

108-Doctors Second Talk-1- WITH DOCTOR S VARMA,24TH DEC 1976,PART-1

Q1: Sir, I have got a question. After this change in the human system, the mind which we normally have, the same type of mind we will have after this so-called realization or transformation or change? May I request you to enlighten me on this?

UG: Sir, but what makes you think that there is a mind there now? If there is a mind, is it separate from the body, has it an independent existence of its own? And if you pose yourself a question like that, what is mind, what is your answer?

Q: Well, sir, sometimes, much against our wishes...

UG: No, we can pose that question ourselves right now. What is mind? That's my question, you see. It's not my question, you see. What is mind? What comes in there is what you call mind. What you have there are only definitions, the knowledge you have about that mind. So you create an object called mind and then look at it. I don't know if I'm making myself clear. So what creates that object called mind? It is the knowledge you have of that mind. That's what you have heard, what you have learned from experts, both Indian and Western. So it is the knowledge that creates the mind. Is there any mind independent of the ideations and meditations you have there of what is called mind? That's my question. To me, there is no totality of thoughts and feelings. They are all disconnected, disjointed things. There is something that links up these disconnected, disjointed things called thoughts, and what links up is thinking. I don't know if I make myself very clear.

Dr Kapoor. We use these terms, any term, for making communication easier, isn't it? Otherwise perhaps there is no need for these terms.

UG: That is true, but you see, are we actually communicating? You have a set of definitions, I have another set of definitions, and throwing these definitions to each other...

Dr K. Well, then what you are raising is a very fundamental question. Whether two people can communicate?

UG: Not on the subject of mind.

Dr K. If not on mind, then not on anything. Then what are we doing here in this world?

UG: I wonder why we are here, is my question. Why are we here?

Dr K. Yes, we wonder why we are here, but yet it's nice to be here.

UG: You can find out the answer for that question.

Dr K. It's nice to be here, that's why you are here.

UG: That is what we are trying to do now. We are interested in finding out, you see, the basic

question or the fundamental question, what is that mind? Is there a mind?

Dr K. I would like to say that mind is the term.

UG. Look here, what you have to say is very important, not what others said, what Freud said, what Jung said, what Kant said, what the whole gang said. That is not important. What you have to say is very important.

Dr K. Yes, but it may be important to me, it may not be important to many other people.

UG. Is it possible for you to say anything about mind?

Dr K. Yes.

UG. What is it?

Dr K. Well, I would like to say, I have thought about it, thinking, I mean, you can't go beyond...

UG. What is the material for thinking?

Dr K. Well, I would say that mind is a term we give to the process of interaction between an individual and his environment. The mind is somewhere here, it's not inside.

UG. So it is that which is distorting the whole thing.

Dr K. What?

UG. You see, what you call the mind, is distorting what is the sensory activity.

Dr K. Of course, the mind is a filter and hence distorts.

UG. It distorts.

Dr K. Oh yes, certainly distorts.

UG. You don't get and you can't get anything of what is there.

Dr K. Exactly. I fully agree with you. It helps and it distorts us, if I may say so. It does both things. Because... I would like to, because this is a question I want to put to you, sir. Because to absorb the environment, because to be with the environment, if we let it get through straight, it can often break the individual. So you use a filter to let something come in.

UG. Ah, that's exactly the point.

Dr K. At the same time, you are cutting out...

UG. No, no, no, you said something very interesting. If you let the whole thing come in, without this filtering process, it will destroy something. What is it you think will be destroyed by that? I am not a learned man, you see. I am just a simple man trying to understand this. If I want to know for myself what this mind is, I have to reject totally and completely what everybody has said about it. That's the only way I can go about it. Otherwise, it has no meaning.

Dr K. It's a very private thing.

UG. It has no meaning.

Dr K. It is a private thing because these are subjective terms, so you have to destroy it.

UG. Everything is subjective. Is there any such thing as objective? I am trying to understand you.

Dr K. No, I am also trying to understand you, sir.

UG. Probably if you have an academic interest or some other interest,

Dr K. I don't have any.

UG. That's a very important thing. You made a very interesting statement that the mind filters the things to prevent the destruction of something that is there.

Dr K. Well, shall we call it identity?

UG. I don't know. That's another word.

Dr K. That's the trouble with words, isn't it?

Q2. Sorry, the very question has gone off the track.

UG. No, I don't think so. I don't think so. We are still right on the track and moving in the right direction. Not the right direction, or if you want you can call it the right direction.

Dr K. Who knows what is right?

UG. Who knows what is right?

Dr K. Perhaps right is what is comfortable.

UG. All right.

Dr K. Would that be the case?

UG. If it satisfies you, it is all right.

Dr K. Is that what you say?

UG. I didn't say that. I don't want any comfort, I don't want any satisfaction. I want to go to the root of the whole thing and find out if there is anything there.

Dr K. The root of the whole thing? What thing?

UG. I mean, tear it apart.

Dr K. Tear what apart?

UG. The whole structure of what is called mind, if there is. The filtering mechanism that is there is the thing that is responsible for the whole distortion of everything that I look and everything that I see. It's very important for me. It may not be of any great interest to you, to me it is distorting, garbling everything I see. It prevents me to look at what is there and what is here inside of me.

There is a feeling, you see. I can't look at that feeling. What separates me from that feeling or what separates me from what I look over there is this mind.

Dr K. Yes absolutely right¹

UG. So how can I have a direct experience of what is out there and what is there inside of me?

Dr K. That's very interesting, sir. You have been able to do that? Get direct experience?

UG. No, you see, if we use the word direct, we get into a very peculiar situation because there is no way of directly experiencing anything at all. So the demand to experience anything, directly or otherwise, comes to an end. Then there is, you see, there is no division, what you call division, so it is one movement. It cannot be separate.

Dr K. To get totally absorbed.

UG. No, absorbed is not the word. Absorbed implies that there is a point here, an entity here which is trying to identify with something else, or absorbed into something else.

Dr K. One can look at it another way, to remove the categorizations. That's what we are, we are categorizing and hence the separations. We remove the categorization and we are back.

UG. What separates you from what you are looking at is this thing, the knowledge you have about it. There is a microphone there. What separates me from that microphone? The knowledge I have. The whole knowledge is symbolized in one word, microphone. So it is that knowledge that comes in the way and separates me from what is there. So is there anything here? That is my point. What is here is only knowledge. As long as I use knowledge as a means to understand anything, as a means to experience anything, we are not in living contact with anything.

Dr K. I think that's absolutely true. But what are then, how then we should experience?

UG. Why is there this constant demand for experiencing things? That is a childish, infantile thing to me. Why do you have to name everything that you see, everything that is going on there inside? We are like children, we are not adults, we are not grown-up people, because every time you look at something, you say to yourself, that's a microphone, that's a man, that's a woman, this is this, that is that, that's a table, that's an electric meter, and so on and so on and so on. Or we say to ourselves, I am happy, I am happy, I am dejected, depressed, and so on and so on. Or you are preoccupied with something totally unrelated to what is happening at this moment.

Dr K. Is it possible to unlearn all this?

UG. It is not possible to unlearn. How is it possible? So that is also a learning process. You introduce another movement called unlearning, which is actually learning.

Dr K. There is no answer then, is there?

UG. There is no... you have to find the answer. What is your answer? You are all experts, learned...

Dr K. No, no, no. At the moment we are not talking as experts. We have heard so much about your

experiences, or you are getting away from experiences, you may say.

UG. No, no, I would like to understand you also. As you said at the beginning, there must be some sort of communication.

Dr K. Well, then if you want to understand, then perhaps we are all in various stages of... in the same quest. What you have said is theoretically absolutely true to me, but I don't know how to do it. You will say, don't do it, that's the way to do it.

UG. No, no, there is no how there. How is the most important question, the question of all questions, and what you call the fundamental question. How? Do you want? That's the next question. Do you want, as you said at the very beginning, if you keep yourself open, that's going to destroy something here. That's true. That is why you don't want to look at anything.

Dr K. We certainly want to grow in both directions, we want everything in, and hence also the ability not to be destroyed. Is that wanting too much?

UG. Isn't that a neurotic state?

Dr K. Is that so? Then I would like to get away from that.

UG. Isn't that a divisive moment? You want and you don't want at the same time. You don't want, I say, because that's going to destroy something which is very precious there for you, the continuity of yourself, as you know yourself and as you experience yourself. So you do not want that to come to you. That is why there is this constant demand for experiencing everything, all the time, whether you are asleep or awake or God knows what. Even while you are asleep, you see, this activity is going on. Probably it is not on the surface level, but underground it's going on.

Dr K. Then how to want?

Q2. But who is witnessing that, sir? My experience is going on, you see. Who is witnessing? Is it mind experiences? Who is this experiencer? The mind is only a...

UG. You see, what I am trying to point out is that there is no experiencer there at all. There is only experiencing. You see, if I use that, you know, it is very difficult because you can't envisage a situation where there can be any experience without experiencer. And even to make a statement like there is an experiencing where there is neither experiencer nor experience has no meaning at all, but that situation can never become part of your experiencing state. We are all familiar with that, you see, the knower and the known, the seer and the seen, and the experiencer and the experienced, the observer and the observed, and the whole lot.

Q2. Theoretically, we all understand.

UG. I don't think we understand. You see, that is the observed, to use your own terminology. What is the observer there?

Q2. The question has been reversed.

UG. Yes. Is there an observer?

Q2. Yes, exactly.

UG. The word microphone is the observer, the word microphone and all that it stands for. You can stretch it and say a lot of things about that. So is there an entity, is there a continuity of all these things there? At this moment it is the microphone, next moment it is the stylophen, next moment it is the necktie and the tie pin, and the buttons there, and so on. So things are happening all the time out there. This is only a camera. Without a cameraman, there is no cameraman, and what is moving the camera is the actions that are taking place out there. So thousands of things are happening here, he has just lifted his head. So that is the thing that is pulling me to this side, there is nobody here.

Q2. Actions.

UG. Life is action, you see. To put it that way, it is mystifying. Life is acting all the time, and you are manipulating that action.

Q2. Now there are two things sir, before I forget to say. Life is acting all the time.

UG. No, no, not acting, action. Action. And that action is not a mysterious thing, not a mystical thing. So action, you see, you have moved your hand there, you are moving your hand there, so where is that movement, is it there or here? It is one movement.

Q2. It continues from here up to here.

UG : No, you are moving there, you see, your hand, you are moving or I am moving it. Who is doing it? Where is this action taking place? This is not metaphysics, I am not talking, indulging in any metaphysical stuff. This is a pure and simple physical, physiological phenomenon. You are moving the hand, something is happening there, that is the action that I am talking about. But where is that action taking place, is it there or here or in this space, where?

Q2. It is here. I give command to my hand to move.

UG. No, but what is my part in that? I am looking at that. The eyes are focused on that movement, not because I want to focus my eyes on that, but that is demanding something. Something is happening there, so automatically the eyes are focused on that. Something is happening here, this is not a corpse.

Q2. So there are two, isn't it, sir?

UG. No, I say there are no two.

Q2. When my hand is moving...

UG. I can't say that I am moving my hand, my hand is not moving, but something is moving here, this movement. Life is another definition, we get lost in this definition. So, life is movement, and so if you use the word movement, it implies that it is moving from one point to another point. Then I have to qualify and say it has no direction.

Q2. Definitely we are having two. When my hand is moving, your head also is moving, that is why it is two.

UG. Who is experiencing this?

Q2. My hand's movement, I am experiencing.

UG. No, you are not.

Dr Desiraju. If you say two, it has to go to infinity because all are also seeing, three, four, five, etc.

Q2. You are all looking at my hand, which direction it moves. Now, the first question was, the mind which we have now, after the experience that everybody is one, suppose I have that experience...

UG: No, everybody is one, cannot be experienced. Concept, yes, an idea, yes, a thought, yes, but the fact that everybody is one, in other words, that you are one expression, I am another expression, you see, that flower is another expression, that fact, the integral relationship that is there, cannot be experienced by you at all. That is all that I am saying. Whatever you experience of that is only an abstraction of that, and what helps you to abstract that is, you see, the knowledge.

Q2. Can you go nearer and nearer to more and more?

UG. For experiences, there is always more and more. So every experience demands more and more, and so it is a repetitive process.

Dr K. That isn't what I was asking, sir. We have heard of ancient seers, let's say, some people who have claimed that they have been able to experience the integrity, experience the oneness.

UG. No, can't be experienced.

Dr K. They have said so.

UG. They may have said so.

Dr K. Well, they say that if you can...

UG. Otherwise I don't accept it on authority, so I question that. It may be true and valid to them, it is true in a way, but not valid for you.

Dr K. No, it isn't valid for us because we are not them.

UG. That means, you see, you accept it on authority or faith, otherwise the statement has no meaning. So if it is possible for that chappy, it must also be possible for you.

Dr K. Yes, perhaps it is possible.

UG. All right, you see, that's all right. Then when am I going to experience that fact, that we are all integrally related? I don't want to use the word, you see, they are all difficult words, but we know what we mean by that. You see, integrity means, integration means that there is a division and then you see they are integrated and so on. So that there is an integral unity. You are one expression of that, I am another expression of that, you see, the flower is another expression of that, and the garden slug is another expression of it, and the fly that is flying is another expression of it. I may think that I am very superior in the scheme of things because I have developed this very complex and complicated structure of thinking and feeling superior to everything. It is not the size, it is not.

Q2. Is that feeling coming from our own consciousness or from our own experience? I feel that I am superior to A or B or C, that feeling,

UG. Thinking. It is thinking.

Q2. Thinking. Is it related to anything?

UG. No, it is related to a position that you have established for yourself, a point here. And in relationship with this point, you see, you experience everything else. First of all, you see, if you reject this point, then where is the point of reference? I have often spoken about this, the Maya business, Vedantins come here and throw all that stuff at me. I asked you the root meaning of the word. Maya means to measure. So, in that sense, you see, probably the word can be explained, to measure. So, measuring implies that there is a point here. So, from this point you measure the distance of that microphone there. So, what creates this point? The knowledge that I have about that point. Otherwise, it is an illusion. You really don't know what you are looking at. We have superimposed the knowledge on whatever it is, but the reality of it can never be experienced by you. Whatever you experience is only through the spectacle you have, the knowledge. So, the same is the case with your feelings also. You have to separate yourself from that and then, you see, abstract something. So, if there is a feeling here, I am happy, so I am in a blissful state, bliss, beatitude, love, God knows what. You have to separate yourself from that. So, whatever you experience there is not really that blissful state at all. Some person may have experienced something. My point is, I really don't have an answer for that question. So, all that man has experienced before you is part of that. So, you can't experience anything there unless somebody else must have experienced whatever you call that blissful state, loving state, God knows what, unless somebody else experienced it before you. You may not even

have thought of that. You see, out of nowhere some extraordinary experience you experience.

Dr K. Does that frustrate you, sir? Not being able to...

UG. You have to come to a point where there is no such thing as a new experience at all. So, what you experience is not yours, somebody else has experienced before you, so it's not yours.

Dr K. So?

UG. What is so great about it?

Dr K. Nothing.

UG. Nothing .

Q2: Dr Kapoor. That's not the question. Now, our friend Krishnamurti was telling us that all these things that you are experiencing are not experiences at all.

Dr K. I got that.

Q2: But at the same time I am there, I am witnessing there.

Dr K. No, I didn't think you said that.

UG. No, no, no, I am questioning that, you see, the witness business, I am questioning the very witness business, the awareness that people talk about, choiceless or otherwise, or the witness, or the Vedantins say, the, what do you call that, Chaitanya, Sakshi Chaitanya. And I think only one chap used that word, very intelligently, and that was Socrates. He called it spectatorhood. Spectatorhood does not mean that there is a spectator. Only one man. I don't know what he meant by that, spectatorhood, that interested me; for the first time, it struck me. So, Sakshi Chaitanya, that is the Sanskrit word he used—so consciousness, pure consciousness—I don't know what all that means.

Dr K. If you reach... May I interrupt?

UG. Yes, yes, please.

Dr K. One has to be very open in this discussion. Otherwise, there is no point in this discussion.

UG. Yes, it is yours, it is not mine.

Dr K. So, often one is able, in certain moments, to follow the chain of logic in the particular way you have expressed yourself. It is not foreign for me, what you are saying. It's not foreign to me, I can sort of empathize with it, and often feel it very strongly.

UG. Because you are familiar with sort, or why is there this empathy between us both? Because you are familiar with these things, or is it a logically ascertained premise?

Dr K. Well, I would not be able to answer that, but what I will say is that often there are moments when this appears true to me, that's it. And how it reaches, I don't know. I mean, that again leads us to language. But once you reach that, then suddenly the very insecurity-producing question arises.

UG. Yes.

Dr K. What is it?

UG. The very thing that is questioning, you see, the existence of that questioner is at stake.

Dr K. Yes, exactly. So that produces a lot of panic.

UG. Certainly it does.

Dr K. Now, obviously, you must have experienced that panic, otherwise you wouldn't have gone to that level.

UG. See, that's the trouble, you see. See, they dare not question that basic thing.

Dr K. Once you dare question it, then what?

UG. Then “what” is absent. Then it begins to act, that is the action.

Dr K. Right.

UG. You see, so nobody—not all those psychologists—dare to put that question, you understand? So they have built a tremendous superstructure.

Dr K. I do very much want to dare. Is there a way to dare?

UG. Is there a way to dare?

Dr K. Dare.

UG. Dare. You see, the question itself has that inherent capacity.

Dr K. To?

UG. To find out the answer for it. You see, if it has no answer, the question cannot stay there. You are waiting for an answer, either from outside or from inside. When both these areas prove to be of no use at all, then what happens to that question?

Dr K. If I am...

UG. You see, the rejection is not because I do not agree with the statements of others or experiences of others, but it is not valid, as far as I am concerned.

Q: Right.

UG. So, you see, it may be true, but it is not valid, so reject them all. All outside, you see, help, is finished for me.

Dr K. Are you left with anything?

UG. No. That is the most important thing. When that goes, there is no helplessness here at all. They are so dependent. They are linked together. You cannot really separate them.

Dr K. Is it possible for a person who wants to move in this direction, or is at least attempting to, to learn something from somebody else's life experience, or not at all?

Q2: Yes, I thought as much.

UG. That is our misery. That is the tragedy of mankind. We have created models, and we imitate the lives of those saints, or whatever—we do not imitate the lives of saints, but now some of those politicians, or movie stars, something else.

Dr K. Then actually this conversation has no business, is there?

UG. For me, that is why I do not get up on a platform and talk; if somebody comes, I talk about it.

Dr K. Because often I find that when I go and talk to people, after a couple of moments I do not want to ask any more questions, because you are left at that level. All that questioning becomes a game then, isn't it? It is a game.

UG. It is a play.

Dr K. It is a pleasure. It is nice knowing you.

UG. My life is worthless for anybody. What I say has no meaning to you. So how can there be any communication? Communication is not at all possible.

Dr K. All right. Is it possible to be happy?

UG. That is another thing.

Dr K. Is it possible?

UG. People ask me several times, are you happy, they ask me, you must be very happy. That question sounds very funny to me, because I never ask myself that question. I never ask, am I happy or...

Dr K. You just be.

UG. I don't know, the question doesn't at all arise here inside of me. I don't even know what happiness is.

Dr K. That means obviously emotions do not come to your consciousness.

UG. The emotions are not there anymore. What is emotion?

Dr K. Why do you laugh?

UG. No. Why do I laugh? It is not an emotion. You, as a psychologist, know.

Dr K. Are you pretending?

UG. No, no. That is also part of the expression. The laughter is because of the absurdity of the question. I am not telling you that the question is your question.

Dr K. No, I understand.

UG. What an idiotic question. And the answer is that smile, or noise, whatever you want to call it.

Not because I feel superior or any such thing, or it is an emotion, but what an idiotic question. And so you laugh at yourself. Why are you asking this question, what is happiness, are you happy?

Dr K. Supposing somebody tries to hit you, will you be afraid?

UG. It is a hypothetical situation; probably I will hit him back. I don't know; I don't preach non-violence. So probably I don't know.

Dr K. Come on, you must have had some experience and somebody is attacking you.

UG. Look here, the problem is that you want to be prepared for every situation.

Dr K. And you shouldn't be.

UG. I don't say you shouldn't be.

Dr K. You can't be.

UG. You can't be. (everybody laughs)

Q2. You see, Dr. Kapoor, I asked in the beginning itself, after a certain stage or whatever you call the experience stage or transformation stage, now he has reached a stage where he understands oneness. That is what he said yesterday. What is the stage we have now?

UG. You see, for example, look here, I am sorry, you go ahead.

Q2. See, as Dr. Kapoor said, somebody hits you, will you tolerate?

Q1. Mr. Krishnamurti said, I may hit him back.

Dr K. That is not my question. Do you feel a feeling of fear? Do you feel afraid at times?

UG. You see, look here, there are certain... You see, there is such a thing as physical fear. You see, that fear is very essential for the protection of the physical organism.

Dr K. Right.

UG. That's very important.

Dr K. Otherwise we will be dead.

UG. Otherwise, you see, so it knows what to do in a particular situation. So we don't have to think about it.

Q: There is no preparation.

UG. There is no preparation. If there is a snake, you step back. And then finish, you see, you walk away. You don't think about it.

Dr K. Physiologically.?

UG. Physiological protection, as I said yesterday, is all that this physical organism is interested in.

Dr K. Right.

UG. Nothing else.

Dr K. But what happens?

UG. So look here, but this structure, which is always thinking of every possible situation, envisaging every situation, how to be prepared to deal with all and every kind of situation that might arise during the course of your life, is a thing that has no meaning because every situation is quite different.

Dr K. So one should not think...

UG. I'll give you an example I have already given, even at the risk of repetition, I will tell you. You see, we go to Detroit where they make cars. They have a library, bigger than this room. And they have envisaged every possible accident that might happen. Volumes and volumes have been written on the subject of accidents, and they have made it possible for the cars to avoid, you see. So every time an accident takes place, they are amazed that it is quite different and that it has no parallel anywhere in the encyclopedic material they have gathered. See, the accidents that happened in the past and all the accidents that they have envisaged through their imagination. There are so many factors there. That is why you call it an accident. You can explain it afterwards and say it's because of this, that, or the other. You may be a very careful driver, but somebody behind you is a crackpot.

He's interested in driving fast, you see. He has this drive to kill himself and kill everybody, maybe. So you can't be always prepared for every situation to meet every challenge. The life, you see, guides you. I don't want to use the word life, because this organism is interested in protecting itself, and it knows what is good. It is not one, you see, but there are so many senses operating here. When I go out for a walk, I tell my friend, please, for goodness' sake, look, don't think. You don't have to think, just use your eyes and your ears. They will guide you. You are walking, suddenly, you see, there is a light there. The red light there tells you that you have to stop because there is a sudden change there. You don't have to think. A minute ago it was green, and suddenly, you see, there is a change of light, red. So, you see, then that tells you, the knowledge that you have in the background tells you that you should stop. You see, if the eyes are looking at something, the ears are listening to the sound, they measure everything. This is an extraordinary computer machine that you have there. It is self-correcting.

Dr K. With a redundant function of thinking, unnecessary.

UG. Thinking is unnecessary except to communicate, to communicate with somebody. Why do I have to communicate with myself all the time? What for? I am happy, I am unhappy, I am miserable. That is a microphone, that is a man, you see, this is something. Why do I have to do it?

Dr K. That is the fault in this machine then.

UG. That is the way it is operating now.

Dr K. But is this a necessary function or not? Talking to yourself, I mean.

UG. Talking to yourself is not necessary. Why are we doing it is the question. That is for you to correct it if you are a psychiatrist. So, you see, everybody is talking to himself. Only when you begin to talk aloud, you put him there. Even the man who is putting you there is talking to himself all the time. What for?

Dr K. Yes, but I think you are suggesting that it is a... and I am agreeing with you, that it is a very...

UG. As long as...

Dr K. ...effort-consuming and tiring sort of thing to do. It is not necessary.

UG. It is wearing you out.

Dr K. It is wearing us out. So then naturally one seeks methods not to do it.

UG. And all the methods that we use are adding more and more to that, unfortunately. All techniques, all systems are adding to that.

Dr K. So either you can do it or you can't do it.

UG. No, you see, there isn't anything that you can do through thinking.

Dr K. All right, then how do you do it?

UG. All right, how not to think is your question. How not to think is your question. So, do you know what that question implies?

Dr K. I think I know.

UG. Yes, you want some way, some method, some system, some technique.

Dr K. I don't know, I just don't want to say.

UG. Then you will still continue to think.

Dr K. I don't want to think. If my question is wrong, perhaps you could suggest a better question.

UG. I am not so sure that you do not want to think. If you come to a point where you say to yourself, I am fed up with this kind of thing..

Dr K. Do you just have to reach that point of absolute...

UG. Nobody can push you there. Nobody can push you there.

Dr K. That's what I meant, either you can do it or you can't do it.

UG. You can't do it. Then you see, even then you will find that you can't do it.

Dr K. Either you will do it or will not do it. I think a better word than *can*, maybe, because *can* again implies something. You have done it.

UG. No, you see, it is there when there is a demand for it. You don't know if it is there or it is not there when there is no demand for it. I am not making mystifying statements. I am not concerned about whether it is there or not. But when there is a need for it, when there is a demand for it, it is there for your help all the time, to guide you and to help you to communicate with somebody. So what decides that demand is not here; it is out there. The situation demands the use of that. It is not self-initiated.

Dr K. Right, got it. But like all of us, you must have passed through a brainwashing procedure in childhood.

UG. Even before I was born, probably.

Dr K. Pardon?

UG. My heredity, the whole thing is there.

Dr K. Yes, so that brainwashing is there. Obviously, you are suggesting at least—I don't know whether you are saying it—but that you have been able to get out of it. We would like to do that.

UG. Everything I did to get out of that situation failed. Everything I did, because that is adding momentum to this mischief-maker. It is giving continuity to that. Being, becoming—all that stuff that the Vedantins discuss everlastingly—is an absurd thing because the very movement in the direction of wanting to *be* is a becoming process. Whether you move in this direction or in that direction, it is the same. To be yourself, all right, it's a marvelous thing. To *be* implies that there is something to do. I was telling these friends, you must get rid of adjectives, adverbs, and verbs too, in the language.

Q1. You haven't done that.

UG. You are bringing out all this stuff from me; otherwise, I don't... These are not my questions. I never ask myself any of those questions, except the questions like, where is the baker, you know. That's all I'm interested in—the basic needs: food, clothing, and shelter. And one thing—even sex, you see. The moment you move one step further, you see the whole problem.

Q1. Is there?

UG. Yes, certainly, there is a division. I'm not saying anything against that, you see. The basic needs: food, clothing, and shelter. So I need to ask these questions. Where can I get my bread? How can I get the money to buy my bread? That's an example I'm saying, you see. That's all. I have no other questions.

Q1. But if this...

UG. Because there's no time for me to ask those questions. Where is the time? It's not that I'm living from moment to moment; all that, you see, is a...

Dr K. You wouldn't have been wearing these clothes if people hadn't asked this question.

UG. Do you want me to walk naked in the streets?

Dr K. No, no, You wouldn't have been wearing these clothes If some people before hadn't asked those questions.

UG. Look here, you see, that is all right, I agree. You see, you have to imitate certain things. There is some kind of an imitation, you see. If I see a nice hairstyle, I imitate it. What's wrong with it? Nothing wrong. So here I come and wear these comfortable clothes. When I go to the West, I wear Western clothes—not the tie and all that kind of stuff—because I don't go to see anybody. Very casual dress. So why do I wear clothes? It's not my question, you see. What do I prove by walking naked in the streets? Can I prove that I have no body consciousness? That to me has no meaning. He's such a man, you see, he's a sick man. There is some neurological disorder in him who feels the separation of body. You know that, I don't have to tell you. It doesn't mean anything.

Q1. Do we come to the conclusion that we are all neurotic in a way?

UG. Yes, every one of us, automatically.

Q1. If you say that we are neurotic...

UG. We love it, we love it. We love that.

Q1. Perhaps some people.

UG. You don't, eh?

Q1. But I would like to ask, when you said that you can't prepare yourself for different situations, why is it that in one particular situation, a person reacts with love and affection, and in the same circumstances, when it happens to some other person, he's violent and he tries to retaliate? Now why this change of what you call the reaction which is taking place?

UG. Because you are interested in what is good for you.

Q1. I beg your pardon

UG. You are interested in what is good for you.

Q1. You mean in the commercial way?

UG. No, in every way.

Q1. So good—if you divide good...

UG. What is a good man good for in this world? You feel good.

Q1. No, but...

UG. Sure, you see, you do good because you feel good. I'm not suggesting that you should not do good or any such thing.

Q1. No, but then if you say that it is good or bad, that means you are presupposing a place where you like to be, isn't it?

UG. I'm not with you, please.

Q1. No, I like to say that if we know what is good...

UG. I don't know what is good; I know only what is good for me. I'm not talking about myself. You know what is good for you. That's all. So you see, that's all that you are interested in.

Q1. Yes, personally.

UG. That's a fact.

Q1. Personally, yes.

UG. That's a fact, you see. So everything is around that.

Q1. Yes.

UG. So that's all, you see. All your altruism centers around that. I'm not cynical, that's a fact.

Q1. Yes, no, I agree. But what I mean to say is...

UG. Nothing wrong with it, I'm not saying anything against it.

Q1. What I mean to say is that suppose our reactions are different at different times, and sometimes the society as a whole, you appreciate the reaction of certain people in certain ways, whereas you don't appreciate the other thing. So when you take it in a group, then what do you say to that group?

UG. I'm not still... Can you explain that to me? It's not a...

Q2. You're not being clear my dear friend.

Q1. What I mean to say is that it is good for me, I understand...

UG. That's all. When that is very clearly understood, the rest of the explanation is not necessary. The situation changes; it is this that is guiding you through all the situations. I'm not saying it is wrong, you see. If it is not so, something must be wrong with you.

Dr Desiraju. That's a little communication gap. He has to understand this level of thinking.

UG. As long as you operate in the field of what they call the pair of opposites—good and bad—you will always be choosy, always choosy in your... in every situation. That's all. You can't help but do that.

Q1. When you are alone, for yourself, do you think anything or you don't think anything? Or is it possible for you to communicate to me what is your state of mind

UG. Say that again.

Q1. When are you for yourself, alone?

UG. I'm always alone, all alone. There is no attempt on my part to establish any relation of any kind with anything.

Q1. In that state, do you think anything about anything, or you don't think about anything at all? Or what is the state of mind you can communicate or describe that state of mind?

UG. See, the moment I try to communicate something, that is gone—the state of aloneness. It's only a shadow of it, you see. That's not it.

Q1. So it's a non-communicable experience?

UG. No, it cannot be experienced. You cannot communicate what you cannot experience. I don't want to use those words, because inexpressible, incommunicable—those words imply that there is something which cannot be communicated, which cannot be expressed. I don't know, there is an assumption that there is something there which cannot be expressed, which cannot be communicated. So there is nothing there. I don't want to say there is nothing there because it will catch me. Emptiness, void, and all that sort of thing, no.

Q1. I can put my question in another way.

UG. I can only put it that way. Whatever is there cannot be... If there is anything there I don't know. I have no way of knowing it at all. And to put it in your own Vedantic terminology, there is no such thing as the unknown at all. Because whatever you know of what is called unknown is not the unknown.

Q1. Say it again, sir

UG. If there is any such thing as unknown, I really don't know. So whatever you know of that unknown, whatever you experience of what you call unknown, is not unknown because it has become part of your knowledge.

Q1. I am alone.

UG. How can you be alone? There are two things going on; you have a companion there, talking to yourself, so you are not alone.

Q1. At Least physically alone. Mentally I may be in a crowd.

UG. Even in a crowd, you see, are you in contact with the others around you? You are always alone. You live in a world of your own.

Q1. So I am alone at the same time and

UG. No, you say... The problem is that, you see, you are all alone, you want to get out of that

loneliness of yours and establish relationships. So that is the cause of your sorrow; that is your pain. You cannot really establish any relationship with anything. There is always a friction. Or if the relationship is based on a simple convenience, it's all right—you gratify me, I gratify you, that's the end of it. It's very simple, you see. It's not that simple, of course, but it takes you into all kinds of funny situations. Now, you can't be interested in this. How can you be interested?

Q1: Very much. Because we are keeping quiet... very much, otherwise no one would come and sit here.

UG. Does it make sense to you? Why, because it fits into something or the framework you have?

Q1: It's a very good question.

UG. No, no, I am just asking. It's a very sincere question, a very honest question, you know. Why? Why do you accept this?

Q1. Silence is the answer

Q1. We find it interesting because we hear something which we have never heard before.

UG. That's not true. That's not true. Even if you have not heard this before...

Q1. It's something new to us.

UG. No, no, you call it new.

Q1. We already know it.

UG. You know it, otherwise it is just noise, like the barking of a dog or the howling of a jackal; it's not different from that. You make sense out of what I am talking about. It's just noise. Not only the language part, but what you are abstracting out of this in terms of your conceptual thinking.

Q. But I think it stimulates conceptual thinking.

UG. Stimulates, I know. Yes, you are stimulated by me, oh my God!

Q1. So that's why we have a talk here. I keep on thinking about it for hours. I can't just get over it.

UG. Have I come to the end?

Dr Desiraju. No, yesterday... It was all very illuminating. All this has been covered yesterday.

UG. I can only repeat it.

Dr Desiraju. Therefore I really have no question now to ask.

UG. I don't know what you are looking for, I can't be of much help to you. May I ask you a question?

Dr Desiraju. Yes, please.

UG. What according to you is a normal man? Is there one? You have to, of course, you see, divide

people. And you have certain psychological norms or philosophical... or a healthy man. What is health? I sometimes wonder, what is health? Who is a normal man? Not that I have an answer...

Q2. This is the biggest question that has been bothering everybody. Because till now it was a statistical norm. That's what we discussed last time. But we all feel that statistical norms depend on the similarities. Whereas yesterday we were discussing the uniqueness. So I think a healthy person is the most unique person. I don't know. I am just saying it to you. Because you can't put it on a comparative basis.

Dr Desiraju. They are different, as you know. I mean, since you asked a question, that is one way.

There is probably no answer to this. I am now trying to speak in an ordinary language, not in that high plane, the truthful plane you are trying to put.

UG. No, I speak in basic language, not technical, not philosophical.

Dr Desiraju. The word *norm* is, of course, set by each society. Now we have to go into the antithesis of the whole concept which we have been talking about. You all the time want to be with others, not alone, of course. Therefore you make certain compromises. I need not talk to you about all this. So I am now thinking, that is the only definition I have, the universal axiom. I need not fill the rest up. Probably you understood what I was saying. That is one side of the story. The other side, *normal*, is the one which we have been thinking of, suggesting. Please don't bother with the semantics. The other side of it, being alone, let us say. That is the other norm. Dr. Meyers has put it as that unique, that is the other side. Well, as members, when you are working, in others we honor—to me personally, I have value in both. The reason is, as long as I am in a society, as long as I have chosen to be in that society, I have to choose this norm. The second norm, this is good so much, I do this, this, morals, I do those and don'ts, etc. And then that is a mental side point, and the physical side, things like that. But when I am alone, or try to be alone—alone not in the absolute sense I am talking—then we all, at least ordinary human beings, would like to revert back to this duality, to try to reach that aloneness. Well, you have explained, thinking to reach aloneness in fact will not lead them. Okay, that is not... But that thinking is there, that is what I mean.

UG. But even such a man, the extraordinary man as opposed to your ordinary man, has to live here in this society. He can't run away and live in a cave and meditate.

Dr Desiraju. That's why you have said he would have to have this, etc.

UG. No, no, not only that. He is not in conflict with this society at all. He accepts the reality of the world, although it is so unreal, and functions in the world, accepting the reality as accepted by everybody. Very important. I can't go and sit in a cave and meditate on *Brahman* and say to myself, *I*

am Brahman. This is the only reality for such a man, and there is no other reality. The ultimate reality is bosh, nonsense. It doesn't exist; it is a myth. So this is the only reality. What other reality is there? So as long as you are thinking the thoughts of the society, as long as you are feeling the feelings of the society, you are part of that society.

Dr Desiraju. Also as long as you are thinking of yourself to be alone.

UG. Because you have no such thing as your own thoughts, your own experiences, your own feelings—you don't have. So you can't run away from society.

Dr Desiraju. But sir, you have explained yesterday in a very succinct way the whole process, which is different from what you are mentioning now. Different means... You... If somebody stops thinking of this normal, what is normal, and so on, maybe even that is difficult. It has to dawn on a person, I don't know.

UG. It has to operate in a natural way. Natural way.

Dr Desiraju. Yes. I mean, I can't repeat all that you have said. I mean, we had another set of whole answers for your question, which we got yesterday—don't drive me...

UG. No, no, no.

Dr Desiraju. What I am answering is only what everyone's thinking.

UG. It's quite clear.

Dr Desiraju. That's why I didn't put a question today. I could at least understand something. And to me, this is a new way of thinking, which I hadn't been exposed to earlier.

UG. There is no religious content to what I am talking about.

Dr Desiraju. No, this is man, the phenomenon of man, it is concerning. Phenomenon of life, universe, actually. I mean, we went much more yesterday. It's not that, you see. I think... Anyway, I think they must be bored

UG. No, no, no, no. They are here to listen.

Q1: Shall I put that question back to you, Mr. UG? Who is a normal man according to you?

UG. There is no such thing as a normal man to me. They are experts on the subject. That's why I wanted to know what according to them.. When I look at these so-called insane people, I wonder, are they insane? Are those who are treating them insane? I was telling them the joke. She told me about some chap in a loony bin. He said, *I am Jesus Christ*. Oh my God! His friend, another inmate, said, *I know you are not. How the hell do you know I am not Jesus? I am the eternal father. I have created you, so I should know you*. Like that, here also, when I see all these people, you know, sitting there, *Aham Brahmasmi, aham asmi so'ham, I am that* What is this nonsense?

Q1. Is it not a play of their own life, sir?

UG. I am not against any of those things.

Dr Desiraju. See, this word *normal*, that definition cannot be put to him because he has explained in a way the whole process of... He put that question, then why he had to get away from that question, etc., etc. That question is for us, in a way. Am I right, sir? You wouldn't ask that question to yourself, *Am I normal?* That's why that doesn't apply to you.

UG. Out of curiosity. Sometimes the only thing I read is *Time* magazine. I read all this stuff. Why do you read *Time* magazine? I am living in this world, I would like to know what is happening in this world. Why not? I don't read anything else. All other books tell me how to improve myself, how to change myself, how to be this, how to be that. I don't want to be anything, other than what I am. So I have no interest in any of those books. Some people ask me, why do you read crime fiction? There is a lot of action there, you see. That's the only thing. If at all I see a movie, I see a cowboy movie. You see, there is a lot of movement there. If I watch television, I watch only commercials. You were asking something..

Q1: It reminded me, In Ramanashram, somebody asked a question, when your knowledge of ..., why are you reading the Hindu paper? He said, *Jagatulo yem jarugutunnadho, paper lo mallii adey choostam. agatu yemi jarugutunnadho*, in the world, what is happening, it is printed in the paper, what is harm in reading?

UG. Yes, that is also affecting you in a way, you see. You are part of this world, you see, you are affected by that. You are not involved, but you are affected. There is a difference between your involvement and allowing yourself to be affected, as you said, All the windows are open, it doesn't matter—cold, wind, this, that, anything can come.

Q1. It doesn't bother you.

UG. No. But you see, we have very strange ideas, in our religious field, that you see, you must torture this body, deny things, control, all kinds of funny things, sleep on the nails. What for? Why deny certain things? I don't know.

Q1. A batch of people do that sir. *Few do bhajan, a few do kirtan, a few say namasmaran, a few just keep quiet*, as you are telling, you are keeping quiet.

UG. To keep yourself out of mischief. No, I don't mean you; it's different..What is the difference between a man who goes to a bar and has a glass of beer, or the man who goes to a temple and repeats *Ram Nam?* I don't see any difference. Probably that is anti-social, they don't think that is anti-social, nevertheless. Here we think it is. So, these are all escapes. I am not against escape,

whether you escape to this avenue or that avenue, escape is an escape. You are escaping from yourself, you see.