



# THE LINK

NO. 12 | SPRING 1997

## The Newsletter

|  |       |
|--|-------|
| Dear Friends                                 | 3     |
| Exploration into the Sacred in Everyday Life | 4     |
| Do K's Teachings Paralyze People?            | 10    |
| A Society in Crisis                          | 12    |
| K: The Place of Social Reform                | 14    |
| Golden Strings                               | 15    |
| On David Bohm                                |       |
| Book Reviews and Comments                    | 18–24 |
| J. Krishnamurti & D. Bohm in Dialogue        | 24    |
| Other Book Information                       | 27–30 |

## Meeting K

|                                    |    |
|------------------------------------|----|
| J. Krishnamurti: Without a Paradox | 32 |
| The Diary of Pascal Ruga – Part 2  | 37 |

## The First Step

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Editor's Note                            | 41 |
| Password to the 'K World'                | 41 |
| A Student's Response to K – Part 2       | 43 |
| An Answer to 'A Student's Response to K' | 46 |

## On Education

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Editor's Note                           | 47 |
| An Experimental Class on Krishnamurti   | 48 |
| Young Children – A Generation at Risk?  | 54 |
| Pre-School Initiative at Brockwood Park | 56 |
| Excellence without Competition?         | 56 |
| The Vanishing Humanities                | 58 |

## Announcements & Addresses

|                                      |    |
|--------------------------------------|----|
| Saanen Gathering 1997                | 62 |
| University without Walls             | 63 |
| Krishnamurti Schools                 | 65 |
| Working at Brockwood Park School     | 66 |
| K: Excerpt from <i>Total Freedom</i> | 66 |

### Intention of The Link

We sense sometimes a little confusion about the intention of The Link. It is not its function to spread the teachings. Krishnamurti said, "You cannot spread the teachings. You must live it, then it will spread." The function of The Link 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.

*Cover Picture: Gate from the Grove, Brockwood Park, Hampshire*

# The Newsletter

## Dear Friends,

When studying at The Krishnamurti Centre, Brockwood Park, one can be sure to meet interesting people from all over the world: the staff, of course, other guests, and sometimes teachers, students and visitors from the School. It's an inexhaustible source of contact and relationship.

On my last visit, in December '96, I brought a friend – a former banker who had been a very young officer during the war and then one of the first German students after the war to attend university in the United States on a Fulbright scholarship; he was received into the United States by President Truman himself. While still a young banker, he had given me a loan (I was even younger than him) to build a new factory in the Black Forest.

By good chance, the first person we met on arriving at the Centre was a lively young German woman who runs a restaurant. Very naturally she conveyed to us her enthusiasm for the teachings. Having just listened to an audio tape, she exclaimed, "I must laugh, how simple it is, what K says."

Other guests at this time included several trustees of the School and the Foundations, a former Brockwood Park student, and several former teachers. We had many discussions during the meal-times and around the fireplaces in the sitting-room and library.

There was also a guest whom I considered to be 'the man from Seattle', which is a phrase K used several times. Here is an extract, from an unpublished report of an international trustees meeting held in Ojai, California in 1977, where K speaks of 'the man from Seattle' – referring to

anyone who comes to the Centre in a certain spirit or with certain questions.

*"I come from Seattle and there you are, a group of you, at the Centre. I'm fairly intelligent; don't treat me like an immature businessman, or an immature traveller, seeking, shopping. I've come and I want to discuss with you, I want to go into a dialogue with you, deeply about fear. Not therapeutically. I want to end fear. I see the importance of it and, by coming here, I hope to end it. And at the same time I want a place where I can rest and be quiet. Out of that quietness, something may happen to me. Being here, discussing, something may ... Suddenly, I may have an insight into the whole thing."* (Copyright KFT)

Our 'man from Seattle' was a surgeon, originally from India, now living in Canada, on his way from Bombay to Montreal. The evening he arrived he began asking burning questions, which initiated discussions for days among many of the guests. He seemed to find the interaction he was looking for. He was also taken by the wonderful beauty of Brockwood. He remarked on the early mornings there, when the dew on the south lawn reflects the bright winter sun, and the deep blue sky.

Early in the mornings, while it was still dark and with no one around, I visited the 'quiet room' – not only to reflect upon myself, but also, perhaps, to bring some energy to the place as K suggested.

*"That should be like a fountain that is filling the whole place. You understand what I am saying. That should be the central flame, that room, from which the whole thing is covered."*

(Copyright KFT, from an unpublished conversation held in Schoenried, Switzerland, in 1984)



On one occasion, two friends and I visited one of Brockwood Park's neighbours, a man who has a remarkable bird sanctuary in his garden and who also helps the School with its maintenance work. Whenever people from miles and miles around find a wounded or orphaned bird, especially a bird of prey, they bring it to this man and he cares for it (using his own resources). His whole garden has become a network of ponds, nest-boxes, coops and cages. When a bird recovers he lets it go free. He had a pair of enormous all-white owls from Scotland which were incredibly beautiful.

As a visiting emeritus trustee, I was also invited to the School's end-of-term drama and concert performances. The students were lovely and did very well. I am amazed at how well the Chinese and Japanese students play classical music – not only the Brockwood students but also the Yehudi Menuhin School students when they visit.

When I recall all that happened in these two weeks I feel I could fill most of this issue of *The Link*, but since we have so many good articles by others I will stop here.

*Friedrich Grohe, March 1997*

---

## Exploration into the Sacred in Everyday Life

*This article is based on a talk given at the Saanen Meetings in 1996 by Mary Cadogan, an author and a trustee of the Krishnamurti Foundation Trust, England, and of Brockwood Park School.*

As soon as I began seriously to contemplate this subject, I realised the inappropriateness of the title I had chosen. Apart from the obvious difficulties of having to use words to describe the indescribable, I came to a deep sense that there was in essence no division between the sacred and everyday life; that nothing – or rather everything – was sacred or, more accurately, that our responses to everything can touch on the sacred, and taste that non-identification which releases extraordinary and abundant energy.

There are, of course, many triggers to this but, before exploring some of them, perhaps we might look at the dictionary definitions of 'sacred'. These are many and varied: Webster's Dictionary, for example, tells us that the sacred

means 'dedicated or set apart for the service or worship of a deity; devoted exclusively to one service or use; worthy of religious veneration; holy; entitled to reverence and respect; not secular or profane; unassailable, inviolable'. I like the last of these definitions, and also 'holy'.

Triggers or pointers to this holistic state come to us in many ways – through natural beauty and relationships; through art, poetry and insights provided by men and women from our own and earlier times. Of these Meister Eckhart is refreshingly direct and immediate: 'Up then, noble soul! Put on thy jumping shoes – and overleap the worship of thy mental powers; overleap thy understanding and spring into the heart of God.'

It seems that even in what can be seen as living in a mechanical state (while travelling to work, washing-up, chopping a salad or weeding a garden, and so on) there can come this openness, this absence of thought without any

consciousness of its absence. Krishnamurti has often spoken of life as a tide which flows through inner and outer being without any sense of separateness, and this perhaps was recently expressed in a very different way by Dame Paula Fairlie, the Abbess of a Benedictine Abbey in the north of England:

*'I arise at 4.50 a.m. into the stillness of the house, aware of being a tiny speck in a universe which I cannot even try to measure. Even the shadows of reality hint at mystery. Then I let the cats out. Bertie, Bruno and Joel have a room to themselves and have a therapeutic quality on us all.'*

Through the ages, of course, mystics have pondered whether there is any relationship between what is sacred and the forms of everyday life. There are saints and sages who maintain that these are quintessentially separate and irreconcilable. My own experimentations in looking and learning have brought me closer to the views of Cezanne, who said, 'I want to stun Paris with an apple' – and did, by conveying his insights into the astounding beauties of this apparently ordinary fruit. I also respond to Joseph Campbell's *Reflections in the Castle of the Grail* which describes the sacred as 'that place – or rather condition of the experienced world – where the transcendent radiance of that which is beyond form is made visible through, and from within, all the forms of all things.'

We are touching here, perhaps, on the concept of 'parallel' worlds of apparently different but actually interwoven realities. One of my long-standing joys is the directness and true innocence which I find in a great deal of children's literature. I became acquainted with P.L. Travers, the creator of the Mary Poppins stories, through her interest in Krishnamurti's teachings. Writing about *The Sleeping Beauty* she commented that 'the world of magic' (and knowing Travers I think that we can, without distortion of her meaning, substitute the words 'the sacred' for 'magic') 'intersects our mortal world at every

point and at every second. The two of them make one web woven fine'.

Similarly, the poet Francis Thompson calls our attention to the renewing silence that is always there, subsuming every sound and thought. In *No Strange Land* is a poem which suggests how simple the process of uncovering the sacred in everyday life can be:

*'The angels keep their ancient places;  
Turn but a stone, and start a wing!  
'Tis ye, 'tis your estrangèd faces,  
That miss the many-splendoured thing.'*

This poem, written during days and nights of human dereliction in the heart of a city (London), goes on almost to convey what I earlier referred to as being indescribable, by words.

Like Krishnamurti, the Victorian writer Lewis Carroll, whose own use of words was masterly, recognised that they could become impediments to understanding. His wonderfully inventive use of puns and word-play in *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* and *Through the Looking-Glass* constantly underlines the limitations of language and, in particular, of categorising and 'labelling'. In *Looking-Glass-land*, Alice enters The Wood of No Names and meets a beautiful fawn, who has no apparent fear of her: 'So they walked on together through the wood, Alice with her arms clasped lovingly round the soft neck of the Fawn, till they came out into another open field, and here the Fawn gave a sudden bound into the air, and shook itself free from Alice's arm. "I'm a Fawn!" it cried out ... "And, dear me! You're a human child!" A sudden look of alarm came into its beautiful brown eyes, and in another moment it had darted away, at full speed.'

More than anyone else, Krishnamurti has pointed out how discovery can often be blocked by our over-eagerness to name and analyse: almost seventy years ago at Eerde, in Holland, his answer to a questioner ended thus: 'I hope I have made it as vague as possible, because if I made it clear for you I should have placed a limitation on the Truth

... if you are wise, you will not tear the petals apart and examine them in order to catch the scent.'

Because all of our lives have been touched by the teaching of Krishnamurti, I feel that it might be helpful to share some of the things he has said to me which have been triggers to that awareness of which he speaks. To convey the quality of knowing him and working with him has relevance to the question of the sacred and everyday life: the greatest gift he gave us was that in relationship with him we were in contact with the unconditioned mind. He frequently talked with me and others about the relationship between the conditioned brain (the personality limited by tradition, memory, etc.) and the unconditioned mind. Is there any relationship? Is this possible?

Yes, there is indeed a relationship, because occasionally we can touch this. It has happened to me on more than one occasion in being with Krishnaji, as I hope I shall be able to convey. There were times when I wondered about the apparent paradox of Krishnamurti: of an unconditioned mind operating in a body subject to what Shakespeare described as 'the thousand natural shocks that flesh is heir to'. In this area there are mysteries – but so often what he revealed was very simple, although able to produce a profound response. For example, he spoke frequently about the limitations of thought – something that I wrestled with over many years.

He helped us to understand that the 'answer' or realisation lies in the penetration of the question itself.

Then one day we talked of this and he said, almost as an aside, 'After all, no-one can know everything' – and it was as if the bright light of clarity suddenly switched on in my brain. If I may drastically mix my metaphors, I can honestly say that he kicked our crutches away before we could walk, and – being thus thrown in at the deep end – we sometimes found that we could fly.

Krishnamurti's total openness was a multi-levelled mirror to the images which so often imprisoned us. On many occasions when a discussion appeared to have gone stagnant, he would open it into truly new dimensions by dropping into it some trigger to the sacred, such as: 'After all, goodness is there, wanting to manifest', or (when suggesting that the process of senile decay could be reversed) 'This timeless insight brings about a deep radical mutation in the mind'.

I was fortunate in having known him for almost all of my adult life, and I had been exploring aspects of my conditioning even before I began to read his talks and books. At the end of the Second World War in 1945, there was I – at seventeen – alive – when so many of my school-friends and adult acquaintances had been killed by bombs and other horrors of war. I somehow still had this extraordinary gift of life, and felt an obligation to find out what it was all about, and whether it could be untarnished by nationalism, separatism or aggressiveness towards any other human being. I felt very strongly that, had I been born a few hundred miles towards the east, I would have fought for 'the other side', because such would have been my conditioning.

Those immediately post-war years were extraordinarily expansive for a teen-ager, and the greatest excitement came when, on reading Krishnamurti, I realised that here was something I could explore which was more open than any other aspect of the religious quest that I had by then embarked upon. I met Krishnamurti in the very early 1950s and worked with him for nearly 35 years. I cannot fathom exactly how or why this came about, but it was not only a learning process but one of great joy and challenge.

I was shy and inarticulate in his presence when I first met him, but it was immensely helpful soon to find myself in a working situation with him – doing a job together. In that way my shyness and the awesomeness of being with him were largely overcome.

There were both remarkable and down-to-earth moments. He approached some tasks in a



*Spring daffodils at The Krishnamurti Centre, Brockwood Park, Hampshire, England*

way that nobody else did. I had many surprises, which of course made me look at even simple things in a new way. The first time he asked me to arrange interviews with him, for people who had written to request these, we were in Saanen. He came into the room where I was sitting, and together we regarded a pile of unopened letters. He asked me if I would help him to answer these, but showed no interest in opening them. Then he asked, 'How shall we proceed?' and the only reply I could make was, 'Shall we open the letters?' 'Good idea,' he declared, and we both started to do so. This must sound rather naive, but I really felt that even in such a simple matter as dealing with correspondence he was approaching it as something new! Nothing was ever taken for granted.

His capacity for finding humour in a wide variety of situations often found expression in jokes of an irreverent kind. At one stage this

became quite a challenge for me, because I told him two or three jokes which really made him laugh, and I felt I was expected to find more. And sometimes he told us jokes; these were funny, but he had a tendency to forget the punch-line or to let it run away with him too soon.

As well as his many irreverent jokes, I remember one which he told with great relish about the first monkey that went up into space in the 1960s. Krishnaji had, I think, seen this in the *New Yorker*, and he vividly described the monkey – in space-garb – lecturing a group of human astronauts who were due to follow it into space on the next trip. I can still recall Krishnaji almost doubling up with laughter as he said, 'The monkey told them, "Well, when you get to a certain height, you will have this absolutely irresistible urge to eat a banana!"'

He said many serious things which had a profound and catalytic effect upon me. I had my

first private interview with him very early in the 1950s. It was a rather daunting business, because I asked him about things which I thought were terribly important but which he brushed unceremoniously aside. Then he said, 'What did you really want to talk to me about?' He did help me to see the falsity in my questions, and at one point I said, somewhat in desperation, 'If what you say is true, really valid, it should work under any circumstances, even in a concentration camp.' And he replied, seriously and with his unique intensity, 'You would be better in a concentration camp'. This seemed a terrible thing to say to anybody not so long after the war, when our memories of what this involved were strong and ghastly. He went on, 'You would be better in a concentration camp than leading the life you are trying to lead. You are involved in far too many things. In a concentration camp, one of two things would take place. Either there is total and absolute horrific destruction ... or, you look and you look and go on looking'. And he said, 'Then something happens'. I knew immediately what he meant, and this has come again to me at several times in my life when I have been in situations of particular challenge and intensity.

Much later on in Saanen, when I and others had many difficulties in working with a man who seemed extremely dominating, we felt over-busy, worn and tired. Eventually I went to Krishnaji and said: 'What you are asking me to do is absolutely impossible. This person is totally impossible to work with – and I am so overburdened that I have no time to do things as I should be doing them.' I felt this very deeply when I went to see him, and thought that this might even be the end of our association – and he just sat and looked at me. And then he said, 'Why do you set a limit on what you can do?' Now, of course, this was said at exactly the right moment in exactly the right way – and suddenly I knew that there was no problem, and that there was the energy, and I could go on doing the work. There was no conflict. I think that this was the unconditioned mind seeing something that I had been quite

incapable of seeing. But it was pointed out in such a way that there could be a total response to it.

There is much about Krishnamurti which comes almost into the area of myth and magic, and I feel I shouldn't really get into this. However, I would like to mention another of the legacies that he, the unconditioned mind, has left us: he did not directly answer our questions: he gave us questions and invitations to explore, rather than answers and reassurances. He helped us to understand that the 'answer' or realisation lies in the penetration of the question itself.

His absence of ego was often and simply demonstrated. Coming into a room at Brockwood once, I found him reading, apparently engrossed in the first volume of Mary Lutyens' biography of him. He asked me several questions about my responses to this – and I found myself saying, 'Krishnaji, I can't really understand why you are so interested in all this, which is so much in the past'. His reply was disarming: 'I'm reading it to find out what happened to that boy'. There was so much that he truly did not remember, and had no desire whatever to hold on to.

To talk of his warmth and humanity sounds sentimental, but in essence he was, as he often

'For God's sake, no more probing. Look at it as the seagull in flight is lifted on the air currents.'

said, talking to all of us, whether in private or in public, as one friend to another. I recall that once in Saanen I went to see him to say goodbye because I was going back to England. He had been giving talks, of course, giving interviews and putting out tremendous energy and strength. I walked into the room between interviews; he greeted me warmly, and then asked, 'What is



your problem?’ I said, ‘Krishnaji, I’ve come to say au revoir. I have no problem.’ And his face positively lighted up as he said, ‘How marvellous to meet somebody who doesn’t have a problem!’

So much of what he said could be a meditation, or a starting point for dialogue, or a pointer to the new as, for example, a comment about looking at conditioning which he made to me: ‘For God’s sake, no more probing. Look at it as the seagull in flight is lifted on the air currents.’

However, I have to say that over several decades of knowing and working with Krishnaji, some aspects of the expression of the teachings seemed to bring about blockages rather than releases in me, and in others. Possibly I applied some of the things he said at inappropriate levels: certainly, and so subtly that it slipped through the net of awareness, I could find myself caught in a Krishnamurti-image-expectation, in which I had made him the authority. To be free of him, is, of course, as important as being able to listen to him. For me, the greatest impediment over several years was the implication that art, music, poetry and literature were simply escapes from facing one’s own emptiness. As long as even a shadow of that hovered over my explorations into life, there was blockage. This was partly brought about by my confusion about the levels on which some of the things he said operated. Context too was important: he would say something at one time which he would apparently contradict at another. Although he could talk of art as an escape, he also said, ‘You know, the word “art” means to put everything in its right place’. He would speak of truth in words that came like the rush of angels’ wings, but, when a lady sitting at lunch with him once asked, ‘What is reality?’, he replied, ‘Madam, you are eating cabbage’ – a response which, though true, is hardly applicable out of context!

There is, then, a danger in quoting Krishnamurti’s comments on almost anything without

also looking at what he might have said on the same subject at another time. I asked a question during his last illness, and it brought about a

When a lady sitting at lunch with him once asked, ‘What is reality?’, he replied, ‘Madam, you are eating cabbage’

reply (published in Mary Lutyens’ *The Open Door*) which has been considered negative by some who have read it. But I put almost the same question to him towards the end of the 1970s when his response was different: I think it is important that both of his answers should be known and considered.

Krishnamurti was then holding, in Ojai, a three-week series of discussions with trustees from all the Foundations. As well as exploring aspects of the teachings with us, he spoke with some urgency about how the work would be carried on after his death (although in the event this was a long way off). I was with him after one of these discussion meetings, and, apparently ‘out of the blue’, found myself asking, ‘When Krishnamurti dies, what happens to all the energy and understanding that is K? Does it continue in some way – does it go on through all of us (meaning not just the trustees of the K Foundations but everyone who was concerned with his teachings)?’ His reply was clear and uncompromising; he grasped my hand and said with that intensity which characterised his most serious moments, ‘Yes, of course – so long as you make the right foundation’.

Is this also a reflection of the sacred in everyday life?

*Mary Cadogan, February 1997*

## Do K's Teachings Paralyze People?

I WAS LOOKING OUT OF THE WINDOW AT THE PINE trees in bloom, pondering the day's work schedule, when the fax machine beeped and began to print. Out came Mark Lee's article 'J. Krishnamurti: Without a Paradox' and David Moody's '*Infinite Potential Falls Short*', his review of David Peat's biography of David Bohm. I read them both eagerly. Mark's article was pretty much self-explanatory, but that word 'paradox' reminded me of a few of my own and made me wonder whether they might also be mere appearance. I couldn't really comment on Moody's text, since as yet I have not been able to get my hands on a copy of the book in question, but I could appreciate the sense of 'loyal friendship' shared by many of us who knew Dr. Bohm as a generous and compassionate human being deeply committed to the understanding of nature and the wholeness of man. In the end one thing stood out in my mind which I think would be worth exploring, and that is whether K's teachings paralyze people.

Moody quotes Peat as saying that K 'did not think much of science, or for that matter of music, art, philosophy, or literature'. This was part of the issue I tried to address in the little article on 'The Vanishing Humanities' (see pg. 58), which in retrospect seems timely. There I pointed out how K's teachings effected a unification of science and the humanities as being aspects of the complex of relations that make up the human being as the summation of all existence. K also gave new life to the different subjects, including science, art, philosophy, literature and religion, by drawing attention to their original meanings. As far as I can see, this is very much a part of the holistic education he proposed. However, it is also true that he denied all this. So here we have what looks like a paradox. And paradoxes, as we know, are paralyzing.

I remember my surprise as a student at Brockwood when K one day, while we were in a

meeting with him, asked us what Shakespeare had said about thought having a stop. I had gotten the impression that he didn't think much of all that, just like Peat says, so how could he be asking us about Shakespeare? He had also been dismissive of Art, and then he told us that he had fallen on his knees before the Parthenon. On another occasion we were discussing freedom and he point blank asked us what Sartre had said about it. He was tremendously keen that we should know all about literature, art and philosophy, even to discuss them with him. K's own mock review of his Notebook makes a similar point about religion. But the paradox continued because, on the one hand, he asserted the importance of knowledge for understanding, and then denied that understanding was a matter of knowledge.

This whole movement of affirmation and denial can be extended to just about everything K discussed concerning the fields of action, knowledge and emotion. It applies to the use of words and to such key notions as thought and time.

K's insistence on now or never and his denial of time as a factor of change could very well lead to the conclusion that all action is futile.

Mark Lee makes some beautiful points on these issues. He also perceived paradoxes, but eventually saw that they were only apparent. How could it take three days for K to get rid of a habit when he had said all along that there was no time involved? Good question. And how is that resolved? Apparently because it takes time by the watch to observe but no psychological time to do so. And here we have a subtle distinction indeed, one on which much potential paralysis hangs.

K's insistence on now or never and his denial of time as a factor of change could very well lead to the conclusion that all action is futile. From this, Peat's second point quoted by Moody regarding K's listeners may draw some credence: '...in their personal lives, many of them fell into a sort of paralysis, one in which any form of practical action seemed inadequate'. This same kind of thought was also expressed, if I remember rightly, by David Shainberg in the film 'With a Silent Mind'. My friend Carlos Silva has long been fond of repeating a phrase he made up to signify this, in his view deplorable, phenomenon around K: 'mental paralysis and heart constipation'. People refrain from thinking and feeling for fear of incurring all kinds of deviations from the proper order K has apparently established. They abstract themselves from relationship and action because it would involve them in all kinds of potentially disturbing situations in which they might lose their virtuous self-possession. Or they become so riddled with self-doubt that they lose initiative. In short, they become afraid of life. K has questioned every sphere of human activity and challenged every meaning and value. This has no doubt thrown a spanner in the works of the consciousness of mankind, which has resulted, naturally, in some confusion.

All this would seem to indicate that a good case could be made for the paralyzing effects of the teachings, even from a merely logical point of view. They could bring about major contradictions in the individual, who is thus divided, and so make for a meaningless existence. K, it seems to me, was aware of this danger. He told us once the following story to illustrate it:

An old thief called his three sons to his death bed to tell them his last will. He asked them to promise that they would continue in their father's trade. They all swore they would, as was demanded of them. So they buried the old thief and they went about the highways robbing and killing as their father had done. One day, on entering the town after one of their forays, they

saw a preacher in the middle of the square. They immediately stuck their fingers in their ears and walked on. As they were crossing the square, the youngest got a thorn in his foot. He unstopped

The teachings can become confusing precisely because they exist on the borderline of the unlimited.

his ears to take it out and heard the preacher say: 'Don't kill, don't rob!' They went on their way, but from then on the youngest spent his days robbing and killing while repeating to himself the words of the preacher.

This was an illustration of the 'poison' the teachings themselves could become for people who heard but did not act on them, who turned them into an ideal to be achieved. And ideals are the essence of paralysis.

It seems to me that the attribution of paralysis to the teachings hinges on this sense of contradiction between their stated truth and one's living reality. And this result, though not so surprising, is altogether ironic given the holistic intent of the teachings. Again, as Mark Lee suggests, the answer lies in the quality of abstraction that takes over. This seems to be the factor of contradiction and paradox that brings about paralysis. Another factor is the failure to see things in context. The teachings aim at the most fundamental wholeness and freedom and this involves the careful observation, understanding and dissolution of the psychological elements of false divisiveness and conflict. They emphasize the sense of limits and of ending to bring about a harmonious quality of living. Their wholeness is necessarily negative, as they mean to put a stop to the illusory and destructive operations of thought-feeling, of self. They do mean to paralyze the pervasive movement of egocentric activity – no small matter,

apparently. This thorough-going denial, which is sane and logical in the highest degree, has vast and unsuspected implications at all levels of relationship. The teachings aim at the unconditioned. They are holistic, which means that in essence they maintain that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts (Plato). And that's why they can first assert and then deny the same thing, because within the context of the whole the part will always reach a point in which it is not. It's like words, which are only a part of meaning and therefore whatever they say 'it' is, it isn't. And that's not a paradox.

The teachings can become confusing precisely because they exist on the borderline of the unlimited. They open on to vast spaces which swallow up the known. Thus they become pathless, for there is no longer any trace of a direction given by the relation of parts. They are

an invitation to enter the emptiness, the silence, to be nothing, to die to every residue of experience, to bring psychological time to an end. He invites us to look on the world, in Mark Lee's expression, with 'affectionate indifference', to be in the world and not be of the world. No wonder some or even many of us end up feeling a strong urge to lead the contemplative life! The teachings aim at dissolving the paralyzing and mechanical elements of human existence so that there can be the greatest flow of energy, which is the undivided movement of the whole, which is the source of creative action, which makes them the most practical, etc. The sense of paralysis or of free movement seems to depend on whether there is a sufficient understanding of ourselves and therefore an opening to the endless flux of that which is.

*Javier Gomez Rodriguez, March 1997*

## A Society in Crisis

*We received a letter from Claude Bobillier around the new year describing, amongst other things, the conditions and nature of his work in the turbulent Great Lakes region of Africa. It struck us forcibly that this was a report from today's 'front line' and that, if we take seriously K's oft repeated observation that 'we are the world', then it also bears directly on the relevance of the teachings in today's world.*

*Having obtained Claude's permission to repeat the following section of his letter, by happy coincidence we were also sent, a little later, copies of three letters written by K in 1944-46 which had just been discovered in Brazil. One of them seemed especially apt and it is included immediately after Claude's report.*

*In juxtaposing these two extracts we do not mean to make a comment on the relative merit of one activity or another, but rather to show how work motivated by immediate social concerns fits within the context of a change in the overall psychology of man. As K says: "Are they not one process?"*

Kagera region has been invaded by close to one million refugees from Rwanda from April to June 1994, following the genocide there. The impact of so many desperate people on Kagera's population of 1.5 million, already some of the

most destitute in the world, has been simply devastating. In early 1995, following a plea from the government of Tanzania, the United Nations was requested by the so-called International Community to step in and assist



*Winter sunset with Rübli, on the way from Saanen to Rougemont, Switzerland*

Tanzania in the rapid rehabilitation of crisis-ridden Kagera.

Kagera region, and Bukoba its capital city (80,000 inhabitants), is located on the shore of huge Lake Victoria (the second largest lake in the world after Russia's Baikal) and shares common borders with Rwanda, Burundi and Uganda, three countries where civil wars are raging. The shores of Lake Victoria are uniquely beautiful, in spite of being witness to regular human and natural disasters! White, virgin, sandy beaches; tropical rain forests; exotic birds, fruit and plants; rare spices; strange fish; remnants of old, long-dead civilizations; gold and diamond mines; prehistoric artifacts of rare significance; impenetrable jungles filled with an incredible diversity of wild animals; are just some of the assets of Tanzania, and therefore also of Kagera region.

These are the positives. Unfortunately, as you can imagine, there are also the negative aspects of life in Tanzania and Kagera. We here in Kagera feel quite isolated from the rest of the world (1500 km from Dar es Salaam, 1000 km from Nairobi and 500 km from Kampala). Roads, if you can call them that, are appalling. In Kagera region, to go from one district to another you need in many cases police or army escort. There are frequent attacks by bandits, hungry refugees and genocidal murderers from Rwanda. Bukoba is ridden with AIDS and other diseases. There are over 100,000 orphans in this region alone. The per capita yearly income is half that of Tanzania's as a whole, which is already one of the lowest in the world at less than US \$ 200.

Working here is difficult, with widespread corruption and incompetence, almost non-existent communications, and a barely functioning state



and local administrative apparatus. As a so-called senior technical adviser, operating on two projects at once, i.e. assuming crucial responsibilities for the strengthening of human capacities at village, ward and district levels for the whole region, and at the same time trying to contribute to the finding of solutions to the awful crises in the Great Lakes area, using Kagera region as a model for conflict resolution, rehabilitation of refugees and long-term sustainable development, I can assure you that my nights and weekends are short!

All this we try to achieve within a cultural context that is mostly alien to western ideas and concepts such as planning, organising, management, efficiency, progress, accountability. Most people here are too busy trying to survive and cope with life on a daily basis to engage in the luxury of a western approach to development. My greatest difficulties and frustrations are, by far, trying to cope and deal with bureaucracies such as those of the government and the United Nations. The proportion of my energy, time and effort spent on trivial matters is quite incredible and unacceptable to me. The amount of pushing,

growing, pleading I do in Bukoba is probably more than I have done so far in my entire life!

Regularly, I have serious doubts about my capacity and willingness to go on. Regularly, too, I dream about the land I bought last year in Goudargues, Provence, southern France, and the day, next year, I can go back there, build our house, sip pastis, play bowls and sniff lavender under the hot sun and in the simplicity of a provencal village.

But the exotic garden that surrounds our house, its tropical birds, flowers and trees, the sound of Lake Victoria's waves and the exciting perfume of its plants make life just bearable here in Bukoba – for another few months! We do need regular signs of life from the outside world to feel that we are not forgotten. We need these to sustain ourselves physically, intellectually, and above all spiritually. Krishnamurti and his unique teachings are, of course, a huge help. But the continued presence of friendship, even at vast distances, is essential too

*Claude Bobillier, December 1996*

## ■ A Letter from Krishnamurti to a Friend

### The Place of Social Reform

Ojai, California, February 7, 1946

**Dear Friend:**

Thank you very much for your letter of December 18th. Of course one should never accept another's thought, whoever he might be, unless one examines and really understands it oneself.

We all see that vast social reform is urgently necessary but such reform, without taking into account the whole of man's requirements I feel

becomes ineffective. We all agree that exploitation of man by man, whether religious or economic, is fundamentally "evil". Social reform, by itself, without taking into account man's tendencies, is soon distorted, which does not mean that we are against social reform. We feel it is important that right place should be given to social reform so the problem is, is it not, that there not only must be social reform but the instinct for acquisitiveness, for dependency, for power, must be examined and eradicated by each individual. Without the freedom from these tendencies we shall merely exploit man on a higher level, but this should not prevent man from social reorganisation.

I do not think that social reform and spiritual freedom are in contradiction with each other.

They go together and cannot be separated. As you say, I do not think we need any philosophy to sweep away the exploitation of man by man, not only in the material world but in the psychological field. In what manner we bring about reform is as important as the reformation itself. Through a wrong means a right end cannot be achieved at any time, and only right means can produce the right ends; and this should be one of the important issues in all our thinking. Social reforms will go on even though individuals are not enlightened, and I do not think such reforms, though essential, will bring about the creative release of man, which does not mean

that I am against social reform. After all, the end of all social reform is to release the true creative life in man. Through this social reformation man will have more leisure and what he will do with his leisure is as important as the reform; so social reformation and the true creative release of man should not be separated. Are they not one process? And in giving emphasis to the one process we will bring about right culture.

I hope I have been able to answer some of your questions.

With best wishes, Yours very sincerely,

*J. Krishnamurti*

---

## Golden Strings

*The following article is an extract from a letter from Alan Rowlands to Friedrich following Alan's most recent trip to India. Alan is a music teacher at Brockwood Park School and a professor of piano at the Royal College of Music in London.*

It was my intention to let you have a detailed account of my recent trip to India, December '96 to January '97, and to help in this I kept a daily diary, the first time I have done this. Now that that diary has disappeared, I cannot tell you how many trees have been planted at Rajghat since my last visit three years ago, nor how many litres the water tower at the Botanical Sanctuary at Wynad will hold. But perhaps the catalogue of such things, including the places visited and the good friends met (with great joy) once again, is not after all of such great significance. I would much rather tell you, at the risk of being somewhat personal, about reflections and feelings that arose, meaningful interactions, things that touched me deeply. I also find that this is the way that writing works best – unless it comes from the heart it doesn't have much meaning.

I could never forget, for instance, the faces of the children at Sholai School (a school and farm in the Nilgiri Mountains founded by Brian

Jenkins, a former staff member at Brockwood) who clustered round as I was trying out the Yamaha Clavinova which I had helped Brian to get some years ago. Their eyes seemed to express the utmost wonder and one young boy's expression was so wistful that it was almost heartbreaking. I later gave an open-air recital on this instrument, facing the beautiful mountain view. Why are Indian children so delightful?

At other times their faces were full of smiles and they were so polite and friendly. "Good morning, Sir! How are you, Sir?", they would say, and it didn't sound mechanical. I much admire what Brian's energy and initiative have achieved in this place, especially in the realm of alternative technology.

Another significant moment was during a poetry session with a class of younger children at the Study Centre at Rishi Valley. I had decided to read them William Blake's 'The Lamb' and 'The Tiger' – two poems of extraordinary power, both

expressing something of the mystery of creation: "who made thee?". 'The Lamb' is also very much about innocence, and during this, seeing all those innocent young faces around me, I suddenly found such a lump in my throat that I couldn't go on. I hardly knew what to do, but managed to resume.

I am reminded that something like this used to happen when I was taking a music appreciation class at Brockwood. Illustrating a talk about, say, Schubert's Unfinished Symphony, which I had known all my life, I would find that its meaning would come over me with such renewed strength and poignancy that my voice would break. I think this is something to do with the communication of beauty and can only happen when a group of receptive listeners is present.

Something similar can take place in piano recitals, too. It is quite rare, but I have on occasion noticed that a new quality of attention has arisen, almost as if everyone had stopped breathing. I feel as if my listening and that of the audience have blended into one, with no sense of separate selves, and at that point all fear disappears (an artist almost always has some residual anxiety about his performance). The music then comes out differently; it is not what one had prepared or practised, but something far more new and beautiful; I am myself surprised by what happens. Insight can arise at this time too, and I recollect a passage in a late Beethoven sonata which had puzzled me for years becoming crystal clear under such circumstances. I could subsequently explain it intellectually, also. How wonderful it would be if this could happen in dialogue or in life! But I have no idea how to bring it about; in fact I don't think it can be; it is like a grace, something unexpected. And the fields of art and of life, though deeply related, run parallel; the insights of one cannot be transferred to the other, and one knows, sadly, of many artists of supreme perception whose lives were very fragmented.

All the same, I am deeply interested in what the poets have had to say about life, especially on

themes of philosophical enquiry, and shared much of this with various groups in India. This was something new for me and started when Dr Satish Inamdar at The Valley School near Bangalore asked me to be with a group of older students who were coming to spend a quiet time at the Study Centre. I didn't quite know what to do until I woke up that morning with some lines of Blake running through my mind that my father had sent me when I was a similar age:

*I give you the end of a golden string,  
Only wind it into a ball,  
It will lead you in at Heaven's gate  
Built in Jerusalem's wall.*

This gave me my theme. Other quotations and ideas came up and in the end (also touching on the theme of "who am I?") I felt able to contribute something. There have been several "golden strings" in my life and I think the most valuable was the one given me by that strange woman in the waiting-room who told me about Krishnamurti's talk – you know that story. Really, the very next person one meets could be an angel in disguise!

Satish reminded me afterwards that there was one Blake verse I'd forgotten:

*He who binds to himself a joy  
Doth the winged life destroy.  
But he who kisses the joy as it flies  
Lives in Eternity's sun rise.*

This seems like pure Krishnamurti, as I believe K himself acknowledges in one of the discussions on video with Prof A. W. Anderson.

Something similar happened when Dr Shirali asked me to address the Senior Assembly at Rishi Valley School one morning. I felt this a considerable challenge and yet that there was something I would like to impart. What came into my mind was a video I had seen recently in which K was talking at Rishi Valley about self-image and whether one can live without it. One quite young boy asked, "But Sir, if you have no self-image what are you?" K answered with great intensity, "Nothing!"

Now how would young people receive a statement like that? It sounds, on the face of it, absolutely outrageous. At the very age when they are going through the greatest changes – puberty, adolescence, discovering their potentialities, wondering what is expected of them, looking for their role in life, confused about their identity – to be told that that identity is in fact non-existent, an absolute zero! – what a shock! – what a come-down! This has long seemed to me one of the fundamental problems of education, because I think that K is in fact absolutely right and that there is nothing at all here at the centre of one's being, but that the growing-up stage is a very difficult time to realise it. The poets have also had something to say about this and so, God help me, I tried to talk a little about it (I put in that reservation because it is such a difficult matter to discuss and I am acutely conscious of the need not to "interpret" K's words). I was relieved when a few people expressed appreciation afterwards or said they were moved.

Another contribution that I was able to make this year was giving workshops in what might be called "seeing who you are", related to what has become known as The Headless Way. This is the long-term result of following another golden string which was put into my hands in Saanen in 1971 when someone gave me a book called *On Having No Head*, by Douglas Harding. I found his insight unique and original, it had a profound impact and has been with me all these twenty-six years. The main point of the workshops is that, by turning the visual attention back upon itself and looking inward, one has a direct insight into the nothingness of what one is and the illusoriness of the self-image. It is sense-based rather than intellectual. I try never to make any connections between this and K's teaching, but let people discover for themselves if there are any.

I did discuss this with K himself in 1977 and have the text of the interview, which I would love to make known at some stage. His last words were, "It is so easy to be caught in some blasted illusion". He did not actually say it was an illusion

and after twenty years of further investigation I do not think it is an illusion, but if someone could show me that it were so I would drop it instantly. I think there is an illusion under which we already live: that we are things, consciousness within bodies and therefore separate, and that the visible world exists independently of ourselves. The workshop shows the opposite of this: that we are nothing and that the body and the world are within consciousness.

So I shared some of this in India and felt very supported by Drs Krishna, Satish Inamdar and Shailesh Shirali in the endeavour. One Buddhist scholar said the workshop brought him an experience of emptiness which up till then had been only theoretical. So perhaps it was worthwhile.

Thomas Traherne, who wrote, "You never enjoy the world aright until the sea itself floweth in your veins and you are clothed with the heavens and crowned with the stars", also spoke of "that shady nothing from which the world was made." He is one of the loveliest of the mystical poets, but I now question that past tense, "was". I remember once Krishnaji asked us at Brockwood, "What do you consider is creation?" Various replies were made and I, thinking of a Beethoven symphony or the emergence of a new species, suggested, "when something arises that was not there before?" He questioned that and I couldn't understand why. I now feel it was because of the time element and if asked again would probably say, "when something arises out of nothing", because that is what I feel I see. But he would probably have found a way to pull that rug out from under my feet also. So no conclusions! Let us keep on looking and enquiring!

Perhaps I could end with a few more of the Blake quotations I used in India (I love the idea of "rightly" knowing something, as Blake says in the second quotation):

*To see a World in a grain of sand  
And a Heaven in a wild flower,  
Hold Infinity in the palm of your hand  
And Eternity in an hour.*

*Man was made for Joy and Woe  
And when this we rightly know  
Thro' the world we safely go.  
Joy and Woe are woven fine,  
A Clothing for the Soul divine.*

*If the doors of perception were cleansed,  
everything would appear to man as it is,  
infinite.*

*Alan Rowlands, February 1997*

## On David Bohm

*The biography Infinite Potential – The Life and Times of David Bohm by F. David Peat – himself a well-known scientist and co-author of a book with Bohm – has given rise to many responses. Stephen Smith, a former teacher at Brockwood now living in Ojai, and David Moody, a former Principal of the Oak Grove School, both knew David Bohm personally. Their reviews appear here. Saral Bohm has also responded, commenting especially on the relationship between Bohm and Krishnamurti toward the end of K's life. Javier Gomez Rodriguez's contribution was written from the perspective of a student (and later teacher) who had met Bohm at Brockwood Park School. This section concludes with an excerpt from the book The Ending of Time, giving a glimpse of the depth and richness with which these two men explored the field of consciousness.*

### ■ Infinite Potential: The Life and Times of David Bohm

A biography by F. David Peat  
Reviewed by Stephen Smith

THIS IS THE FIRST FULL-LENGTH BIOGRAPHY OF David Bohm, whose life and work embraced most of the century. "Bohm lived for the transcendental," David Peat writes in his Introduction, "his dreams were of the light that penetrates," but "he never achieved wholeness in his own personal life." This is not meant as an indictment of the man, but rather as an honest assessment of what he discovered, lived and taught over seventy-five years (1917–1992).

The book proper begins with David Bohm's birth in Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, U.S.A., to Jewish parents of Hungarian and Lithuanian descent. His mother had been traumatized by the move to America and may have passed her instability on to her son. Though mitigated by his colossal intellectual achievements, the tendency

to anxiety and depression never left him, and it re-emerged strongly towards the end of his life. It is to the author's credit that he does not conceal (or attempt to conceal) this human feature of his subject.

Bohm was privy to all the concerns that surrounded modern physics from the '30s onwards. These included the "fourth state of matter" (plasma theory), relativity and quantum theory, hidden variables and causality and chance, a number of which formed the subject of his books. He worked with Oppenheimer during the War and, though he was never actually a colleague of Einstein, they were both in Princeton at the same time. Indeed, Einstein referred to Bohm as his "intellectual son" and said, of the need for a radically new quantum theory, "if anyone can do it, then it will be Bohm."

David Peat is himself a well-known physicist, with a knack for presenting difficult material in such a way as to make it intelligible to the average reader. One gets a whiff of the passion



and contention surrounding such topics as the Copenhagen Interpretation, in his description of which he conveys the subtlety of Bohr's thinking, without necessarily agreeing with him. Bohm, of course, did not agree either as he was, we learn, quite a "physical" physicist, who felt the laws of physics in his body and was sceptical of the growing tendency to reduce the world of nature to mathematical formulations. Like Einstein, he seems to have felt that "God does not play dice with the world" and that an objective description of subatomic phenomena could be found, if one explored far enough ("randomness" isn't satisfactory). This led to the theory of hidden variables and reintroduced the notion of causality – without implying determinism – an edge which, for Bohm, was the right one to walk.

He had, from the outset, a strong social concern and saw in Marxism the possibility of a new world order, linked to the scientific understanding of matter. Exiled to Brazil as a consequence of the infamous hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, he remained a staunch Marxist until 1956, when the Soviets, under Khrushchev, invaded Hungary and put paid to any doubts as to what was really going on. The year 1956 was also the year of his marriage – to Saral Woolfson, in Haifa, Israel. Shortly thereafter, the Bohms moved to England, where David remained for the rest of his life, first in Bristol and later in London, where he was Professor of Theoretical Physics at Birkbeck College.

While browsing through the Public Library in Bristol, Saral came across *The First and Last Freedom*, the Krishnamurti book which, perhaps more than any other, has set readers off on the path of self-enquiry. K spoke of the observer and the observed, a theme close to the heart of modern physics and, indeed, the Modern Movement as a whole. It captivated Bohm, he read all that he could find, and a little while later he met Krishnaji. Thus began the phase of his life with which readers of *The Link* will be most familiar, a phase which led to a wealth of dialogue and collaboration, preserved in such publications as

*The Wholeness of Life, Truth and Actuality, The Future of Humanity* and *The Ending of Time*, as well as in the unforgettable seven-part video series *The Transformation of Man*, with David Shainberg. Significantly, on the last evening of his life Bohm watched the final tape in the series and said to Saral: "We should have gone on talking."

But they had actually stopped talking two years before Krishnamurti's death in 1986, and the breakdown of their relationship was one of the factors which precipitated a crisis in Bohm. One wonders if he ever recovered from it. Here Peat is on dangerous ground, and it is with a certain sense of relief that he returns to the more familiar territory of physics, dialogue and Bohm's experiments with language. The latter, though marginal, are interesting and are incorporated in *Wholeness and the Implicate Order*. They confirm Bohm's vision of the universe as dynamic, a many-levelled reality, of which we see just the external manifestation. As he himself wrote, "That which is truly alive in the living being is ... energy of spirit, and this is never born and never dies." With these words the book ends.

From every human and scientific point of view it is a thoroughly enjoyable read, and it is certainly frank and elucidating. Where it falls down somewhat is in the arena of consciousness, to which Bohm devoted so many of his endeavours, and significantly so with Krishnamurti. One wonders why Peat did not use the device of simply quoting a page or two of their dialogue, as he does so successfully (and chillingly) in the case of the hearings of the House Committee. Bohm went further with Krishnamurti than anyone else was able to do, and an affirmative demonstration of the fact would have been welcome.

For many, Bohm made K's teachings more accessible. He was a master of dissection of the intricacies of thought and a true "friend to man". Mark Edwards' excellent photographs give an all-round impression of a very human human-being, who was at the same time one of the great minds of the century.



*Main building, Brockwood Park School, from the south lawn*

## ■ Some comments by Sara Bohm

OF COURSE, ANY BIOGRAPHY WOULD HAVE BEEN HARD for me to read. No one would have been able to capture in some 360 pages the whole of David Bohm's life, his work, his hopes, his dreams. On the whole I feel that Stephen has written a good review of the book and the points I raise may have more to do with David Peat's biography.

I lived with Dave for almost forty years but sometimes when I read what has been written about him I wonder if this was the man I knew. Any biography contains facts and interpretations of those facts, and it should be remembered on reading the biography that much of what has been written is Peat's interpretation of what he heard from various people giving their versions of what they think happened. Even where letters

or other writings are quoted, when they are taken out of context they may have different meanings to the reader.

To write about Bohm's life and work was not easy for Peat and he has done a very good research job collecting the material for this book. There are parts which read very well and one gets the flavour of Dave's life and work, but there are other parts which I feel were not properly understood. One of these is Dave's long friendship with Krishnaji.

Dave, from the time I first knew him in 1955 in Israel, had talked to me about his concern for a change in society which, even then, he felt could only come about with a change in thought and consciousness. Historically he had been interested in Socialism. He had been brought up in a very poor area of Wilkes-Barre among

children of Polish and Irish immigrant miners and he felt very keenly the hardships he saw in his friends' houses. This, together with other factors, encouraged him to look at many of the philosophical and political theories which were current, especially when he got to Berkeley to do his graduate work with Robert Oppenheimer. When we met he would talk to me about Marx and Hegel. Hegel's theory of the dialectic fascinated him and he saw in it a reflection of what he was trying to do in understanding Quantum Theory and also the question of the inseparability of the observer and the observed.

Therefore when he discovered *The First and Last Freedom* where Krishnamurti goes into his own understanding of these questions, he felt that here was someone who was seeing the very things that he himself felt so passionately about. The two men met and there was an instant rapport. At first they would meet whenever Krishnaji came to England and they would talk openly and freely with one another. There would just be Krishnaji, Dave and myself in the room and these conversations were not recorded. They were two people excited at what they were discovering together. It was not a question of Dave

looking for a guru although he always had great respect for Krishnaji. Those early meetings were extraordinary and I shall always feel privileged that I was present as the "fly on the wall".

Over the following years, as many of you know, the two men had many fruitful discussions together which resulted in books and videos. I do not wish here to go into all the reasons why it was difficult for them to continue their dialogues with the same intensity. One reason was that Dave had major heart surgery during which he almost died. It left his heart badly damaged and he did not have the same strength as before the operation. Another reason was that David became interested in the experiment of dialogue and this was not, at that time, possible to pursue in Brockwood. However, before Krishnaji left for India for the last time, we went to Brockwood to say goodbye to him. Krishnaji, as always when he was alone with Dave, was warm and affectionate and asked him, "David, please come as often as you can to Brockwood". And Dave assured him that he would do so. This doesn't seem to me to indicate the break between them that Peat writes of in the book and that Stephen quotes in his review.

*Sara Bohm, February 1997*

## ■ Infinite Potential Falls Short

Reviewed by David Moody

IN DARING TO UNDERTAKE THE TASK OF COMPOSING David Bohm's biography, science writer David Peat assumed a certain responsibility. He owed it to his subject, and to his readers, to provide a reasonably authentic account of (a) Bohm's scientific achievements; (b) Bohm's interests outside of physics; and (c) the essential quality of Bohm as a man. Only in the first of these categories can Peat be credited with meeting his obligations. With respect to Bohm's non-scientific pursuits and to his personal qualities, *Infinite Potential* ranges from mediocre to mis-

leading. In the process Peat adds to the literature of distortion of Krishnamurti and his work.

Peat has the ability to weave a complex mass of material into an effective narrative line. For sheer dramatic value, the most fascinating episode of Bohm's life is the long sequence of events that led to his expatriation from the United States in 1951. Peat introduces one chapter on this subject with a flourish, by describing the moment when federal marshals arrested Bohm in his office at Princeton University – and then he mis-states the year in which this occurred (it was 1950, not 1949). Although minor in itself, this error is symptomatic of a general tendency.

At the source of Bohm's harassment by the House Committee on un-American Activities was a false and vicious story of a "Scientist X" accused of passing atomic secrets to the Communist Party. The origin of this story has never been determined, but Peat is certainly far off the mark when he claims, without evidence or attribution, that it came from Bohm's mentor, J. Robert Oppenheimer (p. 328). In evaluating Bohm's relationship with Oppenheimer, Peat lays great stress upon an FBI memorandum which said that Oppenheimer considered Bohm to be "truly dangerous" in his political views. What Peat fails even to mention is that Oppenheimer later denied ever having made such a statement, or thought about Bohm in those terms.

Also problematical is Peat's interpretation of the relationship between Bohm's science and his political views. Bohm first achieved international recognition with his description of the behavior of plasmas (plasmas is a fourth state of matter, after solids, liquids and gases, that occurs at very high temperatures). The behavior of matter in the plasmas state exhibits some similarities to certain principles of Marxism regarding human behavior. It is not at all unlikely that Bohm appreciated these similarities at an aesthetic level.

But to suggest that Bohm's scientific discoveries were dependent upon or derivative of his political convictions is absurd. But what else does Peat mean to imply when he writes, "... in the 1950's, Bohm himself made no distinction between his work in physics and his political and philosophical beliefs," (p. 135), and, "His first significant research had been on the plasma, in which, as a reflection of Marxist philosophy, he had seen the freedom of the individual (particle) as arising out of the collective ..." (p. 288). The idea that the scientific community swallowed a Marxist theory of plasma is laughable.

Peat's distortions of Bohm's interests outside of physics do not achieve full flower, however, until he broaches the subject of Krishnamurti.

Peat accuses Krishnamurti of exercising "fine political acumen" by refusing to publish a book of his dialogues with Bohm, while pretending that the decision belonged to someone else. Peat concludes rather vaguely, "Only certain dialogues would be included in another publication" (p. 231). Peat was evidently oblivious of the two dozen such dialogues that were published in all, distributed among five volumes – two of which (*The Ending of Time* and *The Future of Humanity*) consist of no other material.

Peat's account of Krishnamurti's work is punctuated by random remarks that are as gratuitous as they are insulting. "Krishnamurti did not think much of science," he comments in passing, "or for that matter of music, art, philosophy, or literature" (p.225). Peat offers the opinion regarding "those who attended Krishnamurti's lectures" that, "–in their personal lives, many of them fell into a sort of paralysis, one in which any form of practical action seemed inadequate" (p.197). Peat supplies no evidence in support of these wholesale generalizations.

The nature of Peat's attitude toward Krishnamurti is revealed in his repeated references to him (twenty-six instances by my count) as "the Indian teacher," or even, here and there, as simply "the Indian." Nowhere during the course of his narration does Peat refer to anyone else in terms of his or her national or ethnic origin. Imagine if he had referred to Einstein twenty-six times as "the German scientist," or to Oppenheimer as "the Jewish physicist." To refer in this manner to Krishnamurti of all people – has anyone ever so thoroughly renounced the principle of nationalism? – is not only offensive, but embarrassing in its unintended irony.

For those who knew Bohm personally, the saddest element of Peat's biography is his failure to capture the quality of Bohm as a man. The individual who emerges in Peat's portrayal is emotionally constricted and neurotic, however brilliant intellectually. Peat gives only passing

attention to the generosity, the wit, the passion, the scintillating discourse, and the loyal friendship that characterized David's relationships. After absorbing the gray tones that emerge from Peat's pages, one is astonished to come across the first, full-page photograph of Bohm: the vitality, warmth, and wisdom conveyed in that picture alone is the most telling evidence against Peat's rather dreary portrait.

## ■ David Bohm at Brockwood Park

EACH OF US HAS A PERSPECTIVE AND OUR TRYING TO be objective about the biography may turn out to be unfair to the person due to the very limitations of the book itself. In any case, we shouldn't confuse the two.

The thing seems to boil down to our appreciation of Bohm as a person deeply committed to self-knowing and the bringing about of a new culture based on understanding and affection. When I say 'our' I refer mostly to those who knew him at Brockwood, and specially those of us who were students there. I can say that Bohm showed the utmost concern for our integrity as human beings and was unsparing in his generosity. He gave freely of his time, energy and learning. Frode and I went to every one of his weekly discussions and we found Bohm's intelligence a tremendous help. He had a beautiful way of unfolding a question that made us aware of the gaps that we tended to bridge over with assumptions. Some people even then thought he was too intellectual and didn't go. They found his language too difficult because of its high degree of abstraction and logic. It seemed to go over the heads of the younger students, but we were a bit older and were not afraid of concepts. But this verbal difficulty, which at times was tinged with moral overtones of dismissal, made people blind

Peat is highly competent as a science writer, and the passages in which he describes Bohm's contributions to physics are lively and lucid. Taken in its entirety, however, the flaws in this volume outweigh its assets. On balance, the best that can be said for *Infinite Potential* is that it has been largely ignored, both by critics and by the reading public. May it (and its noble subject) rest in peace.

to Bohm's profound commitment to the welfare of mankind. It was a case of not seeing the forest for the trees: they couldn't see his compassion because of his intellect.

Some of us have cared a lot for Bohm and continue to feel the greatest respect for him. I consider him one of the great teachers I've been privileged to meet. I wished I had been a bit more mature when I first met him. Bohm was like the very essence of the West, with his profound aesthetic, scientific and ethical commitment to wholeness. Besides, there are a couple of anecdotes that illustrate that my relationship with him went beyond words and that's why I regretted his untimely death. When I returned to Brockwood as a teacher in 1990, just shaking his hand, after an absence of 12 years, drained me of an enormous load of fear that I was carrying. And why? Because I had the perception at that instant that this inquiry, to which he had devoted his life, was the only worthwhile way of living. Later on, in a staff meeting, I dared to expose a personal problem regarding my conflictive relationship with a student. My directness and his concern established a communication that made it possible for me to look into the hidden conditioned structure of anger. This wasn't intellect. This was self-learning.

Most of the younger staff members were interested in Bohm because of the sense of



clarity he conveyed. We were discontented with world and self and wanted to break through the superficial layers of understanding to the lower, tacit regions of ourselves, since we knew the trouble lay there, in the very reflex structures of our conditioning. This was no longer a fiction. We had experienced, watched and thought enough to know this, but we wanted to go deeper, and that was the very reason we were there in Brockwood. We sensed that here was the key to our very freedom. And I think I am justified in using the plural 'we' as more than a polite figure of speech. Bohm's dialogue proposal made eminent sense to us, specially in view of the practical breakdown in communication we were experiencing at the time among the staff. This proposal didn't find the proper ground in which to prosper then, even with Bohm's own assistance, as the apparent discrepancies polarized into unbridgeable differences and turned into conflict. Some people resented our insistence on this approach to verbal communication and went as far as saying that 'Brockwood is a K school, not a Bohm school'. That was, from my point of view, at best unkind and at worst it showed the real bigotry that had gotten into the place at that time. And this is one of the dangers of the truth, that those who think they have it refuse to learn.

## ■ The Ending of Psychological Knowledge

*These are the first five pages of the eleventh dialogue between J. Krishnamurti and David Bohm as published in the book The Ending of Time. The dialogue took place at Brockwood Park on 18 September 1980.*

**KRISHNAMURTI:** What makes the mind always follow a certain pattern? Always seeking? If it lets go of one pattern it picks up another; it keeps on functioning all the time like that. One can give explanations of why it does so – for pro-

The case, I suspect, is rather that without learning there is no truth.

We didn't know Bohm as a scientist but as a philosopher, although the two things were inseparable in him. This philosophical and human side was the most important to us, not the record of his contributions to the development of physics. Some of us valued his work in this area and made it an essential part of actual courses we taught at the school. We didn't know very much about his personal background, however. Brockwood seemed to communicate an impersonal sense of relationship right from the start, something which had its good and its dangerous sides. These limitations of our knowledge no doubt are behind some of the surprises, both in terms of the Bohm we knew and the one we didn't. Apparently Peat concentrates on the scientific and does not examine as closely Bohm's dialogical side. That may be due to a personal valuation of Peat's, which from his perspective is quite understandable. So it may be up to us to provide the missing part of the story. Even here there will be differences.

*Javier Gomez Rodriguez, March 1997*

tection, for safety, from indifference, a certain amount of callousness, a disregard of one's own flowering, etc. But it is really very important to explore deeply why our minds are always operating in a certain direction.

We said that one comes, after going through travail, investigation, and insight, to a blank wall. And that blank wall can only wither away, or be broken down, when there is love and intelligence. Before we go into that, I would like to ask why human beings, however intelligent, however learned, however philosophical and religious, always fall into this groove of pattern seeking.

**DAVID BOHM:** Well, I think the groove is inherent in the nature of the accumulated knowledge.

**K:** Are you saying then that knowledge must invariably create a groove?

**DB:** Perhaps it is not inevitable but it seems to develop this way in mankind, if we are referring to psychological knowledge, that is to say ...

**K:** Obviously we are talking of that. But why does the mind not become aware of it – see the danger of this mechanical repetition, and the fact that there is nothing new in it? See how we keep on doing it?

**DB:** It seems to me that the groove, or the accumulated knowledge, seems to have a significance far beyond what its significance is. If we say that we have knowledge of some object, like the microphone, that has some limited significance. But knowledge about the nation to which you belong seems to have immense significance.

**K:** Yes. So is this attribution of significance the cause of the narrowing down of the mind?

**DB:** Because this knowledge seems to have a tremendous value beyond all other values, it makes the mind stick to that. It seems the most important thing in the world.

**K:** In India, there is this philosophy that knowledge must end – you know it, of course, the Vedanta. But apparently very, very, few people do end knowledge and talk from freedom.

**DB:** You see, knowledge generally seems to be extremely important, even when a person may say verbally that it should end ...

**K:** You mean I am so stupid that I don't see that this psychological knowledge has very little significance, and so my mind clings to it?

**DB:** I wouldn't quite put it that a person is that stupid, but rather say that his knowledge stupefies the brain.

**K:** Stupefied, all right. But the brain doesn't seem to extricate itself.

**DB:** It is already so stupefied that it can't see what it is doing

**K:** So what shall it do? I have been watching for many years people attempting to become free

from certain things. This is the root of it, you understand? This psychological accumulation which becomes psychological knowledge. And so it divides, and all kinds of things happen around it and within it. And yet the mind refuses to let go.

**DB:** Yes.

**K:** Why? Is that because there is safety or security in it?

**DB:** That is part of it, but I think in some way that knowledge has taken on the significance of the absolute, instead of being relative.

**K:** I understand all that, but you are not answering my question. I am an ordinary man, I

But then the moment comes when knowledge no longer appears to be knowledge.

realize all this, and the limited significance of knowledge at different levels, but deeper down inside one, this accumulated knowledge is very destructive.

**DB:** The knowledge deceives the mind, so that the person is not normally aware that it is destructive. Once this process gets started, the mind is not in a state where it is able to look at it because it is avoiding the question. There is a tremendous defensive mechanism or escape from looking at the whole issue.

**K:** Why?

**DB:** Because it seems that something extremely precious might be at stake.

**K:** One is strangely intelligent, capable or skilled in other directions, but here, where the root is of all this trouble, why don't we comprehend what is happening? What prevents the mind from doing this?

**DB:** Once importance has been given to knowledge, there is a mechanical process that resists intelligence.

**K:** So what shall I do? I realize I must let go the accumulated, psychological knowledge –

which is divisive, destructive and petty – but I can't. Is this because of lack of energy?

**DB:** Not primarily, though the energy is being dissipated by the process.

**K:** Having dissipated a great deal of energy, I haven't the energy to grapple with this?

**DB:** The energy would come back quickly if we could understand this. I don't think that is the main point.

**K:** No. So what shall I do, realizing that this knowledge is inevitably forming a groove in which I live? How am I to break it down?

**DB:** Well, I am not sure that it is generally clear to people that this knowledge does all that; or that the knowledge is knowledge. You see, it may seem to be some 'being', the 'self', and 'me'. This knowledge creates the 'me', and the 'me' is the experience as an entity, which seems not to be knowledge but some real being.

**K:** Are you saying that this 'being' is different from knowledge?

**DB:** It appears to be; it feigns a difference.

**K:** But is it?

**DB:** It isn't, but the illusion has great power.

**K:** That has been our conditioning.

**DB:** Yes. Now the question is, how do we get through that to break down the groove, because it creates the imitation, or a pretension, of a state of being?

**K:** That is the real point, you see. This is man's central movement. It seems so utterly hopeless. And realizing the hopelessness I sit down and say I can't do anything. But if I apply my mind to it, the question arises, is it possible to function without psychological knowledge in this world? I am rather concerned about it; it seems the basic issue that man must resolve, all over the world.

**DB:** That is right. But you may discuss with somebody, who thinks it seems reasonable. But perhaps his status is threatened, and we have to say that that is psychological knowledge. It doesn't seem to him that it is knowledge, but something more. And he doesn't see that his knowledge of his status is behind the trouble. At first sight knowledge seems to be something

passive, which you could use if you wanted to, and which you could just put aside if you wished, which is the way it should be.

**K:** I understand all that.

**DB:** But then the moment comes when knowledge no longer appears to be knowledge.

**K:** The politicians and the people in power wouldn't listen to this. And neither would the so-called religious people. It is only the people who are discontented, who feel they have lost everything, who will listen. But they don't always listen so that it is a real burning thing.

How does one go about this? Say, for instance, I have left Catholicism and Protestantism, and all that. Also I have a career and I know that it is necessary to have knowledge there. Now I see how important it is not to be caught in the process of psychological knowledge, and yet I can't let it go. It is always dodging me; I am playing tricks with it. It is like hide and seek. All right! We said that is the wall I have to break down. No, not I – that is the wall that has to be broken down. And we have said that this wall can be broken

At first sight knowledge seems to be something passive, which you could use if you wanted to, and which you could just put aside if you wished, which is the way it should be.

down through love and intelligence. Aren't we asking something enormously difficult?

**DB:** It is difficult.

**K:** I am this side of the wall, and you are asking me to have that love and intelligence which will destroy it. But I don't know what that love is, what that intelligence is, because I am caught in this, on this other side of the wall. I realize logically, sanely, that what you are saying is accurate, true, logical, and I see the importance of it, but the wall is so strong

and dominant and powerful that I can't get beyond it. We said the other day that the wall could be broken down through insight – if insight does not become translated into an idea.

**DB:** Yes.

**K:** When insight is discussed, there is the danger of our making an abstraction of it; which means we move away from the fact, and the

Knowledge is extremely active, meeting and shaping every moment according to past knowledge.

abstraction becomes all important. Which means, again, knowledge.

**DB:** Yes, the activity of knowledge.

**K:** So we are back again!

**DB:** I think the general difficulty is that knowledge is not just sitting there as a form of

information, but is extremely active, meeting and shaping every moment according to past knowledge. So even when we raise this issue, knowledge is all the time waiting, and then acting. Our whole tradition is that knowledge is not active but passive. But it is really active, although people don't generally think of it that way. They think it is just sitting there.

**K:** It is waiting.

**DB:** Waiting to act, you see. And whatever we try to do about it, knowledge is already acting. By the time we realize that this is the problem, it has already acted.

**K:** Yes. But do I realize it as a problem, or as an idea which I must carry out? You see the difference?

**DB:** Knowledge automatically turns everything into an idea, which we must carry out. That is the whole way it is built.

**K:** The whole way we have lived ...

(Copyright KFT, 1980)

## Other Book News

### **The Beauty of the Mountain: Memories of Krishnamurti**

By Friedrich Grohe

Reviewed by Mary Cadogan

DURING HIS LIFETIME KRISHNAMURTI WOULD OFTEN ask people who worked with him, "How will you convey the perfume of the teachings when K has gone?" This was of course not an easy question to answer, but one felt sure that in a variety of ways the flavour of the teachings, and indeed a sense of Krishnamurti himself, would somehow continue to be communicated to those with the interest and the sensitivity to listen.

One of the values of *The Beauty of the Mountain* is its simple conveyance of that perfume or flavour. It is an unpretentious account by Friedrich Grohe of his association with Krishnamurti, which took place between 1983 and 1986 – in fact, during the last three years of Krishnamurti's life. As well as writing about Krishnamurti's talks and dialogues with a wide range of people in Switzerland, Ojai, Brockwood Park and India, this seventy-page book persuasively describes Krishnamurti's feeling for the natural scene and his "intimate relationship with living things"; his joy in hearing and recounting jokes (particularly those with quasi-

mystical allusions); his observation of the minutiae of ordinary and extraordinary objects and events; the total attention which he gave to individuals and groups – and, above all, the sense of the sacred which, without explanation, flowed through and around Krishnamurti and the places with which he was associated. The book also provides insights of a more down-to-earth nature into Krishnamurti's life and work. It is by turns touching and humorous, and the author manages, despite his deep appreciation of Krishnamurti's rare qualities, to avoid the excesses of hero-worship or cult creation.

Essentially, of course, all of our contacts with Krishnamurti have significance only in so far as they trigger in us that freedom from conditioning

## ■ **Krishnamurti: Reflections on the Self**

Edited by Prof. Raymond Martin,  
University of Maryland  
Reviewed by Michael Lommel

"WHEN TWO PEOPLE ARE INTENT, SERIOUSLY, TO understand something, bringing their whole mind and heart, their nerves, their eyes, their ears, to understand, then in that attention there is a certain quality of silence; then actual communication, actual communion, takes place." (From the chapter 'Dialogue' in Krishnamurti: Reflections on the Self)

In the flow of ideas which has been the history of philosophy comes occasionally such a startling new current that it challenges the whole shape of what philosophy means and how it is approached. Though his central concern is not the reformation of philosophy, but an uncompromising call for a transformation in human life, J. Krishnamurti's investigations may be such a current. Krishnamurti's passionate inquiry into human existence and into the nature of inquiry

to which he so often pointed. One sympathises with the subjective experiences which Friedrich Grohe evokes in *The Beauty of the Mountain*. His quotations from Krishnamurti's works are well chosen, and the book's expansive atmosphere is enhanced by its several excellent colour photographs of Krishnamurti, of his Ojai Valley home, and of the mountains – in spring and in winter – in which he so delighted.

This book has just been reprinted, with the addition of an Epilogue. It may be ordered from Secretariat Friedrich Grohe, Chalet Solitude, CH-1838 Rougemont, Switzerland (price Swiss Francs 15.00 including postage anywhere). It may also be ordered from the Krishnamurti Foundations.

itself, his obviously profound concern for humanity as a whole, and his tireless demand for a meaningful relationship to life, certainly must have relevance to the meeting of investigative minds in a university setting, even if he cannot be called a philosopher in the usual sense.

Krishnamurti: Reflections on the Self, designed with university students and teachers of philosophy in mind, zeroes in with selections from the vast recorded material of Krishnamurti's works, on those themes that speak most directly to the fundamental (and contemporary) issues in philosophical discourse: the nature of inquiry, emotions, self and identification, and freedom. One element in particular that those in the academic practice of philosophy may find of importance to their work is a renewed meaning to the word 'dialogue'. In the sense that Krishnamurti uses this word it means thinking together, an inquiry between people where authority, inwardly and outwardly, are put aside as the basis for shared understanding, rather than the victory of certain ideas over opposing ones. As



*Larches between Zermatt and Zmutt, at the foot of the Matterhorn, Switzerland*

Professor Martin notes in his apt introduction, Krishnamurti's movement asks for an actual living response and comprehension informing one's whole life. Perhaps a thoughtful concern for the significance of this idea of dialogue can be a vital influence in the way inquiry is approached in academia. It is right, I think, to see Krishnamurti as offering – as Professor Martin parallels in his introduction in this regard to Socrates – a radically new challenge to the culture in which he speaks.

Can the culture of academic philosophy respond to such a challenge? Will the torch be taken up? As he ends his introduction to the book, Professor Martin writes: "True philo-

sophers are always open to new approaches. Indeed, when an approach has promise, the more radically new it is, the better. This volume is primarily for them." In Krishnamurti: Reflections on the Self, Professor Martin's deft compilation, the student of philosophy and of life will find a very valuable resource for such study.

This 192-page book published by Open Court Publishing, ISBN 0-1826-9355-8, will be available, from April 15th, from:

Krishnamurti Foundation of America  
P.O. Box 1560, Ojai, California 93024, USA  
Price \$ 16.95 plus postage.



## ■ Krishnamurti or The Rebellious Mind

*This small book of 109 pages is available in French, published by Sagesses, entitled Krishnamurti ou l'insoumission de l'esprit. We found that its introduction, on the back cover, speaks with a voice rather different to that usually heard in this context, and so asked for permission to print an English translation of it here.*

Rare are the voices that do not try to numb our worries, that closely confront the discomfort of existence. Who tells us about ourselves, not as we ought to be, but as we are – without ever disguising the enigma of life? Krishnamurti (1895-1986) represents above all the power of the word which is true, lively and splendidly rebellious. He represents the language of highest disobedience that defines the limits of knowledge and calls for a total overturning of our mode of being. What would a new awareness to the world mean? Perfect freedom? Instant wisdom? An infinite love? And let us dare – a slightly more fraternal world? This book was written to dig into, to haunt these questions. It is not a biography nor a study of the man, but an essay in that word's full meaning; careful to retain K's vivid, non-conformist lucidity; careful never to separate spiritual life from daily living; attentive to our living present – to our astonishing banality. We do not know whether the coming century will be a metaphysical one, but for life not to decline, it should be Krishnamurtian.

*Zeno Bianu*

Zeno Bianu was born in Paris in 1950. He has published several works of poems, adapted baroque authors for the Europe Odeon-Theatre, and translated numerous works from the sphere of oriental mysticism.

---

*This is one of the two trees remaining out of the five originally mentioned in Friedrich's booklet The Beauty of the Mountain. While walking with K, Friedrich went to pass through these trees but K took his arm and said: "Go around, don't disturb them!"*

*In Krishnamurti's Notebook there are many beautiful descriptions of trees, like this one: "The earth had nothing more beautiful than the tree and when it died it would still be beautiful; every branch naked, open to the sky, bleached by the sun and there would be birds resting on its nakedness. There would be shelter for owls, there in that deep hollow ... (Copyright KFT)*



## Meeting K

SEVERAL PEOPLE WHO MET K SAY THAT IN HIS presence everything became more intense, that one became more aware, one got a feeling of what choiceless awareness could be. I would say the same myself, and that the things which happened in his presence more than ten years ago are still very much alive. I can even say that I am still learning from them and understanding them. Instead of 'Meeting K' we could call this section 'Learning with K'. The following little story may illustrate this.

One day in Ojai I was with Michael Krohnen in the kitchen at Arya Vihara chatting with him before lunch and looking at what good things he had prepared for the meal, when K came through the side door. We greeted each other heartily. The next day this happened again, the same friendly greeting, and again for several days.

I had heard around this time that K could see what one was thinking (although he would never "read one's mind"), so I tried a little experiment. I was having some serious problems in a personal relationship during this period, and on one

occasion when K came through the side door I thought very intensely about these problems, asking him mentally if he could help me as a matter of urgency.

As he came through the door, he virtually ignored me, turning his back, showing no interest at all. I thought he didn't get my message, but I also wondered if his indifference might be intentional. And of course now, when I think back, I realise that whenever I tried to put myself in the foreground, he ignored me, became almost neutral, almost absent, one couldn't reach him.

On another occasion, I realised at the time that he could tell very well what I was thinking. I was still a newcomer to the circles around K and he was showing me a great deal of affection without being tough, while with his older friends he was being quite tough. Returning from a walk on Adyar beach in Madras, I was wondering, "What will all his old friends be feeling?", when he suddenly turned round and said, "I don't think this way."

*Friedrich Grohe, March 1997*

### J. Krishnamurti: Without a Paradox

*This article was initially written for the quarterly publication Inner Directions Journal. With their kind permission we reprint this article written by R. E. Mark Lee, who is currently a Director of the Krishnamurti Foundation of America in Ojai, California. He was the Founding Director of the Oak Grove School for ten years and a teacher and Principal of the Rishi Valley Junior School in India for eight years. He has edited several Krishnamurti books and has his own publishing company, Edwin House Publishing Inc.*

Krishnamurti (1895-1986) was a teacher unique among the profusion of teachers, gurus, seers, yogis, saviors, and spiritual men and women of history. He was neither of the East nor

the West; he wanted no followers or adherents; his teachings had no philosophy; and he left a carefully recorded legacy of 20 million words on tape and in books that guarantee the accuracy

and authenticity of his vision for centuries to come. He wrote and spoke in English and his books have sold in the millions in more than thirty languages. Except for mainland China, his teachings in print and video form have reached countless people; in Siberia, all of Europe, Asia, the Americas and South Africa. While his public speaking life spanned almost seventy years he never sought publicity, yet it has been said that he spoke directly to more people than anyone in history, and it was only in the last twenty-five years of his life that public announcements of his talks and dialogues were made. Almost silently, the awareness of Krishnamurti's teachings spread around the world among people who were dissatisfied with the empty hope of organized religion, the insufficiency of so-called sacred books, and the razzle-dazzle of pulpit preachers and fundamentalism.

The very fact that he made no spiritual promises, including hope for enlightenment, but in simple language reasonably described the psychological conditioning of every man, woman, and child on earth without being psychiatric and therapeutic, caused people to pause and reflect. Those who pursued his writings and talks heard an ageless voice that mirrored serious peoples' longing for honesty and integrity in matters of the mind and spirit.

When I first met J. Krishnamurti in 1965, just one month after graduating from college, I was immediately struck with his utter sobriety. My first critical response was that he was paradoxical: pliable but uncompromising; yielding and resolute at the same time; deeply affectionate but unsentimental; and simultaneously shy and passionate. His ability to reflect on the human condition in himself and for others was impressive to a young Californian who was serious when he needed to be. What appealed to me instantly was the practical intelligence of his message. There was no fuss around him and he had no staff. There was no panoply of devotees trying to please him and create a following around his teaching.

What I came to see in time was that there really were no paradoxes in his public and

private life – none in his outward lifestyle and his inner realization. Publicly and privately I saw the dimensions of Krishnamurti's seriousness, including humor, his insightful mind, and his affectionate indifference. I came to know a man who was without fear, political mindedness, or duplicity. His life has been chronicled with astonishing detail, but no biography or memoir has ever adequately captured the spirit of his being.

At that first meeting in his home, in a matter of hours I began to listen without the interpretation of my brain. In a wholistic perception I learned about myself in a new and different sense, seeing my conditioned responses as they came up, but non-intellectually. That first meeting and impact would have been enough for a lifetime for a young man, but I had the good fortune to continue to be around him and continue to learn. What he said in his talks and writings was what he said privately; that he was not my guru and that he was no one's teacher. "Let the listening be your guru." "Do not follow anyone!" The perception of the truth of these statements was profound and changed me fundamentally.

Krishnamurti sent me to India in 1965. There, over an eight-year period, I saw first-hand the 10,000-year-old religious traditions that draw countless Westerners and grip millions of orthodox believers. What I also touched was the religious mind that transcends the 10,000 years of tradition and is without manifestations, personalities, and organizations. One meets that mind not in temples, mosques, and churches but in the silent interactions with villagers on dirt roads, with pundits chanting ancient Vedic verses, and with elderly people sitting in the warm winter sun talking about life. This profound religious mind exists paradoxically in a highly materialistic, violent, and sectarian culture yet is more powerful, pervasive, and untouched than that culture. Krishnamurti described it poignantly in his journal: "The villager stopped in front of you, looked at those startling colors and at you. You looked at each other and without a word he

trudged on. In that communication there was affection, tenderness and respect, not the silly respect but that of religious men. At that moment all time and thought had come to an end. You and he were utterly religious, uncorrupted by belief, image, by word or poverty. You often passed each other on that road among the stony hills and each time, as you looked at one another, there was the joy of total insight."

Those who pursued his writings and talks heard an ageless voice that mirrored serious peoples' longing for honesty and integrity in matters of the mind and spirit.

I came to see that Krishnamurti was an authentic guru in the original, pure sense of that word, which means grave and heavy [as well as dispeller of darkness]. He was a teacher for the world, and I can say with impunity, a World Teacher with a significance that has yet to be fully understood. He traveled the world and taught but had no students and no followers with whom he identified.

I have worked in two Krishnamurti Foundations since 1965, and have seen firsthand the absoluteness of his resolve that the teachings and the work around the teachings not become cultish or a religion. He said at one point, 'The Foundations will not give rise to any sectarian spirit in their activities. The Foundations will not create any kind or place of worship around the teachings or the person'. This meant that in his daily life he was particularly alert to the follower mentality, to the mind that worshipped and did not question. Where he found it around him he would work on that person. If they responded then they stayed in the work. If they did not, then sooner or later they left, because there was no reciprocal leader or guru response from Krishnamurti. There was no darshan, there was

no divine favor offered. It was hard work being near such self reflective, non-romantic simplicity. On several occasions he said, "Make sure you are not being hypnotized (by me)."

This resolve, and his humor, are illustrated by an incident from 1929 when Krishnamurti spoke at a camp in Holland. On the second day of the camp, Saturday August 3rd, he gave his now famous "Truth is a Pathless Land" talk before three thousand people. The talk ended with, "I am concerned only with making men free, absolutely, unconditionally free." But what is not mentioned in books is that, as this was a big outdoor camp for thousands of people, there were several talks before and after that historical speech. In fact, the day before that talk he prepared the eager listeners with a short tale illustrative of the seriousness of his humor. Krishnamurti often began an evening gathering with a camp fire and the chanting of Vedic slokas. But on the evening of August 2nd he first said, "Once upon a time there was a Brahman in India who performed rites every day in front of his pupils, and every day as he was performing them a cat came and rubbed itself against him, and Brahmans are not supposed to touch cats because they are impure animals, especially when you are going to perform a ceremony. So every day he used to put the cat in a room and lock the room. When he died, his pupils every day before they performed the ceremony sought out a cat and locked it in the room, and then performed their rites. So this camp fire and the chant have become a superstition. I have been told wherever I have been that in order to speak in the evening I must have a camp fire and I must necessarily chant at it. So I can foresee what is going to happen later on. I have not chanted this for some time and if I do not quite repeat it properly, please excuse it. I chant it because it has a lovely sound, a lovely meaning, and not because of some mysterious effect." He urged people who understood something of what he was talking about, who had insight into themselves and the teachings, to talk to other people. He said on a few occasions, "Shout it



*Evening sky, Brockwood Park*

from the roof-top". Yet he saw the danger of proselytizing, missionary work, witnessing, and the passionate Krishnamurti fundamentalists who were coming up around the world. There was nothing that could be done about people he did not know, but within the Foundations he spoke of the future and said, "The Foundations have no authority in the matter of the teachings. The truth lies in the teachings themselves. The Foundations will see to it that these teachings are kept whole, are not distorted, are not made corrupt. The Foundations have no authority to send out propagandists or interpreters of the teachings. As it has been necessary, I have often pointed out that I have no representative who will carry on with these teachings in my name now or at any time in the future." There were to be no priests, organization or instrument between the listener and the teachings themselves. When asked why this was so important,

he pointed to the fact that all organized religions historically have created violence and division and that his work was to "set man absolutely, unconditionally free" and not to found organizations or to perpetuate myths about himself. The authenticity of one's perception and insight, and ultimately the quality of one's life, was what mattered – not membership in a group, or what beliefs and ideas one had. His was an austere and simple approach to the ancient striving of humanity for truth, intelligence, love, and peace.

While it has been said there was an apparent paradox (contradiction) between Krishnamurti's outward lifestyle and his inner realization, I never saw it – but I did imagine it. I expected him to behave in certain ways given my ideas about him. The more I came to recognize that my ideas of him were affecting what I perceived was the phenomenon of J. Krishnamurti, the more I saw there was no discrepancy between



the man and the message. The paradox was in my thinking, not in the teachings. Seemingly contradictory statements in his books and talks in context stood alone and true. 'Think about

I can break a habit in three days. It takes me that long to see it totally, to cut it out completely.

this, apply yourself' is not contradictory to 'Thought is the root of sorrow ...' when each statement is viewed in context.

One day, in the garden where he worked wearing soft gloves, blue jeans, a straw hat, and Reeboks, he said, "We have just laid some traps for gophers". He said that one had to make a decision either to have pests and bugs or to cultivate flowers and vegetables. He would never kill an animal for food or eat something killed by another, yet he did not call himself a vegetarian. He said, "I just don't eat meat, but no ism, of any kind". There is no paradox here.

One day, in the Oak Grove School, when we were having trouble with some students, Krishnamurti said, "They are so disrespectful. Why don't they call you sir?" This precipitated a two year discussion with Krishnamurti, staff, parents, and others on respect, student-teacher relationships, and the decline of American culture. He recognized the need for temporal authority but it was religious and psychological authority that were anathema. There is no paradox here.

One day, on a walk, Krishnamurti said to me, "I can break a habit in three days. It takes me that long to see it totally, to cut it out completely." In the face of his caution that time is the enemy of insight and change, I was perplexed. Why three days? He went on to say that he had to watch the habit every time it came up; and to see it completely, to observe it in every setting and relationship, it might take some time. It was my limited, literal mind that made a paradox where in fact none existed.

Krishnamurti had a great sense of place and he was sensitive to landscape and natural beauty. These elements figure profoundly in his books and talks. He commented on trees, the play of light on leaves, and the colors of flowers all the while pointing to the dangers of labeling, naming things. "What happens when we give a name to a flower, to anything? By giving a name to something, we have merely put it into a category, and we think we have understood it; we don't look at it more closely. But, if we do not give it a name, we are forced to look at it. That is, we approach the flower, or whatever it is, with a newness, with a new quality of examination; we look at it as though we had never looked at it before."

I have tried to illustrate my point that there was seriousness in his humor and no real paradox in Krishnamurti the man or the teachings. But these short examples are perhaps simplistic. Now, it could be said that if Krishnamurti was a philosopher, paradox is not inappropriate. With his simple use of words and the scientific disclaimers that he was actually talking about the unnameable, something needs to be said about Krishnamurti's use of language. Prof. David Bohm wrote about this and, as he and Krishnamurti were friends and close in their mutual exploration of the limits of the mind and thought to capture the sacred, I would like to use Bohm's words to point to a different kind of paradox.

"Words and their meanings are never more than abstractions, which cannot substitute for that to which they refer ... Moreover, words cannot abstract all that is to be known about any given thing. Indeed, they do not even abstract all that is essential to the function of that thing ... So, it is necessary to recognize that all language has an essentially negative and partial relationship to that to which it refers. Korzybski has put this relationship very succinctly in the assertion: 'Whatever we say it is, it isn't.' This statement is not a metaphysical assertion about the basic nature of what is. Rather, it is a very deep challenge to the entire structure of our communications, both external and internal (which later are called 'thought'). To understand this chal-

lenge, let us begin with the fact: We are always talking about 'it.' ('It' refers to anything whatsoever.) When we read Korzybski's statement, our first response is to see that we have already begun to say something about 'it' (whatever 'it' may happen to be). And then, noticing that 'it' is not what we say, and that what we say is at most incomplete abstraction even from what is to be known, we assume that 'it' must be something else, as well as something more. But 'something else' and 'something more' are also what we say 'it' is. As we do this for a while, we begin to be struck by the absurdity of the whole procedure. For whatever we say it is, it isn't. What is the appropriate response to such a situation? Evidently, one has to stop saying anything at all, not merely outwardly, but also inwardly. It is suggested here that if all the 'chatter' of thought can really stop, then something new can happen. But even to say this much may be going too far. For if this means that 'it' will be something new, then the novelty that we say 'it' is will be what 'it'

is not. The paradox with which the reader has to be left is 'what is it when there is no saying at all, neither outwardly nor inwardly?'

Krishnamurti has avoided the paradox by not describing 'it'. The silence which he suggests as the entree to that world of the unnameable is at the heart of his teachings. And he left it to the reader to discover that pathless land where there was no saying at all, neither outwardly nor inwardly.

I would urge readers to investigate the works of Krishnamurti for themselves. The teachings have intrinsic weight and authority, they are not derivative. History will probably show that the timelessness of Krishnamurti's insight, and the emphasis on living a life without psychological and religious authority, give the teacher and his teachings a commensurate stellar place in the course of understanding consciousness and questioning traditional human evolution.

*R. E. Mark Lee*

## **Extracts from 'On the Essential' The Diary of Pascal Ruga – Part 2**

*Pascal Ruga describes the discussions with Krishnamurti at Robert Linssen's villa in Brussels in 1956. We continue with the second discussion. The original French text was translated by Stephen Smith.*

### **SECOND DISCUSSION**

I went to the second discussion in the state of mind of someone going to the dentist's ... The reservations I had had about Krishnamurti during the Brussels talks had fallen away. I was convinced that I had met a modern Socrates; like Socrates, Krishnamurti used a maieutic

approach, which did not give us truth on a plate but helped each one of us give birth to it. I even find that Krishnamurti is more stripped bare, more spare than Socrates, for in spite of the enormous admiration I have for the latter, he was to some extent under the influence of sophistry, which already in his time was corrupting the mind of Athens just as the mechanical

brain is corrupting ours today. One could say of Socrates that he was a philosopher, but we cannot say it of Krishnamurti. In light of the thought that emanates from this man, the words 'philosophy' or 'philosopher' acquire for me a pejorative meaning, which I associate with the process of specialisation.

Like the first, the second discussion was entirely devoted to the discovery of our dependence. We all turned somersaults over words; we felt that words were not the means which could get us out of this impasse. I have said that words were traps, that we should be careful of them, that a word could only come about by opposition to its antonym; that it was this duality endemic to the word which made our search for truth difficult. If the word 'good' is stated, we think also the word 'evil'; if we say 'beautiful', we also think 'ugly'. Krishnamurti asked me if I felt that. When I said yes, he responded simply: 'That's it, that's it' in French. Let's not see in these words of his any approval of what I had said; these words were as neutral as could be, despite the emphasis with which they were pronounced. It was a factor in recognising a state. It meant that, since I recognised that words were traps and that I felt it, only that was of significance; it was neither a good thing nor a bad, I was passively aware of what was, and that was all.

Next, we spoke of the fact as knowledge of dependence. What could happen, then, in terms of awareness? Was awareness sudden or gradual? Again we were in a cul-de-sac. Gradual awareness is not awareness, but one of the thousand and one shapes our error takes (however close it may seem to the truth). Krishnamurti was careful not to take a position, he let us splash around at will, aware that truth cannot be given as a reward and that it would only disclose itself to us if we knew how to be empty inside to receive it.

That day we didn't take one step forward, but we already seemed better adapted to the terms of this exploration of reality. We were calmer.

Sometimes great silences hovered over us, like a healing balm over our inner contractions; and,

as the translator did less and less translation, my own thoughts provided me with ample nourishment. This may seem petty, but the circumstances had imposed this limitation on me. I had adapted myself very well to them. When a translation was over, I caught up again with the thread of the exchange, only to discover that we were still at the same point. Often discussions would arise among the participants, in which Krishnamurti acted as a kind of referee, intervening with an intensity of being which turned his presence into a living demonstration of flexibility and vigour of mind, such as I had never encountered on my path before these meetings. Although he never had considerably handicapped Krishnamurti, one felt that it hadn't diminished his presence. Usually, I don't like using the word 'supernormal', but in the case of Krishnamurti I dare give it utterance. This man was supremely awakened; as for us, we were sleeping with our eyes open, tied up in our sentences, stuck in our judgements and our temperaments. We were

Awareness is not explicable. To want to explain it would forever bring about other explanations.

separated from one another by the interest we accorded to our own problems, without taking into consideration those of our fellows, except perhaps to judge them. Never, during these days, did I hear Krishnamurti pass judgement on any of us, except when he pointed out to some that they hadn't understood, but that was not a judgement. I shall always see him, during the last discussion, telling a good little, round-bellied lady, who was very lively and overflowing with naive good nature and who had been incautious enough to say to him that she did not understand how people could talk so much about the difficulty in understanding Krishnamurti's work, which she, for example, had understood perfectly ... I can still see Krishnamurti, with that tone of

voice which was typical of him, telling her vehemently and severely: 'No, Madam, you have not understood.' The little lady seemed delightfully confused, her eyes shone with adoration. It wasn't hard to feel how happy she was to have been scolded a little bit by a man like Krishna-murti. In consequence of which, I realised once more how much human relations are littered with traps, how out of one thing we construct another according to our individual perspectives.

As we were still on the problem of awareness, I gave voice to my conviction that to try, as we always did, to explain the phenomenon of awareness was already to corrupt the object of our explanation. Awareness is not explicable. To want to explain it would forever bring about other explanations: it was a vicious circle. Later, there were several contributions which pointed in the direction of suffering as our sole point of reference in the field of sensitivity.

### THIRD DISCUSSION

In the third discussion we reached the high point of our enquiry, a supreme moment beyond which there could only be silence ... We could not continue to remain arrested at the point of acknowledgement of our suffering. We felt that something had to happen during the course of this third meeting; and it happened in the form of a question, which had all the intensity of a Zen koan. This is the question that Krishnamurti put as a stepping-stone: 'Can one go beyond the state of dependence, without a motive?'

The silence that followed the enunciation of this question was one of the longest and most moving we had. Who would have been incautious enough to reply to this question, which so undermined our omnipotent reason? For some, it might appear completely crazy ... for others, again, it was the dragon they had to slay. We had come to an enigmatic door, and we didn't know its 'Open Sesame!'. All words seemed superfluous to us. Of course, we could have set forth on our great steeds, saddled up a theory, a more or less

'Supreme Doctrine', inspired by Zen Buddhism, Taoism, or even by the Christian mystics, such as Meister Eckhart or St. John of the Cross; but had we not promised, agreed among ourselves, that we would make use of no outside reference? This question was not put in parallel with a religion or a philosophy; it was put to each one of us,

Can we go beyond the state of dependence, without a motive?

honestly, and it was we who had to answer it, no-one else, be it the Buddha or the Christ. Nor could we make an intellectual game of it, we could not go backwards and elicit from Krishna-murti the same questions he had asked us two days before – have him say again: 'You are going too quickly!' or 'What is going on inside you at this moment?' It is from life itself that the answer is demanded – and we know that life isn't made up just of words. Krishnamurti gave us food for our journey with this question; through it alone he was cleansing us of our false enquiry, which was nothing but the building-up of ego under the cover of acquiring culture, which was nothing but distraction from the focus of our real interest. A nudity was given back to us. Personally, I received this question in the way one receives a natural element: wind, rain, fire – it had that simplicity, the mystery of this simplicity. I repeat Krishnamurti's question: 'Can we go beyond the state of dependence, without a motive?'

We must see this question without being tempted to analyse it; let's put our intellect aside. The moment we know that motives give rise to desires and that desires give rise to suffering, what need have we to want to explain the inexplicable? If motives are present, let us observe them, simply, since they are the point of departure of the question; let us observe them without getting attached to our observation, for naturally this is the number one motive. This question tends to bring about in us, beyond all

the explanations, a state of innocence, which by this very fact is unsought. This sites us at the place of paradox, which is at the heart of all life. Paradox is the frontier to which all words bring us, as soon as we want to go beyond the crystallising nature of their symbols. At first sight, the question seems to block our enquiry, but it is only our bulimic greed for life putting up a wall of incomprehension. If we can consider our greed without judging it, either for better or for worse, and we are clear as to what it really is, we shall begin to disclose to ourselves the force for realisation which is contained in the question Krishnamurti put to us. Just this question can be enough for the meditation of a whole lifetime; it orients us, no longer towards knowledge, but towards awareness, an awareness that takes on for us a Sphinx's face, a secret open to the heavens, an awareness that contains within itself the magic and the beauty of a solar explosion. To resolve the question this awareness would give us is to be in the secret of the gods. To be more accurate, if that is possible it is then no longer 'to be or not to be', for these dualistic givens of existence are transcended beyond our human scope. It is no longer our thought, but thinking itself, in which as persons we play a part as a form of the universal play, a form no longer separate and sadly limited by its own cupidity, but a form inhabited by the ineffable, which lies at the heart of all of us. Only, at this point it is advisable to stop; Krishnamurti would tell us: 'You are going too quickly'.

In reality, we cannot answer this question, just as I said during the discussion, we are not in a position to say yes or no. Saying yes implies that we have gone beyond all our motives, which is not the case; saying no means prejudging the real according to the limits of our personhood. And this is not possible if we accept that a door can open, if we have the intuition and the foretaste of it. To tell the truth, I have often imagined a free man as being made up of open doors. This was the content of the third discussion – for

me the last, in spite of the one that took place next day; I considered that the seed had been sown.

#### FOURTH DISCUSSION

The fourth and last discussion was shorter than the others and went ahead unceremoniously. We knew that everything had been said the day before, and we looked on this meeting as being no more than an additional contribution to our enquiry. 'When does learning take place?' Krishnamurti asked us, as if we could really give an answer... We were able then to witness some wonderful 'dialogues for the deaf', to such an extent is our conception of learning still traditional, rationalistic and positive, to such an extent still Western, tied to the meeting of two objects, from which proof and truth arise. Krishnamurti did not assume a position, but he constantly broke down whatever was said in the name of learning that had a tendency to grow and harden into set ideas, dogmas, or the crystallisations of memory. The majority of us were not very clear about what we should be calling 'learning'. And yet the proper nature of its reality was implied in the content of the previous discussions. But one needs to make the point again and again.

That day Krishnamurti got up and left, as usual, without saying a word, but, in contrast to the previous days, when he set off alone with long supple strides along the road which leads to the forest of the Soigne, he waited for us on the drive of Robert Linssen's villa, and he made a point of saying good-bye to each one of us personally. I was one of the last to go by. I held out my hand to him, saying simply: 'Au revoir', and Krishnamurti, with a marvellous smile, said in French: 'See you soon'. That was the only personal conversation I had alone with this man, of whom I can now say that I love him:  
KRISHNAMURTI.

*Copyright Pascal Ruga*

# The First Step

*Contributions and editing of 'The First Step' have been kept anonymous to encourage free written dialogue. This may be seen by some as a license to provoke by way of extreme or exaggerated opinion. That is never the intention, but it needs repeating that the views expressed here do not necessarily reflect those of The Link's editors and publisher.*

## Editor's Note

KRISHNAMURTI SAID THAT HIS LIFE'S WORK WAS TO SET HUMANITY FREE. IN HIS DISCOURSES, HE WAS ALWAYS careful to explain that when he used the word freedom, it was in the sense of freedom from the known or the past rather than freedom to choose, an unusual distinction that I think also applies to the word: reaction.

To illustrate: In listening to a discussion the other day, disappointed that the participants were not going into the subject with a clarity equal to that of Krishnamurti's, I jumped to the comparative conclusion that the discussion was merely intellectual. That conclusion was my personal reaction to what I was witnessing. Later, I asked myself from where in my mind had that reaction come. Surely it had come from my past experience. In other words, my reaction is part of me. I may think I am witnessing something that exists as an independent fact in the world as long as the mirror of relationship is pointed outward, and I react to it, focussing on the content, form, function, structure, style, beauty, and intention of things. But, turn the mirror around and what slowly comes into focus is the realization that I react from myself and that, indeed, I am my images.

I think that in a dialogue, the intent of which is to reveal the process of thought, the distinction between reacting to and reacting from is of great importance. Without keeping in mind an awareness of this distinction, dialogue can become a frustrating or maddening experience. As we mentioned in the last issue of *The Link*, 'The First Step' is intended to stimulate an anonymous, written dialogue among readers who are fellow travelers on the journey of self-discovery. With each issue, we will try to publish ongoing responses.

In this issue, we continue with Part 2 of 'A Closet Thinker's Dilemma', as well as a response to Part 1, which was published in the last issue. Also, we include a contribution ('Password') that describes a response in the so-called 'K world' which, if taken as a reaction 'to' can be seen as controversial, and if seen as a reaction 'from' can be seen as revealing. We'd be very interested in what you think.

## Password to the 'K World'

MY TIME IN THE SO-CALLED 'K WORLD' HAS BEEN AN interesting experience, very, very revealing. I am not writing this as an outsider, because for some time I was an insider. And anyone can be an insider if he knows the password. And the

password is: Interest in Krishnamurti's teachings. I am not writing this cynically or with black humor because, having been an insider, it would be like criticizing myself. I used this phrase years ago without knowing that it was a password to



enter a different world of human beings on this planet 'Earth'.

I didn't know then that knowing 'K language' and 'K vocabulary' was a license to practise varieties of paradoxical and contradictory behavior. This 'K world' accepted and condoned all my eccentricity and erratic behavior, all my traditional and mechanical attitudes, all my aberrations of moral codes if only I used certain words which were highly valued. All I had to do was to say that I am 'aware' or I am 'inquiring' or even 'investigating' or 'exploring'. At other times I would say 'one must doubt' or 'one must question' and at still other times 'let us talk it over', 'let us have a dialogue', 'let us think together'. I had to learn the skill of choosing the right phrase at appropriate moments. As these phrases echoed more often, I began to believe that I was really doing or acting according to the words I was using. This effect spread not only to me but also to my listeners who also began to believe the same. And a new phenomenon of hybrid transformation began emerging in the 'K world'.

Whoever mastered the language had better access to this transformation. The benefits were not only spiritual. A lot more followed. I could become a member of prestigious committees, I could be a head of K institutions, I could travel internationally, give speeches and conduct dialogues of special designs. I could become a mini-guru by condemning all authority and still have a band of disciples from the elite class of different countries. I could write articles, books and have my speeches recorded, on audio and video. I could have scholarships to study in universities abroad or easily get an admission to a 'K' school.

I could get admission to beautifully located, official and unofficial, study centers and retreats and many, many more such places. And all this just for knowing one password: Interest in K's Teachings.

But one day, the dream suddenly broke when I found myself asking, "But what is the teaching of Krishnamurti?" And what do I mean by 'interested'? I had a hard time facing myself because I had spent all my time in learning K's words and using them at different times on appropriate occasions to convince myself that I had understood my 'self' and that I was helping others to understand their 'selves'. New questions began to emerge, and I was shaken to my roots. My mind said, "Krishnamurti says he wants to set man unconditionally free and his teachings are to help those who are hungry, who are thirsty to become free. And if someone is interested in K's teachings, it means that person is interested in being free. Am I?"

I couldn't answer myself. I didn't really understand what 'interested in being free' involved. The word 'freedom' was surely very attractive. I began asking my friends in the 'K world' whatever questions appeared in my mind. And I began discovering the profound ignorance among them of what was involved in wanting 'freedom'. At least, these questions made me a little more honest with myself and a new life began. I got focussed on: "What is it that I really want!" A real doubting and questioning of every trick, every delusion, every belief became my primary concern. So I go on, but now I do not belong to the 'K world' because I no longer know whether or not I am really interested in K's teaching.

\* \* \*

## A Student's Response to K – Part 2

### “Now Where Do I Begin?” A Closet Thinker's Dilemma!

I FIND THAT THE MIND LOVES TO PURSUE IDEAS because of the thrill of discovery and because it does not make any sense to 'pursue' the reality that is already accessible. You cannot desire something if you have it, obviously ... unless you make believe that you haven't got it, which excites the acquisitive impulse ... and the chase goes on! What does it take to realise that we have undertaken an impossible task?

'Knowing' presents us with many peculiar problems, most of them produced by the labels we use to identify concepts. If, through observation, the mind maintains a fine awareness of the interconnected nature of knowledge, and how entirely dependent we are on the whole process, it is then capable of coming to terms with its limitations without experiencing conflict. Seeking implies liberating the known from its limits. Yet it is these very limits that enable us to signify the present by the simultaneous process of acknowledging it as present reality and interpreting it for significance. How can the knower be free of all that is known without perpetuating conflict? How can the knower seek anything without also experiencing discontent with what is already known? Or is it that the problem will remain impenetrable till the nature of seeking is understood?

The mind is capable of grasping the fact that the problem with seeking to understand this whole process is that the very act of 'seeking' relies on endorsing the context that is producing the seeker's dilemma. Seeking invariably encourages the seeker's particular point of view to prevail. Self-assertion is the crux of the whole problem. It not only ensures self-justification, but covertly assists self-validation. Seeking produces conflict by generating the seeker and

the sought after as separate entities within the same context. This ensures that the search for the higher and the search for the place of the lesser in the higher is sustained.

Self seeks security in the absolute, but, by being divided from it, it cannot escape the fact that it is seeking something vastly greater than itself. This division sustains the sense of being an object of victimization, entirely dependent upon the will of the greater for its security. This is a terrifying thought that directs the search towards reassurance, exposing a need to be looked after, to be loved and protected. Protected from what – uncertainty, fear?

'Observation' is simply watching without commentary. Watching requires a fine awareness of what is known to the individual and the fact that this is held within the bounds of what is unknown. The tightrope to be walked is on the line that divides the known from the unknown. Since thought is so 'value based', we can regard this as the highest level of security that the knower can achieve. With this realisation there is a gradual falling away of attachments. There is a sense of psychological stability in the understanding that meaning is relative, and that neither the known nor the unknown hold all the answers. Psychologically, both are ideas. Keeping in sight the fact that, psychologically, the answer lies entirely in the here and the now, balance can be maintained only by being poised on the instant. This cannot be achieved without complete attention.

Attention uncovers insight, which is the perception of the known within the unknown, giving rise to intelligence. Through insight there is an appreciation of the dangers of seeking certainty, whether in the known (self) or the unknown (God). Seeking certainty appears as an avoidance of uncertainty, which is simply an

inevitable by-product of the limited nature of knowledge. Stepping off the tightrope on either side is to fall into delusion. In falling one is overcome by fear, the fear of consequences. Walking the tightrope is to be free of the need for certainty and its impossible demands. It is need for certainty that anchors us all so firmly to fear, belief, and longing.

Desire ends at the point where seeking stops. Desire ends with the insight into its destructive and escapist nature. Even desiring to know is a form of desire, however elevated its purpose. In seeking to know, one is engaged in an acquisitive process with its emphasis not on enquiry, but on acquisition. The emphasis is not on understanding or on the preparedness to learn. This, to me, is the fundamental problem in mainstream education, with its emphasis on knowledge-acquisition and grading according to levels of knowledge. This process inspires fear and destroys the relationship between teacher and students, and introduces the element of competitiveness into the learning environment. Competing for knowledge may fine-tune one's memory, but it undermines one's capacity to

Walking the tightrope is to be free of the need for certainty and its impossible demands. It is need for certainty that anchors us all so firmly to fear, belief, and longing.

learn by introducing stress and the counteractive process of make-believe. Stress requires tremendous energy to be kept under control and becomes a great preoccupation.

In order to learn, the learner must start from the point where his knowledge is limited. Acknowledging this leaves the mind free to learn without asserting what is already known. This enables the context to restructure in relation to anything new that is perceived, giving rise to a

readiness to assimilate what is new without stress. Here, then, there is the capacity to discover without justification. Becoming aware of the limited nature of knowledge removes the sense of inadequacy or anxiety at one's ignorance. It becomes an acceptable fact.

Freed from the defensive nature of acquisition and justification, the mind is then capable of simply watching without transforming what is observed into an object for contemplation. It is simply watchful. The structure that set up duality as self and the other loosens its hold. One is engaged in the process, a movement that demands full participation in the nature of observation. There is no need for fear, no need to withdraw from fact to fiction in order to breach a hole in previously held notions that appear to be under threat by current observation. No defensive mechanisms arise to insist that one follow a particular line of thought, that one believe.

So the capacity to believe begins to diminish. This can be a terrifying experience for self. The fear is relinquished only by comprehending the fact that the persona who seeks to cling to belief is, in fact, fictitious! The fact is that nothing exists there to be held intact, only the realm of ideas held by the brain in the form of memory. Ideas are interdependent and comparative. Any shift in perception requires the adjustment within the context that is required to verify both the past and the present, simultaneously. Attachment to a particular line of thought will insist that any discrepancy in current perception be reconciled by appealing to the authority of knowledge or to a particular body of thought that is deemed to toe the line of truth.

Becoming spontaneously aware of memory, and the shifts and balances that occur in the context of thought through direct perception of the movement, brings about choiceless awareness. When K referred to choiceless awareness, the concept filled me with awe and delight! But the fact that I'd missed the point eluded me as long as it remained a concept. Choiceless awareness is poised on the brink of perception. Perception is only at the point where the sense of

the perceiver and the perceived are absent. Then there is choiceless awareness. There is no

The fear is relinquished only by comprehending the fact that the persona who seeks to cling to belief is, in fact, fictitious!

question of maintaining this level of awareness. 'Levels' belong to the realm of thinking about this state, which is the very cause of the sense of strife that we seek to be liberated from. Whereas 'maintaining' implies continued attachment to preserving the authority of the interpreter.

'Labeling' appears irrelevant in the creative process, but it is enormously relevant in the realm of signifying, which gives meaning and a sense of depth to the act of living. To value choiceless awareness above self-awareness is, again, to be captivated by thoughts and values that give rise to a sense of substance. So there we are, back again, 'confronting' reality instead of being part of it.

In choiceless awareness there is room for insight, but there is no room either to recollect or predict. Consciousness as creation becomes tangible. Whereas insight is poised on the instant, the 'I' steps back in time, seeking to interpret the instant from memory. Re-creation begins since creation is the present. So thought, though it seeks to unravel reality, is inevitably faced with the past. Insight is a process of renewal. In fact there is no sense of time at this point, only awareness without desire, without compulsion, without the need to hold onto any idea or belief previously held as sacred or inviolable.

One realises that one is utterly responsible as part of the creative process. Any sense of frustration implies a step back into ideas that contain one's notion of reality. The backward move is fueled relentlessly by the need to be somebody, or somewhere, else in order to get away from the discontent created by the need! The entire problem is self-inflicted. Even to say 'backward' implies that the other is ahead of one. Hence the need to pursue it!

Since the search is driven by the need to 'get away from it all', what is being pursued is rather unclear: it is represented as a concept. Therefore definitions become paramount and one is lost in the realm of ideas. Looking for the higher by alienating the lower, seeking to be greater by patronizing the lesser, always asserting significance, yet overwhelmed by the need for endorsement, one is bewildered by the fact that, in order to pursue, one has to be constantly on the run! With all this heavy huffing and puffing, I ask myself, is it any wonder that I was unable to listen to what K was talking about?

Speech invites comparison in order to signify. Seeking the higher, the greater, we remain hampered by the lower and the lesser, feeling victimized by the definitions that we use. To be free of the confusion and constraints that drive us to be free, the cause of the confusion must first become apparent. The fact that 'seeking' inevitably personifies the seeker, giving rise to the sense of division and conflict that we find so stifling, is not easy to grasp. We can do nothing but clarify our thoughts, through observing thought in process, in its attempt to signify. Signifying what? Now there is the leading question. The cue that leads me on! Thank you for your time!

\*\*\*

## An Answer to 'A Student's Response to K'

PICKING UP FROM 'A STUDENT'S RESPONSE TO K' where the writer says, 'You cannot desire something if you have it', let's see if we can shed some light or see from a slightly different angle, the origins of desire.

If what is meant by the above statement is that desire seeks fulfilment in experience, then this brings up the question: Why, if at all, is there something to be sought? Why does one desire to have a pleasurable experience? It seems that this must be a reaction to an inner sense of void created by a longing for the repetition of a past pleasurable experience. If it is a painful experience, then it is to be avoided. So the brain conditioned by experience seems to respond from all the accumulated memories of pain and pleasure. So actions are to be regretted or applauded.

Pursuing desire objectively reveals that it is rooted somehow in the memory of a moment gone by. It is perhaps akin to the longing of a partially developed photograph wanting to complete itself. So thought is incomplete, as the memories are contrived and limited by their own choice.

From whatever little knowledge of biology I have, it seems to me that memory is that small but somewhat vital part of the nervous system which is required for the sustenance of the whole organism. This is no doubt true, but when the conditioned memory, which is part of the nervous system, responds from the accumulated memories of past pains and pleasures, then time is born in the psyche – the hopes for tomorrow continued from the burdens of the past. This psychological time, as in the physical world, is a movement, beginning from a fixed, conditioned centre – the ego. Its activities inevitably bring about a sense of time.

Time deprives the brain of its energy. When there is no energy, there is no space. When there is no space, there is no freedom for intelligence to operate. When there is no intelligence, the activities of the brain are disorderly. But a disorderly mind, which is biased and conditioned, cannot possibly be objective about anything.

So one can only begin with desire and try to see the suffering brought about by desire, with all the energy one has left. The little ego must stop for a moment to look. Surely, this must bring about some awareness? If awareness is not afforded that space in the brain, then attention is next to impossible, or so I think!

One must attend to this inner drama that unfolds every day, because there is great tragedy in this, it is much more tragic than anything described in any literature. If one is at all sensitive, there is tremendous sorrow in the hurting of another, may it be a human or a plant or an animal. The living earth suffers and there is sorrow. There is the pain of a thousand yesterdays.

So the question is whether the disorderly brain can correct itself? Can there be a complete healing of the brain cells and is compassion a factor in that process of healing? Can a brain which knows only domination and subjugation understand all this?

Then there is death which says: Do what you will, time is limited. So there is an imagined after-life and the idea of progressive change in a desperate attempt to extend time. It is the complete denial of death as a psychological ending. So thought can never understand death. If it did there wouldn't be any fear.

\*\*\*

## On Education

### Editor's Note

IN OUR LAST ISSUE WE REPRODUCED A LENGTHY interview of the founder and director, if that is the right word, of a village school in central India. This time around the pendulum swings back in the direction of education for older students, particularly in the west. The last Krishnamurti Foundation of America Newsletter contained a fascinating article by Matt Gates, whose interest in K's teachings and dialogue had provided the creative impulse to design and run a course at Berkeley University as part of his undergraduate studies there. Matt kindly agreed to review and, as it turns out, slightly expand that article for us. It provides an unusual look into the minds of a group of young people, working within an atmosphere of intellectual rigour that is a first rate university, most of whom were facing the teachings for the first time. We have appended to the article a few words from a recent letter from our friend Gopalakrishna, formerly of Brockwood Park and CFL in Bangalore, who is currently completing a M.Ph. at Colorado State University, on his impressions of a course at CSU which also involved the teachings.

As readers of the *Brockwood Observer* will know, there has been a lot of effort put into creating a space at Brockwood for the benefit of much younger humans. As balance for an apparent emphasis on later-age education in this issue, there is a look at why this area of education is at least as important as any other, written by a teacher and parent of many years standing who has been actively involved in the discussions from which the Brockwood initiative has arisen. An update of the present situation with that project is also included.

There is an emerging trend in current debates on education in western Europe to emphasize

practical and supposedly financially effective subjects as opposed to those which are perceived to be less quantifiably productive. This tends to translate as an emphasis on the sciences and technologies, with the humanities and arts correspondingly fading from the spotlight. Another old friend and frequent contributor, Javier Gomez Rodriguez, himself a graduate of American tertiary education as well as being a former student and teacher at Brockwood Park, has viewed this trend with increasing misgivings which he has expanded on in 'The Vanishing Humanities'. When he comments that the division between the sciences and the humanities dissolves in the face of realising that 'we are the world', one is immediately struck by the consonance with the extract from an early letter of Krishnamurti's, appearing on page 14 of this publication, where he talks of social reform and spiritual freedom being essentially 'one process'.

What, if anything, can one deduce from this? That if one takes a whole view of either education or human activity, then these divisions which so preoccupy us disappear, or at least are exposed as nothing more than the tools of verbal and organisational convenience? Perhaps. But then, by extension, the division between education and life will also become only a matter of convenience. I suspect that few readers of this publication would find this proposition alarming, or even debatable. However, it is the development of specific programs – curricula – to put this understanding into practice which generates real uncertainty and potential disagreement. Just how do you balance the transfer of knowledge (conventional education) with a process of enquiry designed ultimately to equip a student for living intelligently in a wider world that, at best, appears chaotic and unhealthy (in fact, K spoke of 'transformation', but that is another issue and



the difference is not significant in this context since the product of transformation can be said to be living intelligently). This question never goes away for those actually charged with answering it. Krishnamurti called for 'excellence' on both sides of that equation, but, it may be argued, that was easier for him to say than for us to accomplish.

Further questions of even greater difficulty follow, like: Who do you entrust with a process of such enormous significance? Are there ways of determining when a 'teacher' is sufficiently clear-sighted to be entrusted with a process which can, in the wrong hands, too easily become the imposition of personal idiosyncrasies on young, impressionable minds? Or do you not worry about such matters and just plough ahead regardless, trusting to the fundamental worth of what you are doing to see you over the difficulties which arise? If you are charged with running a school, Brockwood for example, do you in fact have any choice? In other words, do you accept that you make the best of your limited resources and get on with it, or do you draw an arbitrary line somewhere and not proceed at all unless you feel that you can achieve at least that level of 'quality'?

These and similar questions are, in a sense, the real ones. But where, in the 'K world', do

you see dialogue happening around them? Presumably something of the sort goes on within the boundaries of the individual schools, but is that sufficient? Even there, are parents involved in such discussions, or even the students themselves; or do we prefer to keep it easier for ourselves by limiting such involvement? And then, if we are closed in this way, can we touch on this 'other' kind of education at all; are we in fact any different to so-called normal educators who ignore it entirely?

This publication has been a potential forum for such dialogue, or discussion, or even debate – in this instance the terminology is irrelevant, since nothing at all is occurring either in these pages or in any other public forum to our knowledge. Educational conferences and the like occur from time to time in India and Brockwood, for example, but as yet they are still perceived by some, particularly from outside the 'K world', to be exercises in reinforcement of accepted wisdom or shop-windows to impress 'outsiders' of the value of Krishnamurti's views on education. There may be nothing wrong with that, but it is no substitute for real enquiry into the how, what and why we are doing this thing we all supposedly believe to be valuable, if not crucial.

These pages remain open to such enquiry.

---

## Notes from an Experimental Class on Krishnamurti

FOR SOME TIME, I'VE HAD A GREAT INTEREST IN THE teaching of Krishnamurti – an interest that has often been nourished at the expense of my formal education. Until recently. In the spring semester of 1996, the last of my stay in the undergraduate English program at University of California Berkeley, I initiated an experimental course focusing on Krishnamurti's teaching. This

was made possible by a Democratic Education course at U.C. Berkeley, a program through which students, after obtaining faculty sponsorship, are able to design and initiate their own classes, which other students can then take for university credit. The idea for the course arose during the previous semester, as a result of my participation in Professor Ojars



*December sky, viewed from The Krishnamurti Centre, Brockwood Park*

Kratins' seminar, English 142a: "advanced composition for potential teachers of English in secondary schools" – a class that is markedly different from most English courses at Berkeley. Professor Kratins didn't lecture, he merely administered the writing assignments and participated in the discussions. There were only about 30 of us in the class – very small by Berkeley standards – and as the class was often divided into even smaller peer writing groups of 4 or 5, the door was open for us to take initiatives and approach issues directly through intensive, intimate, free-format writing and discussion. Beside English 142a, most of my other classes seemed to be looking at life issues much more circuitously, approaching things in terms of a specific set of literatures or criticisms and according to the designs and expectations of the

instructors. English 142a resonated strongly with my experience of dialogue and the teaching of Krishnamurti, and I naturally incorporated Krishnamurti's words and my sense of them into the papers I wrote for the class.

I was curious to find out what would happen if such a classroom environment were charged by the teaching. While English 142a's openness was definitely a strength, discussion would sometimes leap around rapidly without focus. It seemed to me that, using the teaching of Krishnamurti as a starting point, such a class could potentially go farther and stick longer to the "issues" than English 142a's discussions had. The idea germinated, and I asked Professor Kratins if he would be interested in sponsoring a course, structured like his own, that would use

the work of Krishnamurti to open fundamental issues for direct examination. He enthusiastically agreed. Technically, all the faculty sponsor is obliged to do is sign the grade sheets at the end of the semester, but Professor Kratins participated in the “class” frequently, as Krishnamurti’s work, although new to him, appealed to his interest and seriousness.

The “class” was called ‘Exploring a pathless land: dialogue and the work of J. Krishnamurti’. I put the word “class” in quotes, because it was really a dialogue group. It was announced in the Democratic Education catalogue, and I placed a few flyers around campus in strategic locations. Twenty students enrolled, and since “the door was left open” throughout the semester, there were at any one meeting up to two interested but “uncommitted” members of the university community in attendance, some of whom participated on a regular basis. A diverse range of ages, ethnicity, and fields of study was represented. None of the participants had ever attempted this sort of dialogue before and only about half had given Krishnamurti more than a cursory reading. We met once a week for a two hour session. I chose *The Awakening of Intelligence* as our main text, because of its comprehensiveness; but I also included several essays by David Bohm (“Krishnamurti: an introduction” and “On interpretation”) and the anonymous essay “The nature of dialogue”, all of which I took from literature that had been distributed at KFA dialogues. In addition, we watched several videos, including *The Challenge of Change*, *The Nature of Love*, and the series *The Transformation of Man* with David Bohm and David Shainberg (transcribed in *The Wholeness of Life*).

On the first day of the course, I said a few words about Krishnamurti, the text, and what we would be attempting to do with our class time. I stated that we would normally be seated in a circle, having an open exchange, and that, in spite of my experience with the material and my role in initiating the course, I wasn’t interested in playing

the part of professor or instructor – I just wanted to share dialogue. I emphasised that what I hoped we could do in our dialogue was not talk about Krishnamurti, but rather, by using his words, look at the things he brings up, thereby approaching these issues directly with the teachings, not by looking in terms of them or through them.

In our first discussions we were all a bit anxious. After the first couple of meetings, however, our circle relaxed considerably, and we settled into a friendly and easy exchange. We opened each meeting by either watching a video or breaking into small groups of three to five people to discuss; the second half of the meeting was spent in large group dialogue. We would sometimes start with questions from the reading, but we always took whatever came up and would just go from there.

From the beginning, the dialogues were different in character to any I had ever participated in. Part of this was certainly due to the fact that so many people were grappling with the material for the first time. There was an atmosphere of freshness about it, which was sometimes expressed as perplexity. It also meant that there was a significant and vocal element that became extremely critical (sometimes to the point of irritation) of Krishnamurti’s words and ways of expressing his message – much more so than in any other group I have discussed these matters with before. But in spite of a couple of bad moments where the atmosphere seemed to get a little “warm”, these critical questions and impressions were a good place to start, creating a lively interchange conducive to the possibility of re-evaluation and looking at things simply.

In contrast to these “critical” responses, a tendency toward acceptance was also expressed. The participants that embodied this, in different ways, seemed to have integrated Krishnamurti’s words into what they thought already. They had the feeling that they more or less agreed with Krishnamurti, and that the issue was therefore,

in a sense, “settled”. Such comfortable feelings as our dialogue revealed, entailed sedulously

... irrespective of particular topics, it was these two currents – the “accepting” and the “rejecting” – that were the recurring constants.

interpreting the teaching according to inclination, picking and choosing parts that were appealing and avoiding the perplexing, challenging, and disturbing.

The issues we looked at were varied and we covered a great deal in the readings, but it seems to me that, almost irrespective of particular topics, it was these two currents – the “accepting” and the “rejecting” – that were the recurring constants. For me they most accurately characterise what was happening beneath the surface of our dialogues – we were constantly negotiating these two currents and their tendency toward opposing conclusions. Their mixing and clashing is where we began and ended most discussions; but from there (although we constantly fell back into conclusion) we did manage to pose and sporadically move through pertinent questions as they arose out of the reading and discussion – questions that couldn’t really be claimed by either current, although they were inevitably incorporated by both.

Let me give some examples of what I mean. Some of the most interesting and important discussions occurred when people described what they felt were contradictions in the material we were reading and watching. A good one was: ‘Krishnamurti speaks of a state of attention in which there are no words, where knowledge ends – and yet his entire teaching is rooted in words and knowledge’. To this, acceptance would offer something like: ‘just because Krishnamurti uses

words to describe a wordless state doesn’t mean he is limited by words in the way that we are – his words arise out of a wordless silence which we should aspire to’. The question that came out was: ‘certainly we can’t say that Krishnamurti’s statements are or aren’t limited by knowledge without understanding the mechanisms of knowledge – how do words, past experience, accepted opinions, etc. (i.e. things we know) affect our perception?’

Another big contention which was expressed several times was: ‘Krishnamurti vehemently disparages all organised religions, methods, and paths, yet he has a method and dogma of his own, involving certain prescribed steps, goals, etc. (e.g. rejection of belief, attentive observation, the ending of fear), many of which look extremely similar to the tenets of the very things he attacks. He’s merely setting himself apart, then propagating his own version of the same thing.’ Acceptance side-stepped this with: ‘When Krishnamurti disparages organised religions, he’s expressing his own conditioning (one can see by looking at his history why he would hold a personal grudge against organised ritualistic religion), whereas when he speaks of other things, he speaks from truth, and is one with the great, traditional teachers at the foundation of the world’s religions’. But the questions which bring the matter ‘back home’, as the most important questions must, came up in some form like: ‘Krishnamurti’s words, like anything, can be made into dogma or reflect conditioning – but isn’t it possible that such a reading is overlooking other things he is saying, and thereby taking him out of context? That is, do K’s words necessarily refer to dogma? What, exactly, do we mean by dogma; what are the components of dogmas and methods, and is action in terms of method the only thing available to us?’

To *The Transformation of Man* videos, our most extensive ‘live’ view of Krishnamurti and the actual process that went into creating the text, the critical response was: ‘Krishnamurti’s

evident irritation and pushiness, in the video dialogues and otherwise, reveal that he has an image.' Many people felt there was a valid criticism in this, and the accepting faction was reduced to the ever-popular and useful blanket

These questions that challenge the duelling conclusions without necessarily stating and defending a conclusion within themselves, formed an edge of potential hesitation between the two currents.

defence: 'Never mind the contradictions, you shouldn't focus so much on the negative, you just have to take what you can get out of it, and learn what you can.' Yet even in this schism, there were questions hiding, questions that turned the whole thing in another direction entirely: 'Do K's mannerisms and the outward characteristics of his interactions necessarily indicate an image? Can we say for sure if another person has an image or not? If so, how? If not, why not? In this exploration, is it possible that we have created an image of what an image is? What happens in your mind when you avoid certain unpleasant reactions that arise in relation to the material, suppressing them in an effort to "get what you can" out of the reading and videos?'

These questions that challenge the duelling conclusions without necessarily stating and defending a conclusion within themselves, formed an edge of potential hesitation between the two currents, a brief window of silence which threatened the safety of knowledge and security of both sides. They are questions which implicitly challenge one to hold and attend without answering, to re-evaluate and look directly at what happens inwardly without forming opinions about it and falling off to one conclusion side or

the other. Our dialogue would approach these questions for tiny moments, it seems, balancing on 'the edge', confronted with a silent unknown. But the moments proved too subtle and slippery, as the incessant conclusion-making mechanism of thought proved nearly impervious. The questions, in their turn, were also interpreted in terms of conclusion (acceptance approached them as a kind of rejection and rejection approached them as a kind of acceptance), and things continued to swing back and forth from one static state to another, the edge of watching often passing out of view before we had even noticed a break in the concluding. Before it broke through we were already on to another response, out of which we had to climb to reach 'the edge' again.

Of course, in our dialogue there was no happy, collective resolution to the opposing conclusions; but in the end no one held an opinion that was unquestioned, and I'm fairly certain that no one left feeling unchallenged and without food for thought, or comfortably convinced that they were 'right'. In addition, I think many people, in some brief way, felt 'the edge' – either consciously or unconsciously.

The main assignment for the class was a paper. The students also filled out anonymous evaluations of the class and the material. A few people expressed, to varying extents, indifference or even disdain for the whole thing (one called it "cultish"), but these were a minority. For most people, dialogue and the teaching were a welcome new challenge in the university environment. They stated that the course had been well worth their while ( a couple called it their 'favourite class'), that they had been confronted with things they had never thought about before, and had looked at old issues in a new way.

I had the sense that the class had been what many of my English class discussions wanted to be, but weren't. It seemed that in those situations classes had been dealing with life, but always in

terms of conclusion, hedged by the safe guise of discussions that were addressing a specific literature of one kind or another. Our dialogues were much more intimate, dealing with issues in a way that felt more direct and honest.

Berkeley can be an amazing place, and I don't wish to criticise it. The mere fact that we were able to do such a thing under university auspices is a potent statement in its defence but, as many students stated in their papers, such a large scale education tending toward the mechanical, within which students are directed along a specialised, standardised line of study, can be very stifling, leaving many important things unaddressed. Practically nowhere in our educational institutions are pertinent questions, such as those Krishnamurti raises, to be found; on the contrary, the thought which we value and cultivate in schools seems to be one of the principal barriers to this questioning on 'the edge'. This is especially evident in places such as the Berkeley English Department, where it often seems that one of the primary objectives is to learn how to argue effectively – to claim an opinion as 'mine', backing it up with evidence and defending it against evidence to the contrary.

Practically nowhere in our educational institutions are pertinent questions, such as those Krishnamurti raises, to be found.

I would highly recommend such an endeavour to anyone who might find themselves in a position to start something like it – although this situation was, perhaps, unique, there must be ways. With a little initiative, anyone could probably do something like this in a college or university. Along with the majority of the class, I felt it well worth the time and energy. I was able

to see Krishnamurti's words touching minds up close, which revealed a whole other side of the teaching; and a relatively rigid, bureaucratic, and notoriously impersonal system of higher education was opened up to a new realm of possibilities and significance.

*Matt Gates, February 1997*

---

*The following is extracted from a letter from Gopalakrishna also on the subject of an undergraduate university course involving K's teachings.*

Last semester a course was taught with a substantial section on K by two Professors in the philosophy department here. Students were required to do some reading on Buddhist philosophy and also experiment with certain meditative practices. After this they also read *Freedom from the Known* and had discussions and assignments on the reading. I sat in on one of the discussions and found it to be interesting for two reasons: (1) The participants directly plunged into discussing the content of their readings. As there was little/no previous background about K's personality (reverence towards or criticism against K), the students could really try and examine what was said, without the personality becoming a hindrance. (2) Some of the discussion was surprisingly non-academic (in the traditional sense of that word). The discussion was actually not merely about what was said but more importantly also about one's own response to it. Thus students even spoke about a sense of fear (from having to question their deeply held beliefs and from being divested of the known). Their response was, on the whole, honest and enthusiastic – and I think that some are likely to continue their study.

*Gopalakrishna, February 1997*

## Young Children – A Generation at Risk?

WHAT IS THIS PROCESS CALLED GROWING UP? DO WE begin as empty shells and then evolve through a series of changes, growing physically and psychologically? I think not. The unborn baby is heir to all humanity, subject to its conditioning throughout history. My observation has been that the notion of psychological growth is misleading; the personality traits of the young child often continue through adolescence to adulthood, experiencing only superficial modification. So much of the character of the individual becomes apparent in the early years of life. In fact, if you look carefully you will observe that a great deal of so-called adult behaviour is not far removed from much of what you might see on a typical primary school playground, only more subtle.

If you watch a young child closely you can often quite quickly get a feeling for what that child is like. From the way he or she moves, talks and interacts with the surroundings you can get some essence of the character of the child; particularly if you are impersonal in your observation, you can begin to understand the child. Generally a young child is open, friendly and interested in the world that surrounds her or him. However, we are rapidly approaching a point where these aspects of early childhood are seen as irrelevancies in a world which is quickly degenerating into a place where only the measurable has significance. I am reminded of something that Dorothy Rowe has written in her book 'Guide to Life':

*As small children we are interested in everything and are infinitely talented. However, our education destroys our curiosity and we are taught that we are not the artists, musicians, writers, singers, scientists and inventors we had once thought.'*

In much of the teachings of Krishnamurti it is put forward that inner freedom is essential for humanity. With young children you see the

expression of this in their urge to explore, to find out, a kind of free play with their environment. Surely it is the task of education to ensure that this exploration does not result in a domination of the individual by his or her surroundings, nor by those people with whom contact is made, although neither should it result in the individual being dominant. It is of the utmost importance that education maintain the integrity of the individual, whilst seeking to avoid the setting up of one individual against another.

Children are losing their physical freedom for a variety of reasons. The predominance of car usage is having far reaching effects. Roads are becoming increasingly more dangerous for

If you look carefully you will observe that a great deal of so-called adult behaviour is not far removed from much of what you might see on a typical primary school playground, only more subtle.

pedestrians and cyclists. Fewer children walk reasonable distances, thus they become less physically fit and view life through an isolated, sound-proofed bubble, having no contact with the sights, sounds and smells of those things they pass. Open areas are being closed off; a poignant personal illustration of this is the place where I used to play as a boy, walking through woods and over fields to the sea, which is now a theme park providing expensive entertainment 'for all the family'. A further element in the loss of physical freedom has been an insidious fear that has entered the minds of many parents, fuelled by the immense media coverage that inevitably surrounds the violation of children. Thus, thoughtful protection is replaced by constricting supervision,



sometimes resulting almost in a form of imprisonment of children for their own safety. Watching young children play outside you are convinced of their need for space to run, jump and explore.

Similarly children need inner space to play with ideas, to understand their own thinking and to go beyond their own demands. As we are destroying their physical freedom, so we are also threatening the inner freedom of the young. In their anxiety over their own security parents transfer their hopes and aspirations onto their children. These parents want to ensure that their children come out on top of the heap by passing all their exams and getting good, well-paid jobs. Unfortunately, this thinking is becoming more and more ascendant as the politicians take increasingly greater control of education and see that these attitudes might win them votes. Under the guise of 'improving standards' children as young as five are being tested and these results are being converted into league tables for schools, thereby investing these tests with value considerably more than their worth, that is if they have any worth anyway. This enhances the spirit of competition, pitting school against school, pupil against pupil, creating the feeling that educating the young is a team game complete with winners and losers. Krishnamurti's words from *Education and the Significance of Life* have a particular resonance as we move into a world of education where the watchwords are inspection, monitoring and assessment, where teachers and administrators are forced to defend their livelihoods:

*'When there is love of the child, all things are possible. As long as the institution is the most important consideration, the child is not.'*

The corruption of the politicians is complete as they mass behind the rallying cries of parental choice and parent power, steadily destroying the integrity of educators. We watch silently as the effects of parental expectations blight yet another generation. Anyone who is a parent and is able to

view the experience with some sense of detachment is aware of all the possibilities in the process of bringing up children, and the immense dangers involved.

So what are we to do? Do we continue to send our young children to creches, child-minders, nursery schools, where they often move from

We move into a world of education where the watchwords are inspection, monitoring and assessment, . . .

having individual attention to being lost in the mass? Do we continue to work long hours so that the only time we spend with our children we call 'quality time'? And finally, are we ultimately concerned to make all children the same, conforming to arbitrary norms? The beauty of the majority of young children is in their integrity and unselfconscious differences. This beauty can be seen to fade as they become more aware of themselves and begin to compare themselves to those around them, so their differences are hidden and they seek to be the same as those they admire or fear.

We want to control our young children far beyond pointing out the dangers and delights that life has to offer; we want to clothe them in our own well-meaning, so that they, like us, live second-hand lives. Krishnamurti used the expression 'flowering' as a description of the process of growing up. If we strip away the cloying sentimentality that so often stifles young children and watch them as they are, seeking to understand them as individuals, then this 'flowering' process is sustained by a dynamic new relationship with the child, and all are enriched by the unfolding of this new life.

*Andrew Alexander, February 1997*

## ■ Pre-School Initiative at Brockwood Park

DURING THE 27 YEARS THAT BROCKWOOD PARK School has been in existence there have been various proposals to set up a school for small children here. None of these have come to fruition, partly because of the small number of families here to support such an initiative. However, last year with three families associated with the school, and four children under the age of five to think of, we began to consider the options again.

It was felt that rather than generate grandiose plans and struggle to raise funds and find more children, an organic approach was best. So we set out to find a space in which children and parents could meet and learn together and in so doing discover what they wanted and how they wanted to go about achieving this.

Space is at a premium at Brockwood and so for a solution we looked to Inwoods: a two acre property with a large house and outbuildings

belonging to Brockwood. It is a seven minute walk from the main school and is used for staff accommodation. In the autumn of 1995 we began to work on one of the outbuildings – a former farm shed – with a view to creating a warm, dry, well-lit space. After the help of many friends and a good deal of patience the building is now in use.

Parents and children have begun meeting there on a regular basis and there is already a lot of discussion about how things might proceed. The idea of forming a small school is under serious consideration and there is a good deal of enthusiasm amongst staff and students at Brockwood for such a project. We are now looking at ways of including local families in this process, and have begun making contact with some who share an interest in a different kind of education for their children. We would be glad to hear from people with similar concerns and would be happy to respond to any queries you may have about this project.

*Bill Taylor, March 1997*

## Excellence without Competition?

*The following is an excerpt from an article by Dr Shailesh Shirali, Director of the Rishi Valley School in India. The article was originally published in The Valley, the newsletter of Rishi Valley School.*

Two discussions between staff and students were held during the term at Rishi Valley. One was on the subject of excellence, and the key question was: How can high standards and the desire for excellence be maintained in a school where competition is discouraged? Does a marking system ever measure excellence? What is a good measure of excellence? For those familiar with the history of this school (or of any of the Krishnamurti schools), there is nothing

new in this 'family' of questions – they come up time and again! Nevertheless the issue remains. In *Beginnings of Learning*, a collection of dialogues and talks that Krishnamurti had with students at Brockwood Park, one finds this passage:

*"Most people work either to avoid punishment or to gain something in the way of possessions, money, fame and so on. So most people work under great pressure. Here at Brockwood there is not that extreme pressure, ... Therefore there is a tendency to slacken, to let go, to become rather empty and lose that vitality that youth generally has – that feeling of urgency, ... All that gradually disappears and you are left here to be responsible to*



*Early morning frost, on a walk in Rougemont, Switzerland*

*yourself, which is rather difficult. Most of us want somebody to lean on, ... somebody to say, You are doing very well, carry on! And to push us when we are slack, drive us when we are indifferent, ... so that gradually somebody becomes the authority. Haven't you noticed this? There is no authority here, therefore you are left to yourself and it is very difficult to keep oneself at the highest point of energy, drive, intelligence and affection and not just go off into a kind of day-dream, uselessly wasting time. Brockwood is supposed to give you the terrain, the environment, the atmosphere in which this self-generating energy can go on. How is all this to be created?"*

(Copyright KFT)

It is curious how we are wedded to the idea that grades foster excellence. Perhaps if one

restricts one's vision very greatly and considers the quality of professional work and nothing else, there may be a case to be made for systems of ranking and relative marking – pitting one person against another, and so on. But excellence surely cannot be confined to so narrow a field! What about excellence of one's life as a whole – one's relationships, one's conduct with another, ...? Can a system of competition, or any system for that matter, foster a desire for excellence in this wider sense? What does foster a desire for beauty, for grace, for excellence? Or is it beyond fostering, being in some deep sense intrinsic to human nature? Possibly, but sensitivity surely must have something to do with it: living rightly because it affects those who live with us and around us; living rightly because it matters; living rightly because it is right.

*Shailesh Shirali*

## The Vanishing Humanities

IN RECENT CONVERSATIONS WITH FOUR EDUCATORS, I again got the impression that the Arts and Humanities are being eased out of the curriculum. These four friends teach philosophy, art, religion and literature and they were complaining, as is somewhat usual with teachers in the state system, about the quality of education, the number of students, the heavy syllabus and the lack of understanding of the relevance of their subjects in the overall educational context. Apparently, the state educational programme is very enlightened in print but deficient in practice. It proposes the development of the whole person, few students per class to allow for maximum individual attention, teaching for understanding, development of critical thinking and social responsibility. Teachers embrace these proposals but find themselves bogged down by poor facilities, too many students per class, therefore lack of individual attention, learning for highly competitive exams and no time for communal involvement. The economic question seems to be the lynchpin in these matters. The government, like the educators, has dreams of perfection which the tight budget reduces to a more mechanical kind of schooling. Teachers end up burnt out and frustrated with their jobs, often blaming the system, their colleagues and the students for their insincerity and lack of interest.

Education is the preparation of the individual to enter the social stream of function and therefore its value is determined by its degree of usefulness.

This situation seems to be pervasive within the educational field and those who have a vocation,

and don't give in to circumstances or cynicism, wonder what can be done, if anything.

Criteria of utilitarian functionality seem to prevail within the pedagogical field. Education is the preparation of the individual to enter the social stream of function and therefore its value is determined by its degree of usefulness. In a world still conditioned by modernist notions of economic progress, technological innovation and nationalist interests, the useful is what is conducive to these universal ends. Education itself, as the means to their attainment, comes under the same standards of productivity and competitive efficiency as the prevailing pragmatic system. Thus some universities in the United States are adopting the market model of education, such that the educational institution guarantees its product, namely that the given student knows what he or she is supposed to know by a certain time, or the client can get his or her money back. This is a frank way of admitting that education is a business with a product existing within a given market. The product is knowledge, which is then treated like any other commodity, for knowledge exists fundamentally as a function of commercial demand. Pedagogy thus becomes the development of techniques for the improvement of knowledge acquisition. In this general ambience, the sciences naturally prosper, whereas the humanities tend to wither away or linger as cultural relics of the past.

My friends find that there are fewer teaching positions in their subjects as time goes on, whereas the labs become bigger and bigger. Philosophy has become history, history has become the folk tales of bygone eras, literature has been replaced by television, and religion is a record of ideal fables and real immorality. And as for art, its evident uselessness and apparent lack of method make it an obvious candidate for the academic dump heap. All of them seem to be

fit candidates for the nostalgia of museums, whereas maths, physics, chemistry, biology and kindred subjects are ever in greater demand as the very building blocks of the future. The sciences and the humanities thus seem to be mutually at odds, as though the presence of the one implied the absence of the other. Although science was the child of philosophy, born out of a religious feeling for the whole universe, with

The ascent of man through knowledge was checked by the emergence of a civilization plagued with the discontent attendant on a fragmented psychology.

a deep aesthetic component, it gradually separated itself and became the paradigm of all the other subjects, and instead of it being a particular form of poetry, it demanded to be taken as the measure of all human learning. Its sense of advancement from certainty to certainty set it apart from the fantasies of artists, the ravings of poets and the wild speculations of theologians and metaphysicians. Its positivist outlook implied the derivation of the laws of man from the laws of nature, which at this particular juncture meant the creation of a secular society governed by a modified version of the (generally misunderstood) Darwinian principle of the survival of the fittest. God died in the XIX century at the hands of science, nature was made the object of methodical exploitation for the sake of the wealth of nations, and man became the cunning animal predicted by his own theories.

The results of these transformations are a series of problems that characterize our current human predicament worldwide. Not only has the advance of science met with its own intrinsic limitations, but its optimism has been seriously damaged by its having become the handmaid of human destructiveness. The mechanical, deter-

ministic world view that produced the industrial revolution and promised untold benefits for mankind through increased mechanization and rising standards of living, became the very root cause of conflict. The machine that would save man from slavish labour turned against its inventor as the world was engulfed in fratricidal war. The ascent of man through knowledge was checked by the emergence of a civilization plagued with the discontent attendant on a fragmented psychology. Thus technological progress seems to have implied psychological regress. If we take seriously the observation that the inner invariably overcomes the outer, then this situation is of the utmost danger, as can be clearly seen in the generalized sense of fragmentation in ecology, economics, politics, culture and in practically every sphere of human activity. This being so, it is no wonder that education, this crucible of humanity, should also be in a crisis. So how might it be approached differently?

There are two issues that might be worth considering. One is the undue emphasis given to the outer in detriment to the inner and another is the dualistic pattern of knowledge itself. The easing out of the humanities from the curriculum can be considered as a case of the former. Man's own nature is subsumed under a certain scope of intentionality and its subtler and pervasive aspects are ignored in the wake of the

This understanding that we are the world really means the dissolution of the division between the sciences and the humanities.

ever mounting demand for pragmatic action. What is ignored is the participatory nature of thought and its inbuilt patterns of incoherence. It is assumed that the world is there to satisfy our needs and desires but there is no questioning of the latter, which turn out to be at the root

of the problems that arise in our relationship with the world. Unaware of our own participation, problems become insoluble, giving rise to a widespread feeling of impotence. Our knowledge tells us that we are not the world, that all things, inert or alive, are there for our use and manipulation. It doesn't tell us that we are the world and that whatever we do to it we do to ourselves. This understanding that we are the world really means the dissolution of the division between the sciences and the humanities. In fact it signifies the unification of all the spheres of human activity, and therefore the possibility of a return, if return it can be called, to the origin.

For David Bohm, there were three basic and complementary attitudes to existence, namely the artistic, the scientific and the religious. Krishnamurti himself spoke of the art of living as the highest art and considered the religious spirit and the scientific mind of the greatest importance. Art meant putting things in their right place. Science was concerned with facts, independently of any particular limitation or bias. The religious mind did not belong to anything, was essentially alone, innocent and therefore capable of perceiving the immeasurable. The combination of these three was the basis of a new and creative mind. And at the heart of this explosive wholeness lay the question of self-knowledge. As he said in *Education and the Significance of Life*:

*'The ignorant man is not the unlearned, but he who does not know himself, and the learned man is stupid when he relies on books, on knowledge and authority to give him understanding. Understanding comes only through self-knowledge, which is awareness of one's total psychological process. Thus education, in the true sense, is the understanding of oneself, for it is within each one of us that the whole of existence is gathered.'*

It is clear that understanding is not merely a matter of book learning and authority. It requires direct perception and this 'awareness of one's

total psychological process'. Science progressed because it did not take things on authority and questioned the idols or tendencies and limitations of human nature that can lead to error. Something similar might be done with the humanities, which have a rather poor record in terms of bringing about a good human being. It is here where self-knowledge is of special importance, for it is our meeting ground with the whole of existence, and therefore the ending of the pervasive fragmentation.

Traditionally, subjects like history, religion, philosophy, literature and art have been taught as essential ingredients of culture, which has to do with the understanding and unfolding of the relationship of human beings with their own past, with each other, with the world of perception,

... there is clearly a sense in which (the humanities) are important, since they reflect the ongoing concern of human beings with the totality of relationship, of ourselves.

form and feeling, with the world of thought and meaning, with the beyond. History was taught as a way to learn from our past mistakes and therefore be able to end a series of calamities, such as fanaticism and war. But this lesson has not been learnt. The beauty, goodness and truth at the core of these subjects has not revolutionized human existence. Nevertheless, there is clearly a sense in which they are important, since they reflect the ongoing concern of human beings with the totality of relationship, of ourselves.

Krishnamurti's treatment of the different subjects may throw some light on this issue. He seemed to emphasize this sense of self-learning through every academic subject, indicating that the common ground of all of them is oneself.

As he said to the students in Rishi Valley (22-11-77):

*'History, mathematics, any subject is related to you as a human being, it's not separate from you. If you're studying chemistry, the chemistry of your body, what you eat, how you eat, what kind of food you eat. You follow? All that is implied.'*

Each subject covers an area of this relationship. Thus he would consider that mathematics is the study of relationships of order. History, he would say, 'is the story of man', therefore the story of each one of us. Philosophy is the love of wisdom or, as he preferred, the love of truth. And we've already seen the meaning that he gave to art, science and religion. He draws attention to the original meanings of these subjects and thus reopens their implicit creativity, with an emphasis on freedom of inquiry as against the conditioning of mere book learning and authority. He centres all learning on the human being as the summation of all existence, and thus the education he proposes is eminently humanistic in character. He implies that without this self-knowledge there is no understanding and therefore no possibility of bringing about a good human being and a peaceful and creative world.

My friends and I continue to discuss these things. We are aware of the importance of educating this way as well as of the difficulties involved in bringing about such a change in practice. At times the obstacles seem insurmountable, both on the human and the institutional sides. The social situation seems to give few signs of regeneration. There is a sense of hopelessness and rising violence among the young. The lack of an overall cohesive meaning turns them into conformists, fatalists or mindless rebels. This sense of holistic learning seems to be absent from the educational field and fragmentation plays havoc with relationship. It has reached such a level, that at this point it is not just a question of the humanities disappearing from the curriculum, but of endangering the very future of mankind. That's why the wholeness and creativity at the core of Krishnamurti's educational proposals stand out as a needful and urgent avenue of inquiry and action. Their emphasis on self-learning makes every subject relevant to human existence, which in turn makes them come alive instead of being deadly relics of knowledge or mere playthings of the market place. And the beauty of it is that, as learning, it has no beginning and no end.

*Javier Gomez Rodriguez, February 1997*



# Announcements & Addresses

## ■ Saanen Gathering 1997

AS IN PREVIOUS YEARS, FROM 13TH JULY TO 2ND AUGUST 1997 THERE WILL BE A MEETING OF PEOPLE WHO ARE interested in exploring the work of Krishnamurti. The gathering takes place in Saanen near Gstaad in Switzerland, about two hours by train from Geneva. People can join the gathering whenever they want for however long.

The organised programme includes Sunday, Monday, Wednesday, Thursday morning and Saturday. The schedule starts at 9.45 with a video, a talk or a workshop followed by discussion, ending at around 12.30; the programme continues at 3.00 with further study or discussion groups; at 5.00 one can join a group for body work (Yoga, Feldenkrais). Hikes and walks in the beautiful surroundings are organized on Tuesdays and Fridays.

The cost of participating in the gathering is 80 Swiss Francs per week. Accommodation including meals can be organised at chalet Rosey for around 230 to 400 Swiss Francs a week. Reservations for chalet Rosey are necessary (see address below).

## Main Programme

### 1st week: 13 – 19 July

CREATIVE LIVING IN A CHANGING WORLD – with special participation by Javier Gomez Rodriguez, former teacher at Brockwood Park.

### 2nd week: 20 – 26 July

CONDITIONING AND TRUTH – with special participation by Karen Hesli and Meredy Maynard, directors of the Krishnamurti School in Ojai, USA.

### 3rd week: 27 July – 2 August

ON DEATH AND LOVE – with special participation by Dr. P. Krishna, rector of the Rajghat Educational Centre, India.

Parallel to this main programme there is a special week for **Young People** (under or around thirty years old) from 26th July – 3rd August. The theme is CAN JOB AND CAREER MOVE TOGETHER WITH INNER FLOWERING? Participants will be accommodated in the large chalet Roberti Rosey in Gstaad, next to Saanen. Cost for the week is 270 Swiss Francs for accommodation, two meals and activities.

A programme for **Parents and Children** will take place from 12th – 19th July in a chalet near Gstaad, where the families will live together. Parents can explore the issue of education while their children are cared for. Costs are 300 Swiss Francs per adult and 200 Swiss Francs per child for the week.

## Information and reservation:

Mrs Gisele Balleys – 7 A chemin Floraire – CH 1225 Chene Bourg, Geneve, Switzerland  
Tel & Fax: (41) 22-349 66 74

## ■ University without Walls

IF YOU HAVE EVER HEARD SOMEONE WHO HAS VISITED A FORTUNE TELLER SPEAK ABOUT HIS EXPERIENCE, YOU are very likely to hear that he was told that he would travel. Traveling seems to be a universal desire – to break our routine and see new things and places, to experience new cultures and find out how to handle our human differences, to make new friends, to come in contact with the diverse earth.

Traveling can contribute greatly to the richness of one's life if, while being enjoyed, it is used to learn about oneself. Keeping awake not only to outward experiences but to one's reactions to those experiences is to learn about our own conditioning and to begin to understand what conditioning is and what it does in human life. To travel through life with this intention is to enroll in the university without walls.

By invitation, Raman Patel and I have been traveling extensively through the so-called 'K world' where we have always been received with much affection. While traveling, I have found that most of the people and places inside this world would welcome visitors. Often they will make custom-designed arrangements for board and lodging depending on individual needs and finances. Some of the Krishnamurti schools often accommodate visitors who have a skill and can conduct a seminar for their students. For young people, in between high school and college or college and work-life, very lenient programs involving work-exchange or minimal payments can be arranged. Inspired by the teachings of Krishnamurti, more and more places throughout the world are being created which offer interesting rest spots. Around these, a travel itinerary could be organized. While some of these places are looking for creative people to participate in the development of their projects, all share an interest in the 'mirror of relationship' and the teachings of Krishnamurti and, as such, you will be exposed to many individual expressions of these interests.

As Raman and I travel to these places, we will continue to expand the listing printed in The Link. Not to set standards, but simply to organize this listing, we are defining Retreat Centers, Study Centers and Information Centers as follows:

**Retreat Centers** are quiet places, located in natural surroundings, primarily designed for quiet contemplation. They all offer accommodation and may or may not be involved in study/information center activities.

**Study Centers** have good libraries of K works, primarily designed for the study of the teachings. They might not offer overnight accommodation and may or may not be involved in information center activities.

**Information Centers** are primarily designed to spread awareness of the teachings. They are involved in holding discussions, meetings and dialogues, organizing video showings, translating and distributing books and tapes and providing information about the 'K world'. They may or may not have a library, and don't usually offer accommodation.

Please feel free to contact these places to find the ones that suit your interests. If you want information on countries not listed, contact us at the address shown at the back of The Link.

The addresses of the Krishnamurti Foundations or the centers they operate are not listed here. For those addresses, check the Foundation bulletins and newsletters. Addresses of Foundation schools are highlighted in the 'Krishnamurti Schools' section of this publication.

*Rabindra Singh, March 1997*

---

## Retreat Centers

---

STREAM GARDEN  
282-3 Petchasen Rd., Huanlong, Hatyai, Songkla,  
**Thailand** 90110  
Contact: Venerath (Pook) Sornprasit,  
Tel: [66] (66 74) 23 84 65

KURANDA RETREAT  
2115 Springbrook Road, Springbrook, Q4123,  
**Australia**  
Contact: Geoff Miller, Tel: [61] (75) 33 51 78

HAUS SONNE  
D-79677 Aitern-Multen, **Germany**  
Contact: Christian Leppert,  
Tel: [49] (76 73) 74 92

FRIENDSHIP HOUSE  
PO Box 659, Naalehu, **Hawaii**, USA 96772  
Contact: Devendra Singh,  
Tel: [1] (808) 9 29 86 08

ZASTAVA STUDY CENTER  
Krasnaja Poljana, ul. Zapovednaya 94,  
34500 Sochi, **Russia**  
Contact: Vladimir Riapolov, [7] (8622) 49 40 44

CENTER FOR THE ART OF LIVING  
Jl. Raya Luwus 1/50 Luwus, Tabanam, **Bali**  
Contact: Tungki (Tony) Tjandra,  
Tel: [62] (368) 2 10 93

BADLAPUR CENTER  
Taluka-Ulhasnagar, 250-Mansrover,  
Village-Jambhilgar, District-Thane, Maharashtra,  
**India** 421 503  
Contact: Ramesh Kukreja,  
Tel: [592] (251) 592 947

TIRADENTES POUSADA  
Rua Jao Batista, Ramalho 207,  
Tiradentes MG, **Brazil**  
Contact: Rachel Fernandes,  
Tel: [55] (32) 3 55 12 77

---

## Study Centers

---

SRI LANKA CENTER  
310 High Level Road, Nugegoda, **Sri Lanka**  
Contact: W. R. Fonseka

PENANG CENTER  
31-10-3 Sri York, Condo Halaman York, Penang,  
**W Malaysia** 1045  
Contact: Casey Tiew, Tel: [60] (4) 2 28 52 92

---

## Information Centers

---

JK CENTRE  
3-6-361/20, Behind Lady Hyderi Club,  
Himayath Nagar, Hyderabad 500 029, **India**  
Contact: Aparajita

---

## Schools

---

RIVERSIDE SCHOOL  
40/1 Lumsum, Saiyok 71150, **Thailand**  
Contact: Paiboon Teepakorn,  
Fax: [63] (34) 51 40 85

VIKASANA RURAL CENTRE  
Vishranti Farm, Doddakalsanda,  
Bangalore 560062, **India**  
Contact: Malathi

SADHANA VIDYA NILAYAM  
Thettu Village, Rishi Valley, PO Madanapalle,  
AP 517352, **India**  
Contact: V. Nagabusharam

TIRADENTES SCHOOL  
Fazendo du Colegio, CEP 36 325 000, **Brazil**  
Contact: Rolf Mayer

SHOLAI SCHOOL  
PO Box 57, Kodaikanal 62401, Tamil Nadu, **India**  
Contact: Brian Jenkins,  
Tel: [91] (45 42) 3 02 97

## ■ Krishnamurti Schools

**Rishi Valley School**, Rishi Valley 517 352, Chittoor District, Andhra Pradesh, India.

Dr. S. Shirali, Principal / Founded by Krishnamurti in 1931, Rishi Valley is an English-medium school with 350 students aged 8 to 17, some of whom board. The valley lies between some of the oldest hills on earth. A few years ago, The Rishi Valley Education Centre built a reservoir at one end of the valley, benefiting not only the human inhabitants but also the valley's flora and fauna. The Education Centre also oversees 18 small satellite schools within the valley.

**Rajghat Besant School**, Rajghat Fort, Varanasi 221 001, Uttar Pradesh, India.

Dr. A.S. Mahajan, Director / Founded by Krishnamurti in 1934, Rajghat is a residential, English-medium school with 400 students aged 5 to 16. It is located at the confluence of the Ganges and Varuna rivers and is set in beautiful grounds. It also has an associated Rural Primary School for a further 400 children.

**Bal-Anand**, Akash-Deep, 28 Dongersi Road, Bombay 400 006, India.

Founded in the 1950s by Mrs. Nandini Mehta, in association with the Krishnamurti Foundation, Bal-Anand provides an after-school programme and pre-primary day-care for children from poor families. It is located in a run-down section of Bombay and operates from extremely modest facilities.

**The School – KFI – Madras**, Damodar Gardens, Besant Avenue, Madras 600 020, India.

Mr. G. Gautam, Principal / Founded by Krishnamurti in 1973, this is an English-medium school for more than 330 local children of pre-school age to 17. It is located near the headquarters of the Krishnamurti Foundation of India, in an area of trees in the heart of Madras.

**The Valley School**, Haridvanam, 17th km Kanakapura Road, Thatguni Post, Bangalore 560 062, India.

Dr. S. Inamdar, Director/Founded by Krishnamurti in 1978, this is an English-medium school for 270 students aged 5 to 16. The 110-acre campus is a lush tapestry of forests, streams, fruit trees and playing fields.

**Bhagirathi Valley School**, Devi Dhar, Dunda 249 151, Uttarkashi District, Uttar Pradesh, India.

Mr. R. Dalal, Director / Founded in 1985 by the Krishnamurti Foundation of India, this is a Garhwali-medium school for children aged 4 to 10. Located in the foothills of the Himalayas, the setting of the school is uniquely beautiful.

**Sahyadri School**, Post BIBI (CHAS) 410 513, Tal. Rajgurunagar, Dist. Pune, India.

Mrs. U. Kalyanram, Headmistress / Founded just last year by the Krishnamurti Foundation of India, this is an English-medium school for over 150 students aged 9 to 14. The school is situated on a bare hilltop surrounded by lush forests and vast plains, and has a strong tree-planting programme, with 10,000 trees planted this year alone.

**Brockwood Park School**, Bramdean, Hampshire SO24 0LQ, England.

Mr. L. Peters & Dr. C. Foster, Directors / Founded by Krishnamurti in 1969, Brockwood is an international residential school for 55 students aged 14 to 21. Set in 40 acres of beautiful gardens with a secluded grove, it is where Krishnamurti gave his public talks in England from 1969 until 1985.

**The Oak Grove School**, 220 West Lomita Avenue, Ojai, CA 93023, USA.

Mrs. K. Hesli & Mrs. M. Maynard, Directors / Founded by Krishnamurti in 1975, Oak Grove is an international school for 200 students aged 5 to 18, with some of the high school students boarding. Encircled by protective mountains, the campus includes the grove of old live-oaks where Krishnamurti gave 6 decades of public talks.

## ■ Working at Brockwood Park School

FROM TIME TO TIME, BROCKWOOD NEEDS ADDITIONAL SKILLED AND UNSKILLED HELP. URGENTLY NEEDED AT the moment are: a senior computer administrator, a vegetarian cook, someone to take on administrative/secretarial work, a person who is highly skilled in creating and administering a fund-raising programme, and a gardener.

There are also openings, from August 1997 on, for teachers qualified in Art, Physics, Mathematics and Chemistry.

If you are interested in living at Brockwood and exploring its intentions, and working with the School in one of these positions, please write to: The School Directors, Brockwood Park Educational Centre, Bramdean, Hampshire SO24 0LQ, England.

### **K: An Excerpt from Total Freedom**

*We often hear people say that there is no real difference between K's teachings and some religion(s) or other spiritual teachings. The following extract from Total Freedom (pgs 313-14) is relevant to this question.*

And knowing it [the psyche] is going to end we want comfort, so we say there must be a continuity. The ancient Hindus said there is a continuity, which is called reincarnation. They said you will be reborn next life according to what you have done in this life. If you have behaved properly, decently, morally, in the next life you are going to be better, and through a series of incarnations, and depending on your behavior, you will ultimately come to the highest principle. That is a very comforting theory, and millions believe in that. The Buddhist attitude is that life is a constant flux, a constant movement and when that manifests, an enclosure takes place which becomes the "you," the "me," which through time, through constant movement, undergoes change. And of course the Christians have their own belief in the resurrection; they believe that their own deity woke up from death physically.

We are saying something entirely different. Please listen because you will see, if you really

understand this thing, that there is a timeless movement, a timeless state. First, we said, the world is you, and you are the world. All human beings, radically, basically, are afraid, anxious, in sorrow, confused, unhappy, with occasional joy; psychologically it is a constant movement, wherever human beings are it is the same stream. It is the same stream; therefore, you are the world and the world is you. That's a fact. You may have different temperament, different gifts, capacities, idiosyncrasies, but those are the responses of the culture in which you have lived. But the basic stream is the same.

Therefore, there is no individuality. Individuality implies a wholeness, an indivisible entity, and you are not that indivisible entity. You are divided, broken up; therefore, you are not actually an individual, indivisible. You become totally individual in the complete sense of that word when you are whole, in which there is no fragmentary action. The word whole means



*View of the Swiss Alps from Stuhlsebene, near Haus Sonne, Black Forest, Germany*

healthy, sane, holy. You are the world and the world is you – and you are caught in that constant stream. But sorrow can be ended, fear can be ended – not tomorrow, actually now; then you are out of that stream – not you, there is a manifestation, which is out of that stream or freed from that stream, because that stream is time.

That stream is time. So you have to find out whether time has a stop. Time has a stop when there is no longer the movement of that stream. That stream is fear, that stream is conflict, that stream is sorrow, and all the confusion man has built through thought. So that is the stream of time. When there is an ending to that stream, time has stopped; therefore, there is a totally different dimension.

So the thing that we are afraid of losing when death takes place is the structure that thought

has built as “me,” the form, the name, and the attachment to the form and to that name, which are pain, pleasure, anxiety. All that is the “me,” the “you.” You can say there is a higher me, but that is still the product of thought. So that movement in which human beings are caught is the movement of time, driven by thought. The greater the volume of that stream the greater is the volume of thought. And when that stream, which is our consciousness with all its content, comes to an end, then time has a stop and, therefore, there is a totally different dimension. And when you understand this, not verbally, but deeply, and live it daily – and it can be done – then you will see that death has a totally different significance.

Ojai, California, April 17, 1976  
(Copyright KFT and KFA, 1996)



*Sunset at Brockwood Park, Hampshire, England*

*The Link* was written in collaboration with Nick Short, Jürgen Brandt and Claudia Herr, compiled and edited by Jürgen and designed by TYPOAtelier Gerhard Brandt in Frankfurt. Photographs were taken by Friedrich Grohe unless stated otherwise. The section 'On Education' was compiled and edited by Nick Short. The editors of 'The First Step' and the authors of the articles therein prefer to remain anonymous. Contributions, whether in 'The First Step' or elsewhere, do not necessarily represent the views of the editors or publisher.

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:

Secretariat Friedrich Grohe  
Chalet Solitude  
CH-1838 Rougemont  
Switzerland  
Phone: ++ 41-(0)26-925 94 46  
Fax: ++ 41-(0)26-925 87 62

*This newsletter is printed on chlorine-free paper.*