



teozofija v sloveniji



Anonymus

WHAT DID KRISHNAMURTI TEACH?

A pamphlet by anonymous author and anonymous publisher

Prispevki k raziskovanju zgodovine Teozofskega gibanja - v izvorniku

As it is very uncertain what K wanted to teach, it will be a good idea to do a survey of many students of K and ask them a question: What do you understand from Krishnamurti's teaching? What exactly did Krishnamurti wanted to teach?

* * *

I submit that it would be better to read K's talks and come to one's own conclusions. But you are right here. I also don't think K has any teaching. His is more of anti-teacher in the sense he rejects other teachers and their teachings.

* * *

Perhaps I didn't state my view very well. I was trying to say, that as far as I know, K does not have any doctrinal teachings. By doctrinal teachings, I mean teachings that are authoritatively presented that, if accepted, would be taken on faith: Revelations, if you will. For instance, in the lectures I have heard and read, I'm not aware of K ever telling his listeners about what happens to people after death; or whether or not God exists; how the universe came into being; etc. K called this kind of teaching, "theory."

Rather than doctrinal, K's teachings are methodological in nature. In effect, he is saying: This is what I discovered and this is how you can discover it for yourself. K, speaking in Benares said: "I am not speaking to you from a superior standpoint or from a different attitude of thought. I am not preaching anything which I have not thought out, struggled, fought, sacrificed to attain. I am telling you of that which I have tried; it is not a revelation."

Perhaps Krishnamurti's mission was to free people from religions, spiritual teachers and their teachings. Perhaps Krishnamurti did not want to teach, but he wanted to free people from other teachings and teachers.

Perhaps K's teaching was to free people from whatever imprisons their minds and causes them suffering. K did not teach doctrine. Rather, he taught method. Both doctrine and method could be spiritual, and both imply "knowledge."

* * *

“Suppose somebody says: “The Sun is cubical.” This statement, even if it is wrong, still conveys some definite idea. But if somebody says “the is cube Sun,” it does not convey any idea, whether right or wrong. K’s speeches are something like that, where reader does not understand what point he is trying to convey.”

* * *

Yes. I don’t think the listener will not find any meaning in K’s speeches, if he or she is expecting to find doctrines, revelations or occult theories. That is because K did not address doctrines, revelations or theories. Rather, he was warning people not to be caught up by them.

* * *

My teacher G. I. Gurdjieff had the following to say regarding J Krishnamurti: “Ah ... yes. Very nice man. Very Good man. He likes to live up on the 37th floor without the use of an elevator.” In other words, if I may be so bold, Krishnamurti resided at a higher level of consciousness than everyone else, but had no idea how he had gotten there or help others to get there - so he was stuck on the upper stores so to speak.

We know that the Masters operations had something to do with it and we know that “The Process” had something to do with it. (BTW, The Dalai Lama has affirmed that it takes someone living at K’s “level” to fully comprehend the import of what he is saying.)

Recent research of mine has uncovered the tantalising tidbit that K was, in the 1930’s regularly attending Hollywood, California meetings held by (then-renegade) Fourth Way teacher P. D. Ouspensky. It was there that K established long term relations with the Gurdjieff Work people. It was there that he also made contact with the likes of Aldous Huxley, Gerald Heard, Greta Garbo and Gloria Swanson - all people to become, in their own particular way, important “door-openers” for his Post-Theosophical life. One facet of the Gurdjieff Work focuses on the practice of Self-Observation and Self-Remembering. These practices become the focal point of many of K’s lectures and writings right after the period he would have made contact with O.

It should also be known that Gurdjieff Work leaders Jeanne de Salzmann and John Pentland returned to K. in the 1960’s when they were searching for inspiration to boost a Gurdjieff Foundation which was sailing on the rocky waters of “irrelevancy” to the burgeoning Counter-culture of the period.

My own feeling, my own inclination is to go in the direction of what Gurdjieff said. I’ve always felt K. to have been the recipient of an extremely powerful Kundalini awakening that happened so fast and so quickly (and so permanently) that its “evolutionary” path coursing through his organism ran far ahead of his ability to translate and adequately convey to the rest of us.

For an altogether “different” take on K, there’s that other Theosophical runaway: UG Krishnamurti (or “Krishnamurti 2”, as he is sometimes called). Now, THERE’S a real “kettle of fish” to mull over ... But, I won’t get into that! I promise!!!

* * *

1) Does that mean JK was learning from P. D. Ouspensky in 1930's? This is interesting because already in late 1920's Krishnamurti had declared himself as independent teacher, claiming to know Truth and how to get there.

2) Does it mean that he took ideas from Gurdjieff like Self-Observation and then taught these ideas as his own?

3) Do you think Counter-culture was the result of ideas JK spread himself and through those who were influenced by his ideas?

Krishnamurti says, after becoming independent teacher, that he struggled to become free from Masters, their teachings etc. and because he became free from them, he knew Truth. And he tells others that if they give up following Masters, religions etc, they will also know the Truth. But in reality there is lot of evidence that JK reached higher level not because he became free from Masters, but because he trod the path under Master's guidance. So what JK teaches is opposite of what he did.

Although I don't deny the importance of method, I don't think advanced soul can live without trying to know the doctrine. Who tells that Truth is different from what we perceive through senses? It is the doctrines which teach that Truth is different from the material world. So why would one want to practice the method JK taught, unless he learned about Truth from the doctrines? I don't think JK ever elaborated what Truth means, though he talks about knowing Truth. So to get some idea of what Truth meant to JK, people will have to refer the doctrines and then they may try the methods JK taught. Theory and practice, both are important in my opinion. I don't think JK's denouncing of theory, along with those who gave theory, in favor of only practice is right. And many of JK's followers were very much interested in learning doctrines, though their teacher JK denounced doctrines. It appears that they were not satisfied with JK's philosophy and so they had to read other doctrines.

There is a peculiar behavior in which person tries to get attention of people and become important by criticizing and opposing others. I have seen some people of this type. Psychologists might be having some name for this behavior. JK perhaps managed to get attention of people by ridiculing great teachers and religions. His criticism of religions and teachers was unusual and the trick (or stunt) worked bringing him fame.

* * *

I had to laugh at Gurdjieff's remark that K like to live on the 37th floor without an elevator. G. seems to have had a genius for cutting humor. It either cut through the situation or the person, or both.

I also agree with your analysis that K largely failed to help others to get where he is. He was very good at telling people what they need to do, but most people really need a one to one relationship with someone who is willing to descend to the lobby and show them how to go about it. I'm reminded of Tolle's tremendously popular book, "The New Earth." Thanks of Oprah, he has become sort of a Krishnamurti for today. What he writes about is spot on, and millions have been inspired by him. Yet, unless the inspired reader finds a qualified teacher of a genuine practice, who has the skills to teach, and commits to do the practice, it is all for naught.

I have a magazine from the 30's here in the archives that has a long article on K's stay in Hollywood. You are inspiring me to dig it out again. K always had high profile people around him. We can thank

Annie Besant for that. The Theosophical Society became fabulously wealthy during the 1920's. If you are interested in this era, I recommend Joseph Ross' books on Krotona. Huxley, by the way, sent his children to Happy Valley School, and his last novel, "The Island" is based upon those days.

I think that crediting anyone for K's ideas is problematic. My guess is that he used anything he thought would be helpful, regardless of the source, yet stayed with his own inspiration. One thing, I am sure about, however, his 1929 "Pathless Land" speech shows that he already had the framework at that time. There might be a hint in that speech however. He opens that speech with a story of the Devil spotting someone finding a piece of truth. Actually it is a very thinly disguised Buddhist tale. In the original, the Devil is Mara and the man finding the piece of truth is Siddhartha as he was nearing enlightenment. I don't know the U.K. Krishnamurti story. Perhaps you will share it?

I agree with you that theory and practice are both important. I will add, that they need to be taught together. However, the theory must both relevant to the practice, and serve to advance it. K was clear that the Theosophical theories under which he grew up (AB's and CWL's), were not relevant to the practice he was presenting to the world.

Accordingly, you have raised a two edged sword. Theosophy, or what Blavatsky called "theoretical occultism" was originally promoted without a designated practice. This was because Olcott and others were against Blavatsky starting a school where she could teach practice. They wanted her to only teach theory. When Olcott removed Blavatsky from Adyar in 1885, she resettled in London and in 1888. There, out from under Olcott's thumb, she founded a school where people were taught practice and theory together. That is what we call the ES today. In 1928, Besant closed the ES, because, with the coming of the world teacher, the ES was no longer relevant. In 1930, after K closed the Order of the Star, Besant reopened the ES. But it never regain what it once was, and today, has declined to almost nothing.

* * *

I will preface my statements by saying that most of my Theosophical/4th Way bloodhound work has been a personal preoccupation - it is yet another way of moving towards the Truth of a matter. Given the sometimes Byzantine complexities of both movements - and BTW, I am of the opinion that HPB and GIG are more than casually linked - I sometimes wonder if this isn't also a part of my Path. It is all so fascinatingly "Human" to me, these ins and outs, that I hope no one here will take this as spurious muck-raking; I mean no one offense or harm. I am committed in moving towards "The Actual" of the circumstances.

So, because this has been a "personal" search, and because I never dreamed that I would ever be publicly discussing this my references and verifications are not always what they should be and things have been found by following lines of heresy and conjecture.

I will do my best to back-up when I can - please forgive me when I come up short.

Well, that is the "Question du Jour," isn't it? And I'm afraid I do not (yet) have a solid answer to it. I happened (online) upon a group of elderly gay men who had been connected to Krishnamurti back in those Hollywood days. They were originally part of Swami Prabhavananda's group drawn there by the presence of the swami's famous student Christopher Isherwood. Ouspensky, Huxley, and Heard were there as was K. himself. O. was encouraged (by the Swami???) to start groups relaying what

Gurdjieff had taught him and K. along with others became immediately interested. When I asked this man what K.'s commitment was to O. he told me it was "regular" and "on-going." When I asked further details about what transpired in these meetings, I was told that O. feeling homosexuals to be "degenerate seed" and incapable of spiritual development did not allow them in (BTW, all people of whatever gender, race, orientation were allowed at G.'s table - there wasn't any such discrimination on his and his teachings part). So, this man was only able to report what he had seen from the "outside."

Another source has told me that it was in O's groups that K. and O.'s star pupil John Pentland <http://www.gurdjieff.org/driscoll4.htm> struck up a friendship which endured their entire lives and which became mutually beneficial to their teaching professions. As an aside, for whatever its worth, comparing transcriptions of Pentland and K.'s Q&A Sessions with their particular students, it is almost impossible to distinguish tone of voice, inflection, and general delivery. They are "twinned" in a sense. Of course, they were also educated in the further reaches of upper class British higher education, which alone could impart a similarity of delivery style.

Any who, after time spent in O.'s groups (and probably after O.'s to England [unconfirmed]), K. began the Talks. Groups formed around him in California and as there was no injunction against homosexuals, our Gay Gentleman (and his friends) re-enter the picture, moving away from the swami's sphere and into K.'s arena of influence

2) Does it mean that he took ideas from Gurdjieff like Self-Observation and then taught these ideas as his own?

Well, I believe this is so - but I cannot prove it. Did he "steal" G.'s Teachings? Well, G. himself often suggested that his own acquiring of the teaching he put out could have been an act of theft.). We are within this sphere of Theosophy and The Work dealing with elements of The Great Game, are we not? That alone, perhaps holds an important clue ... perhaps ...? We know that The Masters themselves are not without a sense of humour?

Anyway, it may be that Self-Observation and Self-Remembering became a convenient "fit" and context for conveying the results of the work of the Masters on him and the ongoing Process. Two people who had long-term (over 60 year) membership in ULT and who intuited the seriousness of my Search told me that many in their group hold Ouspensky in very high esteem (!!!) and consider him a "penultimate theosophist" (!!!) even though he had left Theosophical folds for G. They assured me that his exposition of G's Teaching in THE FOURTH WAY holds important practical keys to THE SECRET DOCTRINE and that Self-Observation and Self-Remembering are practices "buried" within the text of HPB's magnum opus.

3) Do you think Counter-culture was the result of ideas JK spread himself and through those who were influenced by his ideas?

It is documented that JK counted an inordinate "flower-child, hippie, counter-culturalist" population amongst his followers. [again, do not have that source at hand]

Fourth Way pariah and JK afficiano JG Bennett did as well.

In my view, one of the great contributions of the counter-culturalist movement of the 1960's was the intense partiality it show towards both HPB and GIG giving both Theosophy and The Work renewed visibility and credence. While the motives for this interest may not always have been the clearest, I

believe the “exposure” and revitalization it engendered was a very good thing indeed. K. was simply part and parcel of all of this. The ideas from all of these various factions (and others) were jiving with the times.

I “feel” that both Theosophy and The Work offer an “alternative,” or better yet “widened” view of what culture CAN be progressing as it does from transformed/transforming individuals and therefore links to what could be termed “COUNTER-culture.” Certainly, JK’s non-authoritarian position (shared by G., BTW) found resonance amongst the Counter-culturalists.

BTW, the Gay Gentleman, his partner and their cronies (certainly counter-culturalists in their own right) continue K. Groups to this day that verge on the devotional. Many have shrines to K. that they are able to carry with them wherever they go and feel that they are still in personal contact with him. Movingly, this man conveyed to me that K. was the first spiritual figure in his life and his friends lives who affirmed their existences as complete individuals totally worthy of spiritual search and the Pathless Path. They live communally and privately and I have said all of what I am allowed to say about them.

There certainly is a viewpoint proffered from many different factions that whatever Teaching you have been brought up through must ultimately be cast behind for further development to take place. Now this, of course, is for each of us to verify for our individual selves.

Six months before my own Search revealed itself - “yes,” I can pinpoint the date and “no” I had absolutely no interest in such things - I was introduced to the practices of Self-Observation and Self-Remembrance in a situation totally unconnected to any of this. K. never interested me. I found his writings obtuse and self-consciously evasive. Time and dogged practice of two ridiculously-simple-to-execute-yet-damnedly-difficult-to-maintain practices has slowly changed this. This AND coming into Gurdjieff’s sphere which isn’t called The Work for nothing!

K.’s writings now reveal for me, someone talking from a certain stance and a certain “place” of being and what the world looks like from that “place”. It is found as simply as he states but he does not convey the “difficulty” in the procedure. “Shadow issues” seem to elude him. “Shadow issues” were also a difficulty in his living of his life ... he seems to have in most things been rather passive. In my experience, “shadows” are everywhere, and have to be incorporated into a procedure of Action. If K. is a case of spontaneous awakening then he is a sort of “Monstre sacree” of Higher Consciousness. Like Isadora Duncan used to say about her Art: “It’s so odd for me: I can dance it but I can’t teach it.” In her case, systematizing was left to her teacher-pupils.

Here are two links:

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/U. G. Krishnamurti](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/U._G._Krishnamurti)

<http://www.well.com/user/jct/>

He is very raw, very rude, and offensively crude at times. I also think he has important things to tell us. If you decide to go into it for yourself I would suggest reading the short bio on the first link and proceeding to transcriptions on the second. I would suggest keeping all of the many videos until you’ve absorbed what has been written - some of them are “shocking” to say the least. I’ve learned a lot from him.

Thanks to everyone else for this for providing the space for this “huge introjection” of mine. Theosophists, who were there at the beginning of my Path have always been kind, supportive and helpful towards me. Therefore, they will always garner a warm place in my Heart.

* * *

I had to laugh at Gurdjieff's remark that K like to live on the 37th floor without an elevator. G. seems to have had a genius for cutting humor. It either cut through the situation or the person, or both.

I'm glad you like that. He is a master at clearing our psychological terrain and getting us to verify Truth for ourselves not believing as he puts it “any old tale.”

I also agree with your analysis that K largely failed to help others to get where he is.

And, of course, if you keep method a secret, you maintain a position of power. Nothing is more “enthraling” than a stated position of higher consciousness which remains out of reach.

He did seem to take the Self-Observation/Remembering from G. through O. and I think you will agree with me that it does become a cornerstone for many of his Talks. His viewpoint about what constitutes meditational practice is also suspiciously close to the practice as taught by G.

The Work practices have since G.'s passing in 1949, suffered from an unfortunate (in my view) over-elaboration, and mystification of some scaldingly real and simple to practice but hard to maintain-in-consciousness techniques. As G. says “I teach nothing more complicated than when it rains, the pavement gets wet.”

UG Krishnamurti's story is one of the Theosophical stories everyone seems to have missed. There is more than a bit of sadness to it and there is also an underlying warning of what pursuit of the Truth costs. This material (the links are in my reply) will not repay superficial perusal. His life story and non-Teaching are troubling most to a complacent attitude. At least I have found them so.

* * *

And, of course, if you keep method a secret, you maintain a position of power. Nothing is more “enthraling” than a stated position of higher consciousness which remains out of reach.

Or it could be that K inadvertently came to some kind of awakening and had no idea how he did it; Or, perhaps he did, and did not know how to teach it; Or perhaps the instructions he gave again and again in his lectures was, in his mind, enough. There are lots of possibilities.

I agree that Self-Observation/Remembering are the cornerstone, not only for many of his talks, but the cornerstone of the method he was trying to convey. I have no way of knowing where he learned those practices. However, however they are central practices in Theravada and Mahayana Buddhism, and also Advaita Vedanta. So, he could have picked up those practices from any number of Guru's, Rimpoches and Roshis he would have met in the Theosophical Society and all over the world. If anyone were to get credit for originating those practices, it would have to be Siddhartha Gautama the Buddha. However, these teachings only began to come into Western culture early in the nineteenth century. Schools for these Eastern methods began to be established after 1893, with the Parliament of World Religions. On the other hand, I did find a Buddhist Magazine that began publication in Santa Clara California in the 1880's. It was slanted towards a general audience.

WHAT DID KRISHNAMURTI TEACH?

As G. says: "I teach nothing more complicated than when it rains, the pavement gets wet."

Reminds me of a Buddhist saying popularized by Dave Brubeck's jazz composition "Zen is When". When one begins to practice, the mountains are no longer mountains, the rivers are no longer rivers, and the trees are no longer trees. When one comes to an awakening, one realizes that the mountains are mountains, the rivers are rivers and the trees are trees.