



T H E L I N K

N O 1 6 · S P R I N G / S U M M E R 1 9 9 9

The Newsletter

Dear Friends	3
Letters to the Editor	8
Was Krishnamurti Conditioned?	8
To See the Fact	9
K: Can I Prevent My Own Destruction?	11
On Contemplating Krishnamurti's Teachings	12
Study Questions	17
The Limits of Thought	20
Who Knows the Teachings?	23

Meeting K

Friedrich's Notes	29
K: To Pay Complete Attention	30
The Full Moon	32

The First Step

Editor's Note	34
Evolution of the Observer	34
The Center of Conflict	36
Virtual Relationship	37

On Education

Editor's Note	39
Krishnamurti's Pedagogy	40
Proposal for a Teacher Training Program	46
Educational Method and Krishnamurti's Teachings	48

International Network

International Trustees Meetings in Chennai 1999	49
The Learning Project	51
Saanen Gathering, July 1999	51
Websites	53
Swanwick Study Centre, Canada	53
Notices and Addresses	54

The Link is produced by Krishnamurti Link International (KLI). The members of the team are Jürgen Brandt, Javier Gómez Rodríguez, Claudia Herr, Nick Short, Raman Patel and Rabindra Singh. Photographs were taken by the publisher, Friedrich Grohe, unless stated otherwise. Contributions, whether anonymous or not, do not necessarily represent the views of the editors or publisher.

Cover Picture: View from Sulzhütte, Graubünden, Eastern Switzerland

THE NEWSLETTER

Dear Friends,

In the last Link I posed the question, “Is it presumptuous to want to go beyond the ‘K world’, to develop The Link to appeal to people who aren’t yet interested in the teachings?” And we received so many responses that I won’t be able to thank or answer each person separately. But I have read all of the letters and appreciate them very much, and am happy to print extracts from a number of them here.

“I am not so certain that anyone truly wants ‘a teacher’, no matter who he/she may be. That one can choose to find answers in one’s self because truth is one and the same for all, that I do believe. Attempting to make K’s teachings into ‘the holy grail’, our holy grail, is a constant danger/temptation.”

Irmgard Becker James from Ojai, California, USA

“I frequently hear comments which say K is nihilistic, negative, not definite enough, irritating; and I myself would try to convince others, or even persuade them, etc. – which is the very thing I do not want to do; what I think I want to do is to create an open, honest atmosphere in which an exchanging and sharing becomes possible, where everybody puts aside everything in order to look at things as they really are; without any ‘religious’, ‘spiritual’, ‘therapeutic’, or other imagination whatsoever, and maybe even without Krishnamurti. Simply undivided awareness of the other and what is.”

U.W. from Germany

“You say there are too few people to do the work of the schools, etc. You say we need more people, more money, more, more, more. Sorry, no, one man will do, a woman, a child. We are always interested in development, not in beginning at the beginning, in anonymity – in a place, whether school, newsletter, or center, born of this.”

G.H. from the USA

“The urge to make others share the joy or beauty of anything is unquestionable. One has to, however, guard against hidden motives of the clever mind such as the inner desire to seek authority or gratification in the name of K. We might also be guided by our evolutionary ‘herd instinct’ to increase the number of our tribe and thus feel more secure in our mission or convictions. Such

motives, even though one is not aware of it, affect the substance and style of our communication and meet with resistance.”

Rajnish Roy

“Going through the Newsletter, I find myself among those who ‘have made a similar mistake’. That is, I had tried to get family and friends interested in the teachings of K. It didn’t work. I also was amazingly disappointed to find that ‘they do not see the beauty of it’.”

Jaydeo Seeboruth from Riviere des Anguilles, Mauritius

“It seems the mind is excited with very compelling possibilities posed by K and so desperately wishes to share, to move forward with the apparent insights. ‘My’ mind has captured K’s words and has enthusiastically hoped to confirm what it has come to ‘know’. And what I ‘know’ may be quite subtle – possibly as simple as sensing the value of others being exposed to K’s teachings. Mind knows and mind intends to expand the teaching. Seems to make sense ... on the level of the mind. But beyond the mental, these words and concepts do not apply. They only reflect this brain’s propensity to entangle being with experience. Try as it might, mind cannot know truth and will not discover appropriate action. As the essence of the belief of me as a separate being, mind inevitably deceives. That which is prior to mind/body, that pure awareness beyond time and space, is truly the focus. And, in such awareness, appropriate action emerges. Yes! Live the teachings and ‘my’ mind dissolves. If I do not harbor thoughts, there is no ‘me’ to be troubled with such questions.”

Fred Campbell from Seattle, Washington, USA

“You are limiting yourself to non-issues. Be totally concerned with your own transcendence – do whatever interests you in your relationship with the world of matter, but know that relationships have consequences – as does withdrawal from relationships. But, all of these activities are self-limiting at best – go for the linchpin: your realization of your totality in one swoop. Of course you will fail in this effort. Disillusionment in the atmosphere of paradox is a ripening process. Nurse your failures back to a new try: repeatedly, until all of the actual dimensions of trying have become unarguably secured. Paradox pauses here, now you know the full dimensions of it too. ... In your No. 11 Autumn 1996 ‘Meeting K’, pg. 25: ‘I couldn’t stand this force, so eventually looked down.’ You must have felt disappointed to realize that you refused, out of fear, the implication that is inherent in this gift of total meeting? On reliable assurances it has been said that this final, total realization can be (has been, will be) transferred from one who has this knowledge, by a touch, a glance or a thought, to one who is ripe for that occasion. Allow that this sequence can be true for you! The fascinating world of measurable matter is only a preparation for leaving it – without a trace of memory. Be willing to meet in equality the austere ...”

Earl Scott from North Hollywood, California, USA

“Is it possible that the teachings draw people by the very nature of what they are? Isn't the Intelligence in the teachings more powerful than our limited understanding of this situation? If we are all linked to each other and to the teachings, isn't this deeper connection more profound and more effective than that generated by publicity? If you try to approach people who have not yet realised this profound connection, are you in danger of potential evangelism? Isn't it more important to give attention to how we ourselves are living? Is it possible not to react? ... May we say in conclusion how much we appreciate The Link as a connection between people interested in the teachings and as an unbiased, open expression of different responses to them. That in itself is a contribution to living the teachings in this chaotic world of ours.”

David and Louise King from Exeter, England

“You are doing a great job in making people aware of what is taking place in the ever widening K-world. As you are doing at present, devote more space for people of different shades of understanding of K's teachings to express their thoughts and feelings on how their lives have been affected by K's words. When I read the account of another, sometimes I feel like communicating directly with the writer in order to get clarifications on certain matters. This is not possible unless the names and addresses are mentioned. Would it be of help if we create a web-page for The Link giving all those particulars? (*Editor's note: please see pg. 53 for information about the new website.*) I feel very strongly that this will help to quicken the spreading of K's teachings. Since there are so many books by K, and on K's teachings, I do not consider it necessary for The Link to take the responsibility of spreading K's teachings outside the K-world. When those within the K-world start living the teachings, the teachings will spread by themselves. So help those within the K-world develop their understanding of the teachings. This I feel should be the strategy to be employed.” *Prem Kumar Balaji from Divulpitiya, Borelasgamuwa, Sri Lanka*

“Please tell Friedrich Grohe to stop worrying about:

a) getting more people (including his own family members) to like and understand Krishnamurti as much as he obviously does. ‘Taste’ for K's ideas is an acquired taste, like an appreciation of a good wine. I know many people who have been reading and quoting K for ages and still don't understand the essence of his teachings, which in my opinion lies in negation. People unfamiliar or uncomfortable with negation will never understand K.

b) adopting a wrong approach in your magazine: no ways! – as long as you remain as open-minded towards K as you appear to be, as long as you publish articles like ‘Why Only One Teacher?’ by David McMullin (Autumn/ Winter '98 Link, No. 15, pg. 6), as long as you are willing to admit that K was a fallible human being and not God, or Perfect Messiah, or the One and Only World Leader – to be emulated in all respects – you may be imperfect and fallible, too, but cannot be entirely wrong.” *I.F. from South Africa*

“You yourself point out that K never looked for popularity. K even said: ‘Popularity is the last thing that is desired.’ (Brockwood Park 1984 Talk 1) True, he also said, as you also point out, that the teachings are for everybody; but that doesn’t mean he wanted people to spread them. I guess he thought that those who don’t understand them cannot spread them and those who do will spread their own experience: the teachings then are theirs, not K’s.

There is another point. To try to interest people in something is to try to influence them, and K warned against that too: ‘Most of us have divided influence into good and bad. But to me, all influence is the same: it perverts, it distorts. A mind that is influenced in any direction cannot see clearly, it is incapable of direct perception.’ (Saanen 1962 Talk 3)

Somebody objected: ‘Are you not influencing us through your words, through your manner, through your gestures and so on?’ K replied: ‘I have been saying that every form of influence, including the influence of the speaker, is destructive ... But ... if ... you listen to discover for yourself what the actual fact is ... then you are beyond all influence, it doesn’t matter whose it is.’”

Francis Ellingham from Bristol, England

“Responding to your query about whether to use The Link to spread the message of K, I say by all means do. I often wonder how different my life would have been if I had not come across K’s writings in my teens. He changed my life irreversibly, and I am sure he changed yours, too. But here’s the point I want to make: K’s teaching should be only ‘pointed out’ to people – period. No attempt should be made to ‘convert’, convince, or persuade. I remember when I was 16 and a friend showed me one of K’s 1948 Talks (which he himself had just been given by a friend), and I began to read. I read the first sentence, and then, after the period, as I began to read the second, I exclaimed to myself, THERE IS ORDER IN THE WORLD! and I felt a tremendous burden lifted off my shoulders. Although still very young, I was not aware of the burden of the disordered world I was carrying until that burden was lifted by K’s words. The point I am making is that fusion with the teaching – and that is what we are talking about – is instantaneous, and remains so every time one comes into contact with them, as I am sure you can attest to.

So, let us expose the teachings to as many people as we can, and leave it at that. And if only a few fuse – even accepting that most in our families won’t – then so be it. K often talked about the few, and that is what I think he meant.”

S.A. from the USA

The Link editors were discussing this matter and they felt that any form of propaganda, any form of trying to persuade, convince or convert another, is antithetical to the teachings and creates authority which may well interfere with understanding and seeing. However, increasing the chance that people know that the teachings exist seems to me to be a different matter. This might take the form of simply making Krishnamurti’s books, tapes, etc., available as widely as possible; it might also encompass a situation in which



friends are looking at life together and one mentions to another that he or she has been touched by what Krishnamurti has said. Of course, even these activities could be driven by self-promoting zeal. So it is, as ever, a question of awareness and honesty. And any of us can make a mistake about this, and look again.

Once more, many thanks for contributing. I am always ready to put this question anew.

Now, in connection with questioning, I have another story. Once during a school meeting at Brockwood Park, with all of the students and staff attending, the importance of being able to ask questions was talked about, since we as human beings are usually preoccupied with having answers. A suggestion was made: one by one, each person in the meeting would ask a question, and what they asked would be related to the question before. As it happened, I was the last of the 100 people present, and so I asked, "When will there be no questions any more?" This was met with applause!

Friedrich Grohe, April 1999

We are very sorry to have to announce the recent deaths of Sunanda Patwardhan, a long-time friend of Krishnamurti and a trustee of the Krishnamurti Foundation India for more than three decades, in Pune, India; and Mary Lutyens, also a long-time friend of Krishnamurti, a retired trustee of the Krishnamurti Foundation Trust, and Krishnamurti's official biographer, in London, England.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Was Krishnamurti Conditioned?

In the recent Autumn/Winter issue of *The Link*, David Moody writes (pp. 7-9) that “historians and psychoanalysts may ponder why a man of Bohm’s intellectual stature and integrity” questioned Krishnamurti’s fallibility. I would like to suggest that it is exactly because of “Bohm’s intellectual stature and integrity” that he did so.

As portrayed in David Peat’s biography, David Bohm’s life work, both as a scientist and a humanitarian, concerned the nature of reality and the nature of conflict. He had developed certain themes that apparently gelled with Krishnamurti’s teachings, and

his subsequent explorations with K well illustrate a very mutual partnership in the exploration of the truth. Much of David’s work in theoretical physics was necessarily speculative – and now he’d met a man whose insights appeared not only to complement much of David’s own work, but to enlarge on it. Yet the extension of David Bohm’s questioning to the mind processes of another human being – that of Krishnamurti – appears to represent some kind of blasphemy to David Moody, who is without any doubts on that score: “Bohm reduces Krishnamurti’s consciousness to a level different only in degree, but not in kind, from most of us,” he writes.

While space to include articles and letters in *The Link* is naturally limited, the publisher and editors nonetheless appreciate hearing from as many readers as possible. Having said this, it is beginning to stretch our resources to engage in correspondence with everyone. *We would therefore ask all correspondents to advise us, when writing, whether or not you would permit your letter, or extracts from it, to be published in a future issue of The Link; we would include your name, together with your city and country, unless you specifically instruct us otherwise.* Moreover, since many letters share a particular topic, some correspondents may wish to engage in a written dialogue with each other outside *The Link*. If you would like to do this, please let us know. Your letter, with your name and address included, will then be forwarded to similarly interested people.

Following on from David Moody’s article, Javier Gómez Rodríguez addresses the question in part by raising the issue of whether “truth” is independent from the messenger: “Suppose that an abstemious man and a drunkard both tell me that drinking is really bad for one’s health. Does the truth of what they say depend on whether they act in accordance with or contrary to their identical statements?”

Obviously not. But suppose a man says to you, “When the ‘me’ is non-existent, I am related. [There is a kind of] relationship in which there is no ‘me’.” The speaker is telling you what he lives, not what he

talks about; if he does not live it, it is hypocrisy.” (same issue, pg. 16, direct from the horse’s mouth). In the above example the drunkard is not maintaining that he is living in accordance with what he espouses. But Krishnamurti did. And because Krishnamurti claimed a state of mind unknown to the common man, and unknown to David Bohm, it makes sense that David, being a scientist, being a pursuer of truth, should at some time be occupied with this question. The issue here is *exactly* that it is *not* reducible to one of “truth of the statement regardless of the speaker”.

It must be understood that Krishnamurti’s integrity is not at issue. This is not being questioned. The question is whether Krishnamurti was subject to the self-deception that arises with the thinking mind. Krishnamurti claimed to be aware of the movement of mind, of thought. So, either ‘self’, when it arose, was instantly recognised for what it was (and presumably ‘defused?’), or ‘self’ never arose. Could ‘self’ – as a movement of thought – ever have arisen or intervened or motivated Krishnamurti without recognition? That is the question. It is a real question, a valid question.

The question is whether Krishnamurti was subject to the self-deception that arises with the thinking mind

By all accounts David Bohm was an independent thinker and an independent inquirer and may the force be always with the possessors of such minds. That he questioned what Krishnamurti was about is in keeping with both the scientific spirit and his own personal integrity – hardly the stuff of “childish resentment” (Moody, pg. 9). A healthy bearing-in-mind of the possibility of Krishnamurti’s personal fallibility, by everyone seriously interested in his teachings, is a sure way to keep those teachings from becoming institutionalised and canonised and I thought that was what we all wanted. There is no better safe-keeper against the trappings (and traps) of faith, or the deification of individuals, than to doubt everything.

Carolyn Brandt, December 1998

To See the Fact

The phraseology ‘the teachings of Krishnamurti’ might at times be misleading as it implies that something is intended to be taught in the traditional sense. Those who are familiar with K know that he never meant it that way. He had repeatedly stressed that he was merely pointing out the facts or ‘what is’, and expected that others would be able to see that, not intellectually, but actually. Any endeavour on our part to defend the teachings or to follow them as a matter of faith, or of seeing them as sacrosanct and infallible, would mean missing the centrality of what K intended.

So far the unfortunate fact for me and perhaps for many others is that we, by and large, understand K only intellectually, though we earnestly and often passionately feel the contrary. K always stressed that one has to have attention in order to see the facts actually – an attention which is not interfered with by thought or memory, the products of the past. He also added the point, which is relevant here, that it is not possible for human beings to be attentive on a consistently high scale for twenty-four hours of the day. Your perspective, therefore, might change in the moments when you are not capable of such attention. Let us not forget that K was a human being and had his moments of inattention. That explains some of his actions which appear similar to those of any ordinary human being: his fascination for his childhood and the boy (which perplexed David Bohm), or K's worries for the future of his teachings, and their originality. It would indeed be unfair to make a sweeping judgement dismissing the extraordinary creativity of his unique genius because of a few instances of inattention, which are unavoidable for a human being.

Those who have glimpses of such attention or insight would be able to compare their states of mind during moments of attention and of inattention. At the time of attention, one feels truly exalted and unaffected by hurt, respect, mundane pleasures, psychological fears or worries and sees the facts dispassionately. At other moments, the old tendencies creep back inexorably. Of course, our encounters with such attention or insight are fleeting, not comparable with those of K. We are like 'candles in the sun' – this metaphor of Emily Lutyens conveys the truth aptly and objectively and is not coloured with hero-worship.

Another issue that has distressed many is why, despite having devoted many years with sincerity and seriousness to the teachings, one has not changed fundamentally. This led David Bohm to comment that the teachings "do not go far enough to change one fundamentally". Here again the same two points stick out. Firstly, we perhaps lack the critical dimension of attention and the absolute urge to see facts. Secondly, in contrast to K, our understanding of the teachings is largely intellectual, though at times sprinkled with short-lived spiritual passions or sentiments. David Bohm, with all due respect to him, was not an exception either. He had a formidable intellect and a superb talent for abstract visualisation, coupled with a rigorous and lifelong scientific self-training. But theoretical visualisation is a product of logic which is rooted in thought and past experience and is certainly not the same as "having seen the totality of facts without interference of memory or thought", which alone brings a fundamental change in life. It is akin to the difference between a genius and a robust intellectual who operate on two different wavelengths, so to speak.

There is, however, no doubt that many who have enquired deeply and earnestly into the teachings have found some real improvement in their lives in terms of reduced psychological baggage, and cracks in the shackles of the oppressive and ever-haunting 'me'.

Rajnish Roy, March 1999

K: CAN I PREVENT MY OWN DESTRUCTION?

The following article is an excerpt of a note Krishnamurti made in June 1969.

We destroy ourselves by our moods, our elation, our deep depression. We are too proud to examine ourselves or to let others examine us. We resist criticism. We cut ourselves off from any relationship that might open the door to our own mind and heart. We become so cunning in our resistance it gets better with age. We manage to make everything someone else's fault. We pick on someone else's faults to mask our own. We become deeply suspicious and every remark, every action, has a double meaning. One grows more and more secretive, lonely, isolated. Can all this have been prevented? Who is to prevent it, the world, or me, or you?

Can I prevent my own destruction? Can I not destroy myself? When I don't destroy myself, I don't destroy another. How can I stop the decline in myself? This wave of degeneration is always upon me. There isn't a moment's respite. How is this to be stopped? Does one ever ask this question, or does one only ask it too late, when the bell has already tolled? Then, of course, it is too late. When is the moment to ask this question? The irredeemable cannot ask this question. He can confess, propitiate all the gods imaginable, make amends, be deeply contrite, but all this is the action of a man who is already dead. It is too late. So one asks oneself when is the moment to stay the corruption? Is it in youth? When is it too late?

It is nothing to do with age, time or circumstances. It is because we rely on age, time, circumstances and opportunity that we are destroyed. This dependence on them is the seed of destruction.

We rely on things outside for fulfillment. This fulfillment never comes ... We blame the world for this greyness, because the world is grey. But it is grey because we, you and I and everybody, have made it so. We are blaming ourselves. I am blaming myself, outside, for what I am inside. There is only one entity, not two.

I am blaming myself but I don't know it. I am responsible for my own ruin. So I am cursing myself, and rightly so, but I don't know it is myself! So what am I to do? The ruin is there screaming at me. It seems to have come from outside, but the outside is made by the inside and is the same as the outside. I am the generator of it all. What can I do? What can you do? Can you really ask this question of yourself and really mean it?

When you ask this question, you have the energy and the earnestness. In asking this question you put all the other circumstances aside: time, age, the world. In this there is no morbidity, depression, hope. You are faced with something enormous. When you are challenged by something so enormous you have the energy to respond, because you are absolutely sure you are responsible for yourself, then you stop decaying. You have blamed the world and others. This has taken great energy and ruined you. You stop blaming others. This energy is there, now. This concentration of energy is the beginning of the end of decline. This energy isn't mine or the world's. It is intelligence.

*J. Krishnamurti, 4 June 1969
Copyright KFT*

ON CONTEMPLATING KRISHNAMURTI'S TEACHINGS

The following was the Address given by Allan W. Anderson, Emeritus Professor of Religious Studies at San Diego State University in California, on the occasion of the inauguration of the new study center activities of the Krishnamurti Foundation of America, in Ojai, California, 5 December 1998.

The founding of the Center is an occasion for double rejoicing. Broadly speaking, it expands access to Krishnamurti's spoken and written legacy. Speaking essentially, though, the Center's academic role invites the contemplation of Krishnamurti's teachings on human transformation independent of knowledge and time. These days I hardly dare use the words academic and contemplative in the same breath. Western culture has, since the 18th century, suffered a steady and increasing estrangement from genuine contemplation as the ancients and medievals recognized it – though it never attracted most persons even then.

The eighteenth century saw the rise of socially organized, experimental scientific inquiry. Experimental science, for good and ill, brought a vast deal of raw nature under so-called human control. This activity continues to hold such theatrical sway upon our titanic imaginations that we tend now to look upon evil as basically a nuisance which must, in time, yield to our experimental cleverness, finally to be eliminated. This naive presumption persists despite our killing more people and species in the 20th century than in all others.

There has always been a trickle of sageliness through this wasteland,

though experimental science with its dependence upon knowledge and time has not a prayer of being able to account for it. How is it, then, that extremely few drink from this stream of sageliness? Ironically, thousands make handsome livings from professing to drink from it but, comically, they don't transform into sages. Nothing has changed. Clearly, this matter lies deeper than we know.

These words might well appear to some as unduly pessimistic and unfitting on this happy occasion of celebrating the birth of a new housing for Krishnamurti's legacy. I quite understand such a sentiment. Yet if we should find ourselves among that number, we can never have pondered the law of compensation which secures that every advance contains the seeds of retreat, and if these seeds are not anticipated and met timely, firmly, and flexibly the advance itself will not prevail. Such seeds are not anticipated through probability theory or rational empiricism. They can be intuited only through what Krishnamurti called the total emptiness of the mind, which is the foundation of genuine meditation without ceasing.

Now I come directly to the point. We cannot employ this Center justly if we do not take with utmost seriousness

Krishnamurti's statement that no one had understood him. Happily, he added a condition. He said one might come to understand the teachings through living them out.

Once, during a 15-minute break between our video-taping two dialogues of the eighteenfold series with the title, *A Wholly Different Way of Living*, he stood up, turned his back three quarters to me and, with a slight droop to his shoulders, said quietly, "I've been saying these things for fifty years..." He did not need to speak the rest. It was plain from his tone and body language that he most likely would have added: "And all to no effect."

Many persons have thought that, given the time it was my privilege to spend with him during our twenty hours of video-taped conversations, surely I must have understood him – at least in some degree. But his last words on the matter during his final days many years later should put to rest any notion that I must have understood him. I am content with that both with respect to our video-taped dialogues and now.

Perhaps someone since then and now has come to understand him by thoroughly living out the teachings. Yet, if so, how would such a one or we validate that since Krishnamurti is no longer with us physically to determine it? In any case, were he still here and willing to make such a determination, he would not make it as an authority over against the person to be measured. To do so would be in contradiction with himself who consistently refused such a role. Further, it would be unnecessary since self-inquiry, deeply engaged as he taught it, is self-validating. One's way of life is totally changed, not in degree but in kind, and

nothing could be more tranquilly evident to oneself. Yet, such evidence is not arguable nor publicly verifiable.

This is precisely why Krishnamurti is not accepted at the university. In the KFA's Newsletter, Fall 1998, Raymond Martin, Professor of Philosophy at the University of Maryland, writes a lucid article on the question: "Why isn't Krishnamurti accepted at the university?" He writes, "A large part of the answer, I think, is that academics, in their official capacities as academics, are theorists ... Krishnamurti went out of his way to discourage people from regarding what he had to say as a contribution to theory. Rather, he encouraged them to regard it as an invitation to meditation." In noting Krishnamurti's statement, "the observer

... there is both cognitive and existential truth, and the infinite gap between them is a truly perilous pass

is the observed" as a truth statement, he comments: "From an academic point of view, when someone claims verbally to be revealing the truth, he or she is proposing a theory. So, whatever Krishnamurti's intentions, it would seem that he and the academics are both partly in the same 'business' of proposing theories ... Academics are interested in considering theories only for the purpose of evaluating them, and at the university the only sort of evaluation of theories that counts is based not on meditation but on argument and public evidence. Krishnamurti

did not provide these to back up what he had to say.”

Professor Martin goes on to point up what he takes to be a resemblance between the 18th century British empiricist David Hume’s critique of the concept of self and Krishnamurti’s. He concludes with the hope that some in academe will work up Krishnamurti’s topics into theory and then, in the standard academic way, assess these theories.

Now, one must ask whether such a program can, if undertaken, promote an understanding of Krishnamurti. What if the statement “the observer is the observed” is not a view, let alone one view among others? What if it is just a simple operational invitation to that quality of meditation that opens out on “observing without the observer”? In that case Krishnamurti was not in the business of proposing theories and therefore had no need to back up what it was he had to say.

What if, with respect to the problem of being understood, he was in the same case with Lao Tzu, the ancient Chinese sage, who said in the *Tao Te Ching*, “My teaching is easy to understand, yet no one understands it; my practice is easy to practice, yet no one practices it!” It is inconceivable that Lao Tzu imagined that argument or public verification would disclose an understanding of him or his practice.

Please do not infer that I am opposed to academic inquiry. On the contrary. However, in all my decades of university teaching of philosophy and religious studies, rare, indeed, was it to find any-

one interested in genuine self-inquiry or meditation as Krishnamurti taught it, which – as different from depth psychology – is not ensconced in theories.

I applaud Professor Martin’s concern and effort to introduce Krishnamurti to the academic community and that he sees, in his own words, that: “Theorizing is one thing, meditating a wholly different thing, perhaps even an antithetical thing. They are like oil and water... and theory and meditation do not mix.”

If we are to take this matter with utmost seriousness in its relation to the founding of the Krishnamurti Center, we must penetrate it a step further. It is always helpful and sometimes useful to see the difference between things. It is quite another thing to discern in what the difference consists. For our present concern, it consists in that truth abides in two different spheres. Truth and falsity are both in thought and in things outside of thought, which is to say that there is both cognitive and existential truth, and the infinite gap between them is a truly perilous pass. Meditating, as Krishnamurti taught it, requires navigating this pass. It is a characteristic of our human condition that we have little if any stomach for this act. Either we navigate this pass or we don’t, and no amount of amiable theorizing on ‘both/and’, rather than facing the ‘either/or’, can lessen the terror of this act. It cannot even touch it. Krishnamurti is a genuine free-flying wild goose and cannot be domesticated to run along the ground with tame geese who just talk about talk.

This brings me full circle to the question of understanding Krishnamurti, and how it is that I am content with it that I do not understand him. Many are



Sunset on Big Island, Hawaii

familiar with our series of dialogues and how they concluded with my thanking him and confessing that throughout them I had been undergoing a transformation. He replied with his last words in the series. Please note, as I quote them, his crucial omission: “Because you are willing enough to listen, good enough to listen. Most people are not, they won’t listen. You took the time, the trouble, the care to listen.” He did not add that on that account I had understood him. From these words it does not follow logically that I had or had not understood him. I preferred to infer that I had not understood him and that open-hearted listening was not enough.

I have only one claim. For the last quarter of a century since we conversed I have unflaggingly attempted not to misunderstand him. With that statement made, the lexicographers, grammarians, and rhetoricians will object that, since the word misunderstand is the antonym of understand and two negatives express an affirmative, I must be affirming that I understand. Now, within the sphere of truth and falsity of statement their objection carries.

At last we have come to the heart of the matter. In claiming the ongoing

attempt not to misunderstand Krishnamurti, I am using words to express a matter within the sphere of the truth and falsity of existence, where only being what one is, is true. Everyone of normal intelligence knows the meaning of the words “be true to yourself, don’t let yourself down.” Not to misunderstand is to stand sure in the perilous pass between truth of statement and truth of being. Given that every succeeding instant bears within it the unpredicted and unexpected, no theoretical understanding, based as it is upon semantic memory, can dictate the timely and fitting response to each moment, each bearing the ultimate moment of truth.

It is for this reason that, during another of our breaks between video-tapings, I asked Krishnamurti about his repeated statement that perception is the action. Did that statement mean that perception coerces the action, or is it not the case that there is an intemporal pause within which one stands or bolts from facing what is at hand? “Oh, yes, sir,” he affirmed.

Let me quote from our last conversation, the eighteenth dialogue, “Meditation and the Sacred Mind”. In the transcript K stands for Krishnamurti and A for me:

A: But that very statement: ‘I am the world and the world is me,’ sounds, as you have said so often, so absurd that one starts to bolt again.

K: I know.

A: To panic again.

K: That means one has to be very, very serious. It isn’t a thing that you play with.

A: No, it’s not what’s called these days a ‘fun thing’.

K: No sir!

A: In no sense. The discussion you have undertaken concerning meditation is so total. It isn’t a thing that you do among other things.

K: Meditation means attention, care. That’s part of it ... all of this comes down to a sense of deep, inward seriousness, and that seriousness itself brings about attention, care and responsibility, and everything that we have discussed ... the ending of suffering means the observation, the seeing of suffering. Not to go beyond it, refuse it, rationalize it or run away from it, just to see it. Let it flower. And as you are choicelessly aware of this flowering, it comes naturally to wither away. I don’t have to do something about it.

It should be clear from these words that none of this is theoretical or based on theories, nor can it be made into a theory. Meditation starts with the confession, ‘I do not know what meditation is.’ As the act obtains there is always the critical possibility, through inattention, of falling out of it. No concept can function as a net beneath this high wire. The great Danish thinker Kierkegaard noted similarly on the act of faith that, even if we could reduce the whole of it to a concept, one still would not know how it got into one or how one got into it.

I have not meant to discourage academic activity for the Center. There is a deal of textual sifting that needs to be undertaken, to rescue Krishnamurti’s talks and writing from the absurd misunderstanding on the part of many of his readers, that thought and words are intrinsically defective and hopelessly

misleading. It is their abuse not their use that he inveighs against. He is not a prophet of voidness nor an advocate of forms.

If the Center can house not only his archival legacy but the activity of students who approach his work with that deep inward seriousness that brings about attention, care and responsibility, the Center will be truly meditational and not let him down. And, from his standpoint, infinitely more importantly, they will not have let themselves down but will have returned to themselves.

Poetry comes more easily to me than prose so I shall, with your indulgence, tie off these remarks with a quatrain that bubbled up for me not long ago:

Driftwood returns to the abandoned
shore
Transfigured, stark and lone;
Those who venture seas unthought
Come back as spirit's own.

*Allan Anderson, December 1998
first published by KFA*

STUDY QUESTIONS

In the last issue of The Link the 'On Education' section included an article by Professor Raymond Martin entitled 'Krishnamurti at the University'. With his permission we are now including a list of examination questions from one of his philosophy courses involving the work of Krishnamurti (Study Questions for a course in Contemporary Eastern Philosophy, Spring, 1985). This was initially intended to appear in this issue's 'On Education' section as a follow-up to that article, but it has been hi-jacked by the rest of the editorial team in the belief that the questions will be of wider interest and therefore should not be limited to the context of education. It should be remembered, however, that that was their original context, which also explains their particular phrasing.

In reading these questions it might be an interesting exercise for readers to bring to it the kind of dispassionate rigour which characterises the best of academia. One might, for example, actually require oneself to posit a contrary argument whenever citing what one understands to be Krishnamurti's viewpoint. This may well deepen the inquiry and also, coincidentally, expose the non-academic reader to the virtues (and dangers?) of that approach.

1.) K is concerned with the problems posed by individual and collective human violence. He thinks there is one and only one solution. What is it? What is his main objection to alternative solutions? Do you agree?

2.) K teaches that gurus and spiritual disciplines are counter-productive. Why? Give the best reason you can for disagreeing with him.

3.) “The great religions of the world are the repository for our collective spiritual wisdom. The wise person will learn this wisdom, and use it as a guide to his own experience.” Would K agree? Explain why or why not. Do you agree with K? If so, give the best reason you can for disagreeing with K. If not, explain why not.

4.) Consider: “The clerk, when he seeks to become a manager, becomes a factor in the creation of power-politics which produce war, so he is directly responsible for war.” Does K mean to imply that you, since you also are ambitious, are also, in virtue of your ambition, directly responsible for war? Do you agree? Give reasons for your answers.

5.) Consider: “One of the fundamental causes of the disintegration of society is copying, which is the worship of authority.” Explain in your own words what K means. Does K recognize any circumstances under which appeal to authority is all right? What do you think is the most serious problem with his view? Give reasons for your answers.

6.) “We will learn how to solve our problems when we learn how to give them more thought and better thought.” Would K agree? Explain why or why not. Give the best reason that you can for disagreeing with K’s answer.

7.) Could you live your life effortlessly? What does K think? Do you agree? If you do, explain why you’re not doing it. If you disagree, explain why.

8.) Do you have a self or just the illusion of a self? In either case, what should you do about it?

9.) Why aren’t we fearless? What does K think? What do you think? Give reasons for your answer.

10.) Consider: “What is important, surely, is to be aware without choice, because choice brings about conflict. The chooser is in confusion, therefore he chooses; if he is not in confusion, there is no choice.” Explain in your own words and in considerable detail what K is talking about.

11.) Consider: “Now, if we examine our life, our relationship with another, we shall see that it is a process of isolation.” Explain in your own words what K means. Give the clearest example that you can, from your own life, to show

that what K is saying is at least sometimes false. Explain why you think this is an especially suitable example. Now explain how someone could best argue that what K is saying is even true of your example.

12.) Bhagwan claimed to be contradictory on purpose. K doesn't make any such claim. But he may be contradictory none the less. Give the best argument that you can that K is sometimes guilty of an important contradiction. Does it matter? Give reasons for your answer.

13.) What does K mean by "loneliness"? How much of your life is an attempt to distract yourself from loneliness – according to K?, according to you?

14.) When you suffer psychological pain, who is it that suffers? How would K answer this question? Explain in your own words what K means, so that someone who had never read K or any other philosopher could understand you.

15.) "K says some confusing things about whether in his view it takes time to acquire self-knowledge. In some places he says things which imply that it does, in other places he says things which imply that it doesn't. Although his words are sometimes unclear, what he means to say is clear enough, and also consistent." Does K say confusing things on this topic? Give reasons for your answer. Is there a plausible interpretation of the many things K says on this topic that is both clear and consistent? Give reasons for your answer.

16.) K talks a great deal about "meditation". What does K mean by "meditation"? Things that some others call meditation, K would not call meditation. What are the most important of these? Why does K think that meditation, as he understands it, is important?

17.) K talks a great deal about memory. He seems to think that memory is often essential, or that certain kinds of memory are essential, and that memory is often a hindrance, or that certain kinds of memory are a hindrance. What are K's views on the importance of memory? What, in K's view, is the relationship between memory and the self? Do you agree with K's views on memory? Give reasons for your answer.

18.) Is K an atheist, a theist, or an agnostic? Explain your answer in considerable detail.

19.) What are K's views on sex and love? Do you agree? Give reasons for your answer.

20.) Taking what K has to say all in all, what do you think is the greatest merit of his views? What do you think is the greatest difficulty? Give reasons for your answers.

- 21.) Briefly explain what K meant by any five of the eight quoted remarks:
- “The understanding of oneself is not a result, a culmination; it is seeing oneself from moment to moment.”
 - “Effort is a distraction from what is.”
 - “Reality, truth, is not to be recognized.”
 - “Action as we know it is really reaction.”
 - “Belief is a denial of truth.”
 - “Cultivation of the ideal is considered virtuous; but if you look at it closely and directly you will see that it is nothing of the kind.”
 - “The more knowledge a mind is burdened with the less capable it is of understanding.”
 - “I think we shall understand the significance of life, if we understand what it means to make an effort.”

Raymond Martin, 1985

THE LIMITS OF THOUGHT

The following are two extracts from the newly published book The Limits of Thought, which contains a series of dialogues held in 1975 and 1980 between Krishnamurti and the physicist David Bohm.

Thought and Perception

KRISHNAMURTI: Why has mankind given such tremendous importance to thought?

DAVID BOHM: You have pointed out that thought gives security in many senses, not only in the sense of psychological security, but also material security.

K: Yes, thought in itself is not secure.

B: Thought cannot be secure, it's a mere reflection.

K: Yes, therefore it cannot be secure in itself and seeks security outside.

B: But why does it seek security?

K: Because thought is constantly changing, constantly moving.

B: But that doesn't explain why it's not satisfied to just be that.

K: Because it sees its own perishable nature.

B: Why should it want to be imperishable?

K: Because that which is imperishable is its security.

B: If thought were content to say, 'I'm insecure, I'm impermanent', then it would be like nature, it would just say, 'I'm here today and tomorrow I'm different.'

K: Of course. But I am not satisfied with that. Is it because of attachment?
 B: But what *is* attachment? Why should thought attach itself to anything? Why shouldn't it say, 'I'm just thought, I'm just a reflection'?

K: But you're giving to thought considerable intelligence. If it says, 'I'm just like nature, I just come and go in constant movement ...'

B: Now are you saying that thought is mechanical, that's why it's doing this. Then we have to see why a mechanism should necessarily seek security. A machine doesn't seek anything in particular; we can set up a machine and it just goes.

K: Of course. As long as there is energy, it'll go on working.

B: If it breaks down, that's the end of it.

K: But does thought realize that it is mechanical?

B: No, but thought made a mistake, there is something incorrect in its content; which is, thought does not know it's mechanical. But does that mean that thought thinks it is not mechanical?

K: Sir, a mechanical thing doesn't get hurt.

B: No, it just functions.

K: Whereas thought gets hurt.

B: And thought has pleasure.

K: Yes, pleasure, pain, and all the rest of it. Let's stick to one thing. It gets hurt. Why does it get hurt? Because of the image and so on. It has created the image, and in the thing that it has created it is seeking security, isn't it?

B: Yes, it is not clear why it ever began to seek that kind of security. If it began as a mechanism, there was no ...

K: This is rather interesting, isn't it? Why does thought not realize it is mechanical? Why does it suppose that it is something different from a machine?

B: Yes, it may in some sense suppose it has intelligence and feeling and that it's a living thing, rather than mechanical.

K: I think that's the root of it, isn't it? It thinks it's living. And therefore it attributes to itself the quality of non-mechanical existence. Thought is clever, giving itself qualities which basically it does not have. Why does it do it?

pp. 67–68, The Limits of Thought, Copyright KFT

If thought were content to say, 'I'm insecure, I'm impermanent', then it would be like nature, it would just say, 'I'm here today and tomorrow I'm different.'

Transformation

DAVID BOHM: Memory is not really a deep function of the brain, though it may appear so. It may treat itself as deep, attribute depth to itself.

KRISHNAMURTI: If I'm a Catholic and I talk with you, and you show me the fault of it, I reason and I see it. Then it's finished, I'm out of it, I'm no longer a Catholic.

B: In principle I think this is right. What actually happens is that a person may see this in a flash of insight, but a certain part of the damaged brain attributes to itself the property of being very deep and beyond thought, and therefore it escapes this insight. It doesn't mean that the damage is deep, but that the damaged part attributes to itself great depth. So that often it is not enough merely to explain to a person who is a Catholic; he might see it in that moment but ...

K: Wait a minute. Say, for instance, I'm attached to my wife, or to something else. You point it out, and because I respect you I listen. If I am fairly sensitive to what you are saying, then it's finished, it's over, I am not attached any more.

B: It doesn't commonly happen that way.

K: Why?

B: That's what we want to find out. One reason is that this conditioning attributes to itself some significance which is very deep and beyond mere memory and thought. Suppose I have been brought up in the Catholic tradition. I have been exposed to it non-verbally and very thoroughly and it has left all sorts of marks. Then when I become frightened, once again it all seems real. And therefore I forget what you said.

K: Of course. But, sir, that's too easy.

B: But that is what actually happens.

K: I think there is something deeper than that. Let's go into it a little, it may not be.
I listen to you because you are serious, because you have detached yourself. When you show it to me and say, 'Look, listen', because I respect you, I am attentive. What you say has a tremendous meaning and I see the truth of it – not the rationalization, but the truth of what you are saying.

B: But there is the tremendous tendency in this traditional conditioning to resist that truth.

K: I am *not* resisting it, because, first of all, I want transformation, that is a basic necessity for me as a human being.

B: Yes, but then there is the other necessity of security, which we have discussed.

K: You show me truth and transformation. There is tremendous security. You point out to me that if I transform myself totally, I will be eternally safe and secure. Because you have seen it, because you have got it, then when you say something it's a shock, and I see it. But if I haven't transformed, if I am a crook, a phoney, then whatever you say has no meaning for me.

B: Then how do you account for the fact that you've been talking for so many years and it has had ...?

K: I think, sir, basically, people won't listen.

B: Yes, but then let's come back to the same point: why not?

K: Because I don't think people are interested.

B: Why not?

K: Why should they be interested?

B: Because life is such a mess.

- K: They have their little harbours in which they are sheltering themselves.
- B: But that's an illusion.
- K: *You* say it is an illusion, *to me* it is not.
- B: I know, but why does the brain resist seeing this illusion? Very often people get shocks which show that something is wrong and then they go back.
- K: Of course.
- B: We have to get through this tendency to go back. We listen to the person who really sees, and there is a shock, but maybe the brain will then go back later.
- K: You are asking why it goes back. That's very simple – because of habit, because of tremendous years of tradition.
- B: The only answer which is adequate is one that will stop that. As I see it, an explanation which doesn't end this thing is not a full explanation.
- pp. 86–88, The Limits of Thought, Copyright KFT*

WHO KNOWS THE TEACHINGS?

This letter was written in response to the last 'Dear Friends' letter. It includes many well made points and lends itself to such good and entertaining reading that we are reprinting it as an article on its own.

Somewhere in your heart, whilst reading a few pages written by our beloved K, I presume that what has just gone through your being is like a thrill of love resulting from a recognition of the crystal clear words bestowed as if 'from above'. I'm sure, too, that you are aware of the fact that this unexpected emerging of 'the new' is not made of a fabric one can simply propagate to the six billion human beings that inhabit this world of ours today.

Of course, it could become the object of propaganda and be made 'known' by means of printed or spoken words, but what of the inward melting of the heart, the scintillating emotion of beauty, the coming upon the tenderness of existence, the sudden awareness of the miracle of

finding oneself here on earth in a less conditioned way (if only for a second or two), or being awe-struck by 'The Beauty of the Mountain'. I reiterate: of course all this can be made the subject of propaganda, but without a shadow of a doubt only for a price that will jeopardise the inner value of the teachings and therefore disturb any feeling of truth being concealed therein.

I started writing these words in the magnificent surroundings of Brockwood Park, where I spent last Christmas, as a short introduction to a succinct answer to your letter, published in The Link, in which you raised the question about the aforementioned 'propagating' or 'dissem-

ination' of the teachings, now that the teacher has gone and the world is being left without the heart-warming and inspiring tone of his voice, with only the smell of the printer's ink on the pages remaining ...

What all this means is that I was touched by your letter in *The Link*, and by the sincere words it contained, not only because I realized the importance of it, but also because it reminded me of the fact that I had been 'walking around' with the same question in mind for rather a long time, that is to say that I often wondered why K's teachings have not become known to the vast majority of human beings, but also – first and foremost – how the teachings, while being disseminated, could be 'preserved' in a

... how the teachings ... could be 'preserved' in a fresh-as-a-daisy state without being mummified into a cult

fresh-as-a-daisy state without being mummified into a cult – a process which has victimised most 'religions' – and unfortunately their followers as well.

Just like you, I made the mistake of trying to get 'my family' interested in the liberating words of that slender teacher who refused to have any nationality, with the only difference being that, as a medical doctor, 'my family' consists of a good number of patients who frequent my practice here in Amsterdam. Of course, I met with resistance and annoyance whilst trying to convey the inner truth, as far as

I was able to comprehend it myself – and in this process I discovered how some resistance and annoyance, let alone a little aggression and even a remnant of megalomania that I came across, was where I least expected it: in myself! How terrible! (Am I the only person to discover that one can be inclined to spread 'teachings' even before they have become an integrated part of oneself, using them – without hardly knowing it – as a means of self-aggrandisement?) Fortunately, this inspired me – notwithstanding the shock it gave me – to 'study our teacher' more profoundly than ever before and to try to unravel the treacherous and well hidden *ichsuechtige Motive* (selfish motives) of the mind. Of course this does not imply that I have completed 'this never ending journey', but in all modesty I might say I have improved in becoming less self-sufficient and more compassionate for *any* fellow human being. In former years it would occur to me to be disappointed at the small scale of my work, as I thought it to be – giving medical and psychological attention to patients I did not esteem 'high' enough for my 'level of being', which resulted in – yes, you already guessed it – which resulted in the wish to do something greater (!), such as *par exemple* playing an active part in some sort of organisation that is concerned with the well-being of the world. Contacting such a world, e.g. the 'K world', and providing it with ideas and suggestions as an answer to various questions, would still contain a contaminated motive, wouldn't it, and therefore remain the subject of suspicion and, as a consequence, be utterly worthless. This unpremeditated item about the motive of the motive (!), which has emerged during the act of writing to you for the last half hour, might contribute to finding an answer to the question raised.

Although it may seem that the above-mentioned sounds like a confession about myself, nothing of the sort is actually the case. All I want to illustrate is that I have observed that our human motives are often intermingled with personal drives and an egotistic craving for satisfaction which has nothing to do with the contents of the 'ideal' to be attained – although ideals are terrible things in themselves ... (It stands to reason that I am not speaking of, or judging, your motives or mine, but the comment is meant in general.) From this it follows that one should be very careful about spreading any teaching, for any impurity that creeps into the motive will become apparent in the results and will be reflected in the world as a whole. But beside this, there is also a sublime irony here, for we are talking about the teachings of K! Spreading another bunch of Buddhist or Hindu dogmas around the world – well, that's a different cup of tea. Who cares for another piece of cake, consisting of a hundred or more extra dogmas and ideas, all very handy in daily life for the millions trying to survive on this cruel planet? But from the 'K world' to the 'real world' on the other hand, is a pathless land, *un sentier immaculé*, where we have to start telling every single human being that the word is not the thing ... and that one even has to forget all about 'God' if one wants that one in a million chance of encountering something that at last may be called the unnameable – and which vanishes the same moment one identifies it as such!

So, although we may agree with K when he tells us that we cannot spread the teachings, we can hardly deny the fact that while doing nothing at all, as we ordinary human beings look upon it, the

Foxgloves, New Zealand



teachings will remain where they are: within the limited radius of The Link – and on a few bookshelves in some bookshops with no ‘salesman’ around to draw attention to the unimaginable treasure laid down on the pages. Here, your concern and mine, I presume, come together – also in the light of the aforementioned purity of motive, where a real longing for a happier humanity emerges.

Strangely enough, and even stranger than it seems, a gradual shift has taken place in my work during the past years. Although invisible, while occupying myself with my patients who flock to my practice every day, and despite my never ending dedication to their often distressing physical symptoms, I have become more and more aware of an inner longing

... keeping an open eye on the cunning of the mind wanting to escape the routine of daily life

to be of a more encompassing service to mankind – as if an inner wish to heal on a principally psychological level, so to speak, made itself known. Of course, one has to be on the alert with ‘hunches’ like these, as I mentioned before, and one should never accept them without scrutinising and investigating the nature of them, keeping an open eye on the cunning of the mind wanting to escape the routine of daily life and secretly looking for more status and recognition and all the rest of it. I might as well refer to this shift in my inner attitude as a sort of going from a micro to a macro level – and although I wouldn’t like to call it a

problem, it looks like something – with your permission – that resembles the sort of problem you may be having: how to take the micro ‘K world’ to the macro world. Or, in other words, despite our understanding that the teachings are not meant to be spread in an ordinary way – not only leaning on K’s words, but mainly on our own insights – nevertheless the consideration to do so can be very genuine and stem from a source of love residing in our hearts. Ever since I had the privilege of attending K’s talks from the end of the sixties onwards, this feeling has accompanied my life and the more I attended the gatherings – from Amsterdam to Saanen and from Saanen to Brockwood Park, with an occasional visit to the Ojai Valley – the more I felt myself inspired to bring people into contact with the teachings, but alas ... only to find very few people willing to listen and even fewer apparently able to understand. Did K himself not have the same experience, be it on an entirely different level and on a scale beyond comparison? Didn’t he look in vain for persons who had experienced the so-called ‘mutation of the brain cells’?

I have just taken a short walk during which I asked myself: what actually has been the cause of my inner rendez-vous with a certain Mr. Jiddu Krishnamurti? Which part in me was responsible for the instantaneous recognition of the truth of what he was saying? Well, as I walked on, the answer to this came as soon as the first raindrops fell on my shoulders: even as a young student I had been dissatisfied with people around me. But it was not, if I may say so, an ordinary dissatisfaction. It pertained to the fact that everybody seemed to be so very convinced and absolutely certain of things, ‘facts’ and subjects one could not be certain about at

all! I was alarmed by it. The pope being absolutely sure that he was the sole representative of the almighty! Buddhists having their Prince Siddharta. Hindus their Ganesha. And clergymen a god of their own denomination! The whole world divided by dogmas and ideas. Not only was I unhappy, I was disgusted. I felt alone. How conceited and deeply asleep mankind had proved to be. I knocked on the doors of all kinds of philosophers – from Nietzsche to Hegel, from Locke to Emerson – only to discover that they were trapped themselves on their own stairways to paradise. And then came that day, somewhere in the late sixties, that a girlfriend gave me a book entitled *The First and Last Freedom*. At last I had met someone who exposed the lie, at last someone who questioned things from the unparalleled clarity of his mind and the absolute purity of his heart. Indeed, with that booklet I found the first man in my life – Krishnaji – who was honest. Need I continue my story? I don't think so, although I am aware that this little history of mine complicates the whole question of how to spread the teachings. But doesn't the seed of it have to fall upon 'fertile soil', upon an inner yearning?

You wrote: "I find it difficult to understand how people can come into contact with the teachings and not develop a life-long interest in them." My answer would be: I find it very *easy* to understand. When one comes into contact with the teachings, there is always a life-long interest. But seeing K's face and hearing him speak, or reading a book of his, does not necessarily mean 'coming into contact'. Just imagine you invite three friends to visit the Boston Museum of Fine Arts; to be more precise: to meet you in front of the famous painting by Paul Gauguin entitled "Where do we come from, what

are we, where are we going". One of your friends will be saying that he likes the colours and the composition, thinking he has been in contact with the secret we call Paul Gauguin. Your second friend talks at length about Paul's lonesome stay on Tahiti and his long letters to Paris telling

At last I had met someone who exposed the lie, at last someone who questioned things

everybody how 'happy' he was. Despite this, your friend is convinced that he was in contact with the miracle of this unique artist. Only your third friend seems to have seen more. He looks changed. The skin on his face becomes radiant. His eyes are soft and introverted. All he says boils down to an inexplicable beauty he has seen. No, not the figures themselves, not the composition, not the colours. Something between these things, behind them – as if he has received the mystery of existence itself. Of course, he has been in contact with the teachings of – Kauguin! Moreover, naturally he doesn't call it 'contact', for when this happens it doesn't know itself! (So beware of people wanting to spread the teachings too enthusiastically, for the chances are they have not met the real Mr. Gauguin at all.)

If you meant that you fail to understand why 'your three friends' are so dissimilar, that's a different issue. People have invented all sorts of explanations for that phenomenon: souls that are rather young or old ... perhaps adultery during a former life ... or rewards for a

good deed during an incarnation long before the time of Atlantis – or some more of that nonsense. I gather it is all very simple: life is ... incomprehensible! (Excuse me if it looks like I am giving a lecture, I'm not.) Years ago I had a neighbour who was a physicist, like Einstein. He was a nice man and a friend of mine. But do you think he was ever in contact with the secrets of matter? I tried time and again to raise the subject, wanting to learn from him and to hear something new. But in vain! Sometimes it seemed that I was more interested than he was. All he wanted to talk about was money. How I wished that Einstein had been my neighbour. One of his hundreds of *bon mots* reads: there are two kinds of people, one who considers nothing to be a miracle and one who considers everything to be a miracle. So I am not writing in my diary: "I find it difficult to understand how people can come into contact with physics and not develop a life-long interest in it." My neighbour is further proof that life is incomprehensible, and I still envy K for having had such a brilliant neighbour during the war as Aldous Huxley.

You wrote: "Is it presumptuous to want to go beyond the 'K world', to develop The Link to appeal to people who are not yet interested in the teachings?" My answer would be: yes it is presumptuous – but only putting the question is presumptuous. Who are we to put the question?

Just compare the teachings with a bag full of tiny diamonds; they come from deep within the earth and hence they belong to everybody. Now, one of the trustees finds this bag and starts ponder-

ing. He tries to recollect what K said about spreading the teachings, about spreading the diamonds. He asks his fellow Brockwood-men about it; meetings are held about the subject; pages are filled with the question; discussions are organised; dialogues set up. But what happens in the meantime? Our trustee forgets all about the bag and leaves it unguarded on the wrong side of the front door ... A man passes by and finds the bag. A totally innocent human being! He has never heard of the 'K world'. Neither does he know much about diamonds. So he thinks the shiny little pieces are just ordinary glass. Nevertheless, he decides to embellish the world with them – why not? – and as 'a sower he went forth to sow'. So the little diamonds soon turn up in the slums of Rio de Janeiro, in the mud outside New Delhi, in the heat near Alice Springs, in the tidy surroundings of Rougemont and even on the green green grass of home between Winchester and Petersfield. And so it comes to pass that the little diamonds are picked up all over the world. Some people think they are just glass and throw them away. Some recognise them as being diamonds and run to the nearby bank to sell them. And some keep them to themselves, as a jewel in their hearts. Who says there is any danger in telling people about the existence of the teachings and giving them information? Who says The Link should not be present in all the book-stalls of the world? Who is free from a wavering opinion about this? Indeed, almost nobody around Bramdean, except K. He knew that the diamonds would look after themselves – as I recall his words: "You cannot protect the teachings, they have their own protection".

Leon Alyon, M.D., February 1999

MEETING K

Friedrich's Notes

When I first came across the teachings, I thought to myself: “Why should I go to the talks? I have the books and tapes.” After some time I did go, however, and I was so fascinated by K that I regretted not having gone earlier. I recall feeling elation after hearing him speak, although I could hardly remember a thing he had said. So, I thought I had better do what I had done at school: learn ‘it’ by heart! As I attended more talks I came to feel after every one that I had understood ‘it’ better than before. In fact, I still feel that, and now with each book I read or tape I listen to.

I did come to understand that ‘studying the teachings’ is not learning them by heart. What K was talking about is life, and a living thing is always new. With the books, I would underline specific points, but when I revisited them I couldn’t work out why I had underlined those points and not others.

I developed a deep curiosity as to how such a man as K, someone who said the things he did, lived in his daily life. What did it mean to learn from him without attempting to copy him became my question, and whether that was even possible. I watched carefully how he went about solving people’s problems or problems at the schools. I suppose I thought I could solve problems the same way, which would, of course, have been imitation. Only later did I learn what imitation

implied and about conditioning; before that I had thought that it would have been good to be conditioned by K, much better than by anything or anybody else.

Around 1984 there was some trouble in one of the K schools and I was sitting in on some of the staff meetings. K was really giving the staff hell and I was so glad not to be one of them. I was even a little horrified by K’s vehemence. After one of these meetings, I joined the staff in the school courtyard to take some air. Suddenly K emerged from the crowd, took my hand and walked with me towards one of the gates, saying: “I never spoke like this before!” But it is only now, years later, that I understand the nature of this passion. One of the staff members, who was at the meeting has told me that he never felt any pressure from K because what K had to say was never ‘personal’.

At one point K invited me to stay with him. At the time, I understood only vaguely what that might mean. Later, not having taken up the challenge, I realised that he had suggested this to people so that he could immerse them in the teachings. He said that he would pressure-cook them. He wanted people to absorb ‘it’, even suggesting that they might at least grasp something intellectually from the process, although on other occasions he said that intellectual understanding alone was meaningless, that it wasn’t true understanding.

In the following extract K asks his friends whether they could stand being “soaked in it ... every day”. And again, at the conclusion of the extract on pp. 30–31, he refers to “inquiring, studying, learning”.

K: ... I would meet you very often till you are soaked in it, soaked in the sense that you understand what I mean, not just repeat what I say ... Suppose we were to discuss every day, could you stand it?

A.C.: Yes.

K: Careful.

A.C.: I could stand it, but to carry it out is the problem. The problem is when I go out of the door.

K: That means you haven't seen this. To see the danger of that, of thought, of the whole mechanistic

process, the inwardness of it, is the very source of intelligence.

pp. 214–215, The Way of Intelligence, Copyright KFT

Also, when I first attended the talks, I didn't believe K when he said that he didn't want anything from anybody – because he insisted on change. But now I do believe it, after listening to him and reading and studying the teachings, but mainly in watching him in daily life, from which I think I learned the most. However, studying the teachings does seem to bring one to a different level. I heard K ask people what happens to them after having been to the talks. They couldn't reply, so K spoke for them: “You become more sensitive.”

Friedrich Grohe, February 1999

K: To Pay Complete Attention

If there is order in one's life, real order, then what is meditation? Is it following certain systems, methods: the Zen method, the Buddhist meditation, the Hindu meditation, and the methods of the latest gurus? If meditation is determined, if it is following a system, a method, practiced day after day, what happens to the human brain? It becomes more and more dull. Is meditation something entirely different? It has nothing whatever to do with method, system, practices; therefore, it can never be mechanical. It can never be conscious meditation. It is like a man consciously wanting money and pursuing money: consciously you meditate, wanting to achieve peace, silence. The man who pursues money, success, power, and the man who pursues so-called spirituality are both the same.





Miramar Beach, Santa Barbara, California

Is there a meditation which is not determined, practiced? There is, but that requires enormous attention. That attention is a flame and that attention is not something that you come to; it is attention *now* to everything, every word, every gesture, every thought; it is to pay complete attention, not partial. If you are listening partially now, you are not giving complete attention. When you are completely attentive there is no self, there is no limitation.

The brain now is full of information, cluttered up, there is no space in it, and one must have space. Space means energy. When there is no space, your energy is very limited. The brain is now so heavily laden with knowledge, with theories, with power, position, so everlastingly in conflict and cluttered up, that it has no space. And freedom, complete freedom, is to have that limitless space. The brain is extraordinarily capable, has infinite capacity, but we have made it small and petty. When there is that space and emptiness and, therefore, immense energy – energy is passion, love and compassion and intelligence – then there is that truth which is most holy, most sacred, that which man has sought from time immemorial. That truth does not lie in any temple, in any mosque, in any church. And it has no path to it except through one's own understanding of oneself, inquiring, studying, learning. Then there is that which is eternal.

*pp. 359–360, Total Freedom, Copyright KFT
(Washington, D.C., 21 April 1985)*

The Full Moon

When I saw Krishnamurti for the first time on the last Sunday of December, 1981, on the lawn of Vasanta Vihar, the first response of my traditional mind was, 'Here is the ancient sage Vasishtha.'

And when I heard him, the scientist in me found in him an incisive intellect to admire. The doctor in me captured a psychologist's insight in K's talk as he was explaining the intricacies of the human psyche and functioning.

I was ecstatically happy walking about on the lawns of Vasanta Vihar, having found one (I could not call him a man) who was beyond all that I had known and could ever imagine. Then I went to him year after year.

One day, the talk was over and the crowds gathered around him. Though I was one among many, I was fortunate. K came to me and gave me a handshake with both his hands. It was certainly not a routine, friendly touch. His love, his affection, his initiation was in that. I never received such a warm, gentle handshake in my life. (I, a good copycat, later went around for a week or so holding people's hands just like he did. But where was that energy, compassion and warmth ...)

About six of us, all students, teamed up together and lay in wait at the steps of the Vasanta Vihar building. We waited at the steps for K and requested him to stay with us quietly for some time. He obliged. He sat amongst us. Initially hardly anybody spoke. After some days, on seeing us, he would directly come and sit with us on those steps. Most of the time he was

silent. If at all, he asked us routine questions. We answered him. Days went by. One day my heart beat faster as I suddenly felt apprehensive that K would go away. He gave me a gentle smile as if he understood me. He got up after a few minutes and when I tried to help him, he gently refused my help. Then he took his slippers in his hands and walked upstairs. As I watched him walk away, immense melancholy enveloped me. I could never explain that.

The seeds dispersed by K were probably lying dormant. Months and years passed. I obtained an M.D. degree and got married. Lots of events, suffering, joys and a certain routine became the fact of life.

Then, a year and a half ago, I suddenly came to Hyderabad. And one day I walked into the Krishnamurti Centre there.

The same *deja vu* feeling ...

Yes, I am related ...

This centre is in fact a small house. The main hall can take only thirty people at a time. It has the austerity, simplicity and the religious touch of which K spoke many times. You enter and you are home. Of course, one may say it is a figment of my imagination.

K spoke in a scientific way, allowing himself to be challenged and doubted. He always said 'That' (enlightenment) is not for a limited few, certainly not for the blessed ones. He said there is no monopoly. It is there for everybody whose eyes are open. This is the truth of K, call it change, transformation or mutation.

If we observe the lives of enlightened men, records show that their mothers felt a difference when they were in the womb itself. Their astrologers, occultists, clairvoyants and many others clearly identified them as unique phenomena at a very tender age. Certainly they were unique since birth. And this is precisely the reason why the common man refuses to accept K when he says 'it' is for anybody who wants to listen. Can the truth of K be proved scientifically? Perhaps a doubtful 'yes'. If only intense observation or awareness pushes the mind into the unknown! Even then how can science tackle the unknown?

But unless at least one person undergoes the radical transformation of which K spoke, his teachings, like many teachings of the Orient, have no scientific validity. But then science also clearly says that mutation is neither a routine occurrence nor repetitive.

How do I, or in fact any other common man, who has led just an ordinary life till now, suddenly transform radically?

In reality it is a great challenge for all of us. But can anyone of us make it?

What are the hurdles?

Why does the door not open? Why, in spite of reading K for so many years, does nothing change?

I am sure many a serious K student can answer this very eloquently.

The fact, however, remains: why does it not occur? Once while talking to Doris Pratt, K says, 'When I was young, I wanted to do everything a young man wants to do – fall in love, get a motor-

bike, race around – I was just a young man – I had to struggle between the myth and the fact.' Later he added very poignantly, 'The tears of all the world have produced the World Teacher.' If we look at this, is it that we have never faced the challenge of the magnitude of K?

Is it that though our words are serious our inner world is not? As Pupul Jayakar succinctly puts it in *Fire in the Mind*, 'One feels that the door is about to open, but it does not. So is there something inhibiting us?'

K benevolently says, 'Are you waiting for the grace?'

In reality, I think we are all waiting for an assurance that nothing untoward will happen to the self or the closely related, either in the physical or any other plane.

If one needs an assurance then we seem to have it too. K said at least twice to my knowledge, 'Anybody who really lives the Teachings, that person will be protected.'

You have that assurance, you do not wait for the grace, and of course you have the tremendous challenge.

Are we willing to accept this challenge?

Till that happens, K's teaching beyond a point is mysterious, as he himself is. Or is it, as we say in Telugu, '*andani chandamama*' – the moon beyond one's reach?

*Dr. Madhusudan Rao Taduri
first published by Jiddu Krishnamurti
Centre, Hyderabad, in
The Presence that Stays, 1997*

THE FIRST STEP

Editor's Note

In this issue of The First Step readers will notice that, at the end of each selection, I have added a quotation from Krishnamurti. These were not originally included by the authors but I did feel that each quotation, while referring to the issue of the selection, does provide another perspective on the questions raised by the authors, and one would hope that we do not fall into the trap of taking Krishnamurti as our final authority. Instead, these quotations can be seen as a contribution to the dialogue started by the author in a way that stimulates a further line of questioning and inquiry.

Evolution of the Observer

Over a vast reach of time, four million years, a diverse group of hominids developed on the face of this globe. All human populations today are members of the sole surviving hominid, Homo Sapiens. Biological evolution is an undeniable fact. Evolution of civilisations from various cultures in different parts of the world is also a historical fact. What we call civilisation is a highly evolved, complex, organised expression of human thinking.

And, as time is passing, this particular faculty of the human brain, the intellect, is becoming more and more complex and subtle. Science, technology, politics, economics, religion and education are ever-growing fields of knowledge. Even the study of one subject like psychology branches into other disciplines like evolutionary biology, cognitive science,

neuroscience, psychophysiology and linguistics.

Yet, there seems to be some part of the human personality which has remained underdeveloped – the animal nature of man. Indeed, with the help of his highly developed intellect, the animal in man has become more cunning, crooked, vicious and destructive. Time, instead of making this better, only makes it worse as more 'self-protective' patterns of behaviour are accumulated. Hence, massacres, genocide, wars – the annihilation of human beings by human beings – exist in our civilised world.

All of us are familiar with the awakening of the animal in us on occasions of fury, passion, greed, wrath and violence when our highly developed, superior intellect is completely subdued by a

voluminous outpouring of emotional energy. All of us have experienced the submission and slavery of our logical and reasoning faculties before the cruel authority of our sensuous desires and fears. The evolution over time of social morality, ethics, religious sanctions and other codes of conduct have never been successful in restraining this destructive force of our desires and fears.

If the human race is to be saved, this devastating energy trapped in human consciousness must be understood and ended, not over time, but every instant as it is born, manifesting in thought and feeling.

The question arises: What is the nature of this energy trapped in the human brain during the evolutionary process? Krishnamurti, the great 20th century sage, suggests that it is the consciousness of a separate ego, a sense of 'me' that desires to be and fears not being, which generates thoughts and feelings that sustain

the sense of separateness. Time only helps to strengthen this self-activating, vicious circle.

So, evolution in the true sense lies not through time but in the ending of time. Processes that take time – methods, systems, practices, disciplines – postpone true evolution. Time is created by the sense of a distinct self, a separate 'I', with its desire to 'be' and its fear of 'not continuing to be'. Therefore, the ending of time, or true evolution, comes about with the ending of consciousness of separateness.

It is not difficult to see that there is no such single entity as 'I' which could be ended; instead it is a composite of thoughts and feelings which create a sense of self as they arise. It is these which must end and end as they arise, that is, not over time. This can happen only by choiceless awareness which is the direct, timeless approach suggested by Krishnamurti. ***

As you walked along quietly, not disturbing the things of the earth around you, the bushes, the trees, the crickets, and the birds, suddenly round a bend there were two small creatures quarreling with each other, fighting in their small way. One was trying to drive off the other. The other was intruding, trying to get into the other's little hole, and the owner was fighting it off. Presently the owner won and the other ran off. Again there was quietness, a sense of deep solitude. And as you looked up, the path climbed high into the mountains, the waterfall was gently murmuring down the side of the path; there was great beauty and infinite dignity, not the dignity achieved by man that seems so vain and arrogant. The little creature had identified itself with its home, as we human beings do. We are always trying to identify ourselves with our race, with our culture, with those things which we believe in, with some mystical figure, or some saviour, some kind of super authority. Identifying with something seems to be the nature of man. Probably we have derived this feeling from that little animal.

pp. 137–138, Total Freedom, Copyright KFT

The Center of Conflict

As I watch the tragic events unfold in Kosovo, I find renewed emphasis given to questions of life's meaning. I'm writing you because I suspect you and others associated with The Link may also be inquiring into the fundamental issues giving rise to devastating human conflicts such as that taking place in the Balkans.

Why, after so many generations, so many centuries, so much in the way of



Green Sand Beach, Big Island, Hawaii

apparent human progress, is one ethnic culture systematically eliminating another? Why are they so stupid? Why have seemingly small and trivial differences led to overwhelming hatred? Why has lifting of the iron curtain apparently unleashed such violent emotions – even after nearly 45 years of living together relatively peacefully (under the clamps of communist rule)? A return to past stupidity? Or, more likely, was this human tendency

towards extreme self-interest and tribalism always lying there, awaiting yet another ugly opportunity to play itself out?

The Balkan ethnic struggles (and others worldwide) seem to reflect an extreme condition, not to be viewed as representative of most human cultures. Is that true? Or is the outer conflict, which is so evident in these struggles, only an expression of the inner conflict we each

carry to varying degrees? Do we all contain the capacity for carrying out similar atrocities? All my life I've contemplated the enormity of the holocaust, hoping to better understand how otherwise normal thinking, normal behaving human beings could ever perpetrate such horrible violence upon others. Certainly, over time, I thought, we had evolved into a more sensitive and less violent species. And now, in the midst of our relatively secure and prosperous societies, no way would we again

descend to such depths.

Then again, how does it happen that teenage gang members here in the USA drive up to a group of opposition gang folk and blow them away? Kids reared in this country! And not necessarily from seriously troubled families. Is that mindset, brought up on America's corporate consumerism, with its attendant conflicting messages and social inequities, in a fundamental sense any different than

that displayed today in the Balkans? On and on I could go with similar examples of our own, albeit less dramatic, human brutality. So, it isn't limited to another place or another time. It's right here and right now!

In fact, it isn't limited to these grossest of violent expressions. In a less overt way, it's a significant part of nearly all of our everyday lives. Verbal, if not physical violence. Incessant conflict. Determined self-interest. Lip service paid to concerns for all of life, while supporting violence (e.g. bombing) to ensure we may continue to waste away limited non-renewable resources. While the vast majority may not act it out in such a physically violent fashion, we clearly carry it on the inside and allow it to play out in our variety of relationships. We seemingly are on the threshold of destructive action on a huge

scale similar to that which we claim to despise.

Is conflict inevitable as long as I continue to see myself as a being separate from all else? Is conflict inevitable as long as there is an "I" through which to see? Could it be that the sense of a separate "me" is so embedded in mind/body that even the effort to understand reinforces the conflict?

An interesting perspective emerges regarding "you are the world; the world is you". Their conflict over there is my conflict right here – we're caught in the same field of conflict and its destructive violence. Similarly, awareness belongs to no one and is available to all. Is it possible that awareness of the propensity for acting from "my" center, strikes at the core of conflict? ***

But to be beyond violence I cannot suppress it, I cannot deny it, I cannot say, "Well, it is a part of me and that's that," or "I don't want it." I have to look at it, I have to study it, I must become intimate with it and I cannot become intimate with it if I condemn it or justify it. We do condemn it, though; we do justify it. Therefore, I am saying, stop for the time being condemning it or justifying it.

pg. 121, Total Freedom, Copyright KFT

Virtual Relationship

In this time of the information technology revolution, the question "Where am I?" still remains more important than "Who am I?". The world can now be mapped down to a single square yard. Maybe unwieldy addresses will go and each individual will get a unique address. It might be some abstract number which may not make any sense but it will be good

enough to track you down in any part of the world. Atomic clocks which can be accurate up to one billionth of a second mounted on twenty-four satellites permanently revolving around the earth have made this possible. So the question "Where am I?" has been comprehensively answered.

As science progresses further and cloning and fibre optics have become household terms, I wonder whether the question “Who am I?” will have any place in the information haystack. The speed with which frames change on MTV and the percentage increase in the decibels that Dolby has ushered in all leave me quite flustered. The pace is breathtaking, but to pause and reflect is neither valued nor desirable. With increasing determination, limited only by the span of attention that we as a race can sustain, we compete with vehicles, scams, movies and elections. Ironically, the atomic clocks were created as an offshoot of studying the basic nature of the universe. I had wished (hope springs eternal) that once again the direction would turn inwards towards consciousness as it did during the onset of studies in quantum mechanics. But unfortunately, the basic research in science is being used for entertainment or war. To guide missiles to their targets, atomic clocks were used in the Gulf War to devastating effect.

If it is true, as Russell once remarked, that “the single most important reason

for war is boredom”, humanity is marching towards more and more gruesome ways of entertaining itself. The precision with which US missiles raided Iraqi targets, as it appeared on television, is remarkably similar to today’s very popular computer games. I wonder whether the blurring of reality and games wrought by electronic media is not symptomatic of the alarming human tendency to seek entertainment at all levels. It seems almost as if we are itching to shift the scene from computer monitors to the actual arena. In either case, all we have to do is click the mouse. Whether a fictitious target on the screen or humans in a factual world are destroyed will be of little importance to the enjoyment of the game as fiction and fact merge. It is not as if this confusion between the virtual and the real is unidirectional. We now have cyberpets in cyberspace who recognise their owners and respond in an “intelligent” manner. As the world gets networked and physical distance loses its importance, will humans ever really meet, or are they doomed to come together only virtually? ***

You have only one head and look after it, for it's a marvelous thing. No machinery, no electronic computers can compare with it. It's so vast, so complex, so utterly capable, subtle, and productive. It's the storehouse of experience, knowledge, memory. All thought springs from it. What it has put together is quite incredible: the mischief, the confusion, the sorrows, the wars, the corruptions, the illusions, the ideals, the pain and misery, the great cathedrals, the lovely mosques, and the sacred temples. It is fantastic what it has done and what it can do. But one thing it apparently cannot do: change completely its behaviour in its relationship to another head, to another man. Neither punishment nor reward seem to change its behaviour; knowledge doesn't seem to transform its conduct. The me and the you remain. It never realizes that the me is the you, that the observer is the observed.

pg. 155, Total Freedom, Copyright KFT

Editor's Note

The emphasis in our last issue on 'Krishnamurti at the University', encapsulated in the article with that title by Professor Raymond Martin, produced some reactions, positive from those involved at similar levels of educational engagement and negative from those who are not. Perhaps this is unsurprising, but what was surprising, at least to me, was the vehemence of some of the anti-intellectual invective. Do the critics think that all academic pursuits are dangerous, and if not, and it is only those involving Krishnamurti that upset them, why do they feel the need to defend the teachings against academics? Perhaps a little generosity would not go amiss. Even Krishnamurti must be read generously if there is to be space for his insights to register. The major criticism seemed to centre on the idea of testing those insights by treating them as 'theories'. But K himself constantly urged us to test everything he said for ourselves. So until we have done that, what do we call those comments which we later describe as 'insights'? And what instrument do we use for this purpose? Is it suggested that the intellect is simply an impediment and should be abandoned forthwith? I suspect the problem might be that we assume that any intellectual process is necessarily an end in itself and that it cannot be part of a greater process demonstrating the truth or otherwise of an 'insight'. For me, one of the great things about Krishnamurti's teachings is that they encompass all human processes, including logic and the intellect, and that his insights appear, at least to me, to satisfy all tests, including those. K's concern was that the intellect was being elevated to a position of supreme and sole authority in the conduct of human affairs. There is some evidence for that in the world today, but I do not believe he meant us to throw the baby out with the bath-water.

So we are unapologetic about the last issue. So much so that a list of examination questions from a course of Professor Martin's is included elsewhere in this issue (see pp. 17–20) – they were considered of sufficient, wider interest by the other editors of this publication to warrant inclusion in the general body rather than just this section. There is also a speech by Professor Allan Anderson which deals at some length with that same article. I recommend them both to readers, despite their academic origins.

The main thrust of this section is the question of a Krishnamurti pedagogy, something that has always been regarded as extremely difficult to

formulate, but which must surely be the key question for anyone attempting to educate according to K's views on that subject.

Javier Gómez Rodríguez has taken the bull by the horns and set out his view of what such a pedagogy would be based upon. It is a brave and remarkably thorough effort which should provide an excellent basis for ongoing development of this issue. Starting with the fundamental purpose of bringing about a whole human being, Javier identifies three fields of activity, four basic 'arts' of living, and six guiding principles which would lead to that end. A related issue is that of a teacher training program for Krishnamurti schools. Such an undertaking would require at least some clarity concerning an appropriate pedagogy. We have, therefore, also included the bulk of the text of a discussion 'note' authored by Stephen Smith late last year on this subject. We also received last year a short letter from a professor in Bogota which attempted that rare thing, a description of classroom practice in which Krishnamurti's work is included in course content and yet remains true to his views on non-competition vis-a-vis grades, etc. It is only briefly put but it does demonstrate at least that it is possible and is happening somewhere. This, too, is included.

KRISHNAMURTI'S PEDAGOGY

There is little question that the field of education is currently in need of an in-depth revision. Its importance and relevance for the individual and for society as a whole have always been evident to educators and lately it's even been picked up by the politicians, who increasingly list it as a top priority in their election campaigns. The urgency of the situation is beginning to generate a good deal of reflection and discontent as well as a frantic search for alternatives to the current system, whose virtues and failings can be readily recognized. It is then natural to pose the question as to what K's proposals for a holistic education are, and how they may contribute to changing the current crisis in the field. What follows is an attempt to spell out a general outline of such proposals.

The purpose of such a holistic education is to bring about a good or whole human being. Whole in this context means not fragmented, not divided or in conflict either within or without. For K this is the unavoidable intent of education: "The vital flame of intent is to bring about a good, intelligent, extremely capable and free human being." (*Letters to the Schools, Vol. 2, pg. 41*)

This fundamental intent of developing the human being to its fullest capacity, intelligence and freedom, informs the three basic aspects of educational activity, which are:

- a. to provide the *knowledge and skills* necessary to function in society;
- b. to discover and cultivate the specific '*hidden*' talents in the individual students;
- c. to awaken a deeper interest in and *concern for the wholeness of life*.

It is clear that in the general state of education, most of the energies are being poured into the first and second levels of activity, which have to do with broadly functional categories and more particularly with areas of talent and specialization. As education is viewed primarily as a socializing force, the goals of the given society are what direct the whole process. As such, education becomes a means of social adaptation, with all that that entails in terms of professional training and identification with a given set of values and mores. Such an education is basically a tool for survival within a particular group or culture. The third aspect is generally ignored or relegated to the category of a specialized or private pursuit, whereas it should be right at the heart of the educational enterprise, as wholeness, however misunderstood, is the fundamental and inalienable intent of man.

This third aspect is continuously emphasized by K as being of the essence and one can't help but feel that its real meaning has hardly begun to be appreciated or understood; it's proving to be elusive and as such seemingly impractical. As one can observe, the three levels of activity increase in order of subtlety and importance and we can no longer take the easy way out, limiting ourselves to providing the training to maintain the universal preoccupation with bread and circus instead of facing up to the full challenge of the selfishness and suffering of our human condition. We have dehumanized ourselves to an incredible extent and we keep avoiding our most fundamental responsibility, which is to respond creatively to life as a whole.

The above three fields of activity are informed by six principal aims, here listed in the order which K himself used (Saanen 1983 2nd Question & Answer session), which are to bring about:

1. a quality of *skill in action*: the way one speaks, eats, walks, studies, behaves;
2. a close *relationship with nature*: not to destroy the things of the earth;
3. *a view of humanity as a whole*: each of us is the world;
4. a deep *sensitivity to beauty* which is more than the appreciation of art;
5. *a quality of affection* and care for all things, of love and compassion;
6. the *awakening of intelligence* or insight beyond mere intellectual capacity.

K often expressed his sense of wholeness as the inward harmony between body, heart and mind, which in turn would manifest itself as non-divisive action in our relationship with things, people and ideas. Sensitivity, affection and intelligence are the qualities involved in the fullness of these three aspects. For K life is action in relationship and the quality of this action is

therefore inseparable from the quality of life. Be it relationship with nature or with other human beings, the essence of right action is the underlying interconnectedness between us and others, between us and all that is. Our responsibility, therefore, is to see this for ourselves and dissolve the factors of divisiveness.

Words like sensitivity, intelligence and love take on a new and deeper meaning in this context. As far as I know, the words affection, love and compassion are seldom mentioned in educational discourse. Intelligence is confined to levels of skill in academic performance, particularly in those subjects requiring complex operations of abstract thought, and sensitivity is generally relegated to areas of feeling like literature and art. The emphasis on technical performance and conformity to the established pattern obscure these fundamental qualities. However, to ignore them would be tantamount



Tasman Range from Nelson Beach, South Island, New Zealand

to letting our human essence be brushed aside by the overwhelming momentum of social efficiency and ‘becoming’, and its obsession with measurement as the very definition of the real.

The meaning of education is to study, act and learn in a space of leisure, leisure being the Greek root-meaning of ‘school’. It is not primarily the acquisition of knowledge and the consequent implantation of a series of moral or immoral habits, but the cultivation, if cultivation it can be called, of four basic ‘arts’, art being the active quality of affectionate sensitivity and understanding that determines whether things ‘fit’. K listed these arts as the art of seeing, the art of listening, the art of questioning, and the art of learning, all of which make up the great art of living. The word ‘art’ in this context refers to the sense of learning as something direct and instantaneous, and not the result of preconceived assumptions and choices. This education, therefore, is

centred on observation and inquiry, on a sense of pliable attention to the ever-changing inward and outward aspects of existence.

This holistic approach requires a corresponding pedagogical atmosphere and practice. Relationship is of the utmost importance here. Education is a microcosm in which the whole world is represented. So one of its priorities is to provide the right physical and psychological environment in which a human being may grow up unhindered and straight. This means that everyone involved in the educational process must be watching and investigating the factors that tend to disrupt this healthy and integrated process of maturation. I here use the word 'practice' not in the sense of a method or standard routine to be followed mechanically, which would run counter to the basic aims and intent of such an education, but rather to refer to the kind of action



(the basic meaning of 'practice' is action, which is basically non-repetitive) that follows from the central concern with wholeness.

One of the first things that clearly stands out is the needful absence of the ingrained pattern of arbitrary authority, with its intrinsic sense of aggressiveness and fear, of punishment and reward, which has been the very trademark of life at school. These things have been implemented as the way to ensure a certain order and discipline in the classroom as well as to condition the child to conform to the pattern laid down by the given establishment, be it religious or secular. Authority, in the sense of imposition, not in the sense of being the author or originator of something, is detrimental to the integral growth of the individual. It destroys the quality of affection that is essential for learning

in relationship as well as the sensitivity and intelligence that go with it. As K never tired of saying, wholeness can only flower in freedom, not in a coercive environment. This structure of hostility and control damages the psyche, the senses and the heart, forcing the individual to take shelter in all manner of illusions. When love and understanding are denied, the psyche tries to drown its sense of loneliness and pain in all kinds of seemingly satisfying substitutes, in conformist, self-assertive behaviour or addictive habits. A division is set in motion and human integrity is lost.

Another danger that K constantly pointed out is that of comparison, the measuring of one person against another, the setting up of scales of superior and inferior. The stratification of society as well as the individual's chances and image of himself are generally determined by this comparative structure. The relationships between human beings are conditioned by this obsessive concern with degrees of high and low, which breaks down the sense of equality as human beings and introduces the spirit of competition, of envy and greed, which are the very fuel of the universal impulse to become something and one of the basic causes of conflict, ultimately leading to war. Comparison is not the key to understanding and it injures the heart, making for isolation and insensitivity. As K put it, "When you admit the more, the better, you are denying the good." And the good is what this education is about.

A question is then generally raised as to how order is maintained or academic excellence encouraged in such a place. Does anybody do anything except out of compulsion or reward? Aren't these our basic motivations? How do people get to cooperate and behave themselves, to become responsible in the absence of these? Won't everyone become sloppy and careless in the name of freedom? If they are not taught to compete and to seek to improve themselves and their lot, how will they be able to adapt to the social environment and its pressure to succeed? What kind of people does this education actually turn out, integrated and capable human beings or mystical dreamers and misfits who shy away from the tough challenges of life? These and other questions are inevitable when looking into the implications of such an educational proposal. Unfortunately, space does not permit a detailed examination of such questions. Nonetheless, and by way of a preliminary answer, it may help to observe that for human beings, and specially for children, relationship is the most important thing in life. Order, cooperation and excellence in action follow naturally from it. So to seek individual fulfillment and the common good through those things that deny relationship is a contradiction in terms. And that which contradicts itself has no meaning.

Things like authority, fear and comparison are detrimental to the proper interaction and atmosphere in the school. Their intelligent removal is the groundwork on which the spirit of inquiry, a sense of mutual respect, consideration and trust, cooperation and a dynamic sense of freedom can flourish. This new quality of relationship provides the background of security in which

sensitivity and the capacity to learn naturally and joyfully unfold. Such an ambiance helps to nourish creativity.

The particular aspect that gives depth to the whole atmosphere is the inquiry into oneself. Education is often described as the process of dispelling ignorance. It is assumed that if we have more knowledge, if we are better informed, we will be better able to solve our problems. It has been the hope of Encyclopedists, Romantics and other positive thinkers, that through informed reason we will achieve social justice, freedom and equality for all. This experiment has had some undeniable benefits, but has not done away with ignorance. On the contrary, the evidence points to the increased threat to life that mankind now poses as a result of such 'enlightened' ideas. Ignorance, as K has pointed out, is not to know or understand oneself. It is the neglect of the psyche that has brought about and continues to engender all sorts of calamities. There is no wholeness without insight into the nature and structure of the self. This attention to the inner as revealed in relationship and in the inward mirroring of thought-feeling, is a key characteristic of the schools where such an education is being tried. This means that there is not only verbal inquiry but also a quality of what K called choiceless awareness, which is the beginning of meditation. This brings about an expansive sense of space and silence which is the ground of wholeness and insight.

To seek individual fulfillment and the common good through those things that deny relationship is a contradiction in terms

This tentative description of the key aspects of K's proposals for a holistic education is offered as a first report of findings in a more extensive and ongoing inquiry into this field. It is a sort of map which, as such, is not and cannot be the territory. Education in this broad sense is a matter of our fundamental intent as human beings and as such is an inescapable responsibility. As K clearly pointed out, the problem in education is not the child but the adult. More often than not, children show that he and she bring with them this very quality and demand for wholeness, which they manifest in so many ways, from the simple concern with truth and affection, to a marked sensitivity to beauty and the beyond. This description is only an approximation, as all descriptions inevitably are, to the real challenge of educating children and ourselves in this wholesome spirit.

It is my sense that the inquiry into this and its implementation in homes and schools hold the potential for a much needed transformation not only of current educational practice but of consciousness and society as a whole.

Javier Gómez Rodríguez, April 1999

Proposal for a Krishnamurti Teacher Training Program

The following is a short paper by Stephen Smith sponsoring the idea of a teacher training program for Krishnamurti schools, and the formulation of a Krishnamurti pedagogy. The latter links it to our first article in this issue by Javier Gómez Rodríguez. This paper was addressed in the first instance to a small number of long-term educators within the schools who were well known to Stephen, and was meant only to act as a discussion/study document designed to encourage people to 'think together' on the subject. We felt it had wider implications and interest and have therefore included it here. Readers' views would be received with interest.

To some it may seem anomalous that one could speak of *training* a Krishnamurti teacher, indeed, that there is any such creature. Isn't it up to all of us individually to apply our understanding in everything we do? Certainly, but the question then remains, how are people to work and think together in a way that is mutually sustaining, as well as consonant with the spirit of the teachings? A split opens up between the teachings and academics, which already have their driven norms and are geared into the competitive structure of society. The teachings then become – as they have tended to become – a marginal activity, even a hush-hush subject. The implication of this, ludicrous in the extreme, is that the teachings are static (a “body” of knowledge) and that, while we might perhaps strive to understand them, we cannot apply them to the task in hand.

The eight-page “note” circulated by the Krishnamurti Foundation of India recently gives voice to this, and many other concerns. I quote: ‘This problem of a lack of suitable and right kind of persons in our places is going to be very much more in the coming years.’ Exactly. Where, then, should we put the emphasis? One place is a teacher training program. But it needs to be an *international* teacher training

program that reflects Krishnamurti's chief concerns:

- (i) global awareness
- (ii) right relationship
- (iii) cultivation of the religious mind

These might be the pillars of the edifice.

There was a time in the early eighties when, at Brockwood Park School in particular, there was a considerable broadening of the curriculum. The teachings were applied in an experimental way (such statements, for instance, as ‘You are the World’, and the whole arena of the *observer* and the *observed*, became the basis for study and inquiry). The mere fact that the teachings were approached in this way – not assertively but investigatively – threw fresh light on such courses as ‘One Earth’ and ‘Modern Movement’, and these, in turn, suggested further courses. The whole thing was exciting and stimulating; there was a real movement, *within the curriculum*, towards breaking new ground and challenging the system. And we need the revolution; it is basic to our cause.

The fact is, though, that this was just a beginning: there is so much more waiting to be developed. In his article ‘The Insight Curriculum’ (*Journal of the Krishnamurti Schools*, vol.2), David Moody suggests a parallel between the shift in perception

students need in order to alter a misconception and a change in consciousness itself. This is surely a ground on which one could build, integrating, as it does, academic learning and the “other.” At the same time it is a move away from the perennial tendency towards compartmentalisation, which characterises the world we live in and which seems endemic to the mind itself.

We should be aiming at global citizenship in the hearts and minds of the coming generation. The parochial attitude is the real enemy, fear of change, and hanging on to territory – these factors we need to mitigate against by bringing on a number of young people with whom we can build the “wave of the future.” I feel that, while those educators, in particular, who had seminal influence in the shaping of the schools – whether that influence has waned or gone from strength to strength – are still youngish, active, and engaged, we should begin, ourselves, to “think together” with a view to extracting the hidden riches of the teachings and creating, if possible, a Krishnamurti pedagogy. Indeed, the dialogue has already begun through the medium of the excellent *Journal of the Krishnamurti Schools*, edited by Ahalya Chari. This really takes up, and considerably expands, the colloquy begun in the early eighties in the form of two inter-school Newsletters.

We need to pass, however, from theory to actuality and to the working out of ideas in reality. This suggests, naturally, a Teacher Training Centre, to which students could come, perhaps initially for one year, and in which, along with faculty, they could learn and explore a different way of living, including specifically a different way of teaching. The whole thing would have, and need to maintain, a dis-

tinctly innovative approach. Those there would generate among themselves a crucible and ferment of “thinking together,” by which they might go from fact to fact, insight to insight, find to find. This, in itself, will suggest new approaches, a more holistic attitude to knowledge itself, as well as generating hands-on “tools” that the teacher can use once he/she is in the classroom.

Much thought will have to be given to the project and many practicalities worked out, but, looking around, it seems abundantly clear that the people who could “teach teachers” are in place. Nor would it be necessary, or even relevant, for all of them to be there all the time. One could think in terms of a number of weeks so that faculty travelling from, say, Europe or America could make a solid contribution to the program without having to abandon their jobs “back home.” It isn’t sacrifice we need but sustained endeavour from many quarters. This is our richness and our strength – while not underestimating the difficulties, we shouldn’t be falsely modest about it.

I feel very strongly that the time is ripe and that we need, very consciously and deliberately, to begin to prepare the next phase now. After all, in twenty years where shall we be? The new century will have defined itself, as the nineteenth and twentieth centuries did. If we want to be part of that definition, even – dare I say it? – help to shape it, we need, by an act of consciousness now, to lay the foundation for a pedagogy whose scope and dimension is still a closed book. Education, downtrodden, maligned, and underfunded, could still be the gateway to the new millennium.

Stephen Smith, 1998

Educational Method and Krishnamurti's Teachings

During my long career as a professor, the most difficult task has been to understand Krishnamurti's teachings in such a way as to share them with my students. Why was this understanding so difficult? I believe it was that a freeing of all conditioning immediately - in the now, as Krishnamurti says - is a truly hard task.

The teachings, content, if intellectually grasped, is refreshing, accurate and digestible; however, when you start to try and live the teachings in your daily life the big problem appears.

The point is that to observe 'what is' without the consideration of time, and without judging it, in order to realize the truth at every instant, is not something that you can do by means of reason. Therefore, if you present the teachings to your students at the intellectual level you are running the risk of distorting them through your own interpretations and judgements.

To remedy that situation, I usually, as a first step, distribute among the students short statements on a specific theme written by Krishnamurti himself, then I create several teams in the classroom that must work together in trying to understand the theme, reading, discussing and producing questions for the attention of the professor. Then, as a second step, I try to answer the questions brought to my attention through exploring Krishnamurti's thought more deeply, by bringing in some of his other writings that treat the same subject, producing in this way a creative dialogue with all the students.

This methodology accords with the individual freedom of each student to receive and understand for him/herself, plus the incentive of working in a team with an interactive group.

The next difficulty consists in the evaluation of each student by the professor, who considers the results of the student's study and the new 'knowledge' acquired, such evaluation having to be in the context of our traditional systems of education, where those results are represented by grades which are then registered on his personal record. However, according to the teachings the only proper means of evaluation is the correct observation of 'what is', something that cannot be measured by any number or letter - the only thing in this case being correct understanding.

At this point we must also consider the fact that, due to his contact with the teachings, the student begins to understand the scope that the teachings offer. He sees how he might change his ways of acting and relating with everyone else and with himself, by means of the application of an attention that permits him to look at 'what is', as it is, observing from a silent and non-fragmented mind. This new 'attention', brought by contact with the teachings, permits each student to evaluate him/herself to accord with the requirement of the Institution to have a grade. In this way the importance of an external grade is reduced to a minimum, consistent with what Krishnamurti thought about grades, when he said that grades debase human dignity and mutilate the mind.

I recognise that all of the above is something developed at an intellectual level, but what we have lived in the classroom was transformed by the enormous and vivid energy brought to us by Krishnamurti in his teachings.

Carlos Arturo Giraldo Franco, April 1998

INTERNATIONAL NETWORK

International Trustees Meetings in Chennai 1999

Madras has changed. It has changed its name to Chennai and the traffic has increased. The noise, the pollution and the dust have risen to new levels. The Adyar River flows slowly out to the Bay of Bengal, the buffaloes still grazing on the green islands, next to the buzzards that wait to feed on refuse and floating carrion. Madras has changed and has remained the same. The deadly stench of the canals still mingles with the magic scent of jasmine. Beauty still lingers in the resilient dignity of the poor and the air still echoes with its ancient religious heritage. The authorities, however, have removed the cows from the main streets. The sacred is in retreat from the mad onrush of modernity and its headlong and multitudinous careering after progress and success. Time and space are shrinking with the new values and their greater speed. The gods are growing silent as the pressing immediacy of living takes over the wills of men. It is the same all over India, all over the world.

Chennai welcomed the representatives of the five Foundations to the International Trustee Meetings, generously hosted this year by KFI. The meetings went on from January 16th through the 19th, following a program of dialogues, sharing of major Foundation concerns, and international committee meetings on publications, education and archives.

All the Foundations expressed the same three basic concerns: the need for more people to join them in carrying on the work, how best to reach out to the general public and other educational institutions, and the quality of relationship between the various Foundations. There is a shortage of people willing to take on the various functional aspects of the schools, the centers, publications and archives. The situations are different for each Foundation, but the problem is similar. The central question is how to keep the flame of the teachings alive as the generations succeed one another and their attitudes and sense of commitment inevitably change.

Outreach is another area in which the Foundations are being similarly challenged: how to make K's message widely available and specially how to bring it to the attention of the young, whose current interests seem to be leading them in a very different direction. There is an impression that in the new social climate the Foundations run the risk of becoming isolated and obsolete. The schools, however, are spaces where the Foundations engage in an ongoing dialogue and interaction with society at large, but their impact, even in India, seems to be disproportionately small. It was observed, however, that it is their quality more than the

quantity or the effect that really matters, and at present they provide very healthy environments for both students and staff.

The relationship between the Foundations has been a primary concern right from their very inception. They were meant to be one Foundation, although legally separate and with exclusive areas of responsibility. The emphasis, like that of the teachings, fell on their indivisible nature, but their cooperation wasn't always smooth, particularly when it came to matters of copyright. It was generally recognized that such relationships have improved markedly in the last decade or so. Significant agreements have been reached and differences have been resolved in a spirit of dialogue and mutual consideration and respect. These international meetings at Chennai were a clear demonstration that such open collaboration among the Foundations is an actuality.

There was a lot of sharing of information regarding new publications and the need to maintain the old books in print, as well as discussions concerning the implications of disseminating the teachings through the Internet. Self-publishing is becoming a reality for the Foundations. Their dependence on commercial publishers to print and distribute the books is subject to the vicissitudes and changing tastes of the market and doesn't offer a sufficient guarantee of continuity. In any case, it is acknowledged that the range of demand for K's works is rather limited and the Foundations might very well meet it by themselves, thus insuring as well a closer relationship with the readers.

Education, as one of the major commitments of the Foundations, received a fair amount of attention. There was a

good deal of concern over the quality of relationship in such institutions and the changing role of the schools in the new information age. One basic issue was how best to convey to the new staff the sense of total responsibility that is the lifeline of K schools. Do these places engage the full potential of teachers and students? A proposal for teacher training was discussed, as well as the need to clarify the overall educational intentions so that the academics won't blot out the subtler aspects of learning and attention to the whole of life.

On January 20th all the trustees attended the ceremony marking the 25th anniversary of the founding of The School-KFI-Madras. This was a lovely occasion for the students, parents, educators and international trustees to share in their common intent to bring about a different quality of mind, a new culture. Next day the trustees made their way by bus to Rishi Valley for a three-day retreat, with visits to the rural schools, nature walks, dialogues in the Study Centre and a trip to K's birthplace in Madanapalle.

The visit to Rishi Valley was a fitting culmination to this year's International Trustees Meetings. It was a good opportunity for the trustees to spend time together without pragmatic pressures and enjoy the tremendous beauty and depth of silence in the place. There is an ageless quality to the range of hills that fade away in the blue distance, as though they embodied an immensity of time. The soil is patiently being brought back to life, turning that once arid land into an expanding oasis. Many birds have returned as the water table rises, the harvests increase and the vegetation spreads over the eroded gullies and the barren slopes.

This landscape of vastness and regeneration was a fitting backdrop to our inquiry into the scope of the teachings and their essential challenge to every structure of duality.

Such was, undoubtedly, the origin of the feeling of togetherness that still remains.

Javier Gómez Rodríguez, April 1999

‘The Learning Project’ in The Netherlands

For the last fifteen years ‘The Learning Project’ (‘Het Leerproject’ in Dutch) has been involved in activities which allow people to study the works of Krishnamurti. Every year the association organises four K study weekends and one summer week in various places in The Netherlands.

The gatherings offer video showings and dialogues, and the summer week is also open for English-speaking participants. Gatherings take place in beautiful locations which offer the possibility of nearby accommodation, camping and nature walks.

In addition to the gatherings the association runs a lending library with a complete collection of books by Krishnamurti.

Everyone interested in the work of Krishnamurti is welcome to join the gatherings or use the library. For further information please contact:

- Wim Opdam, Prismastraat 68, 1339 AM Almere, Holland
- Ciska van Haren Noman, Dorpstr. 3, 3451 BH Vleuten, Holland
- Lieve Vanhoutte, Godshuislaan 86, 8800 Roeselare, Belgium



The Link's function is to keep people informed of what is going on in the Krishnamurti information centres, schools, foundations and related projects; to give individuals the opportunity to report about their investigations, their activities, their relationship to the world and to the teachings. Its main function is to be THE LINK.

Whoever would like to reproduce extracts is welcome to do so, with the exception of reprinted letters and copyrighted articles. Anyone may obtain additional copies of this or previous newsletters free of charge by contacting:

The Link
Chalet Solitude
CH-1838 Rougemont
Switzerland
Tel: [41] (26) 925 9446
Fax: [41] (26) 925 8762
e-mail: KLI@com.mcnet.ch