

MADRAS CONVERSATION WITH P. JAYAKAR AND A. PATWARDHAN 18TH DECEMBER 1982 'THE BOOK OF ONESELF'

Pupul Jayakar: Yesterday you were talking about reading the book of yourself, which is the book of mankind. And you asked a question: with what instrument will I look? Now this book is never complete, as you are reading you are creating it. And in the very observing of something the future is also being created. In this state of flux there are one or two questions which first have to be clarified. That is, what is the nature of what is seen? Because unless we are clear on the nature of what is seen the instrument which sees it can never be clear.

So can we go into it? This instrument and the nature. We have talked about 'what is' from the first time we met you, but what is the nature of this 'what is'?

J Krishnamurti: I think if I may begin: the whole history of man from two million years, or forty thousand years, is part of our consciousness, is part of our story. We, as a human being, we are the whole history of man. I don't know if you would grant that. If you grant that then the instrument with which I can read this vast complex history, the only instrument I have is the action of thought. Thought is the only instrument I have. Just a minute, let me finish. And thought has built all the past accumulation, past experience, superstitions, beliefs, the tyrannies, the wars, and the human mind is the residue, the storehouse of all that. The various gods, the various rituals, the whole movement of man in time is in the background of every human being. If once you accept that, or

see the fact of it, or refute it, then we can start from there. Unless we are clear about that how to read the book of this immense complicated knowledge comes later. I hope I am making myself clear.

PJ: No. Obviously, Krishnaji, human heritage is my heritage.

K: Yes.

PJ: The two are not separate.

K: No. But very few are willing to accept that even.

PJ: No, Krishnaji, at one level I am sure most people will accept that.

K: I doubt it.

PJ: The whole development of man, of human heritage, all that has taken place...

K: Yes, yes.

PJ: ...ideas which have formulated the brain, in a sense, they don't belong to a single person.

K: Wait, wait, Pupulji. But if you asked any of them, any people, I am sure they wouldn't - first of all have thought about this. If they begin to think about it I am not sure they would see the fact of it. That is what I want - if I may - to establish that first. Then we can proceed, if you and Achyutji and a few of us see the truth of it, not the argument of it, not the verbal structure of it, but that we are, we carry with us all the time the vast human heritage. If that is so then we can proceed.

A. Patwardhan: Sir, but would you not concede that though all this may have been accumulated through thought...

K: No, through time and thought.

AP: We get it through time and thought, when I say that I am

the inheritor of the entire past of man, it is not a thought process or anything like that, it is not in that way. The way in which I am the inheritor of it all is not as verbalized thought, or...

K: Let us hold. Do you as a human being, having studied history of the world and so on, do you admit or see the truth that you are the result, and that you hold the whole human heritage and that vast complex book of the story of man?

AP: Right.

K: Not right as argument.

AP: No sir, it is a fact.

K: It's a fact. Either that fact can be an argumentative fact, argumentative, a conclusion, a concept, or it is so. It is so in my blood, in my thoughts, in my life.

AP: That is why I say, sir, if it is in my blood, and if it is in the whole being, then it is not a sequential purpose, it is a totality.

K: It is so.

AP: It is a totality.

K: Yes. Don't use the word 'totality', it is so.

AP: It is so.

K: Now. We if we three at least see the truth of it then from there we can proceed. That is all my point. Not raise this question at the end of the discussion or dialogue that may take place.

PJ: It is as much a truth as the fact that the human body has evolved - let me put it this way, is a universal...

K: ...phenomena.

PJ: ...phenomena.

K: Of course.

PJ: It is in that context that I say I accept I am the human

heritage.

K: Right. Now from there proceed. I am - in me abides the whole story of man: his sorrows, his anxieties, his loneliness, his miseries, his happiness, his experiences, and so on and so on. This vast story.

PJ: Yes.

K: Then the question, which you raised just now, which we raised the other day: what is the instrument with which I read that book?

PJ: I have placed two questions.

K: Yes.

PJ: Before even I go to what is the instrument with which I read that book, what is it that I read? Please let me. What is it that I read? I say I am...

K: As you are reading it is changing.

PJ: It is changing.

K: As you are reading it is moving, living.

PJ: As I am reading the future is also coming into existence, or it is being projected.

K: No, wait a minute. When you use the word 'future', the past - right - meeting the present modifying itself becomes the future.

PJ: And the very thought that arises now contains in it the germ of the future.

K: Contains in it the germ of the future when there is no alteration.

PJ: We start with what actually takes place: it contains the germ of the future. So first of all we have to be clear what is the nature of this 'what is' which we have talked about.

K: What?

PJ: What is the nature of 'what is'?

K: No, you are going to something else, Pupulji. Forgive me if I point out something. If I am the totality of mankind, if I am the storehouse - I won't use the totality - if I am the storehouse of all human endeavour, and I am not aware of it, I don't know the nature of it, the content of it, and I want to study it, I want to learn, if it is possible, the nature of consciousness, not as mine, the consciousness of man which is the past.

PJ: You see the moment you say that, that I am reading the consciousness of man and not my consciousness...

K: There is no 'your consciousness'.

PJ: Look what takes place. The moment you say you are reading the consciousness of man the attitude to that reading has undergone a total change.

K: A total change. That's right. Agreed. But if you insist, or if one is under the illusion that this consciousness is mine, separate from every other consciousness - which most people believe, or perhaps many of the psychologists believe - then we are moving in two different directions.

AP: Obviously.

PJ: But there seems a trap there.

K: Yes, I know the trap there.

PJ: The trap is we say we are the history of mankind but when we start investigating consciousness...

K: Which is the storehouse of man.

PJ: ...but if you were objectively looking at the history of man...

K: Which is the consciousness of man.

PJ: ...you would read it one way, that book. If it was in twelve encyclopaedias you would read it one way.

K: Ah, I'm not talking of encyclopaedias.

PJ: But you would look at it one way.

K: I know what you are saying.

PJ: The moment you see it as something which sprouts within me, within my consciousness, immediately my response to it is of a totally different nature.

K: That's is what I was coming to naturally. If it is - if one sees one's consciousness as universal - if we can use that word, such a large word - that the consciousness which exists in me is the consciousness of all human beings - right - if you accept that after logical examination and investigation, then our whole activity of perception changes. Right?

PJ: Yes.

K: Now, do I regard this consciousness as mine? We must be clear on that point. And not your's or anybody's, it is my private ground, my private property.

PJ: I would say that consciousness of mankind is revealed on my private ground.

K: Now just a minute. Just a minute. You are saying, by understanding my consciousness I recognize that it is the consciousness of man, of all human beings. All right then, I go along with that. But I mustn't insist that it's mine.

PJ: The only thing which I can come with you so far is to say what is revealed, I cannot say that it is unique to me.

K: Unique to you

PJ: It is part of the total consciousness of man.

K: But...

PJ: But it is revealed within my ground.

K: I understand what you are saying.

PJ: And my relationship to it is very different.

K: I understand. Simply: are you saying in the understanding, in the observation, investigation of my consciousness, which I had thought to be separate from everybody else, in that investigation there is the discovery that this, what I have called my consciousness, is not my private ground, but it is the consciousness which is the rest of man.

PJ: You see, sir...

K: If we agree to that I agree. Go on.

PJ: No, because this is not so. You see the observing of that which arises has no place in it for this other state, that it is the consciousness of mankind.

K: What is this? I haven't quite followed.

PJ: The observing of that which arises, after all you can't observe something which doesn't arise, the arising in consciousness of...

K: ...loneliness.

PJ: ...loneliness and the observing of loneliness doesn't bring into it all these other factors that it is the loneliness of mankind. It is loneliness.

K: Take any factor, sorrow. In investigating my sorrow, my loneliness, which I have been scrupulously taking in my courtyard, my private ground, there is the discovery that it is the rest of man. All men are lonely, all people suffer. I discover something tremendous. Not the little, the potty little consciousness which is

mine. The discovery that it is the whole of mankind is an enormous - you follow - perception.

PJ: What brings that perception about? Let us take it minutely through a microscope. Loneliness arises, or sorrow arises: there is an observing of that thing we call sorrow. What brings in this other element?

K: Which element?

PJ: That the observing is not the observing of my petty sorrow, but the observing of the sorrow of mankind.

K: No, I don't observe. Look, Pupulji: I have seen, and you all must have seen, it is not my seeing and therefore superior, I have seen wherever you go this factor is there: loneliness and sorrow are linked together. Go to America, it is there, in Europe it is there, in China, Russia, India, anywhere you go this factor is shared by all of us. To realize that, just a logical conclusion, even to admit to oneself how extraordinary this thing is shared by all of us, is a great - a change has already taken place.

PJ: Yes.

K: Right?

PJ: Yes. Can we proceed. I still go back to these two things.

K: Let's go back.

PJ: One is if you say with what instrument...

K: I'm coming to that a little later.

PJ: But I again ask, what is it that has to be observed?

K: I understand. I understand. I observe sorrow, loneliness, sorrow, they are synonymous those two.

PJ: Which are emotional responses to a situation.

K: To a crisis.

PJ: To a crisis, to a situation. I suddenly have a feeling of shrinking, a feeling...

K: Yes. A feeling of some great loss.

PJ: And I look.

K: No, no. Not you, you don't look.

PJ: That's what I want to come to.

K: Let's be clear. Suppose one has lost a great friend, or a wife whom you really loved, or a person whom you loved, and there is the ending of that person: what has actually taken place there? The ending of all your relationship with that person. And suddenly realizing how utterly lonely you are because that has been the only relationship that has meant something. And suddenly that has gone. And there is the sense of loss. Now just hold a minute. Either I remain, either I remain with it, that is, I don't let thought or any other feeling interfere with that state. I don't want to escape from it, suppress it, analyse it. This is an extraordinary phenomena which I have suddenly discovered that with the loss of that person, or with the loss of some profound conclusion, concept which I have held most dear, suddenly that has been shattered. And then I realize what an extraordinary state of mind has come to an end. Right? Come to an end. I can invent a future, invent, but all those are inventions, but there is an ending without any future. Right? Now can this mind remain with that fact? Not as an observer observing the fact, the observer is the fact, the observer is that state, there is no division between the observer and the thing he is observing. Right? Am I making myself clear? He is the suffering, he is that ending. It's like a jewel that you are looking, holding. And the moment you want to part with it you have entered into a different

state of consciousness, into a different state altogether.

PJ: I understand.

K: Now the history of mankind is my history. Right? Right?

PJ: Yes, yes.

K: I want to read that book because it is a most extraordinary book. It has not been written, there is no chapter, first or tenth chapter, there are no paragraphs, it is a tremendous movement. Right?

PJ: Can the mind, any mind contain the enormity of it?

K: Now wait a minute, we must begin here. What is the mind - may I go into that - what is the mind and what is the brain? Now may I go on with it a little? Please question as we go along.

The brain has infinite capacity. Look what it has done in the technological world, something incredible. Right? But psychologically it has been conditioned through evolution - evolution being time.

PJ: Through that concept?

K: Of course.

PJ: Not through it, through the concept of time.

K: Of course. No, no. Just a minute, go slowly into this, carefully. Seeing that the brain has extraordinary capacity, as shown in the technological world. I mean what they are doing is incredible. And in the other direction, in the psychological realm, it hasn't moved at all, perhaps a centimetre, less than a centimetre. And because it has not moved, it has not flowered, it is conditioned, it is limited. And the mind is not limited.

PJ: When you talk of mind, you speak of what?

K: This is difficult. I'll go into it. The whole, the mind of the

universe, the mind of nature, you follow, everything that has been created is the movement of the mind.

PJ: Everything that has been created.

K: And is creating.

PJ: And is in the process.

K: All this. Therefore there is no limit to creation. I don't know if you understand

AP: Are you suggesting, sir, that when we say that I am the entire heritage of man, it is not the brain that can take in this fact?

K: It is the brain that takes in the fact because I have communicated through words, through thought, and you are looking at it through thought and through words, therefore the communication is verbal and thought. Sir, don't let's go back to that for the moment.

AP: I am trying to pin myself down to this fact that at present whatever I understand I understand through the brain.

K: Ah!

PJ: You see he has moved to another dimension of thought altogether, which if I understand it is this: the brain has done tremendous things in the field of technology, psychologically it is static. The reading of the book...

K: Yes, that's the whole point.

PJ: ...of mankind - I asked a question, can a single brain contain it, and you came to the brain and the mind. That the brain being limited and not having moved can only move within its own circle. The mind being the very source of creation has no limits.

K: That's right.

PJ: And therefore this whole history of man is - if I may put it.

K: Go on, put it any way you like.

PJ: But you say one thing which I would like to point to, when you talk of mind it is all that is created and in the process of creating.

K: Yes. That is, Pupil, let's be clear on this point. Careful, careful. Thought has created in this world, in the physical world, the churches, the cathedrals, the temples, the mosques, and all the things that are in the mosques, temples; thought has created wars; thought has created the conflict between man and man. Right? Thought is responsible for all this. And because thought in itself is limited it cannot - thought cannot perceive a mind that is immeasurable. But thought tries to understand it. Right? Obviously, because that is its function, which is mechanical function of reducing everything to its limited fragmentary activity. Right? And we are saying that as long as that brain is conditioned it can never understand the immensity of the nature of the mind. Right?

PJ: Yes.

K: If you see, the responsibility then is to uncondition the brain, uncondition the limitation which thought has imposed upon it. I've got it!

PJ: Sir, here is something I would like to ask. Is it to uncondition the brain which is conditioned and cannot move out of its groove, or to end the brain, the movement of the brain?

K: It comes to the same thing.

PJ: No, sir. The perception is in the mind itself.

K: What is this, what is this? Careful, careful.

PJ: I want to ask you something. Is it the deconditioning of the

brain which it finds itself unable to do?

K: No, no.

PJ: Let me finish.

K: Yes, yes, I understand.

PJ: Or is it to hold the brain in abeyance so that the perception which is the mind can operate?

K: You are putting in modern language what the old traditions say, 'there is in me god. There is in me some element which is not contaminated, which then operates on that.'

PJ: You have drawn the difference between brain and mind.

K: I have said that.

PJ: You have drawn the distinction between the conditioned and the...

K: ...and the unconditioned.

PJ: ...and the non-conditioned.

K: Yes.

PJ: Between that which has an ending...

K: I haven't talked about ending.

PJ: Everything which is in the brain as it functions is fragmented.

K: Yes. Limited, fragmented.

PJ: Let's cut out ending, but it is fragmented. You have talked of a state of fragmented...

K: Wait a minute. I said we must differentiate the two words, words. Careful. The two, the meaning of the words. And I say that the brain which is limited cannot understand what the mind is. It can only apprehend, be aware of it, when there is no conditioning.

PJ: But you went further. In speaking of...

K: Later. I shouldn't have spoken.

PJ: But you have spoken.

K: I know, unfortunately. Because as a matter of fact Dr Bohm and a few others, we were discussing the very same matter. You understand, Pupil, this is really very interesting. Leave the mind alone for the moment. When you once you see what extraordinary capacity the brain has, in the technological, scientific, communication world, surgery, they have transplanted a heart made by man - I don't know if you read about it?

PJ: Yes.

K: I mean, and the biological experiments, it is incredible what is going on, which is the activity of thought. Thought is limited because knowledge is limited. Now can thought ever be free from its limitation? It can't. Right? Thought can never be free from its limitation because it is born out of limitation. I don't know if you would see this.

PJ: May I ask a question? What is the distinction between thought and the brain?

K: Thought is the activity of the brain.

PJ: Is there anything in the brain apart from thought?

K: I won't fall into that trap! You are now going back to the old...

PJ: No, I am not, sir, I am not. If you accept that the brain has this tremendous potential.

K: And we are only using a very, very small part.

PJ: Obviously. Even at the ordinary level, not talking of anything like that. If you could do with the psyche what you have done with technology...

K: That's all I am saying. I mean then the universe is open to you.

PJ: It's just that.

K: Yes, that's all I am saying. If the brain has been able to do such extraordinary things technologically, if the brain can free from the limitations of the psyche, it is incredible what it can do. Then I am saying the brain is the mind when it is totally free. The capacity - no, I shouldn't use the word 'capacity' - then there is no sense of division, it is the sense of whole, completeness, wholeness. That's all. I don't want to enter in that. You understand what I am saying?

PJ: I understand. Now if I may go further. If the brain has had that thrust, that drive, that insight, the energy to pursue technology, why is it...

K: ...that it hasn't turned the other way?

PJ: ...that they go up into space and are prepared to die, it is not that it is a question of death, or disappear or disintegration.

K: No, there is a great deal behind it: national pride, hero, praise by the country. They are not prepared to die, they have been propagandized to die in the name of your country: or in the name of god, in the name of the saviour, what they have done, burnt people, tortured people.

PJ: No, you are not answering what I am saying. What is that element which enabled man, gave him the curiosity, curiosity to drive in the other direction?

K: The other direction, yes. I think our education is responsible for it. Because we have all emphasized, every culture, except perhaps a few dead cultures, that you must earn a livelihood, work,

work, work. And to do that study, you know, memorize, repeat, repeat, repeat. That's all we do. This morning I met some of the students - forgive me if some of you are here. They haven't thought about anything except this - mathematics, history, geography, and if you ask them to move a little away from that they are lost.

AP: Even among the scientists, there are only a few who go to the impossible question.

K: But, sir, even those are...

AP: Very few. I say similarly today in the present crisis of the survival of humanity there is sufficient motivation - I say motivation deliberately - I say there is sufficient ground for man to say that this is the most intolerable predicament for man, and the brain must be explored.

K: No, sir. They are exploring the activity of the brain.

PJ: Not of the psyche.

AP: No, we are now, we must understand after all that every activity of the psyche is personal to the brain cells.

K: No, no. Just a minute, sir, don't go into the business of what the brain is. What we are saying is very simple, sir. The brain has extraordinary capacity, extraordinary capacity - I don't like to use the word 'capacity' because that means based on experience, and capacity based on experience is not capacity. Sorry! There is a different kind of movement which is not based on experience, knowledge. That's a different matter. The brain has done extraordinary things. And psychically, psychologically it has not moved an inch after all these forty thousand years. Now if there is a breakthrough of that cycle then I am saying there is no division between the mind and the brain, and the energy of the brain - I will

use that, energy of the brain. You understand? The energy of the brain has done the technological world.

PJ: Yes, but it has never been released for this.

K: For the other.

AP: No, sir, what I want to understand is, after all I think the word energy is much better than the word motivation because it is really energy.

K: I said that.

AP: It is the energy of attention.

K: No, sir, don't say attention of anything, just energy for the moment. Psychologically my energy is practically nil. And I am saying that when that limitation has been broken down, or broken through, then there is a totally different energy, which is not channelled through technology which is merely the activity of thought, and therefore that energy is limited. Right?

AP: I am making a very simple statement: that where you point out the limitations of thought, I say that man has within him an energy which can transcend the limit of thought, and that is the energy of attention.

K: No. Don't.

PJ: If we are trying to get to as vast a field as possible, perhaps the word attention again limits it because we have used the word so often in the past, that I think it is better to drop the word.

AP: Drop the word. There is no bother about dropping the word.

K: I am only saying, sir...

AP: We must feel that we have a faculty other than thought to pursue the mind.

K: No, I won't accept that. You see he is introducing again the

same old pattern, which is there is a faculty which is hidden, which is the energy of god, whatever you like to call it.

AP: I am saying I am looking at the real, I am looking at the tree.

K: Which is what?

AP: Which is just plain attention.

K: No, it is energy.

AP: Energy.

K: Keep to that word, keep to that word. Man has used the energy of thought in technology. Right? Right? It is the energy of thought, therefore limited.

AP: Right, quite right.

K: Now the breaking down of the psyche is not the energy of thought.

AP: Agreed.

K: Right?

AP: That's obvious.

K: Ah, no, sir, it is not obvious.

AP: It is, sir.

PJ: Let me probe a little more.

K: Yes. Come down.

PJ: The instruments man has, let us examine those instruments. One is thought. The others are the senses themselves.

K: Sensory responses.

PJ: Sensory responses.

K: The sensitivity of the senses.

PJ: Yes.

K: Sensitivity of the senses and thought, which are both the

same.

AP: How, sir?

PJ: This is what I would like to get at. The sensitivity of the senses and thought are the same?

K: I'll show it to you in a minute. I have just caught something. It may be wrong. So I want to look at it myself. I don't accept what I say. I didn't mean that! I want to examine this. The sensitivity of the senses. Our senses are controlled by thought. Right? Right?

PJ: No.

K: Just a minute, don't say, no. Don't take any definite stand.

PJ: No, I am not saying when you make a statement...

K: I have made a statement, I am going to see if it falls, I'll drop it. If you take a stand...

PJ: No.

K: That's right. I see the senses are now shaped, controlled by thought. That is, my sense of taste, if I like it thought comes in.

PJ: Saying, I want more of it.

K: If I feel something or other thought comes in and says, 'Look, be careful, that is painful, don't go through there'. So is there - I am just asking - is there a movement of all the senses, the total senses, without the interference of thought? Just look at the question first before we throw it out or accept it. That is, have you ever looked at the movement of the sea, movement of the sea, not the movement of trees, the vast movement of the tides, the beauty of the waves, the enormous power of the waves, with all your senses and eye looking? In that there is no interference of thought. Now when thought interferes with the senses it must inevitably limit it or control it. I am right. I am going to stick to this.

PJ: Then what you say is right. No, I'm not wanting to argue with you with what you have said just now. There is a challenge, and my senses respond according to the conditioning of the mind, but there is a response of the senses...

K: Partial, always partial because thought is always watching, controlling it, trying to say, 'I must', 'I must not', 'This is wrong', 'That is right'.

PJ: No, but forgive me. Once, it was some instance, it can be water reflected in water.

K: What is this? What is this?

PJ: It can be like water being reflected in water. That is, there can be a state of sensitivity when there is nothing contained in those senses.

K: Yes, all right, go on.

PJ: So, I want to push one more thing. I won't ask you if you jump down my throat.

K: I won't!

PJ: That is, there is some connection between the senses - you see, sir. It is a little confused, I am not myself very clear about it.

K: All right.

PJ: You look about when you think of your brain, you think of it as there.

K: You think of it as somewhere in the head.

PJ: Somewhere in the head.

K: And told by the scan.

PJ: But when the senses do not operate from thought, do not contain thought...

K: Contain thought?

PJ: Do not contain thought, the place of operation changes.

K: That's right.

PJ: That is all I am saying. I didn't want to put it into words.

K: Of course, it is simple enough. When the senses are observing completely, heightened senses, and when you look at the movement - I am taking purposefully the seeing - or one of those extraordinary sights of the Himalayas, when there is not a cloud or a breath, the line, the sky line of the hills against the blue, it is an extraordinary sight. When you look at the sea completely that way there is no centre, there is no thought. Right? The moment thought comes in there is a centre in the senses. Right?

PJ: We are part of thought, we are part of the senses.

K: Yes.

PJ: Is there a third movement?

K: Yes, that's the whole point.

AP: What is that? Repeat.

PJ: I said we have talked of thought, we have talked of the senses, and now I ask him is there a third movement.

K: This is difficult. Is there an instrument - not instrument - is there an action, a movement, a state - state in the sense not a static state - which is not the movement of thought? That is what you are asking, right?

PJ: Not a movement of thought, not a movement of the senses.

K: Wait, wait, let's look at it carefully. Look at those two words: thought and no movement of the senses. When you observe the sea with all your senses there is no sensory movement. Right? Right? Of course. The senses are not aware that they are heightened. Right? I wonder if I have made myself clear. Yes, anything that is

excellent is not aware of its own excellency. Goodness in the highest sense has no sense of being good.

PJ: You see, what you are saying is...

K: Yes, I stick to this.

PJ: You see, Krishnaji, you are taking - let me...

K: Go on, darling.

PJ: You are taking the essence of all thought, the essence of all senses, and it is essence itself then is the instrument.

K: No. Leave it for the moment. I understand what you are saying. Now first of all I would like to get this clear between ourselves. When there is the heightened excellency of the senses, the senses are not aware they are aware. Awareness takes place that the senses are fully aware when thought comes in.

PJ: Already it has...

K: It has already gone. Right? Now when thought is aware of its own tremendous limitation, then it has broken through. But to realize that, it is not verbal, not thought, to see thought has no place in the movement of - I mustn't go into this, steady! Now wait a minute, what are we trying to get at?

PJ: We are reading the story of mankind.

K: See how far we have got.

PJ: And asking what is the instrument with which we read.

K: I will tell you. The story of mankind is an endless movement. It had no beginning and no end. If you once grant that - right? It has no ending. But my brain being limited is looking for its ending. Right? So I am approaching the book with 'where is the end of all this?'

PJ: The search is for the ending.

K: Of course, of course. But to realize there is no end. You know what it means? Then you enter into something called love. Love has no end. I may love my wife, she dies, or I die, but the thing called love has no end. But I have identified myself with my wife and when she dies my love has gone - or I love somebody else, which then becomes pleasure and all the rest of it. I don't want enter into all that.

So how do I read the book? That's the question. How do I read the book? You don't read at all. Right? There is no book to read if you have come to that point.

PJ: Without coming to that point the other is...

K: You merely examine, analyse, change, move, change the chips in the same field. Right? When you have come to this really deep point that this book has no end and no beginning, which means you are that book. Not that you become eternal, which is dangerous again. But that life as this movement has no end, it is then the universe. Right? Then the cosmos is this whole thing.

PJ: Time for you to end.

K: Oh, yes. Ten past five. Have we been talking nonsense?

PJ: No, sir.

K: Pupilji, if somebody heard all this, somebody who is serious of course. It is all so extraordinarily wild - but it is not. I am just saying. It is not wild, it is very logical, very clear - at least to me - clear and can be stated in Sorbonne, or Harvard, or in Delhi, it will stand water. Right?