first step. Then where are you?

K: What is the first step? Just a minute, go into it, what is the first step?

PJ: I would say the first step is seeing whatever is.

K: Seeing 'what is'. Wait a minute. How do you see it, how do you approach it? On that depends the totality of 'what is', or only you see the partial of 'what is'. If you see the totality of 'what is' - finished.

PJ: See, it doesn't just work like that.

K: Of course not. Because our minds, our thoughts are fragmented, therefore I approach the life, or 'what is' actually with my fragmented mind, fragmented brain which has broken up...

PJ: And, again I'll say with time, the fragmented gets less. Don't jump on me. But it is so.

K: I know what you are going to say. Simple.

PJ: With time the fragmented gets less. And it is possible to listen to you, for the mind to be still, not to make any movements, not to make any effort, but that is still not the first step.

K: No. When you say, please, you used the words, the first step to observe, or to perceive 'what is'. Right? That's what you said. If I perceive it partially, then you know, that leads to further complications. Right? Partial perception creates partial problems. Right? Now is it possible to see the whole complex of 'what is'? To see the whole and not the fragment. That means - wait a minute - that means I have to see if I lead a life fragmented, a life of fragmentation. That is where I would begin. Because if I approach life, which is my consciousness, which is the way of thought, feeling, actions and all that, if I approach it fragmentarily then I am lost. That's what is happening in the world. They are totally lost. Those people who govern us, those people who tell us what is right or wrong, all the rest of it. Is it possible to look at life as a whole without fragmentation? Pupul that is the...

PJ: Why doesn't the ancient mind see this?

K: It can't, won't. How can total complete order...

PJ: But you said that ancient...

K: Just a minute, that is the ancient, the original ground is the most ancient.

PJ: No, that is there.

K: No, no.

PJ: What do you mean, no?

K: Unless - it is there as an idea, which is what all people have maintained. God is there. That is just an idea, a concept, a projection of our own desire to be comfortable, to be happy, to be - all the rest of it.

Can I live a life, can a human being live a life in which there is no fragmentary action? (Pause)

If somebody says, "Where am I to begin?" I would say begin there. Find out for yourself if you lead a fragmentary life. You know what a fragmentary life is - saying one thing and doing another, the whole fragmented way of living, which is isolation, and therefore I have no relationship with my wife, or with the rest of humanity. So begin there. You know what that means, what tremendous enquiry you have to make to find out?

PJ: What is enquiry?

K: Observation. To observe very clearly without any bias, without any direction, without any motive, how my life is fragmented. Just to observe it. Not say, I am fragmented, therefore I must be whole. The idea of becoming whole is another fragmentation. So, the implications of observing the way of fragmentation. Which means thought itself is a fragment. Right? And that is the cause of fragmentation. I am becoming something different from you.

PJ: So the birth of the new...

K: ...is not possible unless you have this. Obviously.

We had better stop.

Second Conversation with Pupul Jayakar at Brockwood Park

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

What Will Bring About Change in the Brain?

First Conversation with Pupul Jayakar at Brockwood Park

Friday, June 24, 1983

Pupul Jayakar: Krishnaji, there is a strange phenomena happening in the world today where the East reaches out to the West to find sustenance, and the West reaches out to the East for - in inverted commas - 'wisdom', to fill some vacuum which exists. Would you say there is an Indian mind which may have the same directions, or contain the same elements of sorrow, greed, anger, etc., but where the ground from which these spring are different?

Krishnamurti: Are you asking - if I may, sorry to interrupt - are you asking whether the Eastern thought, Eastern culture, Eastern way of life, is different from the West?

PJ: Well obviously the Indian way of life is different to the West.

K: It is.

PJ: Because the conditionings of the two are different. But they in a sense complement each other.

K: In what way?

PJ: In the sense that the East, or India more specifically, lacks perhaps that precision of carrying an abstraction to concrete action.

K: Are you saying they live more in abstraction?

PJ: Yes. They are not so concerned about action in the environment, action as such.

K: What would you say they are concerned with?

PJ: Today, of course, there is a great change taking place, it is very difficult to say what the Indian mind is. Because the Indian mind today is looking at one level for the same material comforts...

K: ...progress in the technological world...

PJ: Yes, progress in the technological world.

K: ...and applying it in daily life, and so on.

PJ: And consumerism.

K: Consumerism, yes.

PJ: It has percolated very deep into the Indian spirit.

K: So what ultimately is the difference between the Indian mind, Indian culture, and the Western culture?

PJ: Perhaps still, in spite of this material overtone, there is a certain edge to the delving process, if I may put it. When it goes into the field of..

K: Parapsychology?

PJ: No, not parapsychology - parapsychology is very developed in the West. But I am talking about this delving into the self, the delving into the within, the insights into things. For centuries the Indian mind has been nurtured on a ground of this feeling. Whereas, from a certain time in the West, there was a movement away. And there has always been a movement away right from the time of the Greeks towards the outer, the environment.

K: I understand. But the other day I heard on the television - a very well known Indian was being interviewed - he said the technological world now in India is humanising the Indian mind.

PJ: No - I understand that.

K: I wonder what he meant by that, humanising. Instead of living in abstractions, and theories, and complexity of ideations and so on, the technological world is bringing them to earth.

PJ: And perhaps it is necessary to some extent.

K: Obviously it is necessary.

PJ: So if these two minds have a different essence...

K: I question that very much, whether the Indian thought - I am sorry, I don't mean that - whether thought is ever East or West. There is only thought, it is not Eastern thought, or Western thought. The expression of thoughts may be different in India, and here it may be different, but it is still a process of thought.

PJ: But is it also not true that what the brain cells contain in the West and perhaps the centuries of knowledge and so-called wisdom in the East have given a content to the brain cells which make them perceive in a different way?

K: I wonder how accurate what you are saying - I would like to question what you are saying, if I may. I find when I go there, there is much more materialism now than there used to be.

PJ: Yes.

K: More concerned with money, position, power and all that. And of course there is overpopulation, and all the complexity of modern civilisation. Are you saying that the Indian mind has a tendency to an inward search, much more so than the West?

PJ: I would say so. I would say just as the Western mind has a...

K: technical...

PJ: ...not only technological but environmental...

K: Yes, environmental, economic and so on - ecological.

PJ: Movement outer. There is the inner environment and the outer environment and I think if you take it that way I would say the outer environment is the concern of the West, and the inner environment has been the concern of the East, of India.

K: Has been the concern, but it has been the concern of a very, very few people.

PJ: But it is only the few people who create the culture. How does culture come into being?

K: That is a question... we should discuss, rather. Before we go to that, is there really a distinction between the Eastern thought and Western thought? I would like to establish that. Or there is only this extraordinary phenomenon of the world being divided into the East and the West.

PJ: But what has divided it?

K: Geographically, first. Politically, economically, as a much more ancient civilisation - if I can use that word - than the West. All that is the Indian mind - if we can use that word 'mind' with regard to all that. The Western world is much more concerned, as far as I can see - I may be mistaken - is concerned with worldly affairs.

PJ: But what turned it in that direction?

K: Climate. Climate - much more, very much more, it is a colder climate, and all the inventions, and all the modern technology comes from the Northern part of the world, the northern people.

PJ: Yes, but if it was only climate then...

K: No, it is not only the climate.

PJ: ...Mexico, Africa, Equatorial Africa...

K: Of course not, of course not.

PJ: ...would have the same mind.

K: No, no...

PJ: But it is not that. That's not the answer.

K: It is not only the climate. It is climate and the whole so-called religious way of life in the West is very, very different from the East.

PJ: That's what I am saying. Somewhere along the line people of one racial stock, seemingly, divided.

K: Divided, yes, from Sumaria and so on.

PJ: Divided. And the direction in which the West turned was the discovery of their dialogue with nature, out of which arose technology, out of which arose all the great scientific finds, truths. India also had a dialogue with nature and with the self..

K: But of a different nature.

PJ: ...of a different nature. The dialogues were in themselves of a different kind.

K: So are you trying to say that the Eastern mind, Indian mind, is more concerned with religious matters than the West? Here in the West it is all rather superficial, though they think it is rather deep. And there, in India, tradition, literature and everything says the world is not so important as the understanding of the self, the understanding of the universe, the understanding of the highest principle, Brahman.

PJ: This swiftness with which the mind can start the enquiry is perhaps different to the West, where enquiry, insights, the great insights have been in different directions.

K: Of course. But here in religious matters, doubt, scepticism, questioning, is absolutely denied. Faith is all important here. In Indian religion, in Buddhism and so on, doubt, questioning, enquiry becomes all important. So...

PJ: Out of this today somehow both the cultures are in crisis.

K: Yes, of course. Would you say not only cultures, but the whole human consciousness is in a crisis.

PJ: Would you distinguish human consciousness from culture?

K: No.

PJ: In a sense they are the same.

K: No, basically not.

PJ: So the crisis at the very root is making them search somewhere away from themselves. They feel an inadequacy and so they turn to the other culture. It is happening in both countries.

K: Yes, but you see, Pupulji, I am questioning whether in their search from their materialistic outlook - if I may use that word - they are being caught by all kinds of superstitious, romantic, occult ideas, and these gurus that come over here, and all the rest of it. What I want to find out is whether human consciousness, if it is in a crisis, as it is, whether it is possible not only to resolve that crisis, without war destroying humanity, whether human beings can ever go beyond their own limitation. I don't know if I am making myself clear.

PJ: Sir, may I just...

K: Of course, this is a discussion.

PJ: The outer and inner is like the material and the search within. It's two mirror images of these two directions in which man has moved. The problem really is that if man has to survive the two have to be...

K: They must live together.

PJ: Not live together, but a human culture come into being which would contain both.

K: Now what do you mean by the word 'culture'? What do you mean by culture?

PJ: Isn't culture everything that the brain possesses?

K: That is, would you say the training of the brain and refining the brain?

PJ: The training of the brain and the refinement of the brain.

K: And the expression of that refinement in action, in behaviour, in relationship, and also a process of enquiry that leads to something totally untouched by thought? I would say this is culture.

PJ: Would you include enquiry in the field of culture?

K: Of course.

PJ: Isn't culture a closed circuit?

K: You can make of it that way, or you can break it and go beyond.

PJ: But to take culture as a closed circuit, today culture as it exists...

K: That's why I want to understand what you mean by the word 'culture'.

PJ: As we understand it today, Krishnaji, it is our perceptions, the way we look at things, our thoughts, our feelings, our attitudes, the operation of our senses - you could keep on adding to this.

K: That is, the religion, faith, belief, superstition.

PJ: The outer and the inner, which keeps on growing. It may be growing but it is all growing within that contour. It remains a contour. And when you talk of a search which is no way connected with this, would you include it in...

K: Search.

PJ: Well, enquiry, search, observance...

K: I understand.

PJ: ...you can use any word.

K: Of course, of course.

PJ: But would you put it into the field of culture? You would.

K: Of course. Would you say - I am just trying to clarify the matter - would you say the whole movement of culture is like a tide going out and coming in, like the sea, going out and coming in. And the human endeavour is this process of going out and coming in, and never enquiring whether that process can ever stop. You understand? What I mean is we act and react. That's the human nature. Act and react, like the ebb and flow. I react, and out of the reaction act, and from that action react - it's back and forth. Right? Now I am asking whether this reaction of reward and punishment can stop and take a totally different turn? We function, we live, and our reactions are based on reward and punishment. Right?

PJ: Yes.

K: Both physically, psychologically and every way. And that's all we know, deeply. Now I am asking whether there is this reaction of reward and the avoidance of punishment, and so on, like the tide - is there another sense of action which is not based on this action/reaction? You understand what I am talking about?

PJ: As this action/reaction is an impulse of the brain cells, it can never be...

K: It is our conditioning.

PJ: And it is an impulse of the brain cells.

K: Yes, of course.

PJ: It is the way the brain cells respond, and the way they receive through the senses and the way they...

Now the question you ask...

K: Our question is really, we are enquiring into what is culture.

PJ: What is culture, and we went into that.

K: A little bit.

PJ: Little bit. It can be expanded much further, but still it remains within the same field.

K: The same field but you can enlarge the field.

PJ: Would you say then that culture is that which is contained in the brain cells?

K: Of course.

PJ: Anything else?

K: All our past memories.

PJ: Yes, so if you take all that is there anything else?

K: I understand. Now this is a difficult question because one must be careful, very careful. If there is

something else - if - then that something else can operate on the brain cells which are conditioned. Right? If there is something in the brain, then the activity of that something else can bring about freedom from this narrow, limited culture. But is there something else? Within the brain.

PJ: But even physiologically they are saying, Krishnaji, that the operation of the brain cells today is a very, very, very minute portion of its capacity.

K: I know that. Of its capacity - why?

PJ: Because conditioning limits it, and it has never been free of those processes which...

K: ...limit it. Which means thought is limited.

PJ: Yes. It has put all its eggs in one basket.

K: Thought is limited. And we are all functioning within that limitation, because thought, experience is limited, knowledge is limited for ever, and memory, and thought. So thought is limited.

PJ: What place have the senses and the perceptive processes in this?

K: No, that brings another question which is: can the senses operate without the interference of thought? You understand my question?

PJ: As they operate today, Krishnaji, they seem to have one root. The movement of the senses as they operate is the movement of thought.

K: That's all - therefore it is limited.

PJ: So when you ask a query, is it possible for them, what does one do with a question of that type?

K: I am enquiring. I am enquiring with a lot of hesitation and a certain amount of scepticism, whether the brain - which has evolved through thousands of years, experience, untold sorrow, loneliness, despair, and all the rest of it, and its search to escape from its own fears through every form of religious endeavour - whether those brain cells in themselves can ever change, bring about a mutation in themselves. Otherwise a totally different new culture...

PJ: But if they don't bring about a mutation in themselves and there is nothing else...

K: Yes, I understand your question.

PJ: You see this is a paradox.

K: This is also an everlasting question. I mean, the Hindus raised it long ago, many, many centuries ago - you probably know much more about it than I do - but they raised this question, which is: is there an outside agency, god, the highest principle and so on and so on, the higher self - that's a wrong way of - 'higher self' - we'll use it for the moment.

PJ: The highest principle, may be.

K: Whether that can operate on the conditioned brain.

PJ: Or is it, sir, that can it awaken within the brain? There are two things. One is an outside...

K: ...agency operating.

PJ: ...agency, or energy operating. Or from within the brain cells, the untapped portion of the brain cells, an awakening which transforms.

K: I understand. I understand this question. Let's enquire into it, let's discuss it. Is there an outside agency, outside energy let's call it for the moment, that will bring about a mutation in the brain cells, which are conditioned? Right?

PJ: May I say something?

K: Please.

PJ: The problem is that energy really never touches the brain cells. There are so many obstacles one has built that the flow of energy from nature, from...

K: Energy.

PJ: Energy never seems to touch and create.

K: What are we two discussing, Pupulji?

PJ: We are discussing the possibility of a human culture.

K: A culture which is not...

PJ: ...either of India or of the West, which contains all mankind, if I may say so.

K: All humanity which is not Western, or Eastern or...

PJ: And the division between the outer and the inner end. And insight is insight, not insight into the outer or insight into the inner.

K: So what is the question?

PJ: So for that the instrument is the brain cell, the tool which operates is the brain cell.

K: Is the brain.

PJ: The brain. Now something has to happen in the brain.

K: Yes. I say it can happen. Without the idea that there is outside agency that will somehow cleanse the brain which has been conditioned, or invent an outside agency, as most religions have done. Right? Or can the conditioned brain awaken to its own conditioning and so perceive its own limitation, and stay there for a moment? I don't know if I am making my point clear. You see, we are all the time, are we not, trying to do something, which is, the doer is different from that which is being done. Right? I realise, for example, suppose I realise that my brain is conditioned and so all my activity, my feelings, and my relationship with others, is limited. I realise that. And then I say that limitation must be broken down. So I am operating on the limitation. But the 'I' is also limited, the 'I' is not separate from the other. If we can bridge that, that the 'I' is not separate from the limitation which he is trying to break down. Right? Both the limitation of the self and the limitation of the conditioning are similar, they are not separate. The 'I' is not separate from its own qualities.

PJ: And from what it observes.

K: And one part observes the other part.

PJ: When you say that we all the time trying to do something...

K: Operate on the other.

PJ: ...operate on the other...

K: After all, our whole life is that, apart from the technological world and so on. I am this and I must change that. So the brain is now conditioned in this division. The actor is different from the action.

PJ: That of course, yes.

K: And so that condition goes on. But when one realises the actor is the action, then the whole outlook changes altogether.

Let's come back for the moment. We are asking, Pupulji, are we not, what brings about a change in the human brain?

PJ: That is really the crucial point. What is it that makes it end?

K: Yes. Let's go into it a little bit more. Man has lived on this earth for a million years, more or less. And we are as primitive as we were before, psychologically. And we have not basically changed very much. We are killing each other, we are seeking power, position, we are corrupt - everything that human beings are doing in the world today, psychologically. And what will make human beings, humanity, change all that?

PJ: Great insight.

K: Wait. Insight. Now is so-called culture preventing all this? You understand my question? The Indian culture, take Indian culture, few people, like great thinkers in India have gone into this question. And the majority of the people just repeat, repeat, repeat, repeat - just tradition, a dead thing, and they are living with a dead thing. Right? Now, and here too tradition plays a tremendous part...

PJ: Yes, because it is the other way - a few have great insights into science, and then the rest is...

K: So looking at all this, what would make human beings radically bring about a mutation in themselves? Culture has tried to bring about certain changes in human behaviour. Right? I mean religions have said behave this way, don't do this, don't kill, but they go on killing. Be brotherly, and they are not brotherly. Love one another, and they don't - you follow? There are the edicts, the sanctions, and we are doing everything quite the opposite.

PJ: But cultures have collapsed really.

K: That's what I want to find out. Whether it has collapsed and it has no value at all any more, and so man is now at a loss. If you go to America, for example, they have no tradition. Right? Each one is doing what he likes, he is doing his thing. And they are doing the same thing here in a different way. So what will bring about a mutation in the brain cells, which then...

PJ: What you are saying really is that it doesn't matter whether the Indian matrix is different, or the Western matrix is different, the problem is identical - the mutation in the human brain.

K: Yes, let's stick to that. I mean after all Indians, even the poor Indians suffer as they suffer here - lonely, despair, misery, all that is just the same as here. So let's forget the East and West and see what prevents this mutation taking place.

PJ: Sir, is there any other way but perceiving the actual?

K: The actual. That is what we have been maintaining for sixty years, that the 'what is', the actual, is more important than the idea of the actual. The ideal, the various concepts and conclusions have no value at all because you are away from the facts, from what is going on. Apparently that is tremendously difficult because we are caught up with ideas.

PJ: But in perceiving the actual there is no movement of the brain.

K: That's all I am saying. Facts, if one observes very carefully, in themselves bring about a change. I don't know if I am making...

Human sorrow is not Western sorrow or Eastern sorrow. Right? It is human sorrow. And we are always trying to move away from sorrow. Now, could we understand the depth and the meaning of sorrow - not understand intellectually but actually delve into the nature of sorrow - and sorrow is not yours or mine. So what is impeding or blocking the human brain from enquiring deeply within itself?

PJ: Sir, I want to ask one thing: you used the word 'delving', you used the word 'enquiring' into oneself - both are words connected with movement. Yet you say the ending of movement...

K: Of course, of course. Movement is time, movement is thought, the ending of movement - can that really end, or do we think it can end? You understand my question? After all, the people who have somewhat gone into this kind of thing, both in the past and the present, have always divided the entity that enquires and that which is to be enquired into. That's my objection. I think that is the major block.

PJ: So when you use the word 'enquiry', you use it as perception.

K: Perception, observing, watching. Now we will go into that in a minute, if we have time. But I want to come back to this, if I may: what will make human beings alter - very simply put - the way they behave? Very simply put. This appalling brutality, what will change all this? Who will change it? Not the politicians, not the priests, not the people who are talking about the environment, and the ecologists and so on, so on, so on. They are not changing the human being. Who will change it, if man himself will not change, who will change it? The church has tried to change man - right? - and it hasn't succeeded. Religions have tried throughout the world, to humanise or make man more intelligent, more considerate, affectionate and so on - they have not succeeded. Culture has not succeeded.

PJ: But you say all this, Krishnaji, but that in itself does not bring man to that perception of fact.

K: So what will make him? You perhaps, say for instance, you and another have this perception, I may not have it, so what affect has your perception on me? Again if you have perception and power, position, I worship you or kill you. Right? So I am asking a much deeper question: I want really to find out why human beings, after so many millennia, are like this. One group against another group, one tribe against another tribe, one nation against another nation. The horror that is going on. A new culture, will that bring about a change? Does man want to change, or he says, 'Things are all right, let's go on. We will evolve to a certain stage eventually.'

PJ: Most people feel that.

K: Yes. That's what is so appalling about it. Eventually, give me another thousand years, we will all be marvellous human beings. Which is so absurd. In the meantime we are destroying each other.

PJ: Sir, may I ask you something? What is the actual moment of facing the fact? What is it actually, the actuality of it?

K: What is a fact, Pupul? We were discussing the other day with a group of people here. Fact is that which has been done, remembered, and that which is being done now.

PJ: Being done now.

K: Being done now, acting now, and that which has happened yesterday, and remembered that fact - remembrance.

PJ: Or even arising of a wave of fear, horror, anything.

K: Yes, yes.

PJ: Now how does one actually...

K: I am saying - no, wait a minute. So let us be clear when you say 'what is', the fact. The fact of yesterday, or last week's incident is gone, but I'll remember it. Right? There is remembrance of something - pleasant or unpleasant - happened, which was a fact, is stored in the brain. And what is being done now is also a fact coloured by the past, controlled by the past, shaped by the past. So can I see this whole movement as a fact?

PJ: The seeing it as a fact...

K: The whole movement - the future, the present, the past.

PJ: The seeing it as a fact is seeing it without a cliché.

K: Without a cliché, without prejudice, without bias.

PJ: Or without anything surrounding it.

K: That's right. Which means what?

PJ: Negating, first of all, negating all the responses which arise, surround.

K: Negating the remembrances. Just keep to that for the moment.

PJ: The remembrances which arise out of it.

K: Out of the fact of last week's pleasure or pain, reward or punishment. Now is that possible?

PJ: Yes, that is possible.

K: Possible - why?

PJ: Because the very attention itself...

K: ...dissipates remembrance. Now that means, can the brain be so attentive that the incident which happened last week, the fact it happened, and end the fact - end it, not carry on in memory. My son is dead. And I have suffered. But the memory of that son is so strongly... has such strong strength in my brain that I constantly remember it.

PJ: Rises.

K: Rises and disappears. So can the brain say 'Yes, my son is dead' - that is the end of it.

PJ: Does one say that? Or when there is a rising...

K: And then ending? Which means an endless arising and ending.

PJ: No but, there is an arising.

K: Which is a remembrance. Let's keep to the word currently.

PJ: Which is a remembrance. Out of that there is a movement of pain.

K: Pain.

PJ: The negation of that pain ends not only the pain but the arising.

K: Which means what? Go into it a little bit more - what does that mean? My son is dead. I remember all the

things that he - etc., etc. There is a photograph of him on the piano or on the mantelpiece, and there is this constant remembrance. Right? Flowing in and flowing out. That's a fact.

PJ: But the negating of that pain and the dissolving of this, doesn't it have a direct action on the brain?

K: That's what I am coming to. Which means what? My son is dead, that's a fact - right? - I can't change a fact. He is gone. It sounds cruel to say it, but he is gone. But I am carrying him all the time. Right? The brain is carrying him as memory, and the reminder is always there. I am carrying on. I never say he has gone, that's a fact. But I live on memories, which is a dead thing. Memories are not actual. And I am asking - the ending of the fact. My son is gone. It doesn't mean I have lost love, or anything. My son is gone, that is a fact.

PJ: What remains when a fact is perceived?

K: May I say something without being shocking? Nothing. My son is gone, or my brother, my wife, whatever it is - gone. Which is not an assertion of cruelty or denying my affection, my love. Not the love of my son, but the identification of love with my son. I don't know if I'm...

PJ: You are drawing a distinction between love of my son...

K: ...and love.

PJ: And love.

K: If I love my son in the deepest sense of the word, I love man, humanity. It's not only I love my son, I love the whole human world, the earth, the trees, the whole universe. But that is a different matter. So you are asking a really good question, which is: what takes place when there is the perception, pure perception of fact, without any bias, without any kind of escape and so on, to see the fact completely, is that possible? When I am in sorrow of my son's death, I mean I am lost. It is a great shock. It is something terrible that has taken place. And at that moment you can't say anything to the person. Right? As he comes out of this confusion and loneliness and despair and sorrow, then perhaps he will be sensitive enough to perceive this fact.

PJ: I come back always to this one thing: this perception of the fact, doesn't it need a...

K: ...a tremendous attention.

PJ: ...a great deal of watching?

K: Watching, of course. Of course.

PJ: You can't tell a person who has just lost...

K: No, that would be cruel. But a man who says, my son is dead, what is it all about, death is common to all humanity, why do we... A man who is sensitive, asking, enquiring, he is awake, he wants to find an answer to all this.

PJ: Sir, at one level it seems so simple.

K: I know. And I think we must keep it simple, not bring about a lot of intellectual theories and ideas into it.

PJ: Then why is it - is the mind afraid of the simple?

K: No, I think we are so highly intellectual, it has been part of our education, part of our culture. Ideas are tremendously important, concepts are essential. It is part of our culture. The man who says, please ideas are not very important, facts are, he must be extraordinarily simple.

PJ: You see sir, what you are saying, in the whole field of Indian culture the highest is the dissolution of the self. And you say, you talk of the dissolution of the fact, which is essentially the dissolution of the self.

K: Yes. But the dissolution of the self has become a concept. And we are worshipping a concept - as they are all doing, all over the world. Concepts are invented by thought, or through analysis and so on, come to a concept, and hold that concept as a most extraordinarily important thing.

So come back to the point: what will make human beings, throughout the world behave? Not behave my way or your way - behave - don't kill, don't be afraid, don't - you know, have great affection and so on, what will bring it about? Nothing has succeeded. Knowledge hasn't helped him. Right?

PJ: Isn't it because fear is his shadow?

K: Fear, and also we want to know what the future is.

PJ: Which is part of fear.

K: Yes. We want to know because we have - it is simple - we have sought security in so many things and they have all failed. And now we say there must be security somewhere. And I question if there is any security somewhere at all, even in god. That is a projection of one's own fears.

PJ: What is the action of this dissolution on the brain cell, on the brain itself?

K: I would use the word 'insight'. Insight is not a matter of memory, not a matter of knowledge and time - which are all thought. So I would say insight is the absence, total absence of the whole movement of thought, as time and remembrance and thought. So there is direct perception. It is like I have been going north for the last ten thousand years - my brain is accustomed to enter the north. And somebody comes along and says, that will lead you nowhere. Go east. When I turn round and go east the brain cells have changed. Because I have an insight that the north leads nowhere. Wait, I will put it differently.

The whole movement of thought, which is limited, and which is acting throughout the world now, it is the most important action, driven by thought, thought will not solve any of our problems, except technological. Right? If I see that, I have stopped going north. And I think the ending of a certain direction, ending of a movement that has been going on for thousands of years, at that moment there is an insight, which brings about a change, a mutation in the brain cells. One sees this very clearly. But one asks what will make humanity change. What will make my son, my daughter change? They hear all this, they read something about all this, from biologists and so on, psychologists, and they continue their old way. Is the past tradition so strong? I have thought about myself for the last thousand years and I still am thinking about myself - I must fulfil myself, I must be great, I must become something. This is my condition, this is my tradition. Is the past so tremendously strong? And the past is incarnating all the time. Right? Is that part of our culture, to continue in our condition?

PJ: I would say that is part of our culture.

K: Look at it, I mean, I have been watching this very seriously, how tradition has a tremendous stronghold - not tradition of superstition, I am not talking of that - but a continuity of something of the past moving, moving - you follow? - the past carrying on in its own momentum. And we are that. Culture may be part of our hindrance, religious concepts may be our hindrance. So what is the brain to do? They are saying one part of the brain is the old, and another part of the brain is something totally new, and that if we can open the door to the new there might be change. Because according to this specialist we are using very, very small part of our brain.

PJ: Obviously when there is attention the fragment has ended.

K: Yes, that's it. We can talk about it like this - what is attention, we can describe, go into it - at the end of it a listener says, 'All right, I understand all this, but I am what I am. I understand this intellectually, verbally but it hasn't touched the depth of my being.'

PJ: But isn't it a question of that first contact with thought in the mind.

K: I don't quite follow that.

PJ: I have a feeling, sir, that we talk about observing thought. It is an entirely different thing to the actual state of attention.

K: That is, thought being aware of itself.

PJ: Yes. That one instant.

K: I understand that. We are going away from... I am afraid we going away from a central issue. The world is becoming more and more superficial, more and more money-minded, if I may use - money, power, position, fulfilment, identification, me, me, me, me. All this is being encouraged by everything around you. Right? Now you, who have travelled, who have seen all this too, what do you make of all this business? There are these extraordinary intelligent people, clever people, and the most stupid people, the neurotic, the people who have come to a conclusion and never move from that conclusion, like the Communists - the totalitarian world is that - they have come to a certain conclusion and that is final.

PJ: But those are all commitments which you can't touch. You can only touch the people who are not committed.

K: And who are the people who are not committed?

PJ: I would said today that is the one sign of health.

K: Are they young people?

PJ: Today, as never before in the last twenty or thirty years, there are people who are not committed to anything.

K: I question - I really would like to...

PJ: Really, sir, I would say so. On the one hand you see this tremendous deterioration of everything, on the other somewhere this movement away from a commitment. They may not know where to turn, they may not have a direction, they may...

K: But don't belong to anything.

PJ: They don't belong to anything.

K: There are people like that, I know.

PJ: I mean they may...

K: You see, they become rather vague, they become rather confused.

PJ: Yes, because they turn these into concepts. It is so easy to turn what you say into a concept.

K: Of course, of course.

PJ: And to have axioms which contain what you say. But a culture which is so living because it is only living on insight...

K: I wouldn't use the word 'culture'.

PJ: Well, because you started with the word 'culture' as something which contains more than just the... therefore I used it. But it is a human culture which perhaps will be the culture of the mind that dwells in insight.

K: Culture being - yes.

PJ: In such a state, if I may ask, what happens to all the civilisations which the world has seen and known and contains?

K: Gone. The Egyptian civilisation...

PJ: No, they may have gone but they are still contained in the human race.

K: Of course, of course, it is the same...

PJ: But when you wipe out...

K: Which means, Pupulji, actually, what is freedom? Are we aware that we are prisoners of our own fantasies, imaginations and conclusions, ideas - we are prisoners to all that. Are we aware of all that?

PJ: I think we are.

K: Pupul, if we are aware, if you are attentive to all that, the thing is burnt out.

PJ: This is, of course, at some point where we can't... because - you don't admit an in-between state.

K: That is impossible.

PJ: This is the whole problem.

K: It is like a man who is violent and trying to be non-violent, in-between state he is violent.

PJ: No, not necessarily. Isn't that also a question of this whole movement of time?

K: Time and thought and so on, which is what? Limiting. If we first acknowledge, or see the fact that thought in any direction is limited, in any field - surgery, technology, computers and so on, and also thought enquiring into itself, thought being limited, your enquiry will be very, very, very limited.

PJ: The difference is, sir, I might see that, but the attention necessary for it to remain alive in my waking day is not there.

K: No. I know.

PJ: It is the quantum, the capacity, the strength of that attention which...

K: You see how do you have that passion? How do you have sustained movement of energy that is not dissipated by thought, by any kind of activity? And I think that only comes when you understand sorrow and the ending of sorrow, then compassion and love and all that. That intelligence is that energy which has no depression, none of the human qualities.

PJ: You mean it neither rises nor falls?

K: No. How can it? To rise and fall you must be aware that it is arising and falling, and who is it aware, and so on.

PJ: No, not even that way. But is it possible throughout the day to hold that...

K: It is there. You don't hold it. It is like a perfume that is there. That's why I think one has to understand the whole conditioning of our consciousness. You know what I mean? I think that is the real study, real enquiry, real exploration into this consciousness, which is the common ground of all humanity. And we never enquire into it. Not we enquire as a professor or a psychologist enquires, and we study it, but we never say look, I am going to study this consciousness which is me, I am going to look into it.

PJ: No, one says that. I can't say that one doesn't. One says that.

K: But one doesn't.

PJ: One does it.

K: Partially.

PJ: I won't accept that sir. One does it, one attends, one enquires.

K: And then what? Have you come to the end of it?

PJ: No, suddenly one finds that one has been inattentive.

K: No, I don't think inattention matters. You may be tired, your brain has enquired enough, it is enough for today. There's nothing wrong with it. But you see, again I object to this question of attention and inattention.

PJ: But that is the basic question in most of our minds. Basically if you ask...

K: I would not put it that way. I would say that where there is this ending of something totally there is a new beginning which has its own momentum. It is nothing to do with me. That means one must be so completely free of the self. And to be free of the self is one of the most difficult things because it hides under different rocks, different trees, different activities.

I think that's enough.

First Conversation with Pupul Jayakar at Brockwood Park

Friday, June 24, 1983

Why Are We Frightened To Be Nothing?

Second Conversation with Pupul Jayakar at Brockwood Park

Saturday, June 25, 1983

Pupul Jayakar: I saw a short report in one of the newspapers that a spaceship had been released which would travel to the outer spaces of the universe, and that it would be part of the universe - there will be no ending to it because there was no friction, no time, that there would be no ending. Is the within of the self, of the human brain, the human mind - call it what you will - is there a within of things, whether of man, of the tree, of nature, which is a space without ending? Is it a mirror image of that vastness which exists?

Krishnamurti: Are you asking, if I may repeat what you have understood, what you have said, that within the human brain - I'd like to distinguish between the brain and the mind, which we will discuss a little later - whether in the human brain there is, or there can be, a space without end, an eternity out of time? We can speculate about it a great deal, as philosophers have done, but that speculation is not actuality.

PJ: No. But it was an insight into outer space.

K: The human brain has set a machine that has entered into the whole...

PJ: No, but it was an insight first into the possibility of that, which now made it possible for them to experiment and prove it.

K: To produce a machine that will go beyond the - it will enter into the universe.

PJ: If you do not posit a thing then you cannot even...

K: No, I question whether - I want to be clear on this point - whether we are now in our conversation we are speculating, or theorising, or we are really trying to find out in ourselves whether there is such immensity, whether there is actually a movement which is not of time, which is eternal. Right?

PJ: How do you start an enquiry like this? By examination, or posing the question. If you don't pose the question...

K: We have posed the question.

PJ: We have to pose a question.

K: We have put the question.

PJ: Now whether what comes out of it is speculation or examination depends on how you approach it. But the question has to be put.

K: We have put the question. We have put the question whether the brain can understand - not understand - realise the truth that there is either eternity, or not eternity. That is a question, we have asked that question. Right? Now you ask, how do we begin to enquire into it. How do you begin to feel gently, hesitantly your way into this really fundamental question, a question that has been asked for thousands of years, whether man is bound to time forever, or there is, or there can be, not imaginatively, not romantically, but actually can there be within the brain - or the brain realises itself in a state of eternity. That's the question we are asking.

PJ: Even to proceed into this you started by drawing a distinction between the brain and the mind.

K: Yes.

PJ: Would you elaborate.

K: We are saying, that the brain is conditioned, at least some of it. That conditioning is brought about through experience. That conditioning is knowledge. And that conditioning is memory and experience, knowledge, memory are limited, and so thought is limited. Now, we have been functioning within the area of thought. And to discover something new there has to be, at least temporarily, or a period, when thought is not in movement, when thought is in abeyance.

PJ: The brain is a material thing.

K: Yes.

PJ: It has its own activity.

K: Yes. It has its own activity not imposed by thought.

PJ: But for centuries the operation of the brain has been the operation of thought.

K: That's all. That's all we are saying. That's all we are saying, that the whole movement of the brain, at least that part of the brain which has not been used, is conditioned by thought. And thought is always limited, and therefore it is conditioned to conflict. That which is limited must create division.

PJ: What is mind then?

K: Mind is a wholly different dimension which has no contact with thought. Let me explain. The brain, that part of the brain which has been functioning as an instrument of thought, that brain has been conditioned, that part of the brain. And as long as that part of the brain remains in that state there is no communication, entire communication, with the mind. So when that conditioning is not then there is communication between that mind, which is totally on a different dimension, that can communicate with the brain and act, using thought.

PJ: But you have already posited...

K: Oh definitely.

PJ: ...a state which is outside the realm of thought.

K: That's right. Therefore outside the realm of time.

PJ: But as time seems to be the essential core of this problem...

K: Time and thought.

PJ: Thought is the product of time. I mean, thought is time.

K: That's the real point. Where do you start, you mean?

PJ: No. Perhaps if we could go into this whole business of the flow of time, and at what instant is interception possible?

K: What do you mean, interception, because I don't quite understand the usage of that word. Nobody can...

PJ: I am not talking of an interceptor...

K: That's it.

PJ: ...but the...

K: ...ending of it.

PJ: I was going to use another word, but you can use the word 'ending'.

K: Let's use simpler words.

PJ: Time is from a past immemorial.

K: Yes, which is thought.

PJ: Thought is also from a past immemorial, projecting into a future which is also eternal.

K: The movement of thought.

PJ: Eternal.

K: No. The future is conditioned by the past, as a human psyche.

PJ: So unless the human being ends, unless he ceases to be...

K: Ceases to be conditioned.

PJ: No, but you will still use thought.

K: No.

PJ: The content will undergo a change, but the mechanism of thought will continue.

K: The mechanism of thought will continue - let's put it round - now, thought is the chief instrument we have. Right?

PJ: Yes.

K: And that instrument after thousands of years of various efforts, actions, has not only made that instrument dull, it has reached the end of its tether because thought is limited, and time is limited. Right? Therefore it is conditioned, divided and in perpetual state of turmoil. Now can that end? That's the question.

PJ: Now I used the word interception. This movement of the past as thought, as the yesterday...

K: ...as today.

PJ: But what is the today?

K: Today is the movement of the past modified - memory. We are a bundle of memories.

PJ: That is true. But the contact with time...

K: Now wait a minute, what do you mean contact with time? Time is thought.

PJ: Time as a psychological process - I am not talking of contact...

K: Of course - leave all that.

PJ: But contact with time as a psychological process is in the present, isn't it? There can only be aware...

K: Pupulji, let's be very clear. Time is thought. Right? Don't separate time as though something different

from thought.

PJ: No, time is thought.

K: So it is time-thought.

PJ: Yes. As the past, present and the future.

K: Are you asking, what is the now?

PJ: Yes, because this interception I am talking about - let me use my word till you...

K: All right. Interception, I don't quite understand.

PJ: Interception is contact with, contact with the fact.

K: Contact with the fact that the whole movement of thought...

PJ: Not even all that, just contact with 'what is'

K: Which is what?

PJ: Whatever is, is your statement now. Whatever you are saying now and my listening to you is the contact with 'what is'.

K: Ah, I understand. That is - may I put it the way I understand it? The past, the present and the future is a movement of time-thought. How do you realise it?

PJ: How do you realise it.

K: How do you come to see the truth of it, the fact of it?

PJ: You know sir, there is such a thing as tactile touch.

K: I can touch, yes, textile touch.

PJ: Now...

K: Not textile, tactile. How do you touch this thing?

PJ: How do you touch this thing.

K: How do you - to use your word - come into contact with it, with the fact? With the fact that I am a whole series of memories, which is time-thought.

PJ: Let us be more concrete. The thought that I am going away this afternoon, and that I will be leaving you. It is a thought.

K: It is a thought. It is an actuality.

PJ: An actuality. But out of that there is a certain pain of leaving you, which is the emotional, psychological element which come to cover up the fact.

K: Yes, which is what? You know, in the French, 'partir'.

PJ: So how does one... What is to be contacted? Not the fact that I am going away.

K: But, what?

PJ: But this pain.

K: The pain. I understand. Are you asking, the pain of going, the pain of a thousand aches of years and centuries of pain of loneliness and sorrow and all that, grief, the agony, the anxiety and all that, is that separate from me who is to feel it?

PJ: It may not be separate.

K: It is me.

PJ: At what point, how do I touch it?

K: I don't quite understand your usage of 'how do I touch it'.

PJ: It is only in the present...

K: I see what you mean.

PJ: The whole of this edifice rests on that.

K: Yes, that's what I said. That's what I said. The now contains the past, the future and the present. Right?

PJ: Yes.

K: Let's understand this. The present is the whole past and the future. This is the present. The present is me, with all the memories of a thousand years, and that thousand years being modified all the time, and the future - all that is now, the present. Right?

PJ: But the present also is not a static thing. It's over...

K: Of course, of course, of course. The moment you have said, it's gone.

PJ: It's gone. So what is it that you actually see? What is it you actually observe?

K: Actually observe the fact...

PJ: What fact?

K: The fact - just a minute - the fact that the present is the whole movement of time and thought. To see the truth of that - let's not use the word 'see' - have an insight, perception into that, that the now is all time and thought.

PJ: Does that perception emanate from the brain?

K: Either it emanates, comes from perceiving with the eyes, nerves and so on, or that perception is an insight which has nothing to do with time and thought.

PJ: But it arises within the brain?

K: Yes, or outside the brain, you are asking.

PJ: It's very important.

K: I know, that's why I want to be clear. Is it within the sphere of the brain; or it is that insight which comes when there is the freedom from its conditioning, which is the operation of the mind, which is supreme intelligence. Do you follow?

PJ: I don't follow.

K: Aha. Let's be clear. The brain, whatever part it is, is conditioned by time and thought, time-thought. As long as that conditioning remains, insight is not possible. You may have occasional insight into something,

but pure insight, which means comprehension of the totality of things - yes, I'll use the word 'totality', not wholeness because that word is now being used so much - it is the perception of completeness. Right? That insight is not of time-thought. Therefore that insight is part of that brain which is in a different dimension.

PJ: Without sight there cannot be insight.

K: That's all I am saying.

PJ: So seeing - perceiving...

K: Yes perceiving.

PJ: Perceiving - listening is contained in perceiving - seems to be the essential essence of insight.

K: Would you repeat that again slowly?

PJ: Let us take the word 'insight' - it is seeing into.

K: Into, seeing into.

PJ: Seeing into. Seeing into seeing?

K: No. Seeing into - just a minute, let's look at that word. Seeing, comprehending the totality of something, the vastness of something. Right? Insight is possible only when there is cessation of thought and time. Thought and time are limited, therefore such limitation cannot have insight.

PJ: To understand what you are saying I have to have an open ear and eyes that see. Out of that sound, out of that form, out of that whole...

K: The meaning of the words and so on and so on, yes.

PJ: ...arises a seeing which goes beyond. I am trying to get at something.

K: What are you trying to get at? I don't...

PJ: I am trying to get at - you talk of insight. Now insight cannot arise without attention.

K: No. Don't introduce the word 'attention'.

PJ: Or sight, seeing.

K: If we can stick to the same thing, that is, insight cannot exist as long as time-thought play a part.

PJ: You see it's like which comes first. Which comes first.

K: What do you mean?

PJ: In consciousness, in my approach to this, I can't start with insight. I can only start with observation.

K: You can only start by realising the truth that time, psychological time and thought are always limited. That's a fact.

PJ: Krishnaji, that is a fact.

K: Wait, start from that, and therefore whatever it does will always be limited and therefore contradictory, therefore divisive and endless conflict. That's all I am saying. You can see the fact of that.

PJ: You can see the fact of that outside of yourself.

K: Wait, wait. You can see it politically...

PJ: You can see it outside of yourself.

K: No, wait. You can see it politically, religiously, all throughout the world, this is a fact, that time and thought in their activity have brought about havoc in the world. That's a fact.

PJ: Yes, yes.

K: Now. So the question is: can that limitation ever end? Or is man conditioned for ever to live within the time-thought area?

PJ: You see the difficulty of understanding this is, what is the relationship of the brain cells and the action of the senses - I am not using the word 'thought' at the moment - on a statement like this: that do you see the fact that time, thought...

K: ...are limited.

PJ: ...are limited? What does it exactly mean, how does one see that? It is like telling me that you are an illusion.

K: What?

PJ: It is exactly like telling me that Pupul is an illusion.

K: No, I didn't say that.

PJ: But I am saying it.

K: No, you are not an illusion.

PJ: No, sir, it is exactly that.

K: No.

PJ: Because the moment you say, after all Pupul is a psychological bundle of the past...

K: Psychological movement of time and thought, which is the psyche.

PJ: Which is the psyche.

K: That psyche...

PJ: ...is limited.

K: ...is limited. Whatever it does is limited.

PJ: Then I would ask, what is wrong with it being limited?

K: Nothing is wrong. If you want to live in perpetual conflict there's nothing wrong.

PJ: All right, move further. To end it, is not only to say, to feel that it is limited, but there must be an ending to it.

K: I said there is.

PJ: What is the nature of this ending?

K: What do you mean ending?

PJ: Just seeing...

K: Let's take the word 'ending' - I must be clear what you and I, we are both saying, understanding the meaning of the same word, to end something - to end attachment, to end, not to smoke, not to do this or that, to put an end to it - the ending.

PJ: The flow ceases to flow.

K: Yes, if you like to... The movement of thought and time ceases, psychologically. What is your difficulty? You are making it terribly complex, a simple thing.

PJ: No, sir. There is a point of perception, which is a point of insight, what is that point of insight?

K: What do you mean, point of insight?

PJ: Where I see... In what time space do I see it?

K: Look, Pupul, just let's be simple. Time and thought has divided the world - politically, geographically, religious - that's a fact. Right? Right? Can't you see the fact?

PJ: No, sir. I look outside...

K: Wait, wait. Don't look outside.

PJ: No. I don't see the fact.

K: What do you mean you don't see the fact?

PJ: Because if I saw the fact, really saw the fact...

K: You would stop that kind of thing.

PJ: ...it would be all over.

K: That is all I am saying.

PJ: Why sir, if it is such a simple thing, which I don't think it is, because it has such devious ways.

K: No. That's the whole point - this is where I am saying something which we are probably putting in different words - if you have an insight that the movement of thought and time are divisive, at whatever level, in whatever realm, in whatever area, it is a movement of endless conflict. That's a fact. Britain fought for some island, that's a fact. Because British, British, French, French, German, Russian - they are all divisive. And India against somebody - this is the whole movement of time and thought. That's a fact.

PJ: Yes but you can see it when it is a matter outside of you.

K: That's a point. If you can see it outside, this movement, what it does in the world, what misery it has caused in the world, then inwardly the psyche is time and thought, is the movement of time and thought. This movement has created that. Simple. The psychological movement, the divisive psychological movement has created the external fact. Right? I am a Hindu, I feel secure. I am a German, I feel secure in the word, in the feeling that I belong to something.

PJ: You see, Krishnaji, I would say that all these, being a Hindu, greed, all those one has seen as a product of this movement of time-thought.

K: That is all I am saying.

PJ: But that, it's not quite...

K: What is your difficulty, Pupul?

PJ: There is within it all a sense of 'I exist'.

K: I don't realise the psyche is that!

PJ: That's essentially the nature...

K: Why doesn't it? Because - it is simple enough, why do you make it complex - because I have thought the psyche is something other than the conditioned state. I thought there was something in me, or in the brain, or in somewhere, which is timeless, which is god, which is this, which is that, and that if I could only reach that everything would be right. That's part of my conditioning, because I am uncertain, confused, god will give me safety, protection, certainty. That's all. God or a highest principle, or some kind of conviction.

PJ: What is the nature of the ground from which insight springs?

K: I have told you. Insight can only take place when there is freedom from time and thought.

PJ: It is a sort of unending...

K: No, it is not. You are complicating a very simple fact, as most of us do. If one wants to live at peace, which to live in peace only is to flower, is to understand the extraordinary world of peace. Peace cannot be brought about by thought.

PJ: You see, please understand, Krishnaji, it is the brain itself which listens to that statement.

K: Yes, it listens. And then what happens? Just a minute. What happens? If it listens it is quiet.

PJ: It is quiet.

K: It isn't ruminating, it is not going on, 'By Jove, what does he mean', it is not rattling, it is quiet. Right? Wait a minute. When it is actually, not induced quietness, actually when it listens, and there is quietness, then there is insight. I don't have to explain ten different ways the limitation of thought, it is so.

PJ: I see what you're saying.

Is there anything further than...

K: Oh yes there is. There is a great deal more. Which is: is listening a sound? A sound within an area, or I am listening to what you are saying without the verbal sound? If there is a verbal sound I am not listening, I am only understanding the words. But you want to convey to me something much more than the words, so if the words are making a sound in my hearing I can't deeply understand the depth of what you are saying.

So I want to find out something much more. We started with the present. The present is the now, the now is the whole movement of time-thought. Right? It is the whole structure. If the structure of time and thought ends the now has totally a different meaning. The now then is nothing. I mean, when we use the word 'nothing', zero contains all the figures. Right? So nothing contains all. But we are afraid to be nothing.

PJ: When you say it contains the all, is it the essence of all human and racial and environmental, and nature and the cosmos, as such?

K: Yes. No, I would rather... You see, I am talking of the fact of a realisation that there is nothing. The psyche is a bundle of memories - right? - and those memories are dead. They operate, they function, but they are the outcome of past experience which has gone. I am a movement of memories. Right? Now if I have an insight into that, there is nothing. I don't exist.

PJ: You said something about sound.

K: Yes.

PJ: And listening.

K: Listening without sound. You see the beauty of it?

PJ: Yes, it is possible when the mind itself is totally still.

K: No, don't bring in the mind for the moment. When the brain is quiet, absolutely quiet, therefore there is no sound made by the word.

PJ: There is no sound made by the word.

K: Of course. That is real listening. The word has given me what you want to convey. Right? You want to tell me, 'I am going this afternoon'. I listen to that...

PJ: But the brain has not been active in listening.

K: Yes. And the brain when active is noise, is sound.

Let's go back to something more, we will include, come back to this sound business because it is very interesting what is sound. Sound can only exist, pure sound can only exist when there is space and silence, otherwise it is just noise.

So I would like to come back to the question: all one's education, all one's past experience and knowledge is a movement in becoming, both inwardly, psychologically as well as outwardly. Becoming is the accumulation of memory. Right? More and more and more memories, which is called knowledge. Right? Now, as long as that movement exists there is fear of being nothing. But when one really sees the insight of the fallacy, the illusion of becoming something, therefore that very perception, that insight to see there is nothing, this becoming is endless time-thought and conflict, there is an ending of that. That is, the ending of the movement which is the psyche, which is time-thought. The ending of that is to be nothing. Nothing then contains the whole universe - not my petty little fears and petty little anxieties and problems, and my sorrow with regard to, you know, a dozen things.

After all, Pupilji, nothing means the entire world of compassion - compassion is nothing. And therefore that nothingness is supreme intelligence. That's all there is. I don't know if I am conveying this. So why are human beings - just ordinary, intelligent - frightened of being nothing? If I see that I am really a verbal illusion, that I am nothing but dead memories, that's a fact. But I don't like to think I am just nothing but memories. But the truth is I am memories. If I had no memory either I am in a state of amnesia or I understand the whole movement of memory, which is time-thought and see the fact as long as there is this movement there must be endless conflict, struggle, pain. And when there is an insight into that nothing means something entirely different. And that nothing is the present. It is not varying present, it isn't one day this and one day the next day - being nothing is no time, therefore it is not ending one day and beginning another day.

You see, it is really quite interesting if one goes into this problem not theoretically but actually. The astrophysicists are trying to understand the universe. They can only understand in terms of gases, but the immensity of it as part of this human being, not out there, here. Which means there must be no shadow of time and thought. Pupil, after all that is real meditation, that's what 'sunya' means in Sanskrit. But we have interpreted it ten, hundred different ways, commentaries, this and that, but the actual fact is we are nothing except words and opinions, judgements - that's all petty affairs. And therefore our life becomes petty.

So to grasp, to understand that in the zero contains all the numbers. Right? So in nothing, all the world - not the pain and the - that's all so small. I know it sounds, when I am suffering that is the only thing I have. Or

when there is fear, that is the only thing. But I don't see it is such a petty little thing.

So having listened to all this, what is it you realise? If you could put it into words, Pupilji, it would be rather good. What is it that you, and those who are going to listen to all this - it may be rubbish, it may be true - who are going to listen to all this, what do they capture, realise, see the immensity of all this?

PJ: It is really an ending of the psychological nature of the self, because that is becoming...

K: Wait a minute, Pupilji, I have asked a question because it is going to be very helpful to all of us if you could, as you listen to all this, what is your response, what is your reaction, what have you realised, what have you - say 'By Jove! I have got it, I have got the perfume of it'?

PJ: Sir, it's very... Don't ask me that question because anything I say would sound... Because as you are speaking there was immensity.

K: Yes. Now wait a minute. There was that, I could feel it. There was the tension of that. But is it temporary, is it for the moment, for a second and it is gone? And then the whole business of remembering it, capturing it, inviting it...

PJ: Oh no, I think one has moved from there at least. And another thing one realises, the most difficult thing in the world is to be totally simple.

K: To be simple, that's right. If one is really simple, from that you can understand the enormous complexity of things. But we start with all the complexities and never see the simplicity. That's our training. We have trained our brain to see the complexity and then try to find an answer to the complexity. But we don't see the extraordinary simplicity of life - of facts, rather.

PJ: In the Indian tradition, if I may move away a little...

K: I am glad.

PJ: Out of sound was born all the elements, all the Panchamahabhutas

K: You see...

PJ: The sound which reverberates and is yet not heard.

K: That's it, that's it. But, Pupilji, especially in the Indian tradition, from the Buddha to Nagarjuna, and the ancient Hindus, have said there is that state of nothingness, which, they said, you must deny the whole thing. Nagarjuna says - he came to that point, as far as I understand, I may be mistaken, what I have been told - that he denied everything, every movement of the psyche.

PJ: Every movement of the brain cells as becoming.

K: Yes. It is there in the books, or it is there in tradition. Why haven't they pursued that? Even the most intelligent of them, even the most religious devotee - not to some structure but to the feeling of... the feeling of the divine, the sense of something sacred - why haven't they pursued, denying, not the world - you can't deny the world, they have denied the word, and made a mess of their own lives - but the total negation of the 'me'.

PJ: Really, you know, renunciation - let me use that word - is the negation of the 'me'.

K: Yes, but the 'me' exists still. I may renounce my house, I may get away from my memories but - you follow?

PJ: Basically the renunciation is never in the outer.

K: Inside. Which means what? Don't be attached. Even to your highest principle. Don't be attached to your loin cloth. So I think what is happening is that we are caught, really caught in a net of words, in theories, not in actuality. I suffer, I must find a way to end that, not escape into some kind of silly illusions. Why have human beings not faced the fact and changed the fact? You follow my question? Is it because we are living with illusions of ideas, ideals and conclusions and all that - unrealities? It is so obvious, all this.

PJ: We are living with the history of mankind. That is the history of mankind.

K: That is the history of mankind. And mankind is me. And me is this - endless misery. And so if you want to end misery, end the 'me'. The ending of me is not an action of will. The ending of me doesn't come about through fasting - you know all that childish business that human beings have gone through, who have been called saints.

PJ: It is really the ending of time, isn't it, sir?

K: Yes, isn't it. The ending of time-thought. That means to listen without the sound - listen to the universe without a sound.

We were talking the other day in New York, and there was a man, a doctor - I believe he was very well known. He said, all these questions are all right, sir, but the fundamental issue is whether the brain cells which have been conditioned can really bring about a mutation in themselves. Then the whole thing is simple. I said it is possible only through insight - and we went in, as we have gone into it now. You see, nobody is willing to listen to this in its entirety, they listen partially - agree in the sense, go together up to a certain distance, and stop there. If man really says I must have peace in the world, therefore I must live peacefully, then there is peace in the world. But he doesn't want to live in peace, he does everything opposite to that - his ambition, his arrogance, his silly petty fears and all that.

So we have reduced the vastness of all this to some petty little reactions. Do you realise that, Pupul? And so we live such petty lives. I mean, this applies from the highest to the lowest.

PJ: What is sound to you, sir?

K: Sound is the tree. Sound - wait a minute - take music, whether the pure Indian chanting, Vedic chanting, and the Gregorian chanting, they are extraordinarily close together. And one listens to all the songs of praise - which are, you know what they are! Then you listen to the sound of the waves, the sound of strong wind among the trees, sound of person whom you have lived with for many years. You get used to all this. But if you don't get used to all this, then sound has an extraordinary meaning. Then you hear everything afresh. Say, for instance, you tell me time and thought is the whole movement of man's life, therefore limited. Now you have communicated to me a simple fact, and I listen to it. I listen to it without the sound of the word, I have captured the significance, the depth of that statement. And I can't lose it. It isn't I have heard it now and it is gone when I go outside. I have listened to it in its entirety. That means the sound has conveyed the fact that it is so. And what is so is absolute, always.

I believe only in the Hebraic tradition, Jehovah, or whatever, the nameless one can only say 'I am', like 'Tathata' and so on in Sanskrit.

I think that's enough.

Second Conversation with Pupul Jayakar at Brockwood Park

Saturday, June 25, 1983

