2-14-74

Dear Allan,

Delighted to get your note on "satsun." It was like an invitation to continue with those other, minor dialogs I've always enjoyed so much.

First heard K mention this Sanskrit word two years ago here in Ojai. Looked it up immediately in the indexes of all the books I have on Hinduism, but didn't find it. Then a few months ago I ran across it--can't remember where--spelled satsang.

As for your other remark, no book of K's has ever carried an index. But if a book ever needed one, that's the "A of I." Looking ahead, I figure that K's teaching is so extensive--millions and millions of words of first-class stuff and all of it richly interrelated at hundreds of different points--that half a dozen anthologies of the size and variety of the "A of I" will be needed to give an adequate notion of it. That's why I've been spending a hour or so a day for the last two years working on an index! (What I will soon need is a professional indexer specialized in this field and with some sympathy with K's type of stuff who can work with me (as a paid consultant) for a few weeks to straighten me out on a whole bunch of problems I'm running into..)

I can't say enough (good) about the theme you've chosen for the Dialogs (the last sentence of K's Statement of 10 July): "It is the responsibility...on knowledge and time."

Word responsibility points to the same general area I referred to a while back as self-reliance, a term I've since given up because of its connotations of self. In dealing with K I often find it's better to take a negative approach. In this case what's wanted is to indicate a state of mind that's free from tradition, authority and the rest--free in fact

from all the tremendous influence of the culture.

One of the first great statements of K, way back in the 1920s , was "..and that's the greatness of man, that no one can save him but himself."

Apparently transformation is a very private affair(since conditioning is unique to the individual).

Another of your theme words--time--is as deep as you want to make it, although K's usual introduction to the two kinds of time is always intriguing to the average listener. And for some reason people always nod their heads wisely over the "mysticism of the eternal now." I don't think they have the slightest notion of what it's all about, but it must sound very plausible.

May I say a word about knowledge? Here there's real misunderstanding, even among intelligent friends of mine.

At first K would contrast knowledge with wisdom. Then with understanding (which Aldous Huxley does in the enclosed excerpt, which came out around 1950, toward the end of the period when H was seeing so much of K, and allowing himself, as here, to paraphrase his thoughts.) In both cases the listener or reader gets the idea that wisdom and understanding are superior modes or varieties of knowledge, instead of being something of another nature entirely.

Lately K has been contrasting knowledge with learning. Although he has greatly improved the explanations themselves, the confusion persists because most people continue to believe that learning is just a fancy form of knowledge.

When K forgets to contrast knowledge with this other dimension of consciousness (this mindless and unknowing moving along with what is) everything is O.K. again.

Then we're back with good old awareness (choiceless awareness), which was K's original word for his discovery that when you look without background (center, self) you can really see. Problems dissolve, miracles take place. But awareness is not a method. It's means-and-end.

But even awareness is only a word. It can be sharpened up, freshened up. And K has done just this. He has introduced SEEING. This has given great impact and immediacy to his talking. You must have felt this in the "A of I." "Seeing is the only truth, there is nothing else." "If you can see you have nothing else to do."

K's classic case examples of seeing are very arresting. The looking without knowledge at the tree. The direct contact, without naming, with one's fear, ones anger. The complete attention, as a listener, to what K is saying. All of these can produce miracles. Do it and you will see. Listen as you have never listened before and walk out of this tent today a free man! Instant enlightenment!

Jumping to structure, K has a standard entrance to the mansion of transformation. I call it the one, two, three, and it goes like this. 1. The world is a horrible mess (the audience heartily agrees with this) 2. You are the world (the audience is genuinely surprized at first, but K finally convinces them) 3. Your only hope to change the world is to change yourself.

K was in Ojai today and we had a five-hour luncheon meeting with him. I reminded him of your letter where you said you hoped to find a place in the Dialogs for education and he nodded, looking very pleased indeed.

Discussion of education follows easily after one, two, three. Most of the discussions of K and the students at Brockwood is against this backdrop. K is always pointing out how violent,

how corrupt, how impossible the world is. The only appropriate action is to step out. This can only be done by seeing into ones dependency on the world, which is one's fear, ones greed and the rest. When these disappear in the solvent of awareness, you are an outsider. "In the world (not even in a monastery) but not of it." The only problem then is physical, economic: earning ones living. But if your fear disappeared at Brockwood, then your intelligence awakened, didn't it, along with your energy, your creativeness, your confidence and your initiative? And not being bothered any longer with either status or respectability, you will always find a way to earn a living doing something you really love to do.

Must run to post this. Will put a special delivery stamp on it in hope it will reach you this week, before you are entirely focused on the first Dialog.

All the best.

Love,

Allan