

# Jiddu Krishnamurti

## Can the Movement of the Self End?

*From the series:*

### *Ten Public Meetings at Brockwood Park - 1973*

---

*Thursday, September 6, 1973*

#### *Second Public Dialogue at Brockwood Park*

Krishnamurti: What shall we talk about this morning?

Questioner: Sir, the other day you talked about how we waste energy through the mind. Could we say go into the question about the body and the mind and the heart? Question about health and so on.

K: You only talked about the mind, but you didn't talk about the body, the heart, health and standing on one's head.

Q: When one observes one's mind one notices a constant gossiping, a constant movement of thought. Is it possible at all to finish, and stop this movement of thought suddenly and all at once, or has it any meaning to stop this gradually?

K: If one is at all aware, the mind is always chattering, and is it possible to stop it, to end it at once.

Q: Can we talk about the word 'responsibility'?

K: What do you mean, or shall we talk over together the real meaning of that word 'responsibility'.

Q: Seeing is the action - does thought try to get in, as we are all so conditioned by thought?

K: Seeing, it was said, is the doing. Can thought allow such doing because we are all so conditioned by thought.

Q: Sir could we go into this question of resistance?

K: Could you talk about resistance, which we discussed the day before yesterday.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Talk about the conscious as well as the unconscious. Any more?

Q: (Inaudible) (Sound of aeroplane)

K: I haven't quite... I didn't quite get the meaning of it, sir.

Q: That passion which you may come upon when there is the ending of thought.

K: Could we what, sir. Could we talk about that? May we talk or wait till that real thing comes upon us.

Now, we have asked enough questions. Now what shall we discuss? Shall we discuss, talk over together, putting all these questions together? The body, the mind, responsibility, the chattering of the mind, the conscious as well as the unconscious, and the seeing and the doing without the interference of thought, and so on. Now can we put all that together and discuss it? What do you say?

What is the central issue in all these questions? What do you think is the central point in all the questions that have been put?

Q: The seeing of the problem and trying to find a way out of it.

K: We have problems, and trying to get out of it.

Q: The question of change, when you put all the questions together.

K: When you put all the questions together, the person says, it is a matter of change.

Q: Sir, is it relevant why are all these questions being asked?

K: Why are all these questions being asked.

Q: Sir, is the central point the conflict between the observer and the observed.

K: Conflict between the observer and the observed.

Q: Between the observer and the observed?

Q: Are we not curious? Curiosity perhaps is the central issue, curiosity to know.

K: Curiosity to find out - from whom?

Q: We don't know.

K: There are so many questions that have been put, including the question here and the one that was put the other day about consciousness: what happens when death takes place and naturally the brain cells die, what happens to consciousness, and what is the meaning of consciousness? That was the question that was put the other day.

So - putting all these questions together, I wonder what is the central issue in all this. I would say, subject to your correction, that we have many problems, imposed by society or the culture in which you live, or our own individual personal problems. And we want to resolve them all, in which is included the observer and the observed, conscious and the unconscious, the interference of thought in the seeing and acting. We have all these many problems: ill health, yoga, standing on your head, the meaning of responsibility, what is love, what happens when there is death, and so on. Now who is going to answer all these questions? These are all our problems, collective, personal, quite impersonal, objective and so on. Now who is going to answer all these questions? Suppose there was nobody to whom you could ask these questions? How would you resolve these questions and the problems that arise? That is the central issue in all this, isn't it?

Q: To be aware.

K: No, don't please - let us explore it. Don't say, 'Being aware' - that stops it, please. Now first of all we are accustomed to ask questions and somebody to give you the answers. The world is in such a frightful mess - the dictator says, 'We have the answer', or the politician says, 'We have the answer', or the economist, or the socialist, or the religious person. Now if you don't look to any of these people, because they have led us all up the garden, because they are responsible, as well as we are, for the misery, confusion and sorrow and starvation and wars and violence. If we don't look to any of these people, what is your... how will you find out? There is no authority. Right? No book, no leader, no guru. How will you answer these questions? And I hope you are in that position, that you are not following anybody, that there is no authority which will say, 'Do this' or 'Don't do that'. How will you set about to answer these many questions and many problems that arise in our daily life?

Q: Sir I try to look at myself and I still find there are no answers. Do I then accept that there are no answers?

K: Madame, just wait a minute. Just hold on a minute. Are you in that position when you say, 'I have nobody on whom I can depend for the right answer'? No book, no system and I am left naked, and I have got to find the answer, because my life is very short, I want to live a life that is completely full, rich and beautiful - you know, all that - intelligent, and nobody can tell me what to do. Right? Are we in that position? No.

Q: Yes.

K: Don't say yes or no. It is one of the most difficult things to be in that position, isn't it?

So not relying on anybody, how shall I find the answer, or resolve the problems that arise, every day - there isn't one series, one set of problems - problems are always arising. Now how shall I meet them, resolve them and not be caught in the trap of all this? Where shall I start? You understand sir, what I am asking? Surely that is the only way to find out what is truth, what is a state of mind that is no problem, that is not in conflict, that is supremely sensitive, intelligent, and so on. Now where shall I start?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Looking at what?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Looking at the problem? Who is the creator of these problems? Where shall I look for an answer?

Q: Faith.

Q: In all that is good and true.

K: Oh no madame, don't say all that is good and true, and noble, please. Look I am asking you a very serious question and you say 'Look for all that is noble and true and beautiful'. Keats talked about it endlessly, all the poets, the philosophers and all the writers, intellectuals have... but that doesn't answer my question.

Q: By seeing everything that the problem is not.

K: Look sir, I personally don't read any philosophy, psychology, don't follow any guru - no authority. To me authority is poison, either politically or religiously. And I don't read all the sacred books, in India, or here or in Japan or in China - they bore me. Now where shall I start? Wait. Where shall I start? I say to myself, I have not confidence in myself either - right? - because I am what the world has made me, so I can't rely on myself. I don't know if you follow all this? So I have to... I say to myself, I must understand myself - myself is the world, and the world is me. And I mean that; not just words. And in understanding myself I

understand the world - the world about me, nature, the structure of human relationship, the divisions, the quarrels, the antagonisms, the wars, the violence and all that, it is all buried in me because I am the world. So I must start with myself. Right?

Q: If you are the world and the world is you, how can you start with yourself?

K: If you are the world and the world is you, how can you start with yourself. I start with what I have sir. Shall I go on. Do please move, let's move. It is a hot morning, rather lovely. Let's get going.

I know nothing about myself. I don't start with a conclusion - I am god, I am not a god, I am the state, I am not the state, I am the world, I am not the world, or I am the world - I know nothing. Right? So I begin there. I know nothing. What I know is what other people have told me. Propaganda. What I know, what I am is the result of what others have made me. Or in reaction to the world I am. So I really don't know anything. Right? So I can begin to learn. Right? May I go on? No please, share together. It is not just I go on talking. As I know nothing I begin to learn. So I must find out what it means to learn. What does it mean to learn, not knowing anything, what does it mean to learn? I know, I have to learn a language - Italian, Greek, French or whatever it is. And I store up the words, the meaning of the words, the verbs, the irregular verbs, and so on. So I know a language. I know how to ride a bicycle, drive a car, dig in the garden, or run a machine. I know all that, but actually beyond the technological knowledge I know absolutely nothing about myself. Can we start from there? Can you honestly say, 'I really don't know anything about myself' - not out of despair, not out of a sense of frustration: not knowing myself I am going to commit suicide! You follow?

Q: Excuse me, what do you mean by saying that you know nothing about yourself?

K: What do you mean by saying you know nothing about myself. What I am. Why I do this. Why I think that. What are the motives, the impressions, the... you understand? I know nothing about myself except the technological knowledge, the information, the activity in that field. So I know nothing about myself. I only know what people have said to me about myself - the philosophers, the analysts, the psychoanalysts, the mothers, the fathers, the books - I put all that aside. So I am going to learn - learn about myself. And so before I use that word, I must find out what it means to learn.

Q: To discover.

Q: To wake up.

K: What does it mean to you to learn?

Q: To be vulnerable.

K: To learn.

Q: Isn't it a process of knowledge?

K: I have learnt how to ride a bicycle, I have learnt how to drive a car, speak a language, run a machine or whatever it is. If I am a bureaucrat I have learnt how to push a pencil around, I know all that. What does it mean to learn?

Q: I must be curious.

K: Curiosity. I know what that word means, but will curiosity teach me what it means to learn? I want to learn about myself - what does it mean to learn? If I learn about myself, does that learning lead to knowledge about myself, and from that knowledge I act - you are following? I want to learn about myself - learn. What does that mean? I have learnt a language, ride a bicycle and so on. Myself is a living thing, isn't it? Changing, demanding, asking, lust, anger - all that. I must learn about all that. Now if I learn about anger, that learning can leave the residue as knowledge. Right? From that knowledge I act. Therefore I have

stopped learning. I wonder if you understand this? (Sound of aeroplane).

Q: (Inaudible)

K: The aeroplane must have its voice too, so let's listen to it.

Q: One mustn't accumulate.

K: Sir, if the mind accumulates knowledge about itself, next action or next learning is from a knowledge.

Q: I said I must not accumulate.

K: That's just it. So learning is a process of not accumulating knowledge. I have accumulated knowledge - how to ride a bicycle, speak a language - all that. But when I am learning about myself, any form of accumulation as knowledge about myself will prevent further learning. Is this clear? Please. Because the 'me' is a living thing, it is not a dead thing, therefore the mind must come to it each day, each minute afresh, otherwise it can't learn.

Q: If it doesn't know, then it must come to it afresh.

K: Do listen sir, first listen to what I have said. Not that you must listen to what I've said, but as I happen to talk please listen to it.

In learning about myself, in that learning, if there is any form of accumulation as knowledge, as experience, then further learning is impeded by the past. Therefore is it possible to learn without accumulation? That is very important for me to find out. Because if I am learning and if accumulation goes on, there is no learning. Because the 'me' is a terribly living thing, very active. So I must be as... the mind must be as swift, as sensitive, as subtle as the living thing. Is my mind capable of that? You are following? Please follow this step by step - you will come to it yourself.

Q: Sir, when you look at something, as soon as you begin to think about it, life has gone on...

K: No sir. Look. You are saying life goes on so rapidly, so quickly, so subtly that learning is not possible. Is that it?

Q: No, I didn't say that. I said that's the difficulty of it. As soon as one thinks about something, that one has to be able to see something and immediately pass on without trying to think about it, or grasp it in any way. That one has to...

K: The incident or the happening takes place so rapidly, that thought thinking about it is no good. Therefore I must learn to observe without the previous knowledge which I have accumulated. Right? That is the act of learning. Come on sir.

Q: Therefore one watches carefully one's motive in action.

K: No sir. We haven't come to that. I want to know about myself. I have to learn about myself. What does learning mean? Until I find that out I am merely accumulating knowledge about myself; and you have knowledge about yourself, haven't you? - what the psychologists have said, what the philosophers have said, what the religious books have said, what the speaker has said. So you have knowledge of all that. And when you brush aside all that you are left with nothing, therefore you have to learn and so I am enquiring what does it mean to learn.

Q: Sir, can we question this phrase 'learning about'. Is there a difference between learning about and learning?

K: Yes sir. Learning about and learning, is there a difference between those two? Learning about something,

and learning.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: (Repeating) Spontaneous realisation. I don't know what those words mean. I am sorry. We are not spontaneous - are we? We are so conditioned, so heavily burdened with the past, with all the knowledge, information, how can the mind be spontaneous? I wish you would...

Q: Is not the word learning associated with accumulation?

K: Therefore sir, knowing that learning is associated with accumulation of knowledge, we are trying to separate them. We can't use other words. So I am learning about myself, therefore I am not accumulating knowledge about myself, if I do then that knowledge will prevent me from learning... will prevent further learning about myself. It is fairly simple sir, isn't it?

Q: To learn you have to have observation.

K: To learn you have to have observation. So how do I learn and observe? Right? Observe myself and in the act of observation learn? Now what does observation mean? Can I watch myself, all the movements of myself, without any distortion, without any previous conclusion, which will bring about the distortion - that I am good, that I am bad, that I am divine, that I am marvellous, that I am the most beautiful, lovely person, etc., etc., etc. Can I observe myself without any shadow of distortion?

Q: If I don't try to change myself.

K: Sir, please do hold... Look at it sir. Can you look at yourself without any opinion about yourself?

Q: (Inaudible) (Sound of aeroplane)

Q: Is learning not practising, I think she's saying.

K: Is learning not practising.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Now do start now. Don't let's talk about the baby, but do start. Do start learning now. Please listen to this. Can the mind observe its activity without prejudice? Prejudice being judgement, evaluation which has already been made and through those eyes I look at myself. Can I observe the movement of myself in daily life, cooking, washing, all that, the activity of the mind, observe without any conclusion, prejudice. You say that is not possible. Wait. Do it, sir, please sir, do these things.

Q: How do you do it?

K: I am showing it to you, not 'how' sir.

Q: How are you showing it?

K: I am showing it to you. Watch your mind without prejudice. Can you watch it?

Q: Can I watch my mind prejudicing, can I watch that with prejudice?

K: Can you watch your mind without a judgement?

Q: Making judgement.

K: Not making judgement, sir. Look sir...

Q: Excuse me. Please excuse me - I find as I walk about here doing this and that and so on, there is a

movement, a momentum of making judgements, prejudicing, that caresses my perception. I can feel its quality almost. (Inaudible) Can I observe all that without judging?

K: That is what I am asking you sir. Can the mind watch its activity without any prejudice - prejudice, conclusion, judgement, evaluation, all that - the past. Can it watch? So, until it does it is not capable of learning. Right?

Q: Do you mean observation without thought?

K: Right. Observation without thought. I didn't want to put it that way - then you will go off into: how am I to prevent thought from interfering.

Q: Isn't that what you have to consider?

K: What sir?

Q: How am I to look at thought interfering without prejudice, without judging it?

K: Now there is nobody to answer that question, what will you do?

Q: Squirm!

K: Squirm? Then squirm! (Laughter) But you have to answer that question, it is no good merely squirming, you have got to answer it. Life challenges you. You can't say, 'Well I squirm' and leave it at that. Life says, answer it, you are a man, grown up.

Q: What does squirm mean? (Laughter)

K: What does squirm mean? You have seen a worm squirm!

Q: Sir...

K: No, sir please, just a minute sir. You see, sir, it becomes really quite impossible when your mind isn't giving complete attention to something that demands attention. I want to learn about myself, not through somebody else's eyes - whether it is Christ, Buddha, or the latest guru - I want to learn, the mind must learn about itself. So it says, 'How am I to learn?', which means I must observe. How can I observe when there is so much prejudice? There are thousands of prejudices I have, how can I observe? Then the next thing is, there is nobody to answer, how is the mind to be free of prejudice? You follow? Otherwise I can't observe, the mind can't observe and therefore can't learn. You follow? So how is the mind to be free of prejudice?

Q: When I see something in myself I don't like, that is a fact, not a prejudice.

K: I am asking madame: you have a prejudice, haven't you? All of us have some kind of pre-judgement - that's what it means, prejudice, prejudging something. So how is the mind to be free of prejudice, bigotry, conclusion, how is it? Nobody is going to answer me, because I have got to find out. I can't just squirm, lie under the question, I have got to answer it to myself. Life demands it.

Q: When you see the falseness of it.

K: You see the falseness of prejudice, don't you - but you are still prejudiced aren't you?

Q: I don't know, I can't answer it.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: You are not answering sir. Answer that question for yourself sir. How is the mind to be free of prejudice? You understand? A conclusion, an image which I have built about you. Do listen sir, I have built an image

about you because you are a Christian, I am a Hindu, or I am a Communist or you are something else. Now how is that mind to be free of the image it has built, or the culture has built, or the society has built, which has been implanted in the mind? How is that image to be put away? It is a question sir, you understand, don't answer something else. The image is there, how is it to break down? To be free of it.

Q: Sir, that image is memory, so you are asking really, can one change memory.

K: I am asking a simple thing sir, please don't make it more complicated. I have an image, as being a Hindu, Communist, Socialist, whatever it is - Catholic, and I realise as long as that image exists, observation is not possible, and therefore learning then becomes merely accumulation of knowledge, which prevents further learning. So my question is: can the mind free itself from the image?

Q: You become aware that it is just an image and not a reality.

K: Now, are you in realising that, are you free of the image?

Q: If you actually see the image...

K: Not 'if', this is your question. It is your problem. Are you free of the image?

Q: If you see it...

K: Not 'if'. I come to you, sir, I say, 'Look, my friend, I don't know how to get rid of my image, I have got so many images, tell me what to do'. And you can't answer because you don't know what to do. You say, well let's talk about it endlessly, and I die by the end of it. My problem is I want to end it.

Q: Sir, who is this 'I'?

K: Sir I don't want to go... You see. Can your mind be free of an image which prevents observation? Stick to that thing. Not who is 'I'. We'll go into that.

Q: I am that image.

K: Yes sir. Then what? You are that image. You are the image. Now how is the mind to be free of that image, which is you?

Q: If I am the image...

K: Are you? Sir please, the house is burning! I must do something about it, I can't everlastingly talk about the man who put the fire - has he red hair, brown hair, white skin, black skin, purple - the house is on fire.

Q: By accepting the image.

K: So you accept the image. It is there, why do you accept it? You see how you are totally unaware, if I may most respectfully point out, totally unaware of what you are doing, how your mind is operating.

Q: It comes from fear.

K: Fear. Is fear preventing the mind from putting away the image?

Q: Thought itself preventing it.

Q: Sir, what is this image? I mean, I don't know - does anybody see this?

K: Sir, I've told you what the image is. Image is a prejudice, a word, association of words - I am a Christian, or I am a Communist, I am a Catholic, I am a Protestant, I am a follower of some guru - those are all images.

Q: Sir, but the idea, the idea that there is something to see gets in the way of seeing it. You know, if I say I

am going to see how - you talk about being a Christian for instance - if I am going to observe myself as a Christian, that very idea to see something would stop me seeing it.

K: No sir. No, sir.

Q: The idea that there is anything to see gets in the way of seeing.

K: No. I am a Hindu, a Catholic, a Communist, that is an image, a verbal series of conclusions, ideologies, dogmatic and so on, those are the images that I have built by words. I am asking, can the mind free itself from that? So that it observes without any distortion, otherwise I can't learn.

Q: When I see a prejudice, the only way I can work is to go on seeing it and not try to change it, because that is another prejudice, but to go on seeing it.

K: Now do you see your prejudice? Is the mind aware of the prejudice it has?

Q: Sometimes.

Q: That is the difficulty. Because I don't see that the particular knowledge - I see the knowledge that somebody else has is prejudice - but the knowledge I have about myself...

K: I am talking about yourself, not somebody else.

Q: Yes, quite. Now, I don't see the distinction. Some knowledge I have about myself I have in a sort of tentative way, not as a formed solid thing, I just observe certain things, like a scientist, not building it into dogma about it - is there a difference, or is all knowledge such prejudice?

K: Sir, I have explained... we have explained, sir, all knowledge is not prejudice. Learning to ride...

Q: About myself, I mean. Knowledge about...

K: Learning about how to ride a bicycle or drive a car is not prejudice. It is a function which I learn. But here I am learning about myself, not from what others have said about me, or through others - the mind discards all that, says, it wants to... to learn about itself. Now to learn is to observe. Now can it observe without any shadow?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No, no. I am asking you - not asking you sir - we are questioning, we are asking whether the mind can observe its conditioning.

Q: But I am using my mind to observe it.

K: Observe it sir. Look I have been brought up as a Brahmin in India, and I say, 'I am that'. That is a deep-rooted prejudice, brought about historically, culturally and tradition says, 'I am that'. That is my conditioning. Is it possible for the mind to be aware of that conditioning? Just only that. No more. When it is aware of that conditioning, what takes place?

Q: You recognise the condition of it.

Q: It is no longer conditioned.

K: Are you saying this as an actuality, or a verbal statement?

Q: Well I see that with prejudice, for instance...

K: Sir you are brought up as a Christian - right?

Q: Yes.

K: Now are you aware of that conditioning?

Q: Yes.

K: Now the next step.

Q: That is why I am here.

K: Wait sir, just a minute sir. When you are aware of that, are you trying to overcome it, change it, control it or break through it? Or are you merely aware of it?

Q: I am just aware of it.

K: Now what takes place then?

Q: I become free from it.

K: Wait. Either you are or you are not. You can't say, 'I become'.

Q: I am - if you like.

K: Not what I like, sir. Not what I like - please, (laughter) it isn't a game of what you and I like. The mind becomes aware that it is a Christian, a Communist, a Hindu, and so on. That is its conditioning. In becoming aware of that conditioning what takes place?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No. (Laughs) So I have to find out what I mean by aware, what I mean by observing that conditioning. Is the observer different from the conditioning? You understand my question? I am aware... the mind is aware, or observes it is conditioned. Is the observer different from the conditioning? What do you say? There is nobody to answer you. How will you find out? Is the thinker different from the thought, from the conditioning, or the thinker is the thought and the conditioning?

Q: Do you realise your conditioning when you see that it is part of your mind?

K: No. Yes sir, I understand. I am asking a little more. I am asking - we are asking, when you say, 'I am conditioned', is the 'I' who says, 'I am conditioned', different from the conditioning?

Q: No.

K: It's certainly not.

Q: It's all in the mind.

K: So the observer is the observed. Now wait a minute - stay there for a few minutes. The observer is the observed. Then what takes place?

Q: I have learnt what that thing is.

K: Then I have learnt - you are saying - what actually is. Is there a learning about 'what is'?

Q: (Inaudible)

I must stick to this one thing sir. Sorry. The observer is the observed. Right? We see that. That is, the conditioning and the observer who watches that conditioning are both the same. Both are conditioned. That means there is no division between the observer and the observed. Wait a minute sir. Which means there is

no division between the experiencer and the experience. No division between the thinker and the thought - they are one. Right? Then what takes place? Take time. Go slowly. When there is a division between the observer and the observed, there is conflict. Right? Trying to overcome it, trying to change it, trying to control it and so on and so on. Now when the observer is the observed there is no control, there is no suppression, there is no overcoming it, there is only this actually what is. Only the observer is the observed, the image is the observer. Right? Now what takes place?

Q: Duality comes to an end.

K: Sir when we said duality has come to an end, when you say observer is the observed. Duality exists and the expression of that duality is conflict. When there is no conflict between the observer and the observed what takes place? Nobody there to tell you - you follow sir?

Q: You have immediate action.

K: Wait, go slowly, go slowly. What takes place?

Q: Because I am not different from what I am looking at.

K: Therefore what happens?

Q: You have a passion for learning.

Q: Conflict has ceased.

K: Yes sir, we have said that. When the observer is the observed, conflict ceases. Which is the greatest thing, isn't it? You don't see it. Conflict ceases. Has conflict ceased with you when you realise the observer is the observed? Until that conflict ceases you don't see the reality that the observer is the observed. It is just words then. The moment you see that, the reality of it, conflict has come to an end, the 'me' and not the 'me'. The 'me' is the 'you' - you follow?

So what takes place when there is no conflict, which means when the observer is the observed? Have you ever meditated? I see several of you sitting under the various trees, (Laughter) with great attention. Have you ever meditated? This is meditation - you understand sir. It is the greatest meditation, to come upon this extraordinary thing, which is to discover for oneself - for the mind to discover for itself the observer is the observed, therefore no conflict, which means not vegetation, just - you follow? - just doing nothing. On the contrary.

So I have to find the answer; what takes place when the mind realises the image and the observer of that image are the same? And it has come to that point because it has investigated - you understand? - it hasn't just said, 'That is so'. It has gone into itself. It says, the learning, observing, to observe there must be no prejudice, prejudice is an image, is that image different from the observer. All that is an enquiry. Enquiry in which there is attention, therefore that enquiry brings about the realisation that the observer is the observed, and therefore the mind is tremendously alive, it isn't a dead mind. It is an original, unspoilt mind.

So then what takes place? You understand? It realises the word Hindu, and the maker of that word are the same. So the image, the conditioning, is it there? Don't say no, or yes. Is it there? The mind is conditioned as a Catholic. When the mind says, 'I am Catholic', the 'I' is different from that which has been called Catholic, it is its conditioning. The observer says, 'I am different from my conditioning', and then he battles because he says, 'I must control, I must be generous, I must be peaceful, I mustn't kill, but I will kill when necessary but I won't kill when...' and so on and so on and so on. It plays a game with itself all the time. So when the observer realises he is not different from the thing which he sees, that is the conditioning, therefore the whole thing is conditioned - you understand? - the whole structure is conditioned. Then what takes place?

Q: Conditioning disappears.

K: Has it disappeared with you madame. Don't say things that you don't know.

Q: We are afraid of the consequences.

K: Sir, no. What takes place? We will come to that. What takes place? You understand sir? When there is an image, a prejudice, a conclusion, there is activity. Right? I am a Christian - I must resist everybody who is not a Christian. I am a Communist - I will convert everybody to my ideology - socialism, etc. There is activity going on. Right? Isn't there? Come on sir. The activity of the observer trying to convince others, or proselytise, or threaten and all that, to become this. When the observer is the observed, all such activity ceases, doesn't it? No? So what takes place? There is complete immobility, isn't there? Oh you don't see the beauty of this.

Q: Marvellous!

K: (Laughs) Immediately put into words.

Q: Peace.

K: My darling sir!

Q: Summation.

K: You understand sir. Watch it sir. The mind when it is prejudiced is in movement. Right? I am prejudiced against you because you have hurt me. I resist - that is a movement. The image which I have built about you is the movement of a prejudice against you. I am a Communist and my education is to convince, is to resist, is to bring everybody to that. So having an image indicates a movement. Right? Movement from this to that, or from there to this. Change this to that, thesis and antithesis, and produce synthesis. It is a constant movement of the image, the word, the conclusion. So when the mind realises, sees the observer is the observed, sees, not just verbally accepts some idiotic idea, but actually realises it in his guts, blood, heart, mind, it sees that, that it is no division, therefore this movement of the mind comes to an end. Right? The movement of the conditioning comes to an end. I wonder if you see this?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: No. Just... hold a minute, sir. I want to finish this and then you'll get it. So there is complete immobility of the mind, which doesn't mean it is a dead mind. It doesn't mean a mind that has gone to sleep - it is a mind that is tremendously alive. It is alive because it is not moving in conditioned areas. I wonder if you get this? So what takes place when there is complete non-movement?

Q: (Inaudible)

K: Madame we have been through all that, please don't go back to something.

Q: The mind is free of imitation.

K: Look sir, look sir what has taken place.

Q: Silence should take place.

K: Yes sir. Don't use - unless it is the real thing - don't use words. Then one plays the hypocrite. One says things one doesn't know.

Q: Well I just felt this silence...

K: Yes sir, I am not accusing you sir. Just see. Look sir, it is really the most extraordinary thing one has

discovered, if you have come upon it. That is, all movement is time, and time is thought, thought is conditioned, and when thought operates it can only operate in the area within the field of that conditioning. I am Catholic, Protestant, Communist, Socialist, Right Wing, Left Wing, or Centre, I am a Buddhist, I am nothing, or I must be something. All that is within the area of the known - the movement is in time, is time. Movement is time. Now when the observer is the observed there is no movement at all, there is only the observed. And when there is no movement at all about the observed, 'what is', what has happened? There is no movement, therefore no chattering, no movement from the unconscious to the conscious. No movement at all. Therefore the mind sees, has the energy to look at 'what is', when there is a movement away from 'what is' there is desire to change it, transform it, control it. When there is no movement at all it has this extraordinary energy to observe 'what is'. And what is there? Another series of words. I don't know if you see.

Q: I do not understand intelligence.

K: I'll show you. The speaker is going into it, you are not. It isn't an actuality to you, it is just a verbal acceptance. You don't say, well I am going to look at this, put my energy into this, I am dedicated, I want to find out. And you can only find out when you have totally discarded everything what others have said.

Q: (Inaudible)

K: That is why I am saying you have got... Please, unless you do this you cannot learn. You will repeat what others have said, which you are doing. And what others have said may be utterly silly, may be true, or may be false. Others have no meaning in this. They have meaning when the doctor says from his knowledge, take this pill, you have got cancer you have got to do something. That's different. But here I know nothing, I have to learn. Learning means to observe. There is no observation when there is the movement of the image. You see the beauty of it sir. Movement of the image, which means the conditioning. The movement of the conditioning. And that movement of the conditioning is time. And thought is time. So thought divides itself as the observer and the observed, and the conflict. And this is the movement of our culture, of our religious activity, the conflict between 'what is' and 'what should be', between the observer and the observed. But when there is the realisation that the observer is the observed then the movement of the conditioning comes to an end, because there is no movement. You understand? Therefore such a mind has come to it through meditation, enquiry, looking, asking itself, not anybody else. It has to stand completely alone, which doesn't mean isolated - sitting, you know, becoming a hermit. On the contrary you must empty... the mind empties everything of its conditioning therefore no movement of conditioning, therefore no movement of time. Then there is no 'what is', there is only something entirely different.

Q: Sir all of this sounds so dreamy to me because I can't do anything but pay lip service to you and follow you.

K: Then don't pay lip service.

Q: I can't get beyond observer and observed.

K: Then take time, go into it. Sir you don't say that when you are hungry. When you are lustful, you don't say, well... (Laughter)

Q: (Inaudible)

K: You don't. When the house is burning you want to act. And you act when you have pain, when you have toothache, when you have got some disease you don't say... play around.

Q: What you say about the thinker and thought, the experiencer and the experience, the observer and the observed, isn't this really saying if there is action without the 'I', without the self, then we are coming upon

what you are talking about. In that state there is a possibility of love.

K: Yes sir. Of course sir. But wait, wait sir. How is the self to come to an end? You say that self is not.

Q: What I was going to say sir, there are moments in people's lives...

K: ...when the self is not.

Q: Yes.

K: But that isn't good enough. There are moments when I am healthy - I say that isn't good enough.

Q: But in those moments, maybe one of those a day...

K: A year, half a year!

Q: In those days, there is love.

K: Yes sir.

Q: And this is what you are talking about permanently.

K: No. The moment you use the word 'permanent', that means time.

Q: But this is what you are talking about.

K: Sir, please. Of course what I am talking about is the ending of the self. The ending of the self is the movement - no, the self is the movement of the image, of the environment which has conditioned that self. Now, the ending of the self is... how is it to be done?

Q: Well, it will be done by what you are talking about, but it can also be done maybe for a limited time, when something comes in your way and the self is not.

K: Yes sir, I understand that very well. We have all had those moments when the self is not. Those are rare and happy, like a marvellous day, without a shadow - lovely. But those days are rare. They are like English weather! (Laughter) But what am I to do? I can't wait for those days. Nor remember those days and live on the past.

Q: Nor, can we keep coming to your conventions and listening and repeating like in a parrot fashion...

K: Oh, that is silly! That is silly. But for a man who is very serious, it is important to find out how to end this movement of the self. What am I to do? Is the self different from the action? Or the self is the action. Sir that is all implied.

So, the first thing is never to repeat what I have not seen. When you use the word 'silence', either you really... either there is silence, or you are talking about silence. So don't - if I may say - don't repeat something that you actually have not seen - not experienced. There is a vast difference between seeing and experiencing.

Yes sir?

Q: Sir, these moments of clarity that you say that all of us have, it seems that they, when you think about the observer and the observed that is one - now one finds that this happens in a particular fragmented issue. Say I am jealous, and I can be the jealousy and the jealousy disappears. There is a lot of energy. But I walk out and somebody insults me and I am hurt, which means that there was an overcoming or a dissolving of the one, but it seems as though... How does one be conscious of the entire content of one's consciousness?

K: That is just it sir. That is just it. What time is it sir? I think we had better... Sorry, it is time to stop. Ten to one. Perhaps we can take up this question on Saturday morning. That is: what does it mean to be whole? What does it mean to have this feeling of totality - you follow? - this feeling of complete non-fragmentation? I am all right in the tent but when I go out I am hurt. I am all right in the church - when I leave the church I hate people. I am all right as long as I have got my image, my bigotry and I hold on. But to be free of all that, to have a feeling of the whole. Right? Perhaps we will discuss that on Saturday, sir.