Wed p.m.

Mr. Alvin Patterson
3626 Thacher
Ojai, Ca. 93023

Dear Alvin,

Since you were the first person to invite me on behalf of KFA to undertake the video-taped series of dialogues with Krishnamurti, I am writing this letter to you.

Perhaps you have heard by now of the great difficulty I've run into over signing the release which Sydney Roth presented me with almost two weeks after the conclusion of the series, a copy of which is enclosed. However, I'm not certain that you know of this situation yet, since in a letter to me of April 11, 1974 Sydney Roth wrote that copies of my attorney's redraft of the release had been sent by KFA's attorney, Sol Rosenthal "to certain of the Krishnamurti Foundation trustees." Having heard from none of the trustees personally concerning this matter and not knowing ~~that~~ whether you had been apprised of it I have decided to write a statement to you of my reasons for refusing to sign the release Sydney Roth presented me with, whose content, he said, he anticipated that I might not agree to sign it for he

were unaware of the trustees

left me a note saying that it might seem that I was being asked to sign my life away and advised that if so I should see my own attorney.

I had two objections to signing Sydney Roth's ~~such a~~ release. One is a matter of ~~ethics~~ educational ethics and the other of correct sentiment.

I cannot in good conscience sign a release which provides that KFA "may use the tapes and any materials therein in any manner whatsoever." Such a provision opens the dialogues to any advertent or inadvertent editorial irresponsibility that might obtain now or in the unanticipated future. Whatever value the tapes possess for ~~the~~ education rests precisely on their merit as dialogue. The spirit and context of ~~the~~ dialogue which they presently embody must be preserved if the end for which I was told they were undertaken is to be met justly. I was greatly dismayed to see that this was not anticipated when the release was drafted by Mr. Rosenthal.

I protested this to Sydney Roth and tried during an hour and a half's conversation to present the principle of of education at stake in this but each time his reply was that an editorial

misuse of the dialogues was "remote". I replied that that was not the point I was trying to make as an educator, but it was nevertheless the very one which legally ought to be ~~the~~ as much the concern of KFA as it was mine, and that legally such contingencies are what lawyers are engaged to anticipate and meet effectively. I got nowhere with Sydney Roth and concluded that he was unable to grasp educational principle and uninterested to consider the threat to the integrity of the dialogues which such a provision in ~~the release~~ his release entails.

As you will see from the redraft enclosed which was drawn up by my attorney, Mr. Crandall Condra, I have no objection to editorial changes in the dialogues provided such ~~changes~~ do not alter the context and meaning of the original dialogues. I cannot imagine what objection the trustees would raise to such a condition. It is merely a safeguard against corrupting the text and in no way precludes editorial activity as such. Krishnamurti has never given carte blanche to the Foundations to materially

alter his teachings as is evident from the fifth paragraph of his statement made July 10, 1973: "The Foundations will see to it that these teachings are kept whole, are not distorted, are not made corrupt." I consider that my concern for the dialogues is in principle fully consonant with his own.

I can well understand how such a limitation on the propagation of his teachings puts a certain restraint on their commercial uses, but not on that account unjustly.

Dialogue is a very fragile activity intended to leave the listener with the responsibility to decide freely for himself for or against its content. Its rhetorical form cannot stand alterations that would denature the spirit of free and reciprocal discourse. Only such discourse is properly educational since education itself is essentially an activity freely undergone toward a higher level of existence. Since the dialogues were undertaken to serve the ends of education my insistence that their editing conform to those ends is not strange.

My second objection to the original release concerns point 6. My attorney described it to me as included in a release when one wishes "to make sure that nothing crawls out from under any rock." With that statement he confirmed my initial shock at the spirit and partial content of the release even though Sydney Roth assured me it was a customary release form. I regard point 6 as in violation of correct sentiment. There is no reason to anticipate my being in an adversary relation with K&A — a position wholly opposed to my personal relationship with Krishnamurti and those of the trustees I have met.

Had my interest in the dialogues been a commercial one I should never have permitted Sydney Roth to interfere with the contract arrangement that Paul Steen and I had agreed upon. You will recall that you suggested that Paul Steen would work out the financial agreement with me. However, within 24-48 hrs before the vieds-taping was scheduled to begin Sydney Roth called me at my home and represented the trustees as unable

to approve of the contract statement which Paul Steen and I had drawn up. I was understandably taken aback at such a last minute disruption of what I had taken for granted as settled. Since Krishnamurti and Mary Zimbalist were already in La Jolla by then and a rescheduling of the taping would have been a great inconvenience to both Krishnamurti and me, I went on uninterruptedly with the video-taping as previously scheduled. Furthermore, I had been misinformed that Sydney Roth was one of the trustees and regarded him as impeccably representing them. His appearance on the scene at the last minute introduced a confusion which I could not account for since I had expected from the summer before after meeting in Mary Zimbalist's home in Malibu that you were my proper resource for the overall interest of the trustees in the dialogues.

I had expected to sign a general release of the sort which I signed over a year ago when I made my very first dialogue with Krishnamurti. Had I known before making the present series what sort of release it would be

expected to sign, I should have refused to undertake the dialogues then and there and thus needless expenditure of time and effort could have been avoided. As it is I have had to spend, so far, one hundred dollars in attorney's fees in this initial attempt to preserve the integrity of the series. And I still have not been paid the second half of my honorarium.

Since this mishandling of this matter is not of my own making I ought not to be expected to bear this expense nor any further legal fees connected with this matter.

Please rest assured, Albion, that I have no wish to obstruct or retard KFA's work to say nothing of my own which has already suffered in this ordeal. Nonetheless, I am ethically bound to insist that no ~~[illegible]~~ occasion be permitted for a denaturing of the context and meaning of the dialogues. If necessary ~~I trust things are well with you and yours~~

I shall write personally to Krishnamurti about this but I hope the matter can be cleared up before that is indicated since I wish to spare him where possible.

I trust that I shall be

8/

hearing from you soon and that things are well with you and yours.

As ever,

Allan W. Anderson etc.

P.S. Please send any correspondence to my home address, 12592 Paloro Road, Rancho Bernardo, (7 Oaks), San Diego, Ca. 92128. If possible please distribute copies of this letter to <u>all</u> the trustees. As you can see I am sending copies to Krishnamurti and Mary Zimbalist.

A.

Copies to Mr. J. Krishnamurti,
C/o Mrs. Mary Zimbalist
24734 Pacific Coast Hwy

Mrs. Mary Zimbalist address above

Mark envelopes Personal + Confidential