

107-Doctors Talk-1-UG WITH VARMA,MURTHY,22ND DEC 1976,PART-1

Q. Recently the Government of India, the Government of Karnataka and Dr. Varma has launched a project called Project Consciousness.

UG. What is it called? Project Consciousness!

Q. Just to understand what different levels are there, with the help of gadgets and technicians and psychologists, how much we can go and beyond that if there is how to get them, with the help of people who are exploring those fields?

UG. First of all, it is necessary for us to understand what exactly we mean by consciousness. That is a very important question. We have lots of definitions. You suggested that there are levels of consciousness. And to me, there are no levels of consciousness at all. I can tell you what exactly I mean by consciousness. When do we become conscious of objects outside and the feelings inside of us? These are the two things. What separates the inside and outside is also a very important question. When I use the word conscious, I use it as a synonymous term for thinking. So there is an object here. When do I become conscious of this object here? Only when the knowledge I have about that object comes in and translates the sensations that it is sending out, then only I become conscious of that object. So what creates the centre or point here is the knowledge that I have about this. That is all I know about it. I don't know anything about it. But there is an area where you are neither conscious nor unconscious of the object. For all practical purposes, I really don't know anything about the unconscious. So what all I know is how I am conscious of things. So I become conscious of things out there and conscious of things inside of me only through this process of what we call thinking. And the knowledge we have of the objects out there and the feelings inside, it supplies the grist for the mill, as it were. Otherwise there is no thinking at all. I don't want to give a talk. Can you help me? I really can't give you... I want to make it very important.

Q1. No, this is not an exchange of ideas.

Q2. No, because he said, really an exploration.

UG. I understand, but I must make my position very clear. To me there is no such thing as mind at all. If there is a mind it cannot be separated from the body. Mind and body go together. And there is no self also. There is no I, there is no centre here. So what creates the centre is the knowledge. I have explained to you since you are all familiar with the physiological knowledge. There must be light here. When there is a light, the reflection stimulates the optic nerve and it throws the image on the retina. This is the physiological explanation. But if I want to directly, I have to use the word directly, that does not mean that there is another way. For want of a more adequate word I use

directly, I have no way of directly experiencing this object except through the knowledge I have about it. So it is the knowledge that creates the space between whatever is the point here and the object there. So in that sense thought creates space. If there is no thought there is no space. I don't know if I am making a clear statement. So I must have knowledge about these things. But, as I said at the beginning, there is an area where you are neither conscious nor unconscious. There is no such thing as the unconscious at all. And whatever I know is only on the conscious level. So anything I say about the unconscious is a speculation. But there is something, a physiological response. And that is the area where you are neither conscious of the object nor unconscious of the object, but there is something, which is a pure and simple sensory activity. And it is also not possible for me to separate myself from the sensation, because the thought is absent at that time. , the thought must come. Even if I say to myself that it is a pure sensation, it is a translation of that sensation in terms of my past knowledge and past experience. So there is no such thing as a new experience at all. So I have no way of knowing anything about this object except through the knowledge and that the knowledge is put in, say, by the society or whatever you want to call it.

Q1. Excuse me, sir, but you are aware that there is an object there.

UG. No, the word *aware* is also a loaded word. To me it is a rubbed coin. I don't know what exactly you mean by the word *aware*. So if you want to use the word aware, it is a state of being *aware*. So then there is nobody who is aware of that object. I don't like to use the word aware at all. So what is it that is looking at this? In physiological terms, there is only a reflection of this object on the retina. And the knowledge is totally absent, otherwise it cannot remain just as a reflection of the object on the retina, because it is just a mirror reflecting things. What it is, I don't know and I have no way of knowing it at all, I have no way of experiencing it. Unless I have the knowledge about it, I can't abstract something from that and experience it. So in that awareness, if you want to use the word, these things are happening. That is the pure sensory activity, a pure and simple stimulant and response, I don't know if I... It cannot be separated there. So stimulus and response is one movement, they cannot be separated. If you want to call that state of being, awareness, I have no objection. But you have... you cannot separate yourself from that awareness and say that you are aware of that object without the interference of the knowledge.

Q. That's perfect.

UG. There is no... there is no divisive movement in that awareness. And what creates the divisive movement is the knowledge you have about that person. For purposes of communication I can use the word thought. But it is also not possible for you to know anything about the thought. See, how

does that thought originate, where does it come from, you have really no way of knowing it at all. See, if you really want to know and look at that thought, just the way you are looking at this object, it is not possible for you because it is one thought that is looking at another thought. So it is a very tricky business, you know, it is one movement and what is looking at what you call thought is all the definitions you have about thought. I say thought is matter, thought is space, thought is time. So where from does that thought come, is it there inside or outside? So for purposes of communication or just to give a feel about the whole thing I say there is a thought sphere, you know. So in that thought sphere we are all functioning and each one of us probably has an antenna or, what do you call this, aerial or something, which is the creation of the culture in which we are born. , it is that that is picking up these particular thoughts. But it will be impossible for you to, I can't make such an emphatic statement, but you have no way of finding out for yourself the seat of human consciousness at all because it is all over and you are not separate from that consciousness. So all the experiments that they are doing and wasting millions and millions of dollars just to find out the seat of human consciousness, they will never be able to find out a thought. I am not making a dogmatic statement or any such thing.

Q. I want another question out of that.

UG. You are a very intelligent man, scientists.

Q. This is quite right. There is a certain capability of this picking up from the antenna. Now, without knowing what exactly is behind it, are there ranges of this capability and how to expand it for divination?

UG. To me I am not interested in expanding consciousness at all. It is an experience, you know.

Q. How to get increased capability?

UG. What for do you want to increase it?

Q. Sometimes our capability is very limited.

UG. Yes. So here, I accept the limitations as a fact, you know. I am, to use your scientific term, genetically speaking, limited in my capacities. So anything I do to expand this, in order to experience the expanding consciousness...

Q. No, to get new knowledge and experience.

UG. , I think the capacity of the individual is very limited. It is pre... I don't know how to say...

Q. Pre-determined.

UG. Pre-genetically determined, that's the word.

Q. But we feel that even the genetic potentiality, we are using only a fraction of it. Even what is

given.

UG. Just a fraction. That is my contention. I don't want to use the word contention. , for some reason or the other, the culture has limited the possibility of, the potential evolving itself into its completeness and wholeness, if I may use that word. So somewhere along the line, probably thought was necessary, but it has become the enemy of man now. It has become the enemy of man because the evolutionary, if there is any such thing as an evolutionary process, I don't know, I can't make any definitive statement, but there seems to be something like that. And the potential, of this evolutionary progress is thwarted by culture, because the culture has created a perfect man, a religious man, a true gentleman, a true guru, and so on and so on and so on, and that is, quite the opposite of what is inherent here and what that inherent quality or whatever it is you want to call it, I call it a personality, and I use the word personality in quite a different sense from the sense in which the psychologists use the word. Every human being has a unique personality of his own, and that is trying to express itself. And the culture has created what is called, a moral man, the character building, is in the interest of the continuity of the society. So the character building mechanism has suppressed and thwarted what is there inside. It is in that sense I use the word personality. So there is nobody like you anywhere in this world amongst the four billion people that we have.

Q. It's highly specific.

UG. It is highly, physiologically speaking, it is an extraordinary piece of creation by the evolutionary process. So I say that every individual is unique. Whatever is there is trying to express itself and to flower itself into a human being . So the human being has lost all the animal instincts and he has not developed the human instincts. All these people talk of this like psychic powers, clairvoyance, clairaudience, they are all human instincts. And they are necessary because there are two things that the human organism is interested in. And one, it's survival, at any cost. Why should it survive? I don't know. It's a foolish question to ask. That's one of the most important things. It has a survival mechanism of its own which is quite different from the survival mechanism of the movement of thought. And the second thing is to reproduce itself. It has to reproduce. These are the two fundamental characteristics of the human organism, the living organism. So the culture has made it impossible for this to express itself in its own way because it has different ideas. It has created a neurotic state . It has created this divisive movement. That divisive movement has got to come to an end if this whatever is there to express itself and to become into a flower.

Q. How to? That is the point.

UG. Because that possibility is part of that human mechanism. It is built in there. And so this

divisive movement, this neurotic condition of man has got to come to an end. But is there anything that we can do? That is the question. Is there anything that we can do?

Q. How to go beyond this neurotic state?

UG. The problem is anything you do, any movement in any direction on any level is giving continuity to itself. , the structure of thought, I would put it, the structure of thought. The separation between mind and body must come to an end. See, actually there is no separation. I have no objection to the word mind. It is not in one particular location or area, but every cell in your system has a mind of its own, quite different from the functioning or the workings of other cells. So the whole chemistry of the body has to change. , it has to undergo a sort of alchemy, if I may put it that way. Luckily, fortunately, there are certain... This is what I have discovered for myself . You can accept it, reject it, do what you like with it. There are certain areas in the human organism which are outside the control of thought. They are the glands, what you call the ductless glands.

Q. Fortunately.

UG. Fortunately. Fortunately and luckily, otherwise man is finished. The day you control them, that's the end of man . He will lose everything . He will become just...He's already a nut and a bolt in the social structure. What little freedom or what freedom he can have or what little opportunities there are for this personality to express itself, they will be lost. So they are outside the control of this thought.

Q. They are such glands?

UG. such glands I call them. And the Hindus call them chakras. They are located in exactly the same spots where they speculated about it. It's not in the psychic body. There is no such thing as the psychic body, causal body.

Q. Sir, it is speculated.

UG. Speculated, they must have had some experiences, what you call them ductless glands. Tremendous amount of money they are spending, a lot of research is going on to find out why they are, what the function of those glands are, pituitary glands, pineal gland, thymus gland and so on and so forth.

Q. With chakras you are saying...

UG. I don't want to use the word chakras. I want to use the word Hindus called them chakras.

Q. That is absolutely loaded. This is loaded.

UG. The moment we use the word chakras, we get into... the glands I would call them.

Q. Ductless.

UG. The ductless glands I call them. They are located in exactly the places or the spots where the Hindus speculated.

Q. Do they correspond to the anatomical location of the glands or probably they may be more...

UG. No, no, no, no, exactly, exactly the same.

Q. Oh, exactly the same.

UG. Exactly the same spot where they are. So they are outside, unless they are activated, the chances of human beings flowering into themselves..., the whole thing is lost. I can't say there is any such thing as an evolutionary process. There seems to be... there is such an evolutionary process and what its purpose is I don't know. But it seems to be trying to create something, what its nature...So this is incomplete. Man remains incomplete unless the whole of this human organism flowers into something like a flower. I don't want to use the word flower because it has mystical tones.

Q. That is the actualization of the...

UG. Actualization. And what prevents that is the culture. The whole thing must go out of it. It's not out there. I'm not suggesting the book burning or tearing down the temples or...

Q. But the inherent power is there to recover.

UG. That is you . The society is here inside, the culture is here inside and not outside. And that culture is part of this human consciousness. It is not something... So everything that every man experienced and felt before you is part of that consciousness. But one question for which we don't have any adequate answer is how is this transmitted from one generation to another generation. It is really a mystery. All the experiences, not necessarily your experiences during the span of 30, 40, 50 years of life, but the animal consciousness, the plant consciousness, the bird consciousness, not that there is an entity which reincarnates. There is no entity here, so the whole business of reincarnation is absurd. That's what I'm concerned. So, but , all that is part of this consciousness. That is why, in your dreams, you dream as if you are flying, like a bird, , and the sex fantasies man has, of the animal postures, the thousand and other Kamasutras, of Vatsyayana. So, so all that is, part of that consciousness which is transmitted

from generation to generation. How it is transmitted, I don't know, I can't say, because I'm not competent enough to say. But, this seems to be the means, there must be some means of...

Q. Much more than genetic.

UG. Much more than genetic. Genetic is only part of it, part of it, but consciousness is a very powerful factor in experiencing things. The whole thing, the whole thing, but the content of which is not possible for anybody to find out. It is impossible , it is too vast, you know.

Q. Now, how to facilitate this glandular function which highlights the specificity of the...

UG. I have one thing against medical technology. I have discussed with many doctors and psychologists and psychiatrists, they come to see me out of curiosity.

Q. It's a limited model.

UG. It's a limited model, but the very desire to understand a human being is to control. , that is why I'm not quite in sympathy. , the day you control the endocrine gland, you will change

Q. That is where we have been using...

UG. You don't need any brainwashing. Brainwashing is a very elaborate process, you know.

Q. But how to get this spontaneity out, not with a view to control, but to tune into...

UG. If nature had been allowed to go on in its own way, everybody would have become a unique flower.

Q. Yes, sir.

UG. Why should there be only roses in this world? What for? A grass flower or a dandelion flower has as much beauty, as much importance in the scheme of things. Why should we all have jasmine flowers or roses or some other nice flowers?

Q. I think thought is a product of and controlled by the culture and society.

UG. Culture, you see. So the hope is also there. The possibility of a sudden change taking place is not progressive. It has to happen, in a very sudden, and an explosive way to break the whole thing.

Q. In the individual?

UG. In the individual. This has no social content, as I see. It has no social content at all. It has no religious content. It has no mystical content. It has none of those things..

Q. Except probably it has an inductive effect. If it occurs in one focus...

UG. Maybe, it affects the whole of human consciousness and that is a speculation. I can't say anything about it. Anything I say would be in the area of speculation . But it is bound to have an effect. There is only one mind, not your mind or my mind. So there is only one mind, there is only one consciousness. Whatever happens here is bound to effect, but its effect will be very small.

Q. But how can we promote?

UG. You are coming back to it...

Q. Not to control, but to get this whole thing out.

UG. No, the whole motivation is there, is to change the whole thing. The *how* you are interested in implies change. You want to bring about...why do you want to understand?

I am not saying that you should not understand. The motivation behind your understanding is to bring about a change.. That is part of our culture. Culture demands...

Q. Probably the sufferings under the heavy impact of this culture of restriction.

UG. No, no, no.

Q. No, I am putting it as another question.

UG. But, there is a constant battle going on here. And the battle is between what is here trying to express itself in its own way. In its way, but the culture is preventing it. So is it possible or is there any way that you can rid yourself of, free yourself from this stranglehold hold of this culture? That is the question. Can you do it through any volition of yours? This is my question. Can we do it through any volition of it? You can't do a thing through any volition. So it has to happen. That is why I say it is acausal. It seems to have happened to some people during the course of history and each one has given expression to that uniqueness in his own way and that depends upon his background. It is an expression of that background. But today, this kind of thing is to happen to any individual, it is bound to happen because nature in its own way is throwing out from time to time, some flowers, the end product of human evolution. So the end product of human evolution cannot be used by this evolutionary process as a model to create another one. I don't know if I make sense. If it throws out one flower, that is it. You can't preserve it, you can't preserve the perfume of that because if you preserve that, it will stink. So the evolutionary progress or the movement, I don't know what is the word, the process or whatever word you want to use, is not interested in using the one that it has perfected as a model for further creation. It has a creation of its own. But the question you are asking is a very difficult question to answer, because it has no answer. The *how* has to go. Because the *how* implies that there is a way, that there is a method, that there is a technique, that there is something that you can do to bring about this total change in your chemistry or alchemy. That's the only way.

Q. Which defeats its purpose...

UG. So when you find yourself in a situation where there is no way of finding any answer to that question, that is the moment that something can happen, and that is the moment when the triggering apparatus that is there helps to trigger the whole thing. So when the question of *how*, freed from the desire to understand or to bring about a change, remains there, that is the thought. So the thought, thought after all is a vibration. So it has this built-in atomic structure, if I may use that word. Every thought, there is an atom embedded in that thought. So when it cannot move, cannot make any movement in any direction, something has got to happen to that thought. There is only



one thought. *How?*. The one question that this is interested in is, to throw the whole, the culture and this strangling influence of culture out. So that question is the only question that this organism has. Not as a word, not as a thought, but the whole of human organism is that one question. I don't know if I make myself clear. That is the one question which is throbbing, pulsating, in every cell in the very marrow of your bones, trying to free itself from this stranglehold. So that is the one question, the one thought. That is the saviour. That question which finds that it has no way of finding answer to that, that it is impossible for that question to do anything, so there it explodes, the atom. The explosion takes place. When it has no way to move, no space, then the explosion takes place. So that explosion is like the nuclear explosion. It is not one. So that breaks the continuity of thought. Actually there is no continuity of thought because the thoughts are disconnected, disjointed things. So something is linking up. What you call the *I* or the self or the centre, is an illusory one. I can say it is an illusory one because it is the knowledge you have of the self that creates the self. When you look at the self, the talk of self-knowledge, self-knowing, has no meaning to me. It is all within the framework of this knowledge. It is playing tricks with itself. So this continuity comes to an end and it falls into its natural state. Then it cannot link up. The linking gets broken. Once it is broken, it is finished. Then it is not once that the thought explodes. Every time that a thought arises there, it explodes. So it is like a nuclear reaction. So that shatters the whole body. It is not an easy thing. That is the end of this man. So it is such a shattering thing that it will blast every cell, every nerve in your body. I went through terrible physical torture at that moment. I didn't have any answer for that question. This question was like a question in a whirlpool. Suddenly the question stops. Not that you experience the explosion. You can't experience the explosion. But the after-effects of that, the fallout, is the thing that changes the whole chemistry of your body. Then the thought cannot link up any more. Then, the constant demand for experiencing things comes to an end.

Q. Then that was the time when you got the experience.

Q. That is not an experience. If it captures that experience, through that experience it gathers momentum

Q. But that explosion is not that which you call soul or I or whatever. All these things take place in mind or whatever. But all these processes we are witnessing, or somebody is witnessing, or something is witnessing. Isn't it?

UG. That somebody is finished there. The artificial, the illusory entity. The body has a functioning of its own. Then, even now, there is nobody who is feeling feelings there. There is nobody who is thinking thoughts there. There is nobody who is talking here. This is a pure and simple computer functioning automatically. The computer never asks the question as to how it is operating. It is your question and my question. It is not interested in trying to understand how this mechanism is operating. So all those questions which we have, as a result of our logical and rational thinking, have no validity any more. They have lost their importance. So the mechanism is functioning in an automatic way, but with an extraordinary intelligence of its own. You can't match the acquired intelligence with the extraordinary intelligence that is there. So it knows what is good for it. You don't call it divine, you don't call it. There is an extraordinary, tremendous intelligence which is guiding the mechanism of the human body and its interest is protection. Everything it does is to protect its continuity. That's all it is interested in. So then, the senses become very important factors. They begin to function at their peak capacity without the interference of thought, except when there is a demand for the thought. This is only for purposes of communication, otherwise it has no value. It has no value at all, only to communicate. So then you are guided by the senses and not by your thoughts, not by your thoughts any more. So all this talk of controlling the senses, is absolute rubbish. Then, they have a built-in mechanism of control. It's not something to be acquired. This talk of Yama and Niyama and all that is rubbish, but it has a self-controlling mechanism of its own. So you can try to control your *jihva*, they call it, the taste. But here you don't have to discipline yourself or control yourself, as long as this is one of the senses, the sense of taste, what you call. But actually it is not the sense of taste that plays a very important part, but the smell, the olfactory nerves. And they have, that is what they say, that the olfactory nerves have the capacity to sense four thousand nuances of smells and all that is finished for this. So the physical response I am talking about is a very simple response. There is, for example, the cow dung there, it irritates the olfactory nerves, that's all. But the knowledge you have about that and the dislike you have for that, is in the background, it does not come into operation. Because sensory activity is like lightning. And the thought is a sound, it is very slow. We imagine that the thought is very fast, but it is not. It is very slow, it is a sound. By the time the sound comes and interferes with it and tells you what it is, you have moved on from there to something else. So, there is, for example, a very expensive perfume. The physical response is only the irritation. Ofcourse, you know the value of that, later on it comes. The physical response is quite different from the reactions. I don't know if I am making sense. So in exactly the same way, the tongue, when you eat something, there is a contact with that. As long as

there is contact, the memory is there. So you want more and more and more. Once you swallow, the contact is lost, it is finished for you. You don't have to control anything. So there is no question of controlling your taste at all. It is a natural thing. Once the living contact is lost, there is no need for you to control or do anything. That is why it knows what is good for it. Suppose you give a glass of nitric acid. So the fumes bring the knowledge that is there behind, tells you that it is not good for you, so you reject it. You don't drink a glass of sulphuric acid or nitric acid. So this physical organism or human organism or whatever you want to call it, is guided by the sensory activity alone and not by thinking, not by mind at all.

Q. When you are speaking about awareness, you mentioned that it is because of the thought of the object we become aware of that object. Now, by this process of activating glands, we get rid of all that we follow as a consequence of explosions, etc. We come to a state when thought no longer guides us as a master, but as a slave to our sensory system.

UG. But when you are using it, you can write a beautiful piece of poetry or forge a cheque or do anything with that, so it is there when there is a demand for that. Here I must make one thing very clear. That is not self-initiated. It always comes into operation on demand, it depends upon the demands of the situation. There is a situation where the thought is necessary and so it is there, otherwise it is not there.

Q. Now, in this new situation, probably you mean, this is the new awareness, probably this is the new consciousness you aim at. Awareness earlier required thought, now awareness, or what word I use, in this sensory-dominant situation...

UG. What creates the limitation or puts the frontiers to the human consciousness is the thought. It is that that isolates. So when the isolating thing is not there, it is an endless, boundless, limitless thing. It has no limitation, it has no frontiers, so you have no way of understanding the content of that consciousness at all. So the experiencing structure that is interested in experiencing everything, and constantly demanding experiences, has come to an end there. It is not there. I don't want to say it has come to an end. It is not there any more.

Q. This is an extraordinary statement you have made.

UG. So, then the demand for permanence also has come to an end.

Q. May I?

UG. Yes, yes, please.

Q. In a way we are washing away everything in this process of explosion and new change. It is a way by which we can wash away all that we have learnt, our value system, our culture. We have washed

that away, or we wish to wash away and reach that type of consciousness where everything is of equal value or no value.

UG. No, the value system has come to an end. So it does not create any more new values. No more new values. But one thing you mustn't forget, the conditioning remains there forever. You will never be free from that conditioning. I have lived half my life in the West. So when somebody gives me the mango pickles, which I used to eat, or if there is a choice for me to choose from a number of items, automatically this goes to the one which I have always liked. So if that is not there, the next choice, the next best one I choose. So if any of those things that I have always wanted to eat are absent, there is no craving for them. Why is there no craving for them? Because there is no living contact. There is, for example, an apple there. So there is no linking of these senses. I don't know if I have made myself clear. The five senses are operating independently. There is no coordination between these five senses, except when there is a demand for one, two, or all the senses to be coordinated to function. It is necessary to coordinate. For example, you are talking. So the eyes are focused on your lips, the lips are moving. And you are talking, the sound is registered by some other mechanism. So there is no linking of these two. Somebody asks who is talking, immediately the answer comes, yes, it is Dr Verma. But most of the time there is no linking of these two activities. You play the tape recorder and there is no self-initiated action anymore here.

Q. Sir, I hope I am not...

UG. No, no, no.

UG. It is a pleasure to listen to you, sir. You mentioned that there is consciousness all over. All over means all over in the body, all over in all objects. All over including in the universe, in all objects, everything, cosmic or physical, whatever you like.

UG. I don't know. The question is how do I know that, is that what you are asking?

Q. So when we speak, this whole universe has a consciousness. Probably we are having that also in us because we are part of that.

UG. You are not separate from that. What separates you, what isolates you from that is your thought. So it creates an entity there and that entity is interested in experiencing the expanding consciousness. So that whatever experiences, that entity experiences called the expanding consciousness experiences are created by this one. So the drugs can give you. LSD does give you the... That is why they are all interested, all these boys in the West, you know. They have taken, now they have experienced something more to this consciousness. So that is why they are after all these religious people and they are exploiting them.

Q. Sir, then I am asking, reminding you of the very question you are trying to suggest to me. How do I know that consciousness is universal?

UG. You have no way of knowing that. You have no way of knowing. So you can't experience that, this experiencing structure has understood by itself that it cannot experience it. It's finished. The question does not at all arise any more. The question, what is it that is aware, does not also arise there. The question immediately burns itself. That is what I call it, ionisation of thought takes place. When the thought cannot stay there for long, something must happen to that thought and it burns itself. When it burns itself, what is there is the energy. Not the kinetic energy, not the animal energy, not the frictional energy that the thought creates. So what is there is the throb, the pulse and beat of life, which is consciousness. That's all that is there. So that has no beginning, that has no end.

Q. And no experience?

UG. That cannot be experienced. Because the thought is a dead structure and that is a living thing. A dead structure cannot make living things experience and make it part of that. So this gives up, not because of disgust or exhaustion or any such thing. It has understood that it cannot experience that at all. So then the demand for experiencing things, constantly, is not there. It is not there anymore. So then the demand for permanence also is finished.

Q. So final question.

UG. Why final?

Q. I feel I am taking...

UG. No, you are not talking. They are just listening.

Q. Sir, as an ordinary being I...

UG. I told you, you are not an ordinary being, you are an extraordinary person. There is no one like you, one without a second. You are one without a second that the Upanishads have talked about.

Q. You took words from my mouth. I was about to conclude with that actually. In other words, what you are saying and what little I could understand from your Upanishads seems to run very parallel. Am I right?

UG. That is for the professors to... It is not my concern. I am not interested whether they fit me into this, that or the other.

Q. You don't want to compare?

UG. I don't compare myself. I don't care. I have to use the word flower, this is not because of what you do or what you do not do that this kind of thing happens. That is why I use the word acausal. It has no cause. The structure that is interested in establishing the cause and effect relationship isn't

there anymore. The only thing that is left for this is survival, and that survival is limited. So it has a momentum of its own. When that is finished, it is gone. This cannot reproduce another thing physiologically or otherwise. That is why I say this is the end product of that human. There is no need for the reproduction of another one either as a flower or as another human being. That is why the whole chemistry of your body changes. The hormones change. You are neither a man nor a woman anymore.

Q. Should we wait for such an event which happened to each individual to transcend from this shackled level of man to that unshackled system, or is there any way by which we can help ourselves to unshackle?

UG. There isn't anything that you can do.

Q. I see.

UG. Not a thing. So anything you do will only give momentum to that. And make it impossible for the thing to...The positive and negative operate only in the field of thought. So it is neither positive nor negative. All movement in the direction of bringing about a change has to come to an end. So that cannot be done by you through any effort or volition.

Q. But my problem as a mundane person is to get funds from the government. We have to show we want to introduce a change and you suggest we should not try that.

UG. No, no. That's the situation.

Q. That's my predicament.

UG. No, it's not a predicament. That you have to do. There are so many mentally ill persons. So you have to help them. Whether they are insane or we are insane, I don't know.(everybody laughs). We have for some reason or the other established our psychological norms. So by that, they are mentally ill people and so they probably need help. I don't know. So if somebody comes with a psychological problem I tell them, go there, he is the person who can help you.

Q. But these great things of course we cannot give like a dose of medicine or a pill. It has to happen.

UG. It has to happen. It's a thing which you cannot through any effort or volition bring about. That's the problem. No, when this movement that is constantly demanding permanence through change, comes to an end then the other thing almost automatically takes place. They go together. The space between the cause and effect is not there so cause is the effect and the effect is the cause. When that situation is there, then it explodes.

Q. And you can't volitionally *prevent* that situation?

UG. No, you can't *prevent* that either. So it is written in your cells, if I may put it that way. So I don't see that... such a man has no use for society. Absolutely no use for society. And he cannot create another society. No, he will not. No, you wanted to ask something... They have come all the way. Q. Because you have spoken our language, sir. I didn't know this the first time. Right now I am writing a paper for a computer science thing. Right today I gave a picture, a photographic slide. This is the very sequence in which I have talked, presented. It's amazing how you have analysed the brain function.

Q2. Has he read the thoughts?

UG. No, no, there is no thought reading. There is nothing there to read. All that thought reading..

Q. Is there a common thought all over the world?

UG. There is no such thing as your thought or my thought. There are thoughts. So we, as I said, we are all functioning in the thought sphere. So we pick up certain thoughts. Just the way you pick up certain stations you are interested in. That's all. So what the thought is, we really don't know.

Q. Like a rupee note, there is no rupee note of yours and mine. We just pick up from the bank and circulate.

UG. Here you call it rupee, there in Switzerland they call it franc, in some other country they call it pound, in the United States they call it dollar. So in that way, each person picks up a certain thought from this thought sphere, this is one electromagnetic field. You are part of that. What isolates and creates a small, tiny, little magnetic field is the thought. It's a vibration. In that sense, thought is *matter*. In the sense, I give all these examples, you touch this, this is just a sensation, what that sensation is, you don't know. So it is the thought that tells you that this is hard. So it is the thought that has given solidity and substance and hardness, but there is no such thing as hardness. I don't say that this is soft, so it is the thought that has given the substance and solidity and materialised it as it were. So actually, what is here is energy. What is here is also here. It is all one energy. It is not the thought that burns itself out and creates energy. When the thought burns itself out, what is there is energy. I don't know if I made myself clear. It is not matter becoming energy or... the whole business has no meaning.

Q. Probably you must have undergone great changes and experienced that. I mean, reach a higher plane.

UG. You are talking of planes. There are no planes. No planes, no levels. There is one very strange thing that happens as a result of this explosion, or whatever you call it. At no time the thought that I

am different from you comes into this consciousness. Never. Never does that thought come into my consciousness and tell me that you are different from me.

Q. So this is one of the results of the thought of this explosion?

UG. Yes, because there is no point here. There is no point here at all. There is no centre here. So only with reference to this point or reference to this centre you create all the other points.

Q. The point, sir, is, anyway, you must be very certainly different from another individual being here.

UG. Physiologically, probably.

Q. And you yourself have said there could be tremendous chemical changes even in the individual. How do you know this? Or have you been examined at any time? Or this is just an inference you are presenting.

UG. The chemical change, because of the after effects of that, the way the senses are operating now, without any coordinator, without any centre, is all that I can say. And another thing is, the chemistry has changed, I can say that. Because, unless that alchemy or a chemical change in the whole chemistry takes place, there is no way of freeing this organism from the thought, continuity of the thought. So since there is no continuity of thought, you can very easily say that something has happened, what actually *has* happened, I have no way of experiencing it at all.

Q. It may be our mind's own play. Because I am thinking that I am experiencing, it may be again a mind's play.

UG. So I am not trying to sell anything here. Is it possible for you to simulate that? This is a thing that has happened outside the field of...the area in which I expected, dreamed and wanted the change. So this I don't call a change. I really don't know what has happened to me. I don't know what... So the only way, what I am telling you, is the way I am functioning. There seems to be some difference between the way you are functioning and I am functioning. But basically there can't be any difference. How can there be any difference between you and me? There can't be any difference. But there *seems* to be, from the way we are trying to express ourselves, I have a feeling that there is some difference and what that difference is, is all that I am trying to understand. So this is the way I am functioning.

Q. Sometimes we feel something. It may be a reality or it may be a play of my own mind.

UG. There is no such thing as reality anymore, let alone the ultimate reality. So I do function in the world as if I accept the reality of everything, the way you accept. For example, I always talk about this three-dimensional space in which we are functioning. So is it possible for you to directly experience the three-dimensional space in which we are functioning? No. You must have the



knowledge. So the length is so many feet, the width is so many feet, how can you experience the three-dimensional space except through the knowledge? So if that does not mean the walls don't exist for me. The walls are there and I don't go and bump myself against the wall every time I move in that direction. When you are there, then there is an action. The knowledge you have there tells you that this is. It's like water flowing. And when there is a block there, the water either overflows or then goes sideways. And exactly the same way, there is an action. And that action is possible only when the knowledge that is there in the background comes into operation. And so there is action there. I don't know.

Q. May I? I may be wrong but I want to answer. In what way and how to differentiate between what simulates and what actually happens. Suppose I put it, that we are all potentially extraordinarily different in a basic way. But because of this thought and its social concomitance we tend to be more and more alike.

UG. It is the culture that puts everybody in a common mode.

Q. That's right. Now suppose I put it that the uniqueness and the uncommonness is the index of this explosion. Would that be correct?

UG. No, this individual does not feel that he is unique. Others probably. The expression of that is bound to be unique. So if this kind of thing happens to you, it will probably happen in a different way and how it will express itself, you wouldn't know, I wouldn't know. I wouldn't know how that will give an expression.

Q. The similarity is more when we are less unique. You can only say uniqueness not compared to each other. But uniqueness in that, that many people are not similar.

UG. Yes, exactly, that's what I mean by that.

Q. So that may be an index. And that's the only way probably. Measuring at our common limits. The uncommonness is not manifested because we are socially bound. So I feel that you are expressing a uniqueness much more than any of us are expressing our own uniqueness.

UG. And *you* will begin to express your own uniqueness in quite a different way. That's all that I'm saying.

Q. In that way I will be different from others.

UG. Exactly. And yet you will not be in conflict with society. You will not become an anti-social human being.

Q. No, it's beautifully clear. This is a personal question I'm asking you, if you permit me.

UG. Yes. They are here only to listen.

Q. They might be aware of your events.

UG. Somebody has recorded them but that's of no importance. I am really an ordinary man despite your assurance

UG. I assure you once again, whatever that assurance means (everybody laughs)

Q. Just out of curiosity. This is like a question of Nachiketa. I am very particular to know how these things have happened to you, in personal interest, to the extent you are aware of it, but you just throw some light.

UG. That's a long story. It's not so simple.

Q. We would like to listen.

UG. I have to tell you about my own life. It will take a long time for me. It is the relating of your own life story up to a point and then there it stops. There is no biography any more after that. Because actually there are different views. There is no more biography. The two biographers who are interested in writing my biography have two different approaches. One says that because of what you did, and the whole sadhana exercises, the whole business, background education put you there. And I say in spite of all that. So the other biographer is not interested in my statement, *in spite of*, because there isn't much material for him to write a big volume out of. They are more interested in that and even the publishers are interested in that kind of thing. So that is very natural because you are operating in a field where this cause and effect relationship always operates. That is why you are interested in finding out the cause, how this kind of thing happened, so we are back where we started, how we are in square number one. We are still concerned about *how*. So my background is worthless. It can't be a model for anybody because your background is unique. See, every event that is taking place in your life is something unique in its own way. So your conditions, your environment, your background, the whole thing is different. Every event in your life is different.

Q. It's not to give a model to the rest of the world. It's not from that angle I am asking. It may not be relevant to anybody else, or it may be relevant to still, who knows? That's why I said I am Nachiketa here. I don't like to go without knowing the truth from you.

UG. You need an Yamadharma Raja to answer this.

Q. If you don't mind.

UG. I don't mind, Krishna garu, help me, I am helpless. Somewhere, we can find something to give a satisfactory answer. I don't know where to begin, where to end, I know. Where to begin...

Q. He could start from Ramana Maharshi. The day he went to Ramanashramam and then saw him...

UG. I think I'll have to tell the whole story of my life.

Q. We don't mind hearing, sir.

UG. It doesn't come so easy. I have to tell you to satisfy your curiosity. The other side, the shady side of my life, if I may put it that way. I was brought up in a very religious atmosphere. So my grandfather was a very cultured man and he knew Blavatsky, the founder of the Theosophical Society, and Alcott, and then later on, the second generation and third generation of theosophists. So they all visited our house. He was a great lawyer, a very rich man, a very cultured man, and very strangely, a very orthodox man. He was a mixed-up kid, a sort of mixed-up kid. Orthodoxy, tradition on one side, and then, this opposite, theosophy, the whole thing is on the other side. No, he failed to establish a balance. That was the beginning of my problem. So he had the learned men on his payroll and he dedicated himself for some reason, I don't want to go into the whole business, to create a perfect atmosphere for me and educate me in the right way, inspired by the theosophists and the whole lot. And so every morning those fellows would come and read the Upanishads, Panchadasi, Naishkarmya Siddhi, the commentaries, the whole lot, four o'clock to six o'clock every morning. And this little boy of five, six, seven years, I don't know how old I was, had to listen to all the crap. So much so, by the time I reached my seventh year, I could repeat most of those things, the passages, one Panchadasi, Naishkarmya Siddhi, this, that and the other. And many holy men visited my house, of the Ramakrishna order, this, that, name it, and that fellow somehow visited. That house was an open house for every holy man. So, one thing I discovered when I was quite young, that they were all hypocrites, you know. They talked something, they believed something and their lives were shattered. Nothing. So, that was the beginning of my search..My grandfather used to meditate. He's dead, I don't want to say anything bad about him. He used to meditate one, two hours in a separate meditation room. One day a little baby, one and a half years old or two years old, started crying, for some reason. That chap came down and started beating the child and the child almost turned blue. And this man, meditating two hours every day, look, what is this he has done? That was sort of, I don't want to use a psychological term, but there is no escape from that, such a traumatic experience for me. So there must be something funny about the whole business of meditation. And their lives were shallow, empty, and they talk marvellously, expressing things in a very beautiful way, but what about their lives? There was this neurotic hiatus in their lives. They talked something and they behaved altogether different. And then, things went on and on. So I got involved with these things, and then is there anything, to what they profess, Buddha, Jesus, the great teachers? What is that? Everybody is talking of moksha, liberation, freedom, and I want to know for myself, these are all useless fellows. There must be some person in this world who is an

embodiment, an apostle, of all those things. If there is one, I want to find out for myself. Then, so many things happened, and then there was one man called Sivananda Saraswati in those days. So he was the evangelist of Hinduism. I used to go there, and then that was between 14 and 21. I am skipping many of the unnecessary events. So I used to go there, meet him very often, and then, did everything, all the austerities. I was so young, but I was determined to find out if there is any such thing as moksha, and I want that moksha for myself, and prove to myself and to everybody that, there can't be any hypocrisy in such people. These are all hypocrites. So I practiced yoga, practiced meditation, and studied everything. I was quite young, between 14 and 21. Experienced every kind of experience that books talk about, samadhis, super samadhis, nirvikalpa samadhis, everything. Then I said to myself, this can't be the thing because I am the same person, mechanically doing these things, these meditations have no value to me. So this is not leading me anywhere. And then, the sex became a tremendous problem for me, a young boy. So this to me is something natural, it's a biological thing, the urge in human beings. Why do these people want us all to deny this sex, and suppress something very natural, something which is part of the whole thing, in order to get something else? So this is more realistic, more important to me than that moksha and liberation and all that. So this is a reality, I think of gods and goddesses and I have wet dreams, I have this kind of a thing, why should I feel guilty? Something natural, I have no control over this, this kind of a thing is happening. So meditation has not helped me, the study has not helped me, nothing has helped me, so my disciplines have not helped me, I never touched salt, never touched chilies, never touched any spices. And then one day I found this man eating mango pickles behind the closed doors. Here is a young man who has denied himself everything in the hope of getting something, and that fellow, cannot control himself, here the same hypocrite. I don't want to say anything bad about him. So this kind of life is not for me. And I arrived at a point when I was 21 and felt very strongly that all teachers, Buddha, Jesus, Sri Ramakrishna, everybody cheated themselves, deluded themselves and deluded everybody else. So this can't be the thing at all. And so somehow that kind of a situation, what you call *existentialist nausea*, I didn't use those words at that time, but now I happen to know those words. Existentialist nausea, revulsion against everything sacred and everything holy, crept into my system and threw everything out of my system. No more, no Gods, no religion, no practices, there isn't anything there, but what is here is something natural. I am a brute, I am a monster, I am full of violence. This is reality, I am full of desires, desirelessness, non-greed, non-anger, those things have no meaning to me. They are false, and they are not only false, they are falsifying me. So I said to myself, and finished, I am finished with the whole business. It is not that simple, you see. Then

somebody came along and said, we were discussing all these things and he found me practically an atheist, but not a practicing atheist, sceptical of everything, heretic down to my boots. And then he said, there is one man here, somewhere, that was in Madras, Tiruvannamalai, Ramana Maharshi. He said, I don't want to see any holy man. If you see one, you have seen them all. So I never shopped around, went around, searching people, sitting at the feet of the masters, learning something, because everybody tells you, do more and more of the same, you will get it. So what do I get? More and more experiences, and then, those experiences demand permanence. There is no such thing as permanence. So, do more and more of the same. This I know. I go to a school, you want to solve a mathematical problem, so you repeat again and again and again and you solve the mathematical problem. And then you discover that the answer is in the problem. So what the hell are you doing trying to solve this problem? It is easier to find the answer first instead of going through all these things. So reluctantly, hesitantly, unwillingly, I went to see this man. He said, just come there once, something will happen to you. He talked about it and he gave me a book, I don't know what it was, *Search in Secret India* by Paul Brunton. So that chapter relating to this man, I read it first. I said, all right, I don't mind, let me go and see. So that man was sitting there, his very presence, you know, I said, what, this man, how can he help me? This fellow who is reading some comic strips and cutting some vegetables, playing with this, that, or the other, how can this man help me? He can't help me. Anyway, I sat there, in his presence you feel silent, your questions disappear, his look, you know, gives you the deeksha, and all that story remained a story, fancy stuff to me. I sat there, there were a lot of questions inside. So the questions have not disappeared, you see, I have been sitting here for two hours, the questions are still there. So all right, let me ask him some questions. Because at that time I very much wanted that moksha, that's part of my background, moksha, I want. So you are supposed to be liberated... I didn't say that, can you give me what you have? I asked him this question. And that man, after a lapse of some time he didn't answer the question, I repeated that question, I am asking you a question, what do you have? Whatever you have, can you give it to me? And he said, I can give you, but can you take it? Boy, this fellow for the first time, he says that he has something, and, but I can't take it. *Nobody* before said, I can give you. For the first time this man said, I can give you, but can you take it? Nobody before that. He said, do this, do this sadhana, do that, stand on your head, on your toes, hang from your tree, deny yourself this. That first time this fellow says, I can give you, but can you take it? Then I said to myself, if there is *any* individual in this world, it is me who can take it, because I have done so much of sadhana, seven years of sadhana, if I can't take it, who can take it? That was my frame of mind. And then, then if I can't take it, who can

take it in this world, what is it that he has? That was my question. So that was my fundamental question, the basic question, what is that state in which Buddha or all those people or this man is supposed to be? I asked him a few more questions. Can one be free for some time and not free? He said, either you are free or not free at all. And some other question I don't remember. He answered in a very strange way, there are no steps leading you to that. He also said that, but I ignored all those things. But this question, I must find out what that state is. So nobody can give this state, I am now on my own. I have to go on this uncharted sea without a compass, without a boat, not even a raft to take me. So I am going to find out for myself what is that state in which that man is. I don't want it from him. He says, I can't take it. So then my real search began. From there, all the religious background was there for me. Then I started exploring into psychology, I studied psychology also for some years, and philosophy, western, eastern, and then mysticism, everything.

The whole area of human knowledge I started exploring on my own. And the question had an intensity of its own. So all this knowledge doesn't help me in any way. This is all intellectual stuff, it doesn't satisfy me. So why read all this, you know? And then I went on and on, and I studied philosophy and psychology, which was one of my subjects. Unfortunately, at that time it was part of our studies. One day, because I was interested in psychology for the simple reason that the mind always intrigued me. Where is this mind? I want to know something about it. Here inside of me, I don't see any mind. And all those books, talk of mind. Come on, let me see what the western psychologists have to say about the mind. There they are full of depression. One day I asked my professor, I don't know if it was Bose or somebody, the professor, not Bose, somebody. So, we are talking about *mind* all the time. So can you tell me something about the mind? Do you know anything for yourself, what that mind is? We are studying so many books, these six books, Freud, Jung, Adler, and the whole gang, all that stuff. I know, I read what is there in the books, but do you know something about the mind? He said, don't ask such inconvenient questions. They are very dangerous questions. So if you want to pass the examination, just take down these notes, repeat, memorize, and repeat in the question papers, you will get your degree. I said, I am not interested in a degree. I am interested in finding out the mind. There is no mind here.

Q. This was after meeting Ramana Maharshi?

UG. Ramana Maharshi, but this was after. I never went back to Maharshi, I never read any of those religious books afterward. I finished all of them, but this, the Western science and psychology, and all. And then, I got involved with the Theosophical Society because of the background. I inherited the Theosophical Society, J. Krishnamurti, and a lot of money from my grandfather. So that made it

easy for me. Plenty of money was there at that time, fifty or sixty thousand dollars, so it was a lot of money. And so I could do all this kind of thing. So I inherited this also. I got involved with the Theosophical Society, but my heart was not there. All this is second-hand information. What is the point in giving lectures? I was a very good speaker at that time, not anymore. First-class speaker I was, lecturing everywhere on every platform. I addressed every university in India. At that time, this was thirty or forty, thirty-five years ago. So this is not something real to me. Anybody who has brains can gather this information and then throw it out. So what am I doing? Why am I wasting my time? This is not my living, this is not my means of livelihood. Then I can understand, if it is your living, all right, you should do this, and repeat like a parrot, and make your living. This is not my living, and yet I am interested in something, I am interested in that kind of thing. So then Krishnamurti arrived on the scene. He had just returned from the United States, and started his new kind of...

Q. He looks the same, are you related?

UG. No, Krishnamurti is only a given name, not a family name, it is not a family name. So his family name is G. Krishnamurti is quite common, Jiddu Krishnamurti. So, then I got involved with him. I listened to him for some seven years, every time he came. I never met him personally, because the whole world-teacher business, and all that he created some kind of a distance. How can anybody be created, the world teachers are born, not made, that was my kind of a thing. And I knew the whole background, the whole business. I was also not part of the inner circle, but I was always on the periphery, outside. I never wanted to get involved myself. And then there is also the same hypocrisy, in the sense that, there is nothing in their lives, their shallow lives, but scholars, masterminds, and remarkable people. What is this behind, what is there behind? So then Krishnamurti came along, and then, after seven years, circumstances brought us together. And then we met every day and discussed the whole thing. Then, after listening to him, I was not interested in the abstractions. The abstractions are very familiar to me. I told him once, you have picked up the psychological jargon of the day, and you are trying to express something through the psychological jargon. You adopt the analysis, and then, you come to a point and say that analysis is not it. So, this kind of analysis is only paralysing people; it is not in any way helping. You have paralysed me by this kind of analysis. But somehow I have a feeling, I can't say why, that what is there behind the abstractions, you are throwing at me. That's what I'm interested in. But I have a feeling, for some reason, it may be my own projection, I can't say. You may not have, to give the familiar traditional simile, you may not have tasted the sugar, at least, you seem to have looked at the sugar. The way you are describing things gives me the feeling that you have at least seen the sugar, but I'm not certain if you have

tasted the sugar. So, we went on. Then there was some personal difficulty between us. I wanted some straight, honest answers from him, which he did not give for his own reasons. He was very defensive; he was defending something. What is there for you to defend? You hang the whole thing on the tree, your past, leave it to the people. Why do you want to defend yourself? But I wanted some straight, honest answers about his background, which he did not give to me in a satisfactory way. So the whole thing was coming to an end, as it were. I felt that I was wasting my time. So, strangely in my life, all those things that happened.