KRISHNAMURTI FOUNDATION OF AMERICA

Post Office Box 1560
Ojai, California 93024

OXNARD CA 930 AF CS
PM
12 DEC
2002

JAN DEC 12 '02
CA

U.S. POSTAGE
$2.00
SPLIT
HMETER 831088

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. Postage
PAID
Ojai, CA
Permit No. 356

Allan W. Anderson, Ph.D.
5611 Beaumont Drive
La Jolla
CA 92037

92037-7343

5611 Beaumont Avenue
La Jolla, California 92037

Jan.
~~Dec.~~ 2, '03

Stephen Smith
Center Coordinator
KFA, P.O. Box 1560
Ojai, CA 93024-1560

Dear Mr. Smith,

Thank you for your good letter and invitation to print as a monograph my Keynote address at the K centenary gathering in Ojai.

Enclosed you will find it on diskette for your convenience. I've included with it the inaugural address at the founding of the K Study Center; you are welcome to it should it prove in any way useful.

May I make comment on the apparent trend, so far, of the KFA monograph series?

I quote from Foundation Focus, Summer 2002, p.2: "The objective is to widen the base for the critical examination of the teachings and to secure their relevance not only in academia, but among "thinking people" everywhere."

My concern is with the "critical examination of the teachings and to secure their relevance --- in academia ----"

5611 Beaumont Avenue
La Jolla, California 92037

Would it not be unfortunate if the K. Study Center began to trend toward a conventionally academic stance? The academic mind whose interest is primarily in ideas will on that account attempt to incorporate into its arsenal and zoo of ideas what it will regard as K's ideas and pay no attention whatever to the elementary distinction between idea and teaching.

S. Lloyd Williams exhibits this error in his paper, "Preserving the Teachings:----" He quotes Mary Lutyens: "Krishnamurti requested several times that there should be no authoratative interpretation of his teaching, although he encouraged those interested in it to discuss it among themselves."

Then, three paragraphs later (on his same page), Williams paraphrases incorrectly, "Lutyens' statement, about interested people discussing Krishnamurti's ideas among themselves----"

Lutyens did not refer to K's <u>ideas</u> but to his <u>teaching</u>. Williams goes on to use the words "Kishnamurti's ideas" two more times in his same paragraph. Clearly we are not confronted here with a typo but an academic biographer's misrepresentation of a source. Why?

3/

5611 Beaumont Avenue
La Jolla, California 92037

K seemed never to tire of distinguishing between idea and act, fact and abstraction. (See "A Wholly Different Way of Living" p. 60.

Peter Butcher's description of K's "emphasis on the divisive or distorting nature of thoughts and images" is a fatal misreading or failure to read K's own words or to hear them on video-tape. K. says it is not the natures of thought and knowledge that are corrupt but the usage of them (ibid. p. 186).

These are examples within an academic context of shoddy scholarship and a misconstruing of K's own words. Butcher's notion that K emphasized the divisive and distorting nature of thoughts and images is alarming since it lends weight and professional endorsement to a fatal misconception that, unless I'm misinformed, is endemic to the majority of K's followers and students.

I am not interested in correcting monographs. In this letter my object has been to alert against any naive relation to the current academic world and I speak from a background of 50 yrs of university teaching.

I do not claim to understand K but within the distinction between to understand and not to misunderstand, I do not misunderstand him. This distinction I presented in keynote address on the founding of the K. Study Center.

With best wishes for the monograph series,
Sincerely, Allan Anderson

P.S. Please remember me to Markley, a most dear friend.

P.P.S. On getting ready to mail this to you, it occurred to me that two lines from Shakespeare's <u>Macbeth</u> can serve to summarize the gist of my cautionary concern:

Thoughts speculative, their unsure hopes relate;
But certain issue, strokes must arbitrate.

V. iv.

During my 18 hours of video-taped conversation with Krishnamurti, it became dramatically clear that he had no slightest concern for the idea of self-enquiry, let alone ideas about it. K. gravely understood within his own practice the terror before the strokes in self-examination. He urged that on meeting that abyss, one must not bolt from it.

Conventional academic practice knows nothing of this species of inwardness, let alone finding the nerve to bear it. Perhaps there are a few faculty in a state of readiness to listen to K's teaching, seriously: In K's sense of the word serious, where are they?

A.