Krishnamurti and the Dance of Dialogue:

Instigating insight in higher education

by

Jerry Flexer

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

In the Department of Pacific and Asian Studies

University of Victoria

Supervisory Committee

Krishnamurti and the Dance of Dialogue:

Instigating insight in higher education

by

Jerry Flexer

Supervisory Committee

Dr. Martin Adam, Supervisor
Department of Pacific and Asian Studies

Dr. Michael Bodden, Departmental Member
Department of Pacific and Asian Studies

Abstract

This study examines the dialogic approach of the Indian-born educational philosopher Jiddu Krishnamurti (1895 – 1986), who had developed his own unique approach to dialogue with small groups. The research considered two questions. First, whether Krishnamurti's dialogic approach is one that could be described by specific strategies and techniques; and second, whether this approach and its strategies and techniques could be adapted, adopted, or emulated for use in higher education. In Chapter One of the paper, Krishnamurti's general philosophy and his specific philosophy of education are reviewed, with the aim of placing his dialogic approach within the context of his educational philosophy. The second chapter addresses the study's research questions by presenting a two-part analysis of a transcript of the one-hour dialogue that took place in California in 1981 between Krishnamurti and six American college students. First, even though he used no notes and no lesson plan, the thematic content analysis of this particular dialogue shows that relevant content had in fact been covered and learned, and that this content had emerged as a consequence of Krishnamurti's direction as a facilitator of learning. Second, specific strategies and techniques employed by Krishnamurti in this dialogue were identified and described, with specific examples as presented from the transcript.

The third chapter explores the context of Krishnamurti's approach within a recent developing trend in educational philosophy; a trend described as holistic and transformative, focused as it is on encouraging change in learners' thinking about concepts, rather than on transmitting knowledge from educators to learners. This exploration is done by describing several existing examples of holistic and transformative educational approaches. Some of these described existing approaches are expressly informed by Krishnamurti's educational philosophy, while others, though not expressly informed by Krishnamurti, are nonetheless consistent with his approach. In the final chapter, it is proposed that the analysis of the dialogue in Chapter Two and the comparative context analysis in Chapter Three show that Krishnamurti's dialogic approach both fits well within the general direction and nature of this existing and developing holistic and transformative trend in the philosophy of education, on the one hand, and is also uniquely distinguishable from existing approaches in meaningful ways, on the other. Chapter Four concludes, then, as a result, that Krishnamurti's approach can be adapted, emulated, or adopted for beneficial results in higher education.

Table of Contents

Chapter One
Introduction and Overview

"…it is only the individuals who break through the social pattern by understanding it, and who are therefore not bound by the conditioning of their own minds - it is only such people who can bring about a new civilization…"

J. Krishnamurti[1]

Introduction

Many familiar with the religious philosopher Jiddu Krishnamurti (1895 – 1986) will have engaged with the content of his philosophy or with the extraordinary nature of his life. This study takes a different focus. It concerns the dialogic approach that Krishnamurti had developed over nearly six decades of giving talks before audiences large and small, in different parts of the world. In his talks, dialogues, and publications, Krishnamurti covered themes such as conflict, violence, desire, love, fear, freedom, self-knowledge, relationship, meditation, and awareness. What this study proposes is that Krishnamurti's dialogic approach, specifically with smaller groups, lends itself to close examination and analysis in a way that allows identification and description of certain unique and intriguing features. Further, these features, or strategies and techniques, once delineated and appreciated, can be emulated, adapted, or adopted in higher education to deliver certain thematic content with a holistic attitude, one that views learners as whole persons with intellectual, emotional, and spiritual needs.

Overview

This study examines Krishnamurti's dialogic approach as found in one particular dialogue most amenable to the study's research objectives: to identify and describe Krishnamurti's strategies

[1] Krishnamurti 1974b; http://Krishnamurtirishnamurti.org/krishnamurti-teachings/view-text.php?tid=22&chid=68529&w=&

and techniques in one dialogue with a small group of university students, and to consider how these could be emulated, adapted, or adopted in higher education. In March of 1981, Brij Khare, a university educator in southern California arranged a three-day symposium with Krishnamurti holding four dialogue sessions with small groups of students and teachers. These sessions were recorded on cassette tape and transcribed. I chose to closely read and analyze the transcript of one of these sessions, one that Krishnamurti facilitated with six university students. After reading the transcript of the almost one-hour session, I identified and described specific strategies and techniques integral to Krishnamurti's dialogic approach. This study presents these strategies and techniques as a unique approach for educators inclined to foster a more holistic learning experience. Moreover, this paper will show that, while some educators could argue that Krishnamurti's approach would have no practical benefit in our current higher education system, Krishnamurti's approach fits in well within a fairly recent trend in the philosophy and practice of higher education. But though it fits within a nascent but growing movement, this approach offers a fresh and novel way forward, one that has received so far very little consideration.

World Teacher

Jiddu Krishnamurti (1895 – 1986) was a philosopher and educator born to a Hindu Brahmin family in the south of India. When he was fourteen, he was discovered by Charles Leadbeater of the Theosophical Society to have an aura completely without selfishness. Krishnamurti was then adopted by Annie Besant, then president of the Theosophical Society, and taken to England to be educated privately and prepared for his role as the coming World Teacher. The Theosophical Society, founded in 1875 in New York City, was an organization originally intent on blending science, religion, and philosophy. Still in existence today, it adheres to no formal

doctrine, but values basic truths at the core of many religions, to some extent drawn from Hinduism and Buddhism (Jones 650). Many people disillusioned by existing religious dogmas were attracted to the Theosophists' "synthesis of East and West, religion and science, as well as spiritual and educational understanding." (Jones 651) These soon led the Theosophists to set up a new organization – The Order of the Star in the East – with Krishnamurti as its head, to promote Krishnamurti as the coming vehicle for the world teacher. However, in 1929, Krishnamurti announced in a speech before thousands of Theosophists and other supporters that he was disbanding the order. He renounced his role as the coming world teacher, saying, in part:

> I maintain that truth is a pathless land, and you cannot approach it by any path whatsoever, by any religion, by any sect … Truth, being limitless, unconditioned, unapproachable by any path whatsoever, cannot be organized; nor should any organization be formed to lead or to coerce people along any particular path.[2]

From that time forward, Krishnamurti spoke before audiences large and small, in English, in different parts of the world, as his own man, without the sponsorship or support of any overseeing organization. Though some have suggested his ideas were consistent with Hindu and Buddhist ideas, it is hard to classify Krishnamurti in a category of philosophers of either East or West. (Jones 658) Others (Rodrigues, for example) consider Krishnamurti to have been a religious philosopher. However, as this paper contends, Krishnamurti can also be seen as having left a prominent legacy as an educator, though not in the modern sense of scholarship and academics. In another part of his 1929 speech disbanding the Order of the Star in the East Krishnamurti declared his educational aim with this:

> Because I am free, unconditioned, whole . . . I desire those who seek to understand me, to be free, not to follow me. My only concern is to set men absolutely, unconditionally free. (Lutyens 1983, 15)

[2] See http://www.Krishnamurtirishnamurti.org/about-krishnamurti/dissolution-speech.php

And though many refer to his published works – mainly transcriptions of recordings of his talks – as his "teachings," he never held a teaching post. Nonetheless, less than a year before his death, he was the invited guest speaker before the *Pacem in Terris* Society on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the United Nations, when, at the end of Krishnamurti's talk, the chairperson of the Society said: "…we have the honour of presenting you, Mr. Krishnamurti, the World Teacher, with the United Nations 1984 Peace medal."[3] [4]

Philosophy

Krishnamurti encouraged self-inquiry (Needleman 157), with emphasis on self-knowledge and awareness. His thinking has been extolled by the Dalai Lama; has influenced the aspirations of scientists such as David Bohm and Fritjof Capra; inspired writers like Henry Miller and Aldous Huxley; informed the work of psychologists such as Daniel Goleman; and became a component in the progressive educational philosophy and practice of, among others, Ashwani Kumar and Sandra Wawrytko. David Bohm, a physicist and philosopher who participated in many dialogues with Krishnamurti in the 1970s and 1980s, described Krishnamurti's philosophy as intentionally absent of doctrine, techniques, or methods. For Bohm, Krishnamurti was not out to set up new systems and methods for alleviating individual and collective problems. What Krishnamurti emphasized, rather, was how important it is for every person to try and discover for herself how to live. (Bohm undated).

[3] http://Krishnamurtirishnamurti.org/krishnamurti-teachings/view-text.php?tid=1644&chid=1339

[4] While Krishnamurti received throughout his life generous contributions and support from admirers, his material assets were managed by not-for-profit foundations, set up to support Krishnamurti's work, and three of these continue to thrive. The Krishnamurti Foundation of America, for example, states its purpose is to "preserve and disseminate the teachings of J. Krishnamurti and advance public understanding and realization of human potential by means of the study of these teachings… Our challenge is to make Krishnamurti's teachings available to all age groups, different cultures, economic groups and races, and to do this we continue to expand our dissemination efforts." [see https://kfa.org/ accessed April 20, 2018]

In his talks, Krishnamurti revealed his own unique meaning for many concepts, both of a popular, as well as philosophical, nature. Concepts signified by words such as "attention," "listening," "awareness," "thought," "knowledge," "education," "dialogue," "inquiry," and "insight," for example, take on a special Krishnamurti meaning. For example, Krishnamurti's conception of meditation is quite different from what is commonly accepted. Jones explains how Krishnamurti's notion of meditation connects with what he called "choiceless awareness." Choiceless awareness, in Krishnamurti's conception, serves as a prerequisite for the attainment of insight, which is the event that triggers inward transformation. These notions – meditation, choiceless awareness, and insight – make up the key components of Krishnamurti's conception of right education.

It may be helpful to offer a taste of Krishnamurti's philosophy in his own words. From 1983 to 1985, Krishnamurti recorded some of his thoughts on tape. These were published as *J. Krishnamurti: Krishnamurti to Himself*. In an entry dated April 20, 1983, while in Ojai, California, Krishnamurti recorded, in part:

> There was an eagle flying high in the air, circling without the beat of the wings, carried away by the air current beyond the hills and was lost … Listen to that thunder in the skies, the thunder rolling among the hills ... Watching and listening are a great art - watching and listening without any reaction… When there is this simple, clear watching and listening, then there is an awareness … that leads us to an awareness without choice; to be aware without any like or dislike… When one is attentive to all this, choicelessly aware, then out of that comes insight … You see with absolute clarity, all the complications, the consequences, the intricacies … This is pure, clear insight; perception without any shadow of doubt … This whole movement from watching, listening, to the thunder of insight, is one movement; it is not coming to it step by step. It is like a swift arrow. And that insight alone … will bring about total freedom from conditioning. (Krishnamurti 1987 ii)

We see here see the natural flow of Krishnamurti's philosophy as he describes central themes in his prescription for a better world through individual transformation. What he advocates is

self-inquiry through choiceless awareness, to spark insight into the nature of psychological conditioning, with the expectation that "unconditioning the brain" will lead to a transformation of consciousness.

Education and the significance of life

Krishnamurti speaks to a "higher significance of life," and ties education closely to that higher significance when he asks, "… of what value is our education if we never discover it?" (Krishnamurti 1953, 11). For Krishnamurti, the schools he founded were meant to see if it would be possible for teachers and students – who are the products of cultural conditioning – to shed conditioning influences by attaining self-knowledge, a capacity for choiceless awareness, and insight. Krishnamurti spoke of a discontent that leads to inquiry and allows for doubt and questioning to challenge conditioning influences. "In order to transform the world ... there must be a transformation in ourselves." (Krishnamurti 1953 43, 49, 60, 74). As Krishnamurti explains:

> Education ... should cultivate a mind that is extraordinarily alive, not with knowledge, not with experience, but alive... Now how would you translate all this into education? ... Is it possible to educate both ourselves and students to live? I do not mean to live merely as an individual being but as a complete human being ... seeing the totality, the misery, the love, the sorrow, the beauty of the world. (Krishnamurti 1974a 101, 106, 174)

As Krishnamurti sees it, the world faces a tremendous crisis, one that cannot be resolved by social institutions such as those of politics, science, religion, or business. Individuals in these institutions are programmed to think in a particular way. What is required to initiate real change, according to Krishnamurti, is not to be found in politics, religion, or science, but in understanding the content of consciousness, the consciousness that "has brought us to this point" of crisis, which, as Krishnamurti puts it, results from our cultural conditioning.

(Krishnamurti 1983, 9). Psychological conditioning by society – from parents, schools, organized religions, and political leaders – shapes peoples' consciousnesses in childhood. (Kumar 2013). For this reason, points out Kumar, Krishnamurti sees education as the means for achieving real individual and then social transformation. Krishnamurti's approach to alleviating conditioning influences relies on negating the past, with all the morality, authority, desires, ideas, and beliefs that have come from the past as experience and knowledge, and that have entered into consciousness as memory. In Krishnamurti's view, right education helps learners overcome conditioning influences, and in this way, it also helps alleviate the crisis humanity faces.

So, what is this right education Krishnamurti speaks of? Looking closely at what Krishnamurti has to say about education in *Education and the Significance of Life* (1953), and *Letters to the Schools* (1985), Krishnamurti's conception of right education can be found in these most relevant statements:

- The right kind of educator helps learners observe and understand their own values and judgments, and then helps them become aware of the conditioning influences that have instilled in them these values and judgments. (1953 29)
- Right education promotes freedom from conditioning by enhancing learners' ability to recognize the store of accumulated knowledge and see it for what it really is – conformist tradition. (1985 23)
- If educators are unable to set aside fear, desire for control, and attachment to goals, they are also unable to help learners develop intelligence and freedom from conditioning. (1953 95)
- Fear hinders the kind of awareness needed for developing intelligence, and brings about self-centered action. (1953 35)

- Intelligence is not plain intellect, but the integration of reason and love. But intelligence grows only with enhanced self-knowledge, which is deep understanding of the self. (1953 67)
- The right educator asks for nothing, does not use education for position or authority, and serves learners with an attitude free from the compulsion of society. (1953 99)
- While guiding learners to freedom from conditioning influences, the right educator also learns to shed her sense of "me" and "mine." (1953 41)[5]

Krishnamurti demonstrated his enduring commitment to education in the letters he wrote to the schools, published only a few years before his death in 1986. In his foreword, Krishnamurti writes, in part:

> As I would like to keep in touch with the schools in India, Brockwood Park in England and the Oak Grove School in Ojai, California, I propose to write a letter every fortnight to them for as long as is possible … if I may, I would very much like to write these letters to convey what the schools should be, to convey to all the people who are responsible for them that these schools are to be excellent academically, but much more. They are to be concerned with the cultivation of the total human being… (Krishnamurti 2007)

For Krishnamurti, then, education is the most necessary social endeavour, with the potential to achieve the kind of radical individual and social transformation needed for addressing the present crisis facing humanity. In a public talk he gave in 1970 in London, Krishnamurti was asked how a person could be at peace in a world with so much suffering. In reply, Krishnamurti asked the audience, "Are you not the world?" He suggests that the world is what people have

[5] See Piirto, Jane. "Krishnamurti and Me: Meditations on His Philosophy of Curriculum and on India." *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, Spring 2000

made with their ambition, their greed, need for economic security, conflict and wars, and that the lack of right education is the main cause of conflict and suffering. (Krishnamurti 1973 136).

Dialogue

Integral to Krishnamurti's educational approach is an encounter of questioning and inquiry, intended to let certain truths be realized. This special kind of Krishnamurti encounter has come to be known by commentators and followers as a dialogue. According to Mark Lee, a close follower of Krishnamurti's work, a Krishnamurti dialogue was a process of "being and seeing together," where the ultimate aim was not necessarily to arrive at finding some final meaning, solution, or answer to a problem. (Lee np). The point of dialogue, rather, is to inquire, to listen attentively, to reflect, and to observe the flow of thoughts; the content of consciousness. Such observation opens space for *insight*, a kind of pure learning that brings about a fundamental and permanent psychological transformation. It is pure in the sense that it is no longer contaminated by conditioning influences. For Lee, a Krishnamurti dialogue differs markedly from most educational approaches, where the focus is mainly on delivering information and knowledge, while occasionally inviting discussion and debate. Most contemporary approaches, Lee says, help to create the content of consciousness by filling the mind with knowledge, but Krishnamurti's dialogic approach involves an inquiry into the content of consciousness. Once that content is revealed, potential arises for what Krishnamurti called "the awakening of intelligence." Krishnamurti's approach encourages reflection and self-knowledge, and it does so for the sake of unmasking conditioning influences so they can be transcended. What we find, then, in Krishnamurti's approach, are dialogic activities not found in most approaches to education, such as examination of the thought process; giving attention to the mind and to consciousness; and reflection and examination of relationships in order to

identify and understand conflict. Lee acknowledges that various dialogue approaches have long been used in education, and he mentions, for example, dialogues found in the Upanishads, dialogues of the Buddha, and those of Socrates, as well as council gatherings of indigenous Americans. But Lee suggests that Krishnamurti's dialogic approach represents a new and radical approach, based as it is on deep inquiry intended to penetrate into the core of psychological problems.

Krishnamurti began many of his talks and dialogues by pointing out that he saw himself as a facilitator of a conversation, of "talking together," and he prodded participants to listen attentively and examine for themselves what he had to say, without accepting his words as authoritative. A Krishnamurti dialogue usually deals with questions revolving around a number of themes, (Rodrigues 24) in a kind of dance of dialogue that probes and questions, prods and proposes. At the same time, participants ponder the content of their consciousness by paying attention to their thought process during the dialogue and then carry this activity into their day-to-day lives. Either at a Krishnamurti dialogue, or while paying attention to their thought process in their day-to-day lives, participants will often have a spark of insight that reveals how thoughts and consciousness operate. (Rodrigues 26). Rodrigues argues that the Krishnamurti approach often reveals the source of a psychological problem to be located in the thought processes of consciousness, and not necessarily in any independent, external cause. An inquiry into psychological fear, for example, might reveal that fear flows from thinking about fear, rather than from something outside the thinker. As Rodrigues puts it, in a Krishnamurti dialogue about fear, then, participants might come to an awareness – an insight – that surpasses mere intellectual comprehension, but is rather a realization with permanent psychological transformation. (Rodrigues 26). The benefit of such an insight, as in our example, is that the insight leads to an awareness of the connection between fear and ways of thinking

about fear, and that such an insight cuts off those ways of thinking and leads to the end of the fear as well. (Rodrigues 27).

This is the point where it makes sense to describe, for the purposes of introduction and overview, a few principles of Krishnamurti's dialogic approach. Three of these are: 1) that he purports to hold no authority, 2) that his talk is spontaneous and free-flowing, and 3) that he spoke with an attitude of sharing and inclusivity. To express his emphatic negation of his authority, Krishnamurti would usually refer to himself as "K," or "the speaker," and would rarely use the personal pronoun "I," resorting to its use when sharing a personal experience or feeling, or in direct response to a question he had been asked, or in place of the third person "you" when presenting an example for all to consider. Rodrigues describes Krishnamurti's talks as mostly "spontaneous, free-flowing speech," intended to foster an atmosphere of mutual inquiry. Rodrigues considers this aspect of Krishnamurti dialogue to flow directly from Krishnamurti's "genuine passion to share what he discovered" with others. (Rodrigues 32). An example of Krishnamurti opening a public talk indicates his intention for collaboration, sharing, and discovery:

> We are like two friends sitting in the park on a lovely day talking about life, talking about our problems, investigating the very nature of our existence, and asking ourselves seriously why life has become such a great problem. (Krishnamurti 1983 99)

Also, Krishnamurti would often make an effort to be inclusive by emphasizing common interest and cooperation among all participants:

> Our consciousness is not only that of the specialized group, nationality, and so on, but it is also the human travail, conflict, misery, confusion and sorrow. We are examining together that human consciousness, which is our consciousness, not yours or mine, but ours … We are trying to observe together. It is important to bear in mind all the time that the speaker is merely pointing out something which we are examining together. It is not something one-sided but rather that we are cooperating in examining, in taking a journey together and so acting together." (Krishnamurti 1983 29)

Rodrigues notes that Krishnamurti would often start a talk by introducing a theme, or what he called a problem, often referring to an emotional state such as joy, or anger. (Rodrigues 36). He would then set the foundation for the nature of the inquiry he was about to undertake with the participants:

> We are not merely concerned with the description, with the explanation, but rather with the deep understanding of the problem, so that we are totally involved in it, so that it is the very breath of our life, not mere intellectualization. (Krishnamurti 1972 74)

With this foundation set, Krishnamurti would then explore various contents of consciousness implicated in the introduced theme or problem, while encouraging participants to engage with him in dialogue and inquiry. He would attack the problem by examining it deeply, probing with apt questions and suggestions, defining the problem at its core, and its connection with other related questions. For example, speaking about the question of desire, Krishnamurti said this in one of his talks:

> For most of us desire is quite a problem: the desire for property, for position, for power, for comfort, for immortality, for continuity… to be loved…
> Now, what is desire? … Is it not the symbol and its sensation? Desire is sensation with the object of its attainment. Is there desire without a symbol and its sensation? Obviously not. (Krishnamurti 1975 99)

What Krishnamurti accomplishes with this kind of inquiry, after laying the opening foundation, is to engage participants in deep reflection and examination of concepts that many see as common everyday words not worthy of more than cursory attention. In the above example, Krishnamurti lists several components of desire, to show that desire involves a symbol, on the one hand, and a sensation, on the other. For most, such a notion would likely be coming to their attention for the first time as they hear Krishnamurti's words. But then, if listeners come to a

deeper understanding of the problem of desire, in other words, if they have the insight that opens their eyes to absorb, rather than simply to intellectualize, what desire is at its core, then they gain the potential to transform their conditioned views of desire and escape its conditioning influences.

Insight is the aim of education

The aim of the school Krishnamurti had founded in Ojai, California was to integrate Krishnamurti's philosophy into the curriculum by encouraging *insight*. As mentioned, insight is central to Krishnamurti's radical approach to transformative philosophy in general, and to education in particular. This becomes clearer when looking at a dialogue Krishnamurti had with two scientists (one of whom has the initials AC), where Krishnamurti described why insight is essential for right education:

> **K**: I would say… that insight is not mechanical.
> **AC**: Insight being the ability or the process of seeing instantly through a problem. So, no process of thought or logic is used.
> **K**: Yes.
> **AC**: It is not intuition, it is insight.
> **K**: No, it is insight. That is not based on knowledge, not based on experience, remembrance… It is an insight. Immediate perception. Action.
> (Krishnamurti 1991 150)

So, according to Krishnamurti, the insight sought through a Krishnamurti approach to education is not based on knowledge, experience, or memory. At another talk he gave in 1979, Krishnamurti was asked, "What do you mean by insight?" and Krishnamurti explained what he meant by saying this:

> In the various talks the speaker has given, he has used the word 'insight'. That is to see into things, into the whole movement of thought; into the whole movement, for example, of jealousy. It is to perceive the nature of greed, to see the whole content of sorrow. It is not analysis; not the exercise of intellectual capacity. Nor is it the result of

> knowledge. Knowledge is that which has been accumulated through the past from experience, stored up in the brain ... Then what is insight? It is to perceive something instantly… It is not that one has an insight and does nothing about it. If one has an insight into the whole nature of thinking there is instant action … Have an insight, for example, into the wounds and hurts that one has received from childhood … psychologically. Now, have an insight into the whole nature and structure of that hurt … The consequences of that hurt are isolation, fear, resistance, so as not to be hurt more ... The hurt is the image that you have created for yourself about yourself. So as long as that image remains you will be hurt, obviously. Now, to have an insight into all that, without analysis; to perceive it instantly, then that very perception is insight. It demands all your attention and energy. In that insight the hurt is dissolved. (Krishnamurti 1991 128)

Thus, for Krishnamurti, insight is the lever that lifts the mind from the burden of conditioning influences. His example of wounds and hurt experienced during childhood shows the effect of such an insight – seeing for the first time that the childhood wound is no more than an image created by experience, knowledge, and memory. But this image is not a fixed and permanent content of consciousness. It does not need to remain permanently as part of the self-concept. Once awareness arises that the childhood wound is nothing but an image created by the long-gone memory – once that insight is perceived, not just intellectually but within the psyche – then the possibility arises for that image to evaporate. And as the image evaporates the conditioning influence of the childhood wound also fades away.

In another dialogue, Krishnamurti describes his notion of attentive listening as listening without interpretation, with awakened senses. For Krishnamurti, such attentive listening is essential to gaining insight. He then elaborates on his concept of awareness, describing an awareness that is not accompanied by value judgments of like or dislike or good or bad; an awareness he calls “choiceless awareness.” It is choiceless because it is not distorted by social and cultural conditioning, by memories of past experiences, or by worries and desires. As Krishnamurti explains:

> When one is attentive to all this, choicelessly aware, then out of that comes insight. Insight is not an act of remembrance, the continuation of memory. Insight is like a flash of light. You see with absolute clarity, all the complications, the consequences, the intricacies ... This is pure, clear insight - perception without any shadow of doubt. (Krishnamurti 1987 73)

In Rodrigues' analysis of one of Krishnamurti's last talks at Saanen, Switzerland, in 1985, he describes Krishnamurti's response to a question about guilt. Rodrigues quotes Krishnamurti:

> Like a flower, if you keep pulling it up to see if the roots are working properly, it will never bloom, but once you see the fact, which is the seed, and then stay with it, it shows itself fully. All the implications of guilt, all the implications of its subtlety, where it hides, is like a flower blooming. And if you let it bloom, not act, not say, "I must do or must not do", then it begins to wither away and die … With every issue you can do that… That is insight, not merely remembrance, adding… you see that it is so, then psychologically it is an enormous factor that frees you from all the past and present struggles and effort. (Krishnamurti 1986 123)

Insight, then, must be part of Krishnamurti's approach to right education, since it is the one event that frees the mind to see the self in a new light, in a way that, according to Krishnamurti, allows for transformation of consciousness.

Connecting principles

Krishnamurti's purpose was to encourage people to change so that a better society could emerge as a result, one with less conflict and more suited to alleviate the crisis humanity faces. His philosophy starts with what he sees as the true cause of the crisis – conditioned consciousness. From there, he describes the event that frees people from conditioned consciousness – choiceless awareness that leads to a sudden realization of 'what is', an event he describes as like thunder or a flash of light – *insight*. Krishnamurti placed immense importance on the attainment of insight, and advocated what he called right education as the

approach best suited to fostering an environment where individuals could experience that flash of insight and shed their conditioned influences. In Krishnamurti's words,

> … What is important is not to follow anybody but to understand oneself. If you go into yourself without effort, fear, without any sense of restraint, and really delve deeply, you will find extraordinary things; and you don't have to read a single book … In oneself lies the whole world, and if you know how to look and learn, then the door is there and the key is in your hand. Nobody on earth can give you either that key or the door to open, except yourself. (Krishnamurti 1972 135)

In summary, then, this key Krishnamurti speaks of is right education, as the way to instigate insight, which he sees as necessary for transformation of people and society. Krishnamurti perceived a world in crisis and saw education as a means to move away from crisis toward a more peaceful world. Right education, according to Krishnamurti, is one that fosters dialogue and deep inquiry into everyday problems that create conflict. And this dialogue and deep inquiry is meant to encourage choiceless awareness, an awareness that opens the mind to that potential flash of light that is insight. Then, with insight, people are open to transformation of consciousness. And that is what makes real social change possible.

Chapter Two

Introduction – purpose of study

In examining Krishnamurti's dialogic approach, I found one particular dialogue most relevant to my research objectives, which are a) to identify and describe strategies and techniques of Krishnamurti's approach and b) to consider how these strategies and techniques could be adapted, adopted, or emulated in a holistic and transformative practice of higher education.

Research design and methodology

Criteria for selecting a suitable dialogue were few. Most important was to find a dialogue most likely to represent an advanced stage of development, a dialogue that demonstrates more fully an approach that Krishnamurti had settled on as the best one to use, following many years of practice with groups large and small. A second criteria was to find a dialogue that involved Krishnamurti facilitating a small group of adults, preferably university students, so that comparisons between the actual Krishnamurti dialogue approach with potential future applications and adaptations would be more informative. And, finally, the selected dialogue must have been recorded and transcribed, preferably verbatim. With an audio file, researchers could confirm the accuracy of the transcribed text, examine ambiguities, inconsistencies, and possible discrepancies, and listen closely for voice elements that would not be available with reference strictly to written dialogue text. One such dialogue met all these criteria. And there are two versions of transcripts of this dialogue that were made available for my research; one appears as part of a book publication (Khare), and the second is from the official archives of the Krishnamurti Foundation Trust in England.

This dialogue took place in March of 1981, just five years before Krishnamurti's death, when Brij Khare, a university educator based in southern California, arranged a three-day

symposium with Krishnamurti holding four dialogue sessions with small groups of students and teachers. These sessions were recorded on cassette tape and transcribed. I chose to examine one of these sessions, one that Krishnamurti facilitated with six university students. While I closely read and examined an official, archived, verbatim transcript provided to me by the Krishnamurti Foundation Trust, the trust also gave me a copy of the audio file of the cassette tape recording. My next step was to closely read the transcript of the fifty-nine-minute dialogue, several times, so that I could reliably appreciate, identify, and describe specific strategies and techniques in Krishnamurti's dialogic approach. This chapter describes two analyses flowing from this close reading. The first deals with the flow of thematic content, so that an evaluation could be made of what content had been covered and what, if anything, might have been learned by the participants. This first analysis considers how Krishnamurti's dialogic approach might be applied, given the specific curricula educators deal with in their own practice. After all, before Krishnamurti's approach might be taken up and considered, an educator would need to adapt Krishnamurti's approach to their own classroom needs. The second analysis involves locating, identifying, and describing, with corresponding examples from the dialogue, strategies and techniques of Krishnamurti's approach, so that educators might look at both the detail and the big picture view of what this study refers to as the Krishnamurti approach to dialogue. The hope is that, in this way, educators will be better informed about the potential for applying a more holistic and transformative approach in their higher education practice. The verbatim transcription of the Krishnamurti dialogue selected for this study can be found in appendix A, which includes my commentary in italics in between relevant exchanges in the dialogue.

Thematic flow and improvisation

Krishnamurti uses no prepared lesson plan or notes, but relies on improvisation, as he steers the dialogue toward relevant problems raised by participants and others put by him. As a result, each dialogue encounter unfolds in its own way. What results is not necessarily what Krishnamurti would have planned for or wanted. One of the notable features of his dialogic approach is that he questions and probes and prods participants to delve into actual problems of day-to-day living, while delivering a thematic flow of his spiritual philosophy and psychology.

So, first, let us look at what content this particular dialogue has covered, so that we can glean what participants might have learned in this encounter. My focus here is on the thematic and topical flow, and less on Krishnamurti's strategies and techniques, although where relevant, I refer to these for clarity of description. Where a paragraph number is given, this number refers to the corresponding paragraph, as numbered, in appendix A. The dialogue begins, at paragraph 6, with a question about mediocrity and how individual thinking is related to society as a whole. At paragraph 14, Krishnamurti shifts the dialogue to the theme of conditioning, while connecting "conditioning" with the notion of mediocrity. What Krishnamurti says is that conditioning leads to mediocrity, and that breaking through conditioning allows a person to overcome mediocrity. At paragraph 17, a participant asks if breaking through conditioning should be a goal in life, but Krishnamurti's response is "why establish a goal?" (18) and "why do we project these things and then try to achieve them?"

At 19, a participant answers that we are conditioned to strive, continually in a struggle to attain a goal. But Krishnamurti asks "who has projected the goal?" And at 26, Krishnamurti provides his answer, that "parents, religions, philosophies – all that has helped us to project an ideal, a concept, a goal towards which we are all striving." Krishnamurti follows this with the

declaration that we never "are" because we are always becoming, but Krishnamurti asks "is there really a becoming at all," as a psychological process. (28). And then Krishnamurti says that there is becoming in knowledge, but he draws a distinction between becoming through accumulating knowledge and becoming at the psychological level. Then Krishnamurti asks if knowledge about anything can ever be complete, and proposes the radical statement that "knowledge always goes with ignorance." (38). Soon after, at 48, Krishnamurti introduces the topic of time, when he says "the whole implication of becoming involves time." He asks if there is psychological time at all, since time is involved in acquiring knowledge. Then Krishnamurti introduces the theme of self-knowledge. Suppose, he says, I study myself. "That study can only take place in relationship. We think all that requires time. I question that." (56). With this, Krishnamurti has connected the three concepts of self-knowledge, relationship, and the passage of time.

At 60, we return to the theme of conditioning. In Krishnamurti's view, conditioning is brought about by economic status, climate, food, clothing, nationalism, and other conditioning influences. Krishnamurti points out that self-identifying as a nationalist, or a scientist, for example, contributes to conditioning. But he proposes that if people can become aware of their conditioned thinking, then with that awareness, they can be free of the influence of that conditioning by simply deciding to no longer self identify as, say, Hindu. "It is stupid to belong to any category of that kind," says Krishnamurti. When a participant asks Krishnamurti if striving to not belong to any group is in itself a goal, Krishnamurti's response is that, "no – it is a fact. (62). If I am a nationalist, I contribute to war." So, here Krishnamurti is making the point that one of the causes of war is the conditioning influence of nationalism. Krishnamurti makes a distinction between the future image of a goal, something to achieve over time, on one hand, and the present reality, on the other. When the participant (RW) persists with his contention

that there must be some striving towards a goal, Krishnamurti says "no… I see the consequences of nationalism and it is finished." (64). What Krishnamurti says is that there is no time involved when this happens, because when you see the consequences of nationalism, then you immediately stop letting it influence your thinking. Then, in 72, Krishnamurti elaborates with "… it is not a goal; it is seeing the results of all that; how it divides man." So, what Krishnamurti contends is that the *influence* of conditioning ends when people become aware – when they experience that insight – of the *consequences* of conditioning.

At 75, a participant (PP) offers the comment that people in different cultures understand their environment differently and therefore are influenced by different sets of conditioning influences, but Krishnamurti qualifies that line of thinking when he says "but it is still conditioning." (80). "The demand for security is common to all of us," says Krishnamurti. (86). What we see here, then, is how Krishnamurti strings themes together in a way conducive to instigating insight in the mind of participants. Krishnamurti here connects the theme of conditioning with the commonality of conditioning, a commonality that emanates from the demand for security, a demand that is common to all. It seems an important point for him to articulate here, that since everyone demands security, everyone is influenced by conditioning.

The next theme in the dialogue is competition, and Krishnamurti asks why it is that people compete, and whether it is a danger to people and to society. When a participant proposes that competition is a "sword with two edges," because one brings war and the other brings progress, Krishnamurti responds with his own question, "what do you mean by progress?" (94). Here, Krishnamurti prods the group to dig deeper, to more closely examine the nature of progress. One of the participants comments that progress brings better living conditions, and another says that progress also leads nations to build better bombs. But here Krishnamurti turns to the theme of psychological progress, when, at 106, he first asks "what do

you mean…", and then offers his answer that we haven't changed very much, in a psychological sense. Krishnamurti puts a most significant question to the group, "are you different from me psychologically?" (110), to which a participant replies "I think I am," but Krishnamurti follows up with another question, "are human beings living in the Far East or here or in Europe psychologically different?" Here Krishnamurti coaxes participants to re-examine their own thinking; in other words, to look at their own conditioned views about the notion of psychological differences. Krishnamurti says people suffer… they go through agonies… fear. "Aren't we psychologically, essentially similar, basically?" (114). And, when a participant responds that basically we are, but when we are put within the cultural context, then we are different, Krishnamurti replies using his own question again, "who has created this cultural environment?" Without waiting for suggestions from participants, Krishnamurti supplies his answer, saying "we have created it… we can tear it down or transform it… Physical revolution has never… transformed man… only psychological revolution… will transform man." (120). With this, Krishnamurti underlines his key proposition that only individual, inward, psychological transformation leads to societal transformation.

One of the participants then asks Krishnamurti how to reconcile competing systems, but Krishnamurti will have none of that digression, asking "why do you want to compete with each other, one system against another system?" Still, the participant suggests that competition is a collective effort, and Krishnamurti follows with another question, "collective effort to be what?" Here, Krishnamurti provides his own answer, which is that the collective effort is to maintain security. (134, 136). Krishnamurti asks "but why are we so concerned with the system?" We can see in this exchange how Krishnamurti keeps the dialogue focused on his contention that only psychological revolution will transform man. (see chapter 1 above, at p. 16). Now one of the participants, EM, argues that people do not have psychological

commonality, and this prompts Krishnamurti to add "so each one thinks he is a separate entity." Then Krishnamurti adds: "and each one says 'my security is far more important than the security of the common.'" And before the dialogue can veer off course, Krishnamurti asks, "is there an individuality at all?" and thereby keeping the focus on the relationship of the individual to society. Krishnamurti elaborates. "Psychologically," he points out, "we are similar… culturally we may be different… religiously maybe we are different, but basically, we go through agonies, tortures, uncertainties, despair; great sense of sorrow. We go through all that. So that is the commonality… it is a fact…" (162 and 164) and, "psychologically I am you, basically." (168). Soon after that, though, the dialogue is at risk of veering off course when PP asks if the ego has no purpose then, and referring to the ego as "the self-importance." But Krishnamurti's response restores focus when he asks, "what is the self?" And Krishnamurti continues along this line when he says "let's examine it – the self. What is the self? The 'me', the ego, the whole structure on which thought moves. What is that?" (178). One of the participants responds with "… in essence, it is me," and Krishnamurti simply agrees: "It is me." But Krishnamurti prods for a deeper inquiry, and so he asks: "What is the 'me' composed of?" (182). A participant suggests: "feelings… thoughts," and Krishnamurti adds "thoughts, reactions… "desires, fears." (184, 186) and that the 'me' is "my consciousness." (188, 190). But now Krishnamurti continues with the question, "what are the contents of my consciousness, common consciousness?" and when a participant proposes "basically, we all share the same content," Krishnamurti exclaims "Exactly." When PP asks if people all have a collective consciousness Krishnamurti's response is "Obviously… not collective. It is common consciousness." (196). And now Krishnamurti introduces concrete examples. "I suffer. I am anxious. I am terribly depressed … and my friend in India goes through the same thing. Or in Japan. So, our consciousness with its content is common to all of us." (198). Krishnamurti then

connects two related concepts when he asserts that "consciousness is put together by thought." In other words, for Krishnamurti, thought creates the content of consciousness. So, at 202, Krishnamurti moves the dialogue toward what he sees as the problem of thought: "What is thought? What is thinking? Why have we given such extraordinary importance to thought?" Krishnamurti supplies his own answer. "Thought has built the great cathedrals, great architecture, painting, poetry. And also, thought has created all the illusions in the cathedrals. Right?" Continuing here with the problem of thought, but taking small steps, Krishnamurti asks "What is the source of thought?" He then goes on to explain that "… thought has created nationalities. Thought has created God… all the rituals, the dogmas... Thought has divided man, essentially... So, one has to inquire into what is thought." (208). Krishnamurti explains why this inquiry into the nature of thought is so important. Participants suggest thought is a reaction to environment and that it is language, but Krishnamurti prods them with "yes; yes; but go behind that. Go further, a little further. What makes you think?" (213, 215). And he gives his own answer, but he deftly blends his answer with contributions from participants. "Knowledge. Right? You said 'the past'. Man's past is the story of man as knowledge; as experience; stored up in the brain as memory… and the reaction to that memory is thinking." (223).

Elaborating on the theme of thought, Krishnamurti describes thought as a "material process." And then he adds "and that has created all this misery in the world; wars. (227). He goes on to delineate the steps in the thought process. As Krishnamurti sees it "thought is the response of memory… memory is knowledge; knowledge is experience…. so, thought is always incomplete." (233). This last statement – that thought is always incomplete – suggests that perhaps Krishnamurti means that thought must be incomplete because it is ultimately based on our experience, which is always partial, from one side, and limited. After a brief exchange, Krishnamurti recaps. "Thought has put together the me. Thought has put together my

consciousness… my consciousness with its content is the movement of thought… So… one has to understand and explore what is thought, which is common to all mankind." He urges participants to "see the limitation of thought… and whether there is something limitless, whole." (245, 249). Then one of the participants (PP) states his understanding of the problem of thought, saying "… you are saying that… we think we can solve everything with thought, and it's not true." (250). Krishnamurti replies with a straightforward "that's right. You haven't solved a thing." And now, Krishnamurti moves the dialogue forward to the theme of thought in relationship, saying "let us see how extraordinarily limited thought is and how thought has bound us, shaped us; our thinking; life; our relationship with each other." Now the dialogue broadens into the many ways thought pervades day-to-day experience. Krishnamurti connects thought to the nature of traditional education. "All our education," says Krishnamurti, "is the cultivation of thought. And we are trying to resolve the problems which thought has created by thought. And so, it is hopeless." (253). For Krishnamurti, the "problems which thought has created" are connected with how thought is implicated in the chaos, disorder, division, and conflict in the world. Then, after a brief exchange about language and communication, Krishnamurti returns to the theme of thought, with the most radical proposition "thought is limited. Thought is the most dangerous instrument that man has." (260). So, not only is thought always incomplete and limited, but thought is also dangerous. And, to accentuate the import of this radical notion, Krishnamurti poses the question that serves as a kind of fulcrum for this whole dialogue. "Then what shall we do," Krishnamurti asks. He repeats this question, at 268, and again at 270. "If we… see that thought has created such chaos in the world, such violence, such brutality, such agony in the world, then what shall we do? How shall we go beyond thought? Not stop it, because thought is necessary to communicate."

Krishnamurti reviews again the dialogue about thought to this point, to make a fresh start, or to take a pause and then resume the dialogue on this theme. "We are saying that thought creates the thinker; the thinker then separates himself from thought; then the thinker tries to control thought. But thought is the thinker," (282) and "there is no thinker without thought." (286). But Krishnamurti is not yet done with this theme. PP suggests "I don't think we understand the source of thought," (292), and so Krishnamurti explains that experience brings learning and knowledge, stored in the brain as memory. And memory is used in relationships. Psychologically, in our relationships, we use images from our knowledge and we then act on that knowledge. (293). Krishnamurti acknowledges that people need knowledge to go to the moon, but why, he asks, would we need it in relationships? (295). Krishnamurti here makes an important distinction. He distinguishes between how people apply knowledge to get things done, on the one hand, and how they apply knowledge in relationships, with images from past experience stored as memories, on the other.

Krishnamurti then returns to the theme of experience when he asks, at 304, "what is experience?" PP offers an example of how knowledge enters into relationship, when he tells the story of his wife serving a cold meal, and the experience makes him think that it could happen again. PP says that his experience means he is "… becoming prejudiced… I have a prejudiced view of my wife." Krishnamurti listens intently and casually asks this question: "which means what?" (310). And when one of the participants proposes "it is past, it is history," Krishnamurti agrees, but now connects the notion of history (the past) to that of knowledge, and points out how knowledge from past experience affects relationship in the present. "History. Right? Which is what? Knowledge." (317). Krishnamurti then elaborates, saying that knowledge "is memory," and "to experience implies recognition of that experience… which means memory operating." (321). Now Krishnamurti declares boldly that "thought is a dangerous movement in

relationship. Life is relationship. And there, thought is creating havoc," (324). Since thought is based on history, on the past, and stored in memory as images, according to Krishnamurti, then, thought creates havoc because relationships are never freshly experienced as they develop, but rather are always muddled by images from the past, which may or may not be reliable guidance for deciding how to act in the present. At this point, Krishnamurti returns to the essential question, "so what shall we do with thought?" (326). And to emphasize the gravity of his contention about the danger of thought in relationship, which is why he feels it is so important to inquire into the nature of thought, he declares that thought has become "… psychologically a dangerous instrument, because it has divided man. Belief, your belief, my belief…it has divided man and destroyed man. It is destroying man." (332).

At this place in the dialogue, participants propose suggestions for addressing the dilemma posed by Krishnamurti. For example, at 333, EM suggests that "as the thinker, we need to eliminate memory." But, Krishnamurti rejects this suggestion, noting bluntly "you can't eliminate memory." Krishnamurti says "we look at life through a process… accumulated knowledge, … experience, knowledge, and memory. We are back again in the same circle." (342). Then Krishnamurti elaborates: "We act this way: experience, knowledge, memory, thought, action. That is the chain in which you are caught. And we think that is perfectly all right…. But see the danger of it." (346). Significantly, Krishnamurti indicates the steps in the process that, in his view, describe how people think, with the pivotal role of the past as memory, and with memory affecting how people act. Following a brief exchange, a participant says "I am following you," and asks "but what happens now?" (362). And Krishnamurti replies with an example. "If it is a good museum, you see only one painting on a wall, right? You sit there and look at it, get the whole feeling of that picture – painting, the shadows, the light, the colour, the beauty… You look at it. We are doing the same now with regard to thought."

Krishnamurti continues with this metaphor, when he says, at 365, "Looking at the whole painting of thought… the whole movement of thought… Just look at it without trying to understand it, without trying to go beyond it… Just look." Krishnamurti adds, "thought has created the society in which we live… [but] society is an abstraction. The actuality is relationship between man and man. In that relationship thought enters." (375). The problem, Krishnamurti repeats, is this: "So what shall I do? … thought is necessary in a certain direction… [but] I see thought as the most dangerous thing in relationship. I am stuck here… I discard all authority. The priest... all that stuff." And he asks "so, what takes place then?" (379, 381). When ET suggests "you look to yourself," Krishnamurti cautions "No, wait.... do it and see what happens actually." (383). Krishnamurti urges participants to look more closely at their own thought process. EM suggests that "we need to be concerned with complete analysis of our inward self so that we don't find ourselves in the position of going through this eternal cycle." But, Krishnamurti modifies this with "yes…but not through analysis… Just observe." (392). At this point, EM proposes that "we are really at a plane where thought is not being used as a process," and though Krishnamurti says "that's right," he soon adds, at 396, "only observation," distinguishing between analysis, which requires judgment, and observation, which does not require judgment. "Like a good scientist just observes." (398).

What has been learned?

So, what content has been covered? Let's consider what has taken place and imagine this approach to be somewhat equivalent to certain kinds of higher education encounters. What can we say about Krishnamurti's approach? Could it be a potentially beneficial, viable, and efficacious educational approach? Before I discuss the strategies and techniques of Krishnamurti's dialogic approach, let us look at how the thematic flow of this particular

dialogue might have contributed to certain "learning outcomes." What follows is my reading of the themes that cropped up in this improvised dialogue, in the sequence they appear to flow.

On conditioning

Mediocrity means not living up to our potential, and breaking through conditioning gives a chance to break through the limitations of mediocrity. Krishnamurti says people are conditioned to strive and struggle to attain goals, as a result of influences from parents, religions, philosophies; these all make people project ideals, concepts, and goals to strive for.

On becoming, knowledge, self-knowledge, and time

We never "are" because we are always becoming, but is there really a becoming at all? There is becoming in acquiring knowledge; but at what level? Knowledge always goes with ignorance. Becoming involves time, but Krishnamurti questions if there is such a thing as psychological time. Gaining self-knowledge can only take place in relationship, and though people think that gaining self-knowledge requires time, Krishnamurti doubts that as well.

On de-conditioning as goal; and de-conditioning in time

Conditioning influences come from religion, economic status, climate, food, clothing, nationalism, and the like. But according to Krishnamurti, it is stupid to identify with any category of that kind. One of the causes of war is the conditioning influence of nationalism. But when you see the consequences of nationalism, that influence is finished. No time is involved in that, says Krishnamurti, because once you see the consequences of nationalism, such as the horrors of war, then you stop letting it influence your thinking. But this is not a goal to strive for. Rather, seeing how it divides and destroys people, that seeing, in and of itself, at that moment, is not subject to any conditioning influence.

On conditioning in different cultures

Note that this theme was discussed only in response to a participant's question about different cultures, such as Western cultures compared with African Bushmen. Krishnamurti explained that people in different cultures have different conditioning influences, but they are all nonetheless subject to conditioning influences. All cultures, even with disparate conditioning influences, demand security; a demand common to all.

On psychological progress, suffering, and transformation

Krishnamurti says that throughout history, people have not changed much in a psychological sense. People suffer, they have agony, and fear. But Krishnamurti asks if people are essentially, psychologically, similar, basically. And since people are those who have created the world, then it is people who can tear it down or transform it. For Krishnamurti, only psychological revolution will transform people.

On the self and consciousness

The self is the 'me,' And the 'me' is the content of consciousness, made up of thoughts, reactions, desires, fears. In Krishnamurti's view, all people share the same content of consciousness.

On thought and knowledge

Consciousness is made by thought. But thought creates nationalities, God, rituals, dogmas, and all of these divide people into separate groups that believe in different things. "I believe in this. I don't believe in that," says Krishnamurti. For this reason, we have to inquire deeply into what thought is, to find out what makes people think the way they do. Thought, says Krishnamurti, arises from knowledge, developed through experiences and stored in the brain as memories.

And thinking is the reaction to those memories. What Krishnamurti proposes is that thinking is a process that brings misery. And thought is responsible for putting together the self.

The limitation of thought in relationship

For Krishnamurti, thought shapes our lives and our relationships. Not only that, but our education is all about the cultivation of thought. And since all we can do is to use thought to try and resolve human problems created by thought, the whole endeavour is hopeless. For Krishnamurti, thought is responsible for human conflict because thought is limited. "Thought," says Krishnamurti, "is the most dangerous instrument that man has." The question, then, that we must all examine, is what shall we do? "How shall we go beyond thought," he asks. "Not stop it, because thought is necessary to communicate," but to move beyond thought.

On knowledge and images in relationship

Knowledge is stored in the brain as memories, and those memories govern how people act in relationships. Psychologically, people use images from their knowledge when they take action. Though we need knowledge to go to the moon, for example, Krishnamurti questions if we need knowledge in relationships.

Thought is dangerous in relationship.

Krishnamurti says that all life is relationship, and in life thought creates havoc. "So," Krishnamurti asks, "what shall we do with thought?" Thought has become the most "… psychologically dangerous instrument, because it has divided man… your belief, my belief…it has divided man and destroyed man." Krishnamurti describes the process of thought. We act this way, he says: We have experiences; gain knowledge from these experiences; retain knowledge as memory; memory creates thought; and thought leads to action. " But see the

danger of it." Krishnamurti advocates that we simply observe this process without trying to understand it, without trying to go beyond it. Just look. Thought has created our society, but society is only an abstraction. The actuality is relationship between people, and in that relationship, thought is limited and dangerous.

What can be done when you recognize this problem with thought?
Krishnamurti reminds us that thought is necessary for many practical functions but, he cautions, thought is the most dangerous thing in relationship. "I discard all authority," Krishnamurti says. "The priest... all that stuff." Inquiry into the process of how thought works is what is needed, but not by way of analysis. "Just observe," he says.

So, what thematic content was covered in this almost one-hour-long dialogue? Though the dialogue began with a participant's question about mediocrity of individuals and society, Krishnamurti redirected the focus to themes that make up part of his 'curriculum'. Applying a collaborative approach, and without notes or a written lesson plan, Krishnamurti has covered content that could have followed a formal lesson plan. One of Krishnamurti's key themes, for example, is conditioning. And though the dialogue opens with a question about mediocrity of the individual and society, Krishnamurti facilitated the dialogue in a way that redirected the conversation to the theme of psychological conditioning. Not only does conditioning seem to flow naturally, as a theme, from the relationship between individual and society, but conditioning also causes, in Krishnamurti's view, individual and social problems. Krishnamurti found a way to bring in the theme of conditioning into the dialogue seamlessly, while also facilitating a response to the opening question about the mediocrity of individuals and society.

Let us suppose that Krishnamurti had used a lesson plan to facilitate this dialogue session.

What might such a lesson plan look like? One possibility could be something like this:

Conditioning and the danger of thought in relationship

Sample lesson plan based on March 22, 1981 Krishnamurti dialogue

Topic	Activity	Time (minutes)
Introduce learning outcomes • Describe general objective: to engage in a dialogue of deep inquiry into conditioning and the danger of thought in relationship	Instructor speaks; participants listen and ask questions; all engage and contribute	2
Learning outcome #1: Conditioning and self-knowledge • Define conditioning and its sources • Identify consequences	Dialogue (open discussion) – whole group; facilitated and directed by instructor	8
Learning outcome #2: Psychological progress; individual and society • Examine individual becoming, • collective effort, striving, and time	Dialogue (open discussion) – whole group; facilitated and directed by instructor	10
Learning outcome #3: The self, consciousness, and knowledge • Discuss what is the self; the 'me' • Consciousness	Dialogue (open discussion) – whole group; facilitated and directed by instructor	10
Learning outcome #4: The process of thought, and the danger of thought in relationship • Describe content of consciousness and process of thought	Dialogue (open discussion) – whole group; facilitated and directed by instructor	14
Learning outcome #5: What should we do? • How to break through conditioning	Dialogue (open discussion) – whole group; facilitated and directed by instructor	6
Total time		50

What I propose is that Krishnamurti's approach could be adapted and applied in classroom settings in higher education. And though Krishnamurti facilitated dialogue sessions without the use of notes, without a lesson plan, and relying mainly on improvisation, what I perceive is that he had achieved in this dialogue a highly skilled level of facilitation. My sense, then, is that instructors who are inclined to explore a more holistic or dialogic format for some of their lessons, or some component of their lessons, could adapt some or all of this approach's features to the benefit of their professional practice and their students. While it could be argued that Krishnamurti's skill at facilitation could have been attributed to his intimate and profound understanding of his subject matter – its thematic content, and also to the many opportunities he had over five decades to develop and perfect his approach, still, it seems to me that both these factors – facilitation skill, on the one hand, and familiarity with the thematic content of the material, on the other – come into play in a variety of learning encounters in higher education, and should not necessarily be seen as available only to someone with Krishnamurti's skill. No doubt such educational talents can be learned and developed, not to mention that many educators already have the skills required to apply Krishnamurti's approach. That said, whether such an approach can be practically applied in higher education, given a variety of factors inherent in higher education today, such as competitive assessment, for example, remains to be explored. But, as I intend to show in chapter 3, Krishnamurti's approach – what I would like to call "insight education" – aligns well with several similar approaches offered recently by educators, including a few that have been applied in higher education, with some measure of success. Indeed, what I see is that Krishnamurti's approach fits nicely within a recent trend among many educators who have proposed and who practice alternative, more holistic approaches.

Strategies and techniques of Krishnamurti's dialogue approach

What does Krishnamurti do when he facilitates such a dialogue? What does he refrain from doing? What does he do to set up the most suitable environment for his approach? In other words, what specific strategies and techniques would an educator consider when adapting or emulating Krishnamurti's approach?

How does Krishnamurti create an atmosphere suited to his approach to dialogue?

- Krishnamurti builds rapport with the participants in a way that minimizes participants' relying on his authority as a highly regarded and well-known figure.
- Krishnamurti aims for a collaborative dialogue, even if he does most of the talking and directs the focus of the inquiry.
- Small groups are better suited to this approach, since it seems likely smaller groups would more easily be able to foster a closer rapport and collaboration.

What does Krishnamurti do in his approach?

- Krishnamurti emphasizes precise use of language
- Krishnamurti is polite and respectful with all participants
- Krishnamurti is intimately familiar with his thematic content, so that he is able to direct, lead, and facilitate a collaborative dialogue into abstract and complex concepts and themes.
- Krishnamurti skillfully asks questions, to explore deeper meanings for concepts and problems, but also to elicit self-reflection by participants.
- Krishnamurti prods and coaxes with probing questions meant to instigate insight for inward, psychological, transformation.
- Krishnamurti improvises; he does not rely on notes or a written lesson plan.

- Krishnamurti is skilled at listening intently to participants, and often will take up their language and modify it to suit the focus of the dialogue.
- Krishnamurti keeps the focus on the theme.
- Krishnamurti keeps the dialogue moving forward and does not allow it to digress.

What does Krishnamurti refrain from doing?

- Krishnamurti does not establish an agenda, though in public talks he will often begin with an introduction of a topic or continue with the topic last discussed in his previous talk in the same place and with a similar audience. (Many of Krishnamurti's talks were part of a series scheduled for a particular place on specific days.)
- Krishnamurti does not tell participants how to think or what to do, although he will sometimes share from his own experience, to suggest what is possible. He prefers to point out problems and talk through them together, often using questions to direct the dialogue in a particular course.
- Krishnamurti does not expect that participants will gain any particular knowledge or that they will change in accord with what he says.
- Krishnamurti does not strive to achieve any specific learning outcomes.
- Krishnamurti does not assess, judge, or evaluate what participants learn.
- Krishnamurti rarely interrupts and is careful not to cut off participants' contributions except in those rare circumstances where a comment or question is likely to divert the dialogue away from its thematic focus.

- Krishnamurti refrains from providing a straightforward answer to questions he feels should be more closely examined by the group, although he will on occasion provide his ideas when he feels it necessary to keep the dialogue moving forward.

Krishnamurti strategies and techniques described

In this section, I describe Krishnamurti's dialogic repertoire of strategies and techniques, with examples referenced to dialogue paragraph numbers in appendix A as they appear in the flow of the dialogue.

Krishnamurti prefers relying on precise language. (7, 9, 12).

Krishnamurti uses questions to probe for meaning. (7, 9, 12).

Krishnamurti agrees with participants' comments and elaborates with a more complete explanation and a modification when he feels the need to keep the dialogue focused. (16).

Krishnamurti restates a word used by a participant so that the dialogue can proceed with greater precision. For example, Krishnamurti takes the word "condition" used by one of the participants and changes "condition" to "conditioning," which gives him the opportunity to move the dialogue forward by introducing one of his key themes, that of conditioning. (16).

Krishnamurti agrees when it makes sense to do so, and then elaborates, as in "Yes. But either you accept the conditioning…" (16).

Krishnamurti encourages further discussion and examination with pointed questions, such as "who has projected the goal?" (20). Asking the right questions at the right times is an essential feature of Krishnamurti's approach to collaborative dialogue.

Krishnamurti facilitates and directs a collaborative dialogue that flows forward in a reasoned and logical fashion. (24 – 34).

Krishnamurti engages participants in dialogue with appropriate, well-placed questions. (throughout)

Krishnamurti politely invites feedback. "Right, sir?" (26).

Krishnamurti holds the focus by occasionally offering a brief summary of what has been said. (28).

Krishnamurti uses "no" when appropriate – to hold focus; to change the flow of the inquiry; to move the dialogue forward; to correct participant thinking. As an example of the last, at (28), Krishnamurti says "No. We never 'are.' We are always becoming." He makes a subtle, but significant, correction here, because "becoming" is another theme for Krishnamurti. Krishnamurti improvises by taking a comment from a participant and adding to it or modifying what has been said, with the aim of moving the dialogue forward in the direction he wants to take.

Krishnamurti expresses his own limitations in communicating ideas, which tends to build rapport and help make participants more at ease and thus more inclined to engage in the dialogue. In 34, for example, he says "I don't know if I'm making myself clear."

Krishnamurti holds the focus on the problem; for example, with psychological becoming, at 40 to 56 (and others). Krishnamurti's approach seems at first to flow freely, but close reading reveals that Krishnamurti is skilled at holding the focus on themes he wants to explore.

Krishnamurti uses real-life analogies, as for example, in 56 when he starts by saying "suppose I am."

Krishnamurti improvises. For example, he takes DS' comment about trying to follow a pre-ordained path, and he switches back to knowing oneself. (56).

Krishnamurti balances talking and telling, on the one hand, with listening and observing, on the other. Also, Krishnamurti balances his role as facilitator, one who is directing and leading, on the one hand, with his preference to collaborate and aim for shared understanding, on the other. We see this in 56, especially when he says "we think all that requires time. I question that. That's all." This statement directs the flow of the conversation toward the concept of time, method, and process. But rather than flatly declare his doubt around the necessity for time to be involved, he introduces this notion to the group gently and politely as his own skepticism. Expressed this way, participants are more likely to reflect on his contentions with an open mind, rather than accepting what Krishnamurti says without checking to see how it fits with their thinking.

Krishnamurti engages participants by asking questions, and by prodding participants to dig deeper; to go into a deeper inquiry. And also asks questions to help participants develop their own thinking, and to revisit their own perspective on the problem being discussed. (throughout)

Krishnamurti introduces real life examples to elucidate complex processes and concepts. (56).

Krishnamurti facilitates insight in the minds of participants. For example, at 57 to 67, Krishnamurti responds to the participant's comment about the goal of wanting to change a conditioned view. Krishnamurti here suggests that once a person sees the impact and consequence of nationalism, for example, that then the conditioning influence of nationalism evaporates. Participant RW says "to want to not be there is a goal (that would require time, or a process or method of some kind), but Krishnamurti says "no; I see the consequences of nationalism and it's finished." And at this point, DS asks "is that why you are saying then there is no time involved," and Krishnamurti replies "that's what I am trying to get at." Now, it seems, participant DS has an insight into the point Krishnamurti is making, and he expresses this insight when he says: "It just happens when you see the problem." I get the impression that, notably, DS has had this insight through his realization of a wholly new way of looking at his experience and his thinking, and not as a result of absorbing any knowledge handed down from some external source, such as Krishnamurti.

What we see in Krishnamurti's approach, also, is that sometimes Krishnamurti responds to a question with his own question; then, possibly follows up another question with still another question. This seems to be a natural and organic approach to dialogue that Krishnamurti

employs as he facilitates and encourages a closer, deeper, examination of a concept or theme. He puts questions to the group, or to a participant, as a response to their own questions, coaxing them to go further into the inquiry. (92 – 98, for example).

Krishnamurti uses "no" when correcting course or correcting a participant's comment. In other words, Krishnamurti is not averse to using the negative when he finds it appropriate; there is no point, perhaps he feels, in being fuzzy. Krishnamurti even uses "no" twice if he needs to, which seems to place an emphasis on his correction. It could be suggested that this emphatic "no" seems to contradict the notion of not seeing Krishnamurti himself as an authority. What I sense, though, is that Krishnamurti uses "no" in this way in order to keep the dialogue in focus and moving forward to where he wants to take it. (86).

Krishnamurti connects related concepts to keep the dialogue focused. He avoids going off course by revealing certain important connections when necessary. (86).

While occasionally affirming a participant's contribution when it adds to shared understanding, Krishnamurti steers the dialogue back to the theme, if necessary, by asking a question but providing his answer to restore the focus. (94 – 106).

Krishnamurti listens with devoted attention and injects encouraging remarks and modifications, such as "yes," "not necessarily," "certainly," "we know all this." (120, 126, 128, 130, 132, and more).

Krishnamurti is always in control, never losing sight of the main themes that keep the dialogue in focus and moving forward. For example, in one section, he finds the right moment to bring the group back to “conditioning” by connecting “collective effort” with the desire for security. (134 - 162).

Krishnamurti's approach aims to be collaborative. Consider, for example, his contention that there must be an individual, inner, psychological revolution. Krishnamurti finds a way to inject this point into the dialogue through collaboration with the participants. Perhaps he is well aware that simply stating that contention without subjecting it to close dialogical investigation would unlikely lead to any change in perspective. (148 - 152).

Krishnamurti constantly moves the dialogue forward in the direction he wants to take, sometimes gradually but always moving forward. He is not deterred by doubting questions and comments, and actually seems to recognize how valuable such questions are to shared understanding. Also, participant questions – especially those that are challenging – are perhaps the best way to gauge the group’s level of engagement and understanding. (131 - 140).

One of the most significant features of Krishnamurti's approach is that it often instigates insight – a fresh new perspective. At 159 to 161, for example, EM seems to have come around to accepting the notion of commonality of consciousness.

Krishnamurti prefers not to tell participants what to think, nor does he want to tell them what they need to know. (178 - 196).

Krishnamurti blends questions, affirmations, modifications, corrections, and clarifications, all of which help to foster shared understanding. (200 - 208).

Krishnamurti often uses a series of questions to move the dialogue forward. When the dialogue arrives at a key concept that he feels requires closer examination, such as the concept of "thought," for example, he follows up with the question "what is thinking?" and the question encourages participants to reflect on thought differently, which also helps to move the dialogue forward. (206 - 208). Krishnamurti often prefers to hold off with his definition of a key concept. He could simply tell the group what "thought" is, in his view (he does eventually), but he prefers at this point in the dialogue to hold off, realizing that participants will be better able to appreciate his meaning if they reflect first on their own ideas.

Though improvisational, Krishnamurti's approach involves leading and directing the dialogue and inquiry. He maintains control of the discussion throughout. (208 - 227).

Krishnamurti often explains, restates, and summarizes a problem, concept, or theme; sometimes with a concrete example. (255).

Krishnamurti sometimes says that he is not sure if he is being clear, suggesting that he accepts his responsibility as the facilitator of the dialogue, a responsibility that includes recognizing the limitations of language for communication as well as his own personal limitations. (253).

Important questions and problems receive greater emphasis when Krishnamurti suggests that they should pause to reflect and more closely examine the problem. (266, 270).

Krishnamurti leads in a kind of dance of question and answer, where he seems quite comfortable addressing participants' doubts about his contentions. In the exchange from 293 to 324, for example, Krishnamurti points out his ideas about knowledge and relationship, asks questions about experience, and affirms certain points made by participants. However, he refrains, for the most part, from supplying an answer directly. Rather, he invites the group as a whole to discuss important concepts and to come up with an answer in a collaborative way.

Krishnamurti develops a theme using a collaborative approach as far as he can take it, but he is not reluctant to state his own understanding of a problem when the dialogue does not get there (381 – 398).

Krishnamurti's approach has the potential to instigate insight. Problems and concepts that may have seemed vague and abstract can sometimes be understood instantaneously, like a flash of light. At the final exchanges in the dialogue, for example, EM expresses this kind of insight, with great enthusiasm, when he says: “Ah, that's thought. Right. I see. I see. Yes.” And then, further confirmation of this insight comes when EM says: “I see. We are really at a plane where thought is not being used as a process.” EM’s use of the metaphor of sight for his newfound understanding is an apt – and also common – description of a moment of insight. (391, 393). See also the table of dialogic strategies and techniques at appendix B.

Principles of Krishnamurti's dialogic approach

What are the principles that guide Krishnamurti's dialogic approach, as found in this 1981 dialogue with a small group of American university students? These flow from the analysis of the dialogue:

1. Adopts and demonstrates a collaborative attitude and strives for shared understanding
2. Balances telling with listening
3. Balances allowing flow of dialogue with holding the focus; always in control of the flow
4. Always moving the dialogue forward
5. Uses a variety of expressions to engage participants
6. Relies on questions, affirmations, paraphrases, and modifications of participant contributions
7. Brings in simple real-life examples and analogies to elucidate complex concepts
8. Improvises – does not rely on notes or a lesson plan
9. Not overly concerned with achieving learning outcomes or change in participants
10. Not concerned with evaluation or assessment of participant learning
11. Open to skepticism, doubt, and challenges and responds fully
12. Not averse to using "no" when correction is necessary to hold the focus
13. Prefers use of precise language
14. Relies on a limited number of common themes
15. Suggests a pause when needed
16. Cautions against hasty conclusions
17. Establishes and builds rapport with the group
18. Adopts a polite and respectful attitude
19. Expresses his own shortcomings to help participants feel at ease

20. Diminishes a sense of his authority as much as possible

21. Prods and coaxes participants to dig deeper; to closely examine themes and concepts

22. Uses inclusive language to build rapport

23. Displays a serious attitude but injects humour if an opportunity arises naturally

24. Establishes a setting that is most conducive to flashes of insight in participants

Krishnamurti's dialogic approach – adaptable in higher education?

This study demonstrates that through a close reading and analysis of a suitable Krishnamurti dialogue session, it is possible to delineate and appreciate a unique approach to dialogue and inquiry intended to instigate insight. Krishnamurti's dialogic approach, with its strategies and techniques, recognizes participants as whole beings with intellectual, emotional, and spiritual needs. This study, so far, also shows that Krishnamurti's approach, as yet relatively unexamined, lends itself to adaptation in higher education. An educator would not necessarily need to have Krishnamurti's skills or knowledge to make good use of some or all of the strategies and techniques of Krishnamurti's approach. Moreover, while it could be argued that Krishnamurti's approach is not feasible in the world of higher education today, I intend to show in chapter three that Krishnamurti's approach fits neatly within a recent trend of educators who propose and experiment with alternative, holistic approaches. In chapter four, I touch on some of the ways educators could take Krishnamurti's approach and adapt, emulate, or adopt parts or all of it in their own professional practice.

Chapter Three

1. Recap and introduction

So far, in Chapter One, we have looked at who Krishnamurti was and what he thought about education and the significance of life, with an eye to exploring how his philosophy of education and approach to dialogic inquiry might be beneficially applied in higher education. Also, we have identified and described Krishnamurti's strategies and techniques in his dialogic approach, based on a two-fold analysis of one particular recorded and transcribed dialogue Krishnamurti had held with American college students in 1981. To review, the aim of this study is to examine whether Krishnamurti's dialogic approach has a fitting role to play in the growing trend of educational philosophy and practice shifting to a more holistic attitude, an attitude that views the role of education as transcending the bounds of knowledge transmission and engaging participants as whole beings with, physical, emotional, intellectual, spiritual, and social needs.

This third chapter locates Krishnamurti's approach within the context of this growing trend, and shows how it might be aligned and consistent with other approaches that make up this recent trend. Such approaches include theoretical proposals offered for scholarly feedback and comment, and also proposals that have been applied in education practice. Some of these proposals and applications are expressly informed by Krishnamurti's philosophy of education. Some are not. Among educators with approaches consistent with Krishnamurti's approach, some describe their approach as "holistic" or "integrated," "education for wisdom and compassion," "spiritual" (Miller 2006, 2002, and 2000), "transformation of consciousness" (Hart 2009), and "meditative inquiry" (Kumar 2013). Walker (1993) sees a resemblance in Krishnamurti's dialogic approach with what is often referred to as a "Socratic" dialogue

approach. One of the educational approaches not expressly informed by Krishnamurti's approach, but, as I will show, closely aligned with it, is transformative learning, or what some refer to as emancipatory learning (Mezirow and Taylor 2009). One interesting indicator of how the two approaches align is that Mezirow speaks of "transformative insight" as integral to transformative learning, and as discussed in Chapter One, transformative insight – an insight that transforms a participant – is very much at the heart of Krishnamurti's approach as well.

Others have studied Krishnamurti's general approach to education (Mukerji 2006), and Krishnamurti's discourse style has been the subject of some scholarly analysis (Dashti and Mehrpur 2017, Rodrigues 2001, Walker 1993). Also, several biographers have touched on Krishnamurti's discourse approach, but these are only brief descriptions meant to aid in the discussion of Krishnamurti's discourse themes. This study is different in the way it explores and proposes that Krishnamurti employed a principled approach to dialogic inquiry that is most conducive to instigating insight. However, there has been one prior comprehensive analysis of Krishnamurti's dialogue approach that needs to be mentioned here. Rodrigues (2001) analyzed the verbatim transcript of Krishnamurti's last talks in Saanen, Switzerland in 1985, shortly before Krishnamurti's death in 1986. Rodrigues does two things that relate closely with this study. He describes Krishnamurti's style of integrating common themes in dialogue, and he also highlights the role insight plays in Krishnamurti's approach.

While this present study takes these previous educational approaches and studies into account, its main contribution is to identify and describe specific strategies, techniques, and principles that make up the fully developed Krishnamurti dialogic approach as it might be applied in small groups or seminar size groups in higher education. This chapter, then, presents an overview of several recently developed progressive and holistic approaches to higher education, and proposes that Krishnamurti had developed a dialogic approach that goes

beyond existing theory and practice. For example, while Krishnamurti's approach is very much concerned with instigating insight, readers should note that Krishnamurti's description of insight differs from the descriptions of insight described by these other approaches. This will be discussed more fully toward the end of this chapter and in Chapter Four. The point of this study is to bring attention to the potential application of "insight education", as Krishnamurti might have described it in the context of his vision for what he called "right education." To start off, this chapter looks briefly at three important figures in the development of progressive and holistic approaches to higher education in North America. These are Paulo Freire, John Miller, and Jack Mezirow. Following that, several other notable examples of relatively new appro aches will be discussed more fully.

2. Recent trends in progressive, holistic approaches in education

2.1 Paulo Freire's critical consciousness

Though Brazilian, Paulo Freire (1921 – 1997) has had considerable influence in the recent growth and development of late 20th-century philosophy of education in the English-speaking world, mainly through his publication *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, which introduced the notion of education based on a reconceptualized perspective on the relationship between teacher, student, and society. Freire's influence on North American educators was enhanced also following several visits to the United States. One of Freire's innovative formulations, most relevant to this study, is his notion of "critical consciousness," which he de scribed as the ability to look at reality differently with the aim of changing that perspective in a meaningful way. (Freire 1990 22-23). Development of critical consciousness can help learners to discern and acknowledge unconscious, hidden, images and representations that have emotional influence in their daily lives. Once such discernment is realized, learners are then able to undergo a transformation of consciousness that liberates them from socially constructed and oppressive

self-identification. While apparent similarities can be found between Krishnamurti's approach and Freire's, for the purposes of this present study we should simply note the possible influence of Freire on those educational philosophies discussed in this chapter. This is not to suggest that Krishnamurti was influenced by Freire, but rather to note the growing trend toward progressive and holistic education that gained momentum in the latter half of the 20th century in America. This movement shared a diversity of influences and also a shared motivation to promote an education of liberation, emancipation, freedom, and love, as a means to achieve both individual and social transformation for a more peaceful world.

2.2 Jack Mezirow' transformative learning

In the late 1970s, Jack Mezirow (1923 – 2014) founded an approach to adult learning that he called transformative learning. Mezirow's approach placed the focus of education on encouraging a change of self-identity. He described the basis of his approach as a "critical dimension of learning intended to help learners recognize and then re-evaluate assumptions and expectations that frame their thinking, feeling and acting." (Mezirow 2000 12). Mezirow's transformative learning aims to initiate significant long-lasting changes, as well as continuing debate and critique, in fields as diverse as social activism, management of human resources, and higher education. Transformative learning is a theory still expanding, and it has attracted the attention of educators from a wide variety of theoretical backgrounds. Transformative learning will be discussed more fully later in this chapter.

2.3 John Miller's holistic curriculum

John (Jack) Miller, professor in Curriculum, Teaching, and Learning at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto,[6] has been involved with holistic education for over four decades and has authored and edited twenty books on holistic learning and contemplative practices in education. Miller has written about Krishnamurti's holistic education (Miller 2001) with approval. But, though he has been informed by Krishnamurti's educational philosophy, Miller has developed a theoretical outlook and approach that does not necessarily rely on Krishnamurti, but is perhaps a blend of Miller's understanding of several educational philosophers, on the one hand, together with his own perspective based on many years spent educating educators, on the other. Miller's approach will be discussed more fully later in this chapter.

3.0 Three categories of progressive, holistic approaches to higher education

In this chapter, examples of recent developments in progressive, holistic approaches to education are discussed in the following sections based on these three categories:

1. Holistic and transformative approaches;
2. Holistic and transformative approaches that are somewhat consistent and aligned with Krishnamurti's philosophy of education; and
3. Holistic and transformative approaches that are somewhat consistent and aligned with Krishnamurti's philosophy of education, and that are also expressly informed by Krishnamurti.

[6] See University of Toronto, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, at https://www.oise.utoronto.ca/ctl/Faculty_Profiles/1265/John_Miller.html accessed June 7, 2019.

The next part of this chapter (section 3) gives a brief overview of several examples in the first category, while sections 4 and 5 describe more fully two examples of each of the second and third categories above.

Seven examples of holistic and transformative approaches

3.1 Ian Harris' education for peace

Ian Harris is the author of *Peace Education*, director of the International Peace Research Association Foundation, and a founding board member of the Wisconsin Institute for Peace and Conflict Studies. Harris (2003) says leaders in societies resort more and more these days to peace education strategies as a way to counter what he views as an epidemic of violence. What he advocates for schools and communities is to engage in an education about nonviolence. While he is informed by the nonviolent approaches of Gandhi and Martin Luther King, Jr., Harris refers with approval to what Krishnamurti had to say about education and peace. He notes, for example, that Krishnamurti laid the responsibility for building a peaceful and enlightened society on educators. Harris points out Krishnamurti's distinction between intellect and intelligence, when Krishnamurti stated that educators should endeavour to engage learners' intelligence, which integrates reason with emotion, rather than engaging only their intellect, which functions without emotion. (Krishnamurti, 1953, 64) Also, Harris' education for peace affirms Krishnamurti's contention that the key to right education is self-knowledge, and that with self-knowledge a feeling of love arises, and that love alone can bring about relationships grounded in peace. (Krishnamurti 1981 113).

3.2 Tobin Hart's education for wisdom and compassion

Tobin Hart, professor of psychology at the University of West Georgia, blends the educational wisdom of Plato, A. N. Whitehead, William James, Aurobindo Ghose, R. W. Emerson, and

Krishnamurti with transpersonal and consciousness studies, scientific developments in learning, education theory and practice, and philosophy, into what he calls “education as transformative.” (2009 7). What Hart proposes is an approach to education designed for “inner significance,” one that provides an opportunity for "bringing forth" the inner person. For Hart, educators should create an experience that offers opportunities for learners to experience “unfolding of consciousness,” (2009 7), instead of an education intent on instilling more and more information into their minds. Education then, for Hart, becomes not just transmission of information and knowledge, but should aim to bring about a psychological transformation. Hart’s process of knowing and learning has six interrelated layers. Information (1) is the surface layer, and information opens up to knowledge (2), where direct experience brings together different pieces of information into a whole body of knowledge. Knowledge then allows for intelligence (3), and beyond intelligence learners gain access to intuition, analysis, and understanding. When these develop, learners can move from the power of intelligence to “the eye of the heart, a way of knowing that serves character and community.” (4) Experience then cultivates wisdom (5), “which blends insight into what is true with an ethic of what is right,” (2009 2), a state of being that can lead to transformation (6). This learning process, claims Hart, can happen in an instant or gradually over time, but it never damages the process of information transmission. Rather, learning now becomes “richer, gives it context, and brings it alive.” (2009 3).

3.3 Gnanakan’s integrated education

Ken Gnanakan is an Indian educator who teaches, and advocates, an approach to education he calls “Integrated Learning." His approach is influenced by Krishnamurti in so far as Gnanakan feels that Krishnamurti saw that the main function of education should be to show learners

how to be integrated, how to act as individuals capable of dealing with life as a whole. Gnanakan's integrated learning, informed as it is by figures such as Tagore, Gandhi, Maslow, and Krishnamurti, privileges the idea that learners learn best when learning is "part of their life's experience." (Gnanakan 13). Contrary to most current education systems, which try to connect various disjointed pieces of knowledge that are never actually experienced together, integrated learning connects real-life experiences to form one interconnected whole, and thereby achieves a more complete kind of learning. As Gnanakan puts it, integrated learning includes the ideas of "holism, interconnected curricula, and relevance to the social and physical context in its entirety," where learning becomes integral to the whole process of life. (Gnanakan 13).

3.4 Elizabeth Tisdell's spirituality in higher education

Elizabeth Tisdell coordinates the doctoral program in Adult Education at Penn State. Her research interests include spirituality and culture in adult learning, with a recent leaning toward the role of meditation in education.[7] Tisdell does not rely for her educational approach on Krishnamurti's philosophy or views about education. Her educational approach and philosophy of education involves looking at how spirituality relates to cultural identity and how that connection might help to develop a culturally responsive approach to higher education. For Tisdell, education that is culturally responsive is both a spiritual and intellectual pursuit. She argues that "for critical multicultural teaching to have transformative power, it must engage in and help learners explore and reclaim their cultural identity." (Tisdell 2006 19). As Tisdell explains, this reclamation process is all about the spiritual, because it is the

[7] See https://harrisburg.psu.edu/faculty-and-staff/elizabeth-tisdell-edd accessed June 12, 2019

spiritual aspect of personality that most fully engages learners' cultural imagination and creativity. In Tisdell's approach, spirituality in higher education is not about pushing a religious agenda but instead spirituality "is about the core of our interior world – it is about human consciousness, meaning making, the affective dimension of our being, our deepest sense of values, and a sense of mystery that defies definition." (2006 21). This notion of spirituality is at the core of Tisdell's approach to educational philosophy and practice. She feels that educators should consider its role in learning "because meaning and purpose questions pervade all areas of our being and learning." (2006 21). A key component of Tisdell's approach is her view that "learners construct knowledge in different ways," and that knowledge comes from not just rational and intellectual activities, but also from spiritual pursuits "related to learners' cultural identity, their personal experience, history, and relationship to the community." (2006 23). What Tisdell's approach reflects most of all is a "more holistic approach to learning that gets at the interconnectedness of all things," (2006 23) a notion she considers to "touch on the spiritual." (2006 23).

3.5 Michelle Tanaka's transformative inquiry

Michele Tanaka is Assistant Professor, Educational Foundations and Teacher Education at the University of Victoria. Tanaka explores how beliefs and attitudes transform education to help create more vibrant, meaningful, and sustainable spaces of learning and teaching. Transformative Inquiry aims to bring learners' attention to social, cultural, and ecological influences on education and life as a whole. Transformative Inquiry is an approach that encourages educators to ask these questions, among others:

- How do my attitudes, beliefs and values affect my teaching?
- What do learners really care about?

- How do I/we build a healthy learning community in my classroom?
- What matters in our broader communities, both local and global?
- What is my responsibility in tending to our environmental crisis?
- What do students offer to help resolve environmental dilemmas?

Tanaka encourages educators to step away from the comfort of traditional educational systems, and instead initiate a kind of "confusion that might lead to empathic inquiry, as a departure from modern reason."[8] As the name suggests, transformative inquiry commits to transformation, with participants engaged in learning that seeks to overcome divisions, and to demolish the tradition of teacher as transmitter of knowledge. Tanaka's approach intends to lead participants to see education as a transformation in thought, feelings and actions.

3.6 Paul Herder's constructivist education

Paul Herder describes his constructivist approach in his book *Revolutionary Minds: The Educational Vision of J. Krishnamurti and Its Practice*.[9] He notes that Krishnamurti's ideas "were at odds with the prevailing educational values and practices," and that after Krishnamurti's death in 1986 "his work was largely ignored." (Herder 2012, iv.). Herder discusses Krishnamurti's view that the aim of education should focus on awakening intelligence, and that such an awakening can take place only within the context of dialogic inquiry. Also, Herder describes the conditions that optimally nurture a learner's inquisitive mind, a mind engaged not only in academic achievements, but more importantly in self-discovery. Herder's educational philosophy combines education theory, cognitive science, and his personal

[8] See https://www.uvic.ca/education/inquiry/
[9] See https://oakgroveschoolojai.blogspot.com/2012/09/revolutionary-minds-introduction-by.html

experience as an educator applying Krishnamurti's approach. Herder refers to his adaptation of Krishnamurti's approach as constructivist. Herder agrees with Krishnamurti's assertion that education must be the catalyst for a transformed society, and Herder also argues that such a catalyst can only be fostered by educators who engage in inquiry in the classroom. In Herder's view, constructivist education differs from traditional approaches that view learners as blank slates passively absorbing knowledge. Instead, a constructivist approach to education sees learners as individuals who construct learning not only from what they hear from educators and read in books, but also from their past life experiences and prior knowledge.

3.7 Walker's education for self-knowledge

Foster Walker was a professor in Philosophy of Education at the University of Alberta. He advocated for a view of education that strives to live up to its most serious meaning, that of "enabling people to activate their own powers of discernment concerning what is true and what is false; what is trivial, ugly, and destructive; and what is fundamentally important, beautiful, and beneficial." Walker aims to direct attention to Krishnamurti's mostly unrecognized contribution to educational philosophy, a contribution focused on dialogic inquiry for fostering self-knowledge. As such, Walker is not so much a proponent of his own approach to education, but instead is a keen advocate for Krishnamurti's approach to receive greater consideration. Most relevant for this study, though, is Walker's contention that Krishnamurti's notion of transformative insight describes an event that can only be experienced "in the kind of relational dialogue advocated by Krishnamurti." (Walker 1993 45).

Two examples of holistic and transformative approaches that are somewhat consistent and aligned with Krishnamurti's philosophy of education, but that are not expressly informed by Krishnamurti.

This section of the chapter presents a broader overview of two of the approaches introduced briefly earlier. While neither of these approaches rely on Krishnamurti's philosophy or his educational approach, each merits a fuller description in this study. American Jack Mezirow's transformative learning is influential and continues to expand in scope and application. It has also has received a great deal of attention from scholars, not only from those interested in progressive education theory and practice, but also from others engaged in a variety of fields of knowledge. And the reason for giving Canadian John Miller's approach a broader overview in this study is that he has demonstrated over several decades, in his educational practice and in his writings, the adaptability and the expansive potential of transformative learning. And most relevant to this study's objectives, both of these approaches help to shore up the contention that Krishnamurti's dialogic approach, with its focus on transformative insight, and with its holistic attitude towards learning, could be seen by educators as adaptable and viable for practical application.

4.1 Jack Mezirow's Transformative learning

According to Mezirow, transformative learning helps learners "transform… taken-for-granted frames of reference (meaning perspectives…) to make them more inclusive, discriminating, open… reflective," so that they serve as more true and justified guides to action. (Mezirow 2000 7-8). For Mezirow, the focus of learning is the individual, not the collective, since social transformation is the combined impact of many transformed individuals. This is consistent with Krishnamurti's approach. Mezirow described four kinds of learning:

- acquisition of new knowledge and skills,

- elaboration on existing knowledge and skills,
- revision of meaning schemes (change in beliefs and values), and
- revision of meaning perspectives (change in worldview and relationship of self to the world).

Transformative learning involves the fourth kind of learning referred to above, a "perspective transformation" process with three dimensions: changes in understanding the self, belief systems, and lifestyle. Transformative learning is the expansion of consciousness accompanied by a revised worldview and a transformed sense of self, a process for evaluating the contents of the unconscious to critically analyze assumptions and underlying premises. Mezirow acknowledges that, for practical purposes, this kind of perspective transformation does not happen frequently in learning environments, because transformation usually results from what he called a "disorienting dilemma," a dilemma brought on by a life crisis or traumatic event. On the other hand, transformation also comes about, as Mezirow sees it, from gradual accumulation of transformations in meaning schemes over a period of time. Not only that, but even less dramatic predicaments, some of which can be simulated or created in an educational encounter, can also encourage transformation. As we saw in Chapter One, Krishnamurti rejected any suggestion of a gradual or accumulated, time-bound transformation. But transformative learning, as described by Mezirow, emphasizes critical self-reflection, which is also a focus of Krishnamurti's approach, though let us keep in mind Krishnamurti's caution against self-analysis. Transformative learning promotes critical reflection to understand the social and cultural motivations behind needs and desires. With this reflection and self-knowledge, learners can develop greater autonomy and build more authentic relationships.

Mezirow felt it is the job of educators to help learners enhance their capacity to function as self-directed agents in their own learning process.

Scholars have critiqued Mezirow's work as being more a theory of individual rather than social transformation, and also as overly reliant on rational self-examination and critical reflection as an effective means for challenging and changing long-held beliefs.[10] Perhaps similar criticism is justifiable with respect to Krishnamurti's approach. However, as Tisdell rightly points out, transformative learning has contributed, and continues to contribute, a great deal to holistic educational approaches if at least in the way it promotes and describes practical techniques educators and learners can implement on their way to transformed perspectives. As such, transformative learning, as a progressive educational approach, remains both relevant and effective. Tisdell also reminds us that Mezirow agrees with critics that the best view of transformative learning is to see it as a theory in progress. She notes that the boundaries of transformative learning continue to expand, and cites several expansionary trends flowing directly from transformative learning, with a variety of applications, such as considering asymmetrical power relations, dealing with diversity issues, attending to cross-cultural problems, and developing a better understanding of "others" who belong to different groups and communities. These all serve to foster social change through individual change. Further, while transformative learning expansions rarely embark on discussions of spirituality, Tisdell is right to recognize, for example, Tobin Hart's educational approach (see above), with its

[10] See, for example, Kucukaydin, Ilhan and Cranton, Patricia. (2012). "Critically Questioning the Discourse of Transformative Learning Theory." *Adult Education Quarterly* 63(1) 43–56; Tisdell, Elizabeth. (2006). "Spirituality, Cultural Identity, and Epistemology in Culturally Responsive Teaching in Higher Education." *Multicultural Perspectives*, 8:3, 19-25, DOI: 10.1207/s15327892mcp0803_4; and Illeris, Knud. (2014) *Transformative Learning and Identity.* Abingdon: Routledge, especially at page 146.

application of transformative learning from a "transpersonal psychology and evolutionary consciousness perspective that very much integrates attention to the spiritual." (Tisdell 2003 89).

One of the main educational benefits of transformative learning is that it engages participants in meaningful learning experiences that challenge existing beliefs. These meaningful learning experiences are transformative in the way they

> "foster radical shifts in one's consciousness, in one's ways of being," [and can also be] "deeply emotional, evoking powerful feelings, such as fear, grief, loss, regret, and anger, but also sometimes joy, wonder, and awe. At times, these experiences may leave us feeling deeply moved or shaken to our core. We are left with the feeling that life will not be as it was before, that this experience has created a sense that we cannot go back to the way we were before the experience." (Dirkx 129-130)

In Mezirow's conception of transformative learning, such experiences constitute what he refers to as disorienting dilemmas, experiences that cause shock and trauma. Transformative learning scholar John Dirkx describes these disorienting dilemmas as experiences that often bring emotional pain and struggle, but that the disorientation also offers an opportunity "to reflect on and re-examine aspects of our lives that we may not have thought about for many years, if ever." (Dirkx 131). Proponents of transformative learning have developed a widely accepted description of its six core components. First is individual experience, consisting of what each learner brings to, and experiences in, the education encounter. Second is critical reflection that questions assumptions and beliefs. Third is dialogue, the discourse approach that best promotes inquiry and skepticism into preconceived truths, beliefs, and assumptions. Fourth is a holistic orientation, which engages ways of knowing other than intellectual ways, such as through felt emotions and relationships. Fifth is an awareness of context, where learners appreciate many different learning activities and settings, their prior experiences, and

their background in the context of society as a whole. The sixth component, and perhaps the most difficult to apply, deals with establishing authentic relationships through an attitude that enhances rapport, reduces tension, and enhances an open-minded outlook with attentive listening and greater acceptance of new ideas. (Meesuaisinta et. al 925).

4.2 John Miller's holistic education

Another proponent of extending transformative learning to the sphere of the spiritual is John Miller. Miller discusses his notion of letting go of knowledge instead of adding knowledge, and also encourages learners to take up meditation to quiet the mind so they can experience events and thoughts with more clarity. With meditation, says Miller, "… if I have a negative thought about another person, I can see that… thought floating by and not taking hold…, a realization [that]… lessen[s] the impact of the negative thought… and I can… let go of past conditioning." (Miller 2000 97). Readers will note the possible influence of Krishnamurti's philosophy in Miller's reference to "conditioning," but Miller does not rely solely on Krishnamurti in his approach to holistic education. Aside from meditation, Miller proposes cultivating attention to what is happening in the here and now, but without classifying events and thoughts as either good or bad. Miller expressly refers to Krishnamurti's conception of choiceless awareness, an awareness that Miller describes as seeing events and thoughts as they are, without repressing them, and without "labeling and analysis." (Miller 2000 101).

While arguably Krishnamurti may have had an inspirational influence on John Miller, Miller has nonetheless developed an educational approach informed by a blend of influences. In his latest book, *Love and compassion: Exploring their role in education* (2018), Miller describes his blended holistic approach as an educator of learners in the process of becoming professional teachers themselves. For Miller, a class size in the low twenties is best because

that allows for the most interaction. For setting, he arranges chairs in a circle, noting how meeting in a circle goes back to indigenous practices, and Miller feels the circle offers the most healing environment. He holds class in a room without desks and where no one uses a computer. Also, he prefers learners not take notes. Miller employs these setting features to enhance the sense of community in the classroom. Miller's educational practice relies on three different methods: transmission, transaction, and transformation (Miller 2018, 120). Transmission is simply conveying information or ideas, usually through a mini-lecture. Transaction involves students interacting with each other, usually in small groups, to discuss ideas, tasks, and problems. An example of the transaction method is when on the first day of his course in holistic curriculum, Miller gives participants a handout with six different conceptions of holistic education and they choose one they prefer to discuss in small groups. Miller's transformation method is about connecting with the inner life of the student. An example here is Miller's loving-kindness meditation they do at the beginning of class. For Miller, these three different methods of his holistic learning blend together in a way most conducive to bringing about meaningful learning. Also, Miller asks learners to engage in a practice; this could be to meditate for a period of time, or keep a gratitude journal, yoga or qigong, or volunteer work. Miller sees such practices contributing to a deeper sense of community, and this sense of community builds up into a collective energy that then enhances learning in the classroom. Miller describes what he calls education as "great learning," a kind of learning that is transformative, with learners often accomplishing successes that surprise even themselves. Miller shows how his students can be emotionally impacted, as he reproduces part of a student's essay called "Compassion Flows in Every Direction," which is about children of Holocaust survivors caring for their survivor parents:

> I learned a great deal about compassion, care and love from my Israeli family's stories. I had not expected to focus on the transmission of love from child to adult. At school, the love from teacher to child seems to be the natural way of life; however, this mini-study has compelled me to look at how compassion flows in every direction. It has been my folly not to develop this awareness earlier. I have recognized how children, when they have their needs met, have a great capacity to care for adults both emotionally and physically. During the course of writing this paper, I have begun to look for the compassion, patience and forgiveness that students show their teachers in my school, and I have been so pleased to notice many instances. It is a great capacity we are born with: when we feel loved, however imperfect that love may be, we respond with compassion and more love. It is a wonderful cycle. (Miller 2018 121)

For Miller, this is a beautiful expression of love in action, a most satisfying consequence flowing naturally from his blended approach to holistic education. Miller describes feeling honoured that this learner (teacher to be) would share such an emotional experience with his teacher. Miller says it is common for love to unfold as a consequence of his holistic education approach, and he shows this with this quote from another learner's essay:

> Simply put, I feel this course is about healing one another. To me, it is 'home' as it has been welcoming and inviting enough to allow me to develop close and intimate relationships with many people whom I had just met. I also find this course real, authentic and organic. It is first and foremost about us, one human being to another, about opening our hearts, reaching out and supporting one another, sharing our stories of joy and sorrow, our moments of vulnerability and allowing ourselves to feel empathy at a very deep and personal level. (Miller 2018 123)

Another student wrote in his course evaluation that "His (Jack's) loving energy creates the kind of space that allows students to explore safely. In this way, the students can bond. His emphasis on love is profound, absolutely necessary." For Miller, holistic education works best when it nurtures love, which arises when learning is in harmony with "connection, nonviolence, curiosity, and presence." Holistic educators, says Miller, should create a learning environment that gives learners opportunities to experience this harmony "through a variety of connections.

A connection can eventually lead to love whether it be love of knowledge or love of others." (Miller 2018 124)

5. Two examples of holistic and transformative approaches that are somewhat consistent and aligned with Krishnamurti's philosophy of education, and that are also expressly informed by Krishnamurti.

This section of the chapter presents an overview of two examples of approaches that are both consistent and aligned with Krishnamurti's philosophy of education, on the one hand, and also both informed significantly by it, on the other. The first is Ashwani Kumar's curriculum as meditative inquiry, and the second is David Moody's insight curriculum. The overview that follows describes these two approaches, and discusses how they might be compared with Krishnamurti's educational philosophy and dialogic approach.

5.1 Ashwani Kumar's curriculum as meditative inquiry

Ashwani Kumar is Associate Professor, Faculty of Education, at Mount Saint Vincent University in Halifax. His book, *Curriculum as Meditative Inquiry*, describes his educational philosophy and practice as an approach informed by both Krishnamurti and James Macdonald. Through his curriculum as meditative inquiry approach, he advocates a re-imagination of education as a way to understand transformation of consciousness. Curriculum as meditative inquiry is based on four principles: a) human consciousness is in conflict; b) education reflects the content of consciousness; c) meditative inquiry helps transform consciousness; and d) curriculum as meditative inquiry offers transformational experiences for both learners and educators. (Kumar 36). The first principle, that consciousness is in conflict, means that consciousness, which is the basis of our thinking, feeling, and action, is both common to all humanity and is in crisis, a principle very much consistent with Krishnamurti's philosophy. While cultural

differences lead to differences among peoples' consciousness, as far as Kumar sees it, there is a common consciousness characterized mostly by fear, conditioning, becoming, and inner and outward fragmentation. Furthermore, our social, political, economic, and educational problems are not independent of but, rather, are closely dependent on the content of consciousness. For Kumar, since consciousness consists of varied conditioning influences and divisions that are all closely connected, it is important to examine these conditioning influences and conflicts as connected concepts and processes, rather than to examine them separately. The second principle, that education reflects features of consciousness, points to the "interpenetrative relationship of consciousness and education." (Kumar 38). Educational institutions, says Kumar, are created by human consciousness, but are also affected by, and have an effect on, consciousness. Kumar emphasizes that because consciousness and educational institutions are linked and affect each other, it does not make sense to look in isolation at problems in education, such as discipline, for example. The third principle, that meditative inquiry transforms consciousness, focuses on meditative inquiry as a viable approach for addressing conflicts. Because consciousness is always in flux, it cannot be understood and transformed strictly by looking at "theoretical, intellectual, or philosophical approaches." (Kumar 38). And since intellectual approaches all depend on memory, which is based on past experience, intellectual approaches cannot deal with conflict and fear, because fear always arises in the present. Meditative inquiry, as Kumar describes it, is an approach that brings awareness of the activity of consciousness, but a kind of awareness that is not accompanied by analysis or judgment. (Note here the alignment of Kumar's description with Krishnamurti's notion of "choiceless awareness.). "On the one hand, meditative inquiry underscores the limitations of thinking and analysis, but on the other hand, it emphasizes meditative listening and observation." (Kumar 38). The final principle, that curriculum as meditative inquiry is a way to

self-transformation for educators and learners, stresses two attitudes. The first is that "there is a close relationship between the nature of human consciousness and educational institutions; and the second is [that] meditative inquiry is a viable approach to understand and transform … consciousness." (Kumar 40). Curriculum as meditative inquiry, then, is a transformative approach designed to "undermine and possibly dissolve the conflicted nature of… consciousness, by cultivating a deeper sense of awareness." (Kumar 40). Kumar claims that curriculum as meditative inquiry combines attentive listening and seeing, on the one hand, with opening a space for deeper perception into consciousness and relationships, on the other. As such, this is an educational approach not concerned so much with information transmission or attaining knowledge, but instead one that aims to promote the freedom learners need for them to focus on their own sense of self and on relationships with people, nature, and ideas. As mentioned before, Kumar has been informed a great deal by Krishnamurti's educational approach and philosophical thinking. Kumar quotes Krishnamurti (from *The Network of Thought*, 1983, 9):

> We are facing a tremendous crisis; a crisis which the politicians can never solve because they are programmed to think in a particular way—nor can the scientists understand or solve the crisis; nor yet the business world, the world of money. The turning point, the perceptive decision, the challenge, is not in politics, in religion, in the scientific world; it is in our consciousness. One has to understand the consciousness of mankind, which has brought us to this point.

What Kumar finds significant about Krishnamurti's statement is its radical contention that the crisis facing humanity does not result from human systems, but instead lives and grows in the consciousness of human beings. Furthermore, the only way out of this crisis, says Krishnamurti, and echoes Kumar, is by radical transformation of consciousness. For Kumar, the best educational approach to achieve this is his meditative inquiry approach. Kumar agrees

with Krishnamurti that while there are cultural and personality differences in consciousness and in conditioning influences, deep down, common to all human consciousness is psychological suffering, anxiety, pleasure, pain, conditioning, fear, fragmentation, and becoming. (Kumar 47-52). Kumar defines conditioning as the incessant repetition of certain values, beliefs, and attitudes that shape the way people perceive the world. Here Kumar relies on Krishnamurti's language again:

> We are conditioned—physically, nervously, mentally—by the climate we live in and the food we eat, by the culture in which we live, by the whole of our social, religious and economic environment, by our experience, by education and by family pressures and influences. All these are the factors which condition us. Our conscious and unconscious responses to all the challenges of our environment—intellectual, emotional, outward and inward—all these are the action of conditioning. Language is conditioning; all thought is the action, the response of conditioning. (*The Urgency of Change*, 1970, 110)

Kumar follows Krishnamurti in asserting that conditioning influences lead people to create images about themselves and others, and these images prevent real relationship coming about between people. What actually happens is that relationships develop with abstract psychological images. As Kumar puts it, there is constant conflict between the image, which is abstract, and what is real. As a result, relationships, with people, property, or ideas, are based on images rather than on what is real. Hence there is always conflict. For Kumar, the great danger is that people translate their present experiences on the basis of images from past experience. "If we are unaware of it," Kumar argues, "we may even behave like a programmed computer. Thus, conditioning influences of various sorts distorts our perceptions of reality." (Kumar 47). Moreover, in Kumar's view, since different people have different conditioning influences – ideological, religious, racial, cultural, economic, and educational – they live in conflict with one another. Conditioning influences divide people into fragments, including racial, nationalistic, and religious groups. And the presence of these fragments brings about,

through conditioning, widespread violence in the world. Kumar cites Krishnamurti: "When you call yourself an Indian or a Muslim or a Christian or a European, or anything else, you are being violent… Because you are separating yourself from the rest of mankind. When you separate yourself by belief, by nationality, by tradition, it breeds violence. (Krishnamurti 1969 51).

Kumar then raises the problem, again following Krishnamurti, of how to break through conditioning. And he also describes Krishnamurti's notion of a way of being untouched by thought. This way of being, says Kumar, is what Krishnamurti calls "awareness," where people observe what is, without "any judgment, condemnation, or appreciation." (Kumar 58). For Kumar, the importance of this kind of awareness is that it is one of the core elements of curriculum as meditative inquiry. It is this aware state of mind "where thought has come to a silence, or consciousness is in order." (Kumar 59). And when consciousness is in order, conflict, both within and between people, ends.

So, how does curriculum as meditative inquiry provide learners opportunities to discover what is real, to reach their potential, to transform, and to establish genuine relationships? How does Kumar's approach set the scene for self-transformative educational experiences? In meditative inquiry, learners attend intensely to the way they each think, feel, and act inwardly, but also to their relationship with people and nature. Awareness implies a meditative state of mind, activated when one observes people and nature without any interference from thought. This kind of meditative observation opens the door to a deeper perception and a profound learning, such as allows for transformation of consciousness. Kumar contends that meditative inquiry points to something that is missed by traditional education, and that is an examination of the nature of consciousness, and therefore also an appreciation of the potential for potential transformation of consciousness through educational encounters.

Curriculum as meditative inquiry, in that it views consciousness, meditative inquiry, and curriculum as deeply connected spheres, also expands educational theory, with its employment of techniques that include personal inquiry, autobiography, and reflexivity. And, like all of the approaches discussed in this chapter, Kumar's curriculum as meditative inquiry takes education out of traditional norms of curriculum as transmitted knowledge, which is valid, tested and established, and instead to direct attention to what is mostly an unexplored dimension of learning, that of the relationship between consciousness, meditative inquiry, and curriculum.

5.2 David Moody's insight curriculum

David Moody is the author of the *The Unconditioned Mind: J. Krishnamurti and the Oak Grove School* (2012). He was the first teacher hired at the Oak Grove School in Ojai, California, then served as Educational Director and as Director of the school, a position he held at the time of Krishnamurti's death in 1986. Moody's experience with the Krishnamurti-oriented school in California makes his description of how a Krishnamurti dialogic approach might be applied in higher education particularly relevant for this study. Especially interesting in this regard is Moody's application of Krishnamurti's conception of insight in his "insight curriculum" approach, and the way he combines Krishnamurti's thinking with recent findings in educational psychology. Moody's approach aims to take into account new science about how learners learn about the natural world, which according to Moody, now shows that far from having empty minds passively receiving information from educators, learners actively contribute to, and construct, what they learn in their educational setting, together with their own existing ideas, concepts, opinions, and beliefs about the natural world. As Moody points out, only recently has cognitive science recognized the validity of researching and learning

about the nature of thought as a process. For Moody's insight curriculum approach – that emphasizes insight – scientific confirmation that thought and thinking can be observed, analyzed, and evaluated with the use of data is an exciting development. One reason Moody is excited about this scientific development is that now, cognitive science, when applied to the study of education, also confirms the validity of a constructivist attitude in education. According to the constructivist model, says Moody, learning involves engagement with the natural world, both in and out of the classroom. Learners construct knowledge as they bu ild on what they already know. Construction of knowledge, according to this cognitive approach, is a natural activity of the growing mind, a constant that engages learners with everything they encounter in their environment, through interaction and observa tion in nature, as well as through ideas shared by family, friends, the media, entertainment, school, educators, and other influences.

The problem Moody has with the application of such a constructivist education, is something he has found in his own educational practice, and that is also confirmed by recent research. Moody is especially concerned with the prevalence of situations where learners construct their knowledge, but in a way that leads them to hold inaccurate beliefs. Of special concern for Moody, as a science teacher, is how common it is that learners persistently hold on to erroneous beliefs about scientific explanations for natural phenomena. In his book, Moody presents an example of this kind of contradictory construction, when he teaches abou t the shape of the Earth. Moody has found that many students have erroneous ideas about the science of the seasons on Earth. According to the naive notion held by many students, explains Moody, the orbit of the Earth around the sun is somewhat elongated or elliptical. As a result, say these students, the distance of the sun from the Earth fluctuates during the course of the calendar year, and that is why seasons change over the year, because of this changing distance

between the sun and the Earth. One recent study, says Moody, found that a large number of Harvard graduates actually thought this erroneous explanation for the seasons was the actual scientific explanation. In scientific knowledge, though, the seasons result form the fact that the Earth's axis of rotation tilts in relation to the plane of its annual orbit around the sun. Moody notes that recent research reveals "a vast number of misconceptions of this kind." (Moody 149). These misconceptions involve a range of subject matter, from the laws of motion (students favour Aristotelian rather than Newtonian ideas) to the mechanism that drives biological evolution (where Lamarck prevails over Darwin). Electricity, light, sound, photosynthesis, and the properties of atoms and molecules are among the many topics that seem to attract such misconceptions.

So, from Moody's educational stance, where he sees how fixated such misconceptions can be, pointing out how actively resistant they are to correction through traditional forms of instruction (Moody 154), this reality results in a great deal of frustration. It seems that it makes no difference to learners' beliefs even when a reliable educator demonstrates how their preconceived ideas are wrong. But, and this is most relevant to this study, what is immensely valuable in Moody's view is that with his insight curriculum approach he has found a reliable way to address this frustrating educational problem. Moody claims to have developed an educational strategy that, more often than not, succeeds in changing erroneous preconceived scientific notions. What this involves, as Moody describes it, is simply this. He first demonstrates thoroughly how inadequate and inappropriate a learner's strongly held conception is, when this is compared concurrently with the correct scientific knowledge. And here is the intriguing aspect with this approach. Moody says that for this strategy to work, the learner often needs to take what Moody calls a conceptual leap; "a shift in understanding of a whole constellation of relationships among facts and events." (Moody 155). This is where

Moody's educational experience teaching about nature and science meets recent developments in cognitive science, and also blends with what appears on the surface to be similar to Krishnamurti's thinking. Here is how Moody explains this similarity between his insight curriculum approach and Krishnamurti's thinking. Moody argues that the kind of cognitive shift involved in the perception of a new set of relationships is best described as a moment of insight. In the case of the explanation for the seasons, for example, students need to have an insight into the implications of the tilt in the earth's axis of rotation. This insight includes, then, a new perception of relationships among at least four elements: the axis of rotation; the plane of the Earth's orbit around the sun; the angle of incidence of the sun's rays; and the corresponding changes in climate. To see the manner in which these elements function together to produce the seasons is what Moody calls an "insight." As Moody asserts, educators might envision an entire curriculum organized around moments of insight, but though science offers a long list of topics that could benefit from this approach, many different fields of knowledge can also benefit, such as mathematics, language, and social studies, because these fields also exhibit so many misconceptions held by learners. Ultimately, says Moody, it is possible to envision an insight curriculum approach for all fields of knowledge where misconceptions are common, especially where insights come across as unusually interesting or novel. Moody sees such an approach as an opportunity for connecting the thinking of Krishnamurti with the practical problems of the classroom.

So, Moody's insight is simply this. By means of insight curriculum, it might be possible not only to accelerate learners' academic progress, but also to give them a grounding and a degree of expertise in the process of insight itself. And learners guided through a sequenced series of insights may begin to appreciate more fully the nature of a cognitive shift of this kind. Krishnamurti, according to Moody, often pointed out the general characteristics of this

moment, when the mind must be quiet in order for something new to occur. (Moody 178). And more important for Moody, in this way Krishnamurti's educational philosophy helps illuminate the process of academic learning. Moody (2012) explains the distinction between insight and knowledge, for example, by showing how learners invariably explain the existence of perennial seasons. Learners usually explain seasons based on the less than complete knowledge that Earth's orbit around the sun is not a perfect circle but rather an ellipse, and that the seasons match the changing distance from the sun as the planet makes its perennial journey, with its tilting axis of rotation. Moody sees this explanation as an error in knowledge, because a series of additional questions needs to be asked: "Why does the tilt in Earth's axis of rotation have the effect of causing seasons? What is the relationship between the tilt and the result? How does it come about?" And to answer this final question, says Moody, students need to *see* a whole set of connected and interrelated relationships – the Earth spinning, orbiting the sun, tilting on its axis – all these causes taken together change the amounts of sunlight that fall on the northern and southern hemispheres over the course of the seasons. According to Moody, then, without seeing this set of connected factors taken together, the fact that seasons come about as the effect of the Earth's tilt in its axis of rotation seems just an arbitrary fact, a trivial bit of knowledge. But *insight*, claims Moody, is what transforms trivia into a thing of beauty. While Moody acknowledges that the distinction between knowledge and insight has been widely discussed, in his mind no one has given insight a more comprehensive analysis than Krishnamurti. Therefore, Moody feels that when insight becomes an integral component in education, learners' capacity for learning can be enhanced greatly, to an understanding that transcends knowledge. Still, Krishnamurti's conception of insight differs significantly from Moody's conception, and does not veer far from Ash et. al.'s (2012) approach to describing

insight in the context of problem-solving. In a 1985 discussion with Buddhists, for example, Krishnamurti had this reply to a question:

> *Insight* is not dependent on the intellect; it is not dependent on knowledge. It is not dependent on any form of remembrance, and it is not dependent on time. *Enlightenment* is not dependent on time. Time, memory, remembrance, cause - they don't exist; then you have insight, complete insight. (Krishnamurti 1988 90) (Emphasis added)

Krishnamurti's apparent comparison of *insight* with *enlightenment* in the above quoted excerpt suggests that he placed these two concepts – insight and enlightenment – in the same category of experience. In another public talk, Krishnamurti proclaims, "*Insight is like a flash of light*. You see with absolute clarity… This is pure, clear insight - perception without any shadow of doubt. (Krishnamurti 1987 73) [emphasis added]. While Krishnamurti's conception of insight may include Moody's view about insight as an educational problem-solving event, it is arguable that Krishnamurti elucidated quite a different conception of insight, supported, as indicated by Krishnamurti's comparison of insight to a flash of light. As indicated before, Rodrigues (2001) emphasizes that insight is an essential ingredient in Krishnamurti's dialogic approach to education, because it is the event that liberates learners (and educators) from inner conflict, an event that, according to Krishnamurti, is the way toward transformation of consciousness. Following Rodrigues, then, the key to Krishnamurti's dialogic educational approach is "insight," and "insight education" could be an appropriate name for Krishnamurti's right education. But Krishnamurti's approach would have to be distinguished from Moody's "insight curriculum" because Krishnamurti's insight education extends the transformative nature of insight beyond Moody's conception of insight. Krishnamurti's insight is about a radical change – a transformation of consciousness, whereas Moody's insight seems more like a problem-solving

"aha" moment, a leap forward in seeing the solution to a problem, but not necessarily the kind of radical change leading toward transformation of consciousness.

6. Conclusion

As the discussion in this chapter shows, it would appear that Krishnamurti's educational dialogical approach makes it a good fit for adaptation in higher education. Given the ongoing trend of expansion in the field of transformative learning, and the general view that transformative learning should be seen as a theory in progress, Krishnamurti's approach, with its emphasis on the transformative nature of insight, seems a well-placed addition to the widening class of transformative higher education approaches. Moreover, several transformative learning educators have been influenced or informed by Krishnamurti's educational philosophy, while a few others have expressly integrated or adapted at least part of Krishnamurti's educational thought in their own adaptation of education philosophy or practice. Krishnamurti, then, had developed a most viable and beneficial educational approach, one that fits neatly within the context of a recent growth trend in the philosophy and practise of education, but also has the potential to expand the holistic and transformative approach with a fresh application based on instigating insight. More on this will follow in chapter four.

Chapter Four

Recap and introduction

Krishnamurti's educational philosophy and dialogic approach can be described using such terms as "holistic", "transformative", and perhaps "spiritual." In this chapter, I consider its suitability for higher education, either as a further expansion of the growing field of transformative learning or as an approach classified under the heading of holistic education, by comparing it with the existing approaches described in Chapter Three. Recall the challenge presented by this study's thesis that Krishnamurti had developed a most viable and efficacious, though novel, approach for instigating insight, one that lends itself to beneficial application in higher education. And so, this chapter will show that:

- Krishnamurti's dialogic approach is consistent with holistic, transformative approaches in higher education.
- Krishnamurti's dialogic approach can be distinguished from other approaches discovered by the research in this study, and is a new approach, as yet not fully explored.
- Krishnamurti's dialogic approach can be applied by educators through adoption, emulation, and adaptation.

Overview of what has been discussed so far

Chapter One described Krishnamurti's conception of right education this way:

- Right education instigates insight. Instigating insight is encouraged by dialogue and inquiry.
- Right education is concerned with the cultivation of the "total human being."

- Right education is the way to address the crisis of chaos and violence in the world, but through individual transformation. Lack of right education is the main cause of conflict and suffering.
- Dialogue engages learners in deep reflection.
- Insight in education is enhanced when there is attentive listening and a mental attitude of choiceless awareness.

Chapter Two examined and described the selected Krishnamurti dialogue from two perspectives: the thematic flow of content; and Krishnamurti's facilitation strategies and techniques. Looking at the thematic flow, it was shown that though Krishnamurti facilitates dialogue and deep inquiry through improvisation, he nonetheless responds to the participants' questions and also manages to convey his own ideas. Krishnamurti's strategies and techniques were then described, with the contention that Krishnamurti's dialogic approach, as examined, demonstrates its efficacy in instigating insight. Moreover, two examples of expressed insight during the dialogue were highlighted. Chapter Three then reviewed several existing educational philosophies and approaches that are consistent with Krishnamurti's dialogic approach, in order to show that a Krishnamurti approach fits neatly within the recent trend that favours a holistic attitude to learning. This fourth chapter discusses briefly how Krishnamurti's approach aligns with existing approaches, on the one hand, and also extends beyond existing approaches, on the other. In addition, this concluding chapter proposes that Krishnamurti's dialogic thematic approach can be applied by educators through adoption, emulation, and adaptation, based on the analysis in Chapter Two. The chapter will conclude with brief suggestions for the application of Krishnamurti's approach in higher education.

Krishnamurti's approach compared with several existing holistic, transformative approaches

As discussed in Chapter Three, three examples explicitly informed by Krishnamurti 's thinking demonstrate how it aligns well with other approaches in the present context of higher education. Harris has already proposed an education for peace influenced by Krishnamurti's thinking around the causes of violence in society and Krishnamurti's contention that only individual transformation can bring about the kind of quiet revolution necessary to transform society into one grounded in peace. Hart, also influenced by Krishnamurti's thinking, proposes an educational approach based on transformation of individuals and society through cultivation of wisdom and compassion. And Gnanakan promotes an education that aims to help learners become integrated with the whole of life, not just what society wants them to know. Gnanakan's integrated educational approach is also very much informed by Krishnamurti's philosophy.

Next, we considered two approaches very much aligned and consistent with that of Krishnamurti. The existence and nature of these two approaches show that educators who are not influenced by Krishnamurti's educational philosophy have, independent of any apparent Krishnamurti influence, nonetheless developed approaches that could blend well with Krishnamurti's. Tisdell's spirituality in higher education, for example, while it does not refer to or rely on Krishnamurti, does refer to Hart as advocating a spiritual approach, and we have already seen how Hart's transformative approach through wisdom and compassion relies on Krishnamurti's thinking. In addition, Tanaka's transformative inquiry is a good example of the continuing expansion of transformative learning as an educational theory and practice. The creation of Tanaka's University of Victoria course in transformative inquiry contributes to the expectation that Krishnamurti's approach, especially since it can also be described as dialogue and deep inquiry for transformative insight, might be well received in higher education.

As aligned and consistent as the above-mentioned approaches are with Krishnamurti's dialogic approach, the latter is distinct from them. As we have seen in our examination of the thematic content of the Krishnamurti dialogue in Chapter Two, a Krishnamurti approach in higher education can be adapted for a variety of thematic content, whether it is concerned with peace, wisdom and compassion, integration, spirituality, or culturally-specific transformative inquiry. Moreover, as proposed by Moody in Chapter Three, Krishnamurti's insight education could enhance learning in a variety of topics, since insight is a desirable requirement for effective education in many fields of knowledge. And even though Moody's conception of Krishnamurti's notion of insight is arguably (as this paper shows, for example) less than complete, Moody's proposition about the wide-ranging adaptability of Krishnamurti's insight education has merit and seems worthy of further exploration. As for Tisdell's and Tanaka's approaches, Krishnamurti's approach can be distinguished from these also. Krishnamurti's attitude to learning extends beyond Tisdell's aim of reclaiming learners' cultural identity. Moreover, as shown in Chapters One and Two, Krishnamurti's thinking about right education includes the intention that learners examine their own thinking and gain freedom from all kinds of conditioning influences, including those of culture. As such, Krishnamurti's right education would arguably oppose an intention to reclaim culturally-specific identity. The kind of psychological transformation a Krishnamurti education would aim for is deeper than the use proposed by Tisdell.

Tanaka's transformative inquiry aims to promote the attitude that learners (future educators) consider their responsibility for helping to resolve environmental dilemmas, but Krishnamurti's educational philosophy would likely doubt the possibility that any positive consequences might flow from environmental action based on the kind of intellectual approach proposed by Tanaka. Krishnamurti, as we have seen in Chapter Two, speaks of the process of

thinking, experience, memory, and knowledge as in need of close scrutiny due to this process having harmful effects on relationship. Krishnamurti points to a deeper kind of self-knowledge, one that brings about right action. Tanaka's transformative inquiry, though in some ways consistent with Krishnamurti's approach, contrasts with it by placing a great deal of reliance on intellectual thinking. Tanaka's approach may be effective in changing learners' attitudes and actions toward addressing environmental dilemmas, but Krishnamurti prefers to focus on individual transformation for transcending divisions and conflict, both inner and external, while rejecting the efficacy of organizations and collective action.

Another way transformative inquiry diverges from Krishnamurti's approach has to do with the notion of "becoming." For transformative inquiry, the process of becoming an educator is essential, but as pointed out in Chapter Two, for Krishnamurti any becoming involves a process, or a method, which contradicts his conception of insight as instantaneous. Tanaka's learners would make a division between environmentally responsible actions as opposed to environmentally irresponsible actions. Krishnamurti's learners would be invited by educators to question the psychological benefits of such a demarcation. Krishnamurti's right education is aimed at individual learners, and addresses social concerns only as a consequence of individual transformation, whereas Tanaka's approach aims for social change to be included as an integral component of transformative education.

Herder's constructivist approach relies a great deal on Krishnamurti, but it is debatable whether it is fair to consider Krishnamurti's dialogic approach as constructivist. For Krishnamurti, learning for insight requires radical transformation to gain freedom from conditioned influences, by way of deep inquiry. Thinking together and collaborative shared understanding are integral to Krishnamurti's approach. But is a dialogue approach based on collaborative inquiry and aimed at shared understanding consistent with the philosophical

attitude that learners construct new knowledge from their past experiences combined with what they learn in the classroom? Krishnamurti's right education aims for a revolutionary kind of freedom, for a whole new way of encountering the inner self and the world. A constructivist attitude towards education seems to recognize the intellectual and practical reality of knowledge as accumulative, which would seem appropriate for that necessary component of education that Krishnamurti calls academic learning. But for that component of Krishnamurti's right education that is concerned with self-knowledge, the accumulative constructivist attitude contradicts Krishnamurti's notion of thought as the most dangerous instrument, as mentioned in Chapter Two's analysis of the dialogue's thematic content. Recall that for Krishnamurti the danger of thought in relationship flows from the imposition of images from past experience, images that inhibit genuine relationship.

Walker's education for self-knowledge relies heavily on Krishnamurti's thinking, and advocates for educators to give more serious consideration to Krishnamurti's philosophical ideas. Walker affirms that transformative insight can only come about in a learning setting of relational dialogue, which is consistent with Krishnamurti's approach. For Walker, with self-knowledge learners develop perspectives that they feel are distinctly and authentically their own. But such a change in learners, while consistent with the aims of transformative and holistic approaches, falls short of Krishnamurti's right education intended to bring about freedom from conditioning altogether, a perspective on the effect of self-knowledge that goes beyond that of Walker.

Krishnamurti's approach compared with Mezirow's transformative learning and Miller's holistic education: two approaches not expressly influenced by Krishnamurti's educational philosophy

Transformative learning aims to change learners' accepted frames of reference, or meaning perspectives, so that these convert to more inclusive and accepting outlooks, with the expectation that learners will have then adopted more authentic guides to action. For Mezirow, the focus of learning is the individual, not the collective, since social transformation flows from the combined actions of individuals, a focus that is also very much at the heart of Krishnamurti's approach. Another way that transformative learning aligns with Krishnamurti's approach is that transformative learning seeks to expand consciousness and transform the self by critical analysis of existing beliefs. However, the kind of transformation that transformative learning seeks can also come about from a series of accumulated changes in meaning perspectives over time. And as shown in Chapter One, Krishnamurti's notion of transformation depends on instantaneous insight, and so Krishnamurti would reject any suggestion of a gradual or accumulated, time-bound transformation. Krishnamurti's main concern was for people to be transformed by freeing themselves psychologically from conditioning influences. Transformative learning, on the other hand, aims to help learners accommodate an expanded worldview, with revised meaning perspectives, which does not go as deep as Krishnamurti's aim for learners to gain psychological freedom. Still, as mentioned before, several educators have already taken transformative learning beyond its early conceptualization, leading some, as well as Mezirow himself, to describe it as a theory in progress. Krishnamurti's approach fits well within the continued development of transformative learning. First, with its emphasis on transformation through overcoming conditioning influences, Krishnamurti's approach aligns with transformative learning's objective of transforming meaning perspectives. What Krishnamurti's approach adds to transformative learning is its comprehensive and articulate

description of insight as the crucial event in the kind of transformation both approaches aim to encourage. And second, both approaches employ the technique of closely examining existing beliefs to reflect upon and reconsider these beliefs. But while transformative learning aims to help learners develop more inclusive and accepting outlooks, Krishnamurti's approach aims to help learners arrive at an outlook free from conditioning influences.

Another approach that extends transformative learning beyond its early development is John Miller's holistic education. Miller's approach aims for a "letting go" of knowledge instead of adding knowledge, an attitude that brings to mind Krishnamurti's caution, as shown in Chapter Two, that knowledge can never be complete about anything. But Miller also encourages learners take up a meditation practice to quiet the mind for greater clarity. Miller describes meditation as a practice that helps overcome conditioning and enhance the capacity for paying attention to the present, without classifying events and thoughts as either good or bad. In this regard, Miller expressly refers to Krishnamurti's notion of choiceless awareness. However, Miller's holistic learning contrasts with Krishnamurti's approach in the way each describes meditation. For Krishnamurti, though he highlights the connection between choiceless awareness and insight, there can be no method that leads people to insight, whereas Miller's meditation is very much a methodical practice.

Krishnamurti's approach compared with Kumar's curriculum for meditative inquiry and Moody's insight curriculum: two approaches that integrate Krishnamurti's educational philosophy

Kumar adopts a great deal of Krishnamurti's philosophy in his curriculum as meditative inquiry. For example, like Krishnamurti, Kumar sees education as the way to address the crisis of violence in the world, and he has developed his meditative inquiry as the educational approach best suited to that task. Kumar also agrees with Krishnamurti that there is a common

consciousness, with its attendant conditioning influences and psychological suffering. Conditioning influences distort perceptions of reality and divide people into fragmented groups based on racial, nationalistic, and religious differences that bring about widespread violence. For Kumar, achieving the kind of choiceless awareness described by Krishnamurti is the main aim of curriculum as meditative inquiry. Kumar aims, very much like Krishnamurti, to bring order to consciousness and an end to conflict. But, as noted earlier, Krishnamurti rejects the possibility of a method that could bring a state of choiceless awareness or insight, or that could lead to breaking through conditioning. Another way that Kumar's approach differs markedly from Krishnamurti's is that it advocates for the use of activities and practices, aside from meditation, that educators can use to enhance meditative inquiry. Krishnamurti's dialogic approach is dialogic, in that it relies solely on the setting, the principles, and the strategies and techniques of dialogue that are conducive to instigating insight. Krishnamurti's approach does not employ any activities other than conversation, that is, dialogue.

Like Kumar's curriculum as meditative inquiry, Moody's insight curriculum also relies heavily on Krishnamurti's educational philosophy. However, Moody's approach differs from Krishnamurti's in the way Moody applies the concept of insight. Moody advocates his insight curriculum as beneficial mainly for addressing the problem he sees with the prevalence of erroneous conceptions many learners have about how science explains natural phenomena. Moody asserts that Krishnamurti's concept of insight offers beneficial opportunities for educators in a range of fields of knowledge, including science, to overcome learners' misguided beliefs and assumptions about what they think know. However, Moody's conception of insight is at odds with the full implication of the role insight has in Krishnamurti's approach. For Moody, insight is a cognitive shift in perception that leads to new ways of looking at relationships, new perceptions that are psychological events of the same essential quality as

Krishnamurti's insight. But, as shown in Chapters One and Three, insight, in Krishnamurti's conception, leads to a deep and total transformation of consciousness in a way that eradicates the major cause of individual and social conflicts – the conditioning that determines peoples' beliefs. But the traditional use of the term *insight* contrasts with Krishnamurti's conception. Traditionally, insight is spoken about in connection with problem-solving situations. One example is where a solution comes to mind suddenly, in a kind of "aha!" moment that brings to mind an elegant, but so far hidden, solution. But insight in Krishnamurti's conception transcends problem-solving; it conceives of a radical change that is broader than that of a cognitive leap required for learners to see natural phenomena in a different, more accurate, perspective. Furthermore, Krishnamurti draws a significant connection between choiceless awareness and insight, contending that insight arises from the state of being choicelessly aware. Insight is like a flash of light, says Krishnamurti. For Krishnamurti, insight is an event that leads to a deep and total transformation of consciousness, and as such, it is the essential aim of right education. In that light, Krishnamurti's conception of insight must refer to an event that brings profound personal transformation, a conception much different from Moody's problem-solving educational technique. As Krishnamurti emphasized, "Insight transcends learning." (1991 23). Moody's conception of insight is very much part of learning, rather than one of transcending the learning process.

Krishnamurti's dialogic approach can be applied by educators through adoption, emulation, and adaptation

There are at least three distinct ways to apply Krishnamurti's philosophy and dialogical approach in higher education. First is to offer a course on Krishnamurti's thinking in general, and in application to Krishnamurti's thinking around particular subjects. Examples could be

Krishnamurti and education for peace, Krishnamurti and spiritual education, Krishnamurti and self-knowledge, Krishnamurti's religious mind, Krishnamurti and psychological freedom, and so on. Assistance for such an endeavour might be found by looking at Chapter Two's thematic analysis of, together with the sample lesson plan for, the examined dialogue that took place in 1981 between Krishnamurti and six American college students. A second way to apply Krishnamurti's philosophy in higher education would be the way envisaged by this study, which is by adapting Krishnamurti's dialogic principles, strategies, and techniques in a course with content that lends itself to dialogic inquiry. For this way of applying Krishnamurti in higher education, educators may find assistance, as far as this study offers, in Chapter Two and in Appendices A and B. Chapter Three provides an overview showing how Krishnamurti's dialogic approach might be combined with other approaches. A third way to apply Krishnamurti's thinking in higher education is to use it in educating educators, by creating a course designed to help educators adapt Krishnamurti's educational approach in their practice.

Conclusion

We can conclude that Krishnamurti's approach is well-suited to take its place among the best of those engaged in the evolution of higher education from knowledge transmission to transformative learning. An apt name for Krishnamurti's approach, perhaps, is dialogue and deep inquiry, an approach for instigating insight. Dialogue and deep inquiry, or DDI, seems appropriate because, as mentioned above, Krishnamurti's dialogic approach is unique in the way it is applied as wholly dialogic, that is, as completely reliant on nothing more or less than conversation.

This study describes what is possible. It remains for educators to adapt, adopt, or emulate Krishnamurti's DDI in higher education in order to gain a measure of confidence about

its efficacy and practical viability through testing, evaluation, and feedback. Not only would such implementation provide valuable information about DDI's potential efficacy, but it would also help to adapt the approach to particular thematic content and educational settings. Moreover, Krishnamurti's DDI approach might be efficacious in settings outside higher education, and perhaps even in settings unrelated to education, such as conflict resolution situations. If Krishnamurti is correct in his assertion that only individual transformation can bring about a peaceful world (see Chapter One), then further efforts to adapt DDI, both within and outside the sphere of education, could prove beneficial. Most notably, as this study has shown, Krishnamurti's DDI could be a most highly effective approach for instigating insight. Recall, for example, that in the dialogue examined in Chapter Two, we saw two instances of insight expressed by participants. In one of these, a participant says "I see. I see," expressing exactly the kind of insight – that flash of light – that Krishnamurti speaks of. (See Chapter One). As such, and given the pivotal role such insight plays in Krishnamurti's thinking about addressing the present crisis humanity faces, educators might wish to consider DDI's efficacy as a dialogic approach for collaborative, holistic, learning, as well as its potential for the kind of individual and social transformation required for movement toward a more peaceful world.

Bibliography of works considered and cited

Aberbach, David. (2014). *Charisma in Politics, Religion and the Media: Private Trauma, Public Ideals*. Place of publication not identified: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ash, Ivan, Jee, Benjamin, and Wiley, Jennifer. (2012) "Investigating Insight as Sudden Learning." *The Journal of Problem Solving*. Vol 4, no. 2 Spring 2012.

Aveling, Harry. (1990). "Krishnamurti on Education." *Social Alternatives* Vol. 9 No. 1 1990 33-36.

Bohm, David. (undated) *Introduction to the Work of Krishnamurti*. Krishnamurti Foundation of America Web Site. hhtp://www.kfa.org/bohm.htm

Bohm, David. (2014) *On Dialogue*. London: Routledge.

Boutte, Veronica. (2002). *The Phenomenology of Compassion in the Teachings of Jiddu Krishnamurti, 1895-1986*. Lewiston, N.Y: Edwin Mellen Press.

Boyle, R. P. (2015). *Realizing Awakened Consciousness: Interviews with Buddhist Teachers and a New Perspective on the Mind*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Castelli., Mike and Chater, Mark. (2018). *We Need to Talk about Religious Education: Manifestos for the Future of RE*. Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Chesters, Sarah Davey. (2012). *The Socratic Classroom: Reflective Thinking Through Collaborative Inquiry*. Boston: Sense Publishers.

Claris, Lionel. (2011). "Partial and Total Insight: Constructivism and Krishnamurti's Pedagogy." *Journal of the Krishnamurti Schools* 15 January 2011 doi http://www.journal.kfionline.org/issue-15/partial-and-total-insight-constructivism-and-krishnamurtis-pedagogy accessed June 9, 2019.

Dashti, Laleh and Mehrpour, Saeed. (2017). "Representation of Social Actors in J. Krishnamurti and Alan Watts' Philosophical Speeches: A Critical Discourse Analysis." *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research* Vol. 4-4, pp. 51-59.

De Nicolás, Antonio, ed. (1989). *Habits of Mind: An introduction to the philosophy of education.* New York: Paragon House.

De Sousa, Avinash. (2012). "Mind and Consciousness as per J. Krishnamurti." *Mens Sana Monographs*. Jan-Dec; 10(1): 198–207. doi: 10.4103/0973-1229.86145

Dirkx, John, and Mezirow, Jack. (2006) "Musings and Reflections on the Meaning, Context, and Process of Transformative Learning: A Dialogue Between John M. Dirkx and Jack Mezirow. *Journal of Transformative Education* Vol. 4 No. 2 123-139. DOI: 10.1177/1541344606287503

Dhopeshwarkar, A. D. (1973). *Krishnamurti and the Experience of the Silent Mind*. Bombay: Chetana.

Eppert, Claudia, and Wang, Hongyu. (2008). *Cross-Cultural Studies in Curriculum: Eastern Thought, Educational Insights*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Fairfield, Paul. (2011). "Dialogue in the Classroom." In *Education, Dialogue and Hermeneutics*. Paul Fairfield, Ed. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Field, Sidney and Hay, Peter, ed. (1989). *Krishnamurti: The Reluctant Messiah*. New York, N.Y: Paragon House.

Forman, Robert. (1999). *Mysticism, Mind, Consciousness*. Albany, N.Y: State Univ. of New York Press.

Freire, Paulo. (2001). *Pedagogy of Freedom: Ethics, democracy, and civic courage*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Freire, Paulo. (1990). *Education for critical consciousness*. London: Sheed and Ward.

Gnanakan, Ken. (2011). *Integrated Learning*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Goleman, Daniel. (1988). *The Meditative Mind: The Varieties of Meditative Experience*. Los Angeles: Jeremy P. Tarcher.

Grant, James. (2000). "Consciousness-based Education: A Future of Higher Education in the New Millennium." In Inayatullah, S. and Gidley, J. eds. *The University in Transformation: Global Perspectives on the Futures of the University*. Westport, Connecticut: Bergin & Garvey.

Guiffrida, Douglas. (2005). "The Emergence Model: An Alternative Pedagogy for Facilitating Self-Reflection and Theoretical Fit in Counseling Students." *Counselor Education & Supervision* Vol. 44 pp. 201-214.

Harkins, Mary Jane and Barchuk, Zhanna, eds. (2014). *International Conversations of Teacher Educators: Teaching and Learning in a Global World*. Halifax: Mount Saint Vincent University.

Harris, Ian and Morrison, M. L. (2003). *Peace Education*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Co.

Harris, Ian. (1995). "Peace education: A modern educational reform." In C.W. Strokel & D.B. Owens (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Midwest Philosophy of Education Society* (pp. 253-274). Ames IA: Midwest Philosophy of Education Society.

Harris, Ian. (1993). "Teaching Love to Counteract Violence." *Thresholds in Education,* 19(3), 12-20.

Hart, Tobin. (2009). *From Information to Transformation: Education for the Evolution of Consciousness*. New York: P. Lang.

Hart, T. (2004). "Opening the contemplative mind in the classroom." *Journal of Transformative Education, 2*(1), 28-46. doi:10.1177/1541344603259311

Herder, Paul. (2012). *Revolutionary Minds: The Educational Vision of J. Krishnamurti and Its Practice.* Paul Herder. Self-published.

Hufford, Don. (2006). "Interpreting Jiddu Krishnamurti: Educational Implications." *Journal of Philosophy and History of Education*. Vol. 56, 73-80.

Hunter, Alan. (1988). *Seeds of Truth: J. Krishnamurti as Religious Teacher and Educator*. PhD Thesis, University of Leeds. Accessed October 27, 2017 http://etheses.whiterose.ac.uk/409/

Illeris, Knud. (2014). *Transformative Learning and Identity.* Abingdon: Routledge.

Irvine, W. B. (2015). *Aha! The Moments of Insight that Shape our World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

James, William, and Bradley, Matthew. (2012). *Varieties of religious experience*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Jayakar, Pupul. (1995). *Fire in the Mind: Dialogues with J. Krishnamurti*. New York: Penguin Books.

Jayakar, Pupul. (1986). *Krishnamurti: A biography*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Jefferies, Kathryn. (2015). *Awake: Education for Enlightenment: Redefining Intelligence in the Age of the New Consciousness*. Mariposa Press.

Jones, Constance. (2015). "Techniqueless Meditation: J. Krishnamurti's This Light in Oneself" in *Contemplative Literature: A Comparative Sourcebook on Meditation and Contemplative Prayer.* Komjathy, Louis ed. State University of New York Press pp. 645-676.

Jones, Constance. "New Religious Movements, Modern Esoteric Movements, and Integral Consciousness." *Integral Review* July 2012 Vol. 8, No. 1 http://integral-review.org/new-religious-movements-western-esotericism-and-integral-consciousness-2/ accessed October 12, 2018

Joshi, Kalidas. (2002). *Understanding J. Krishnamurti*. New Delhi: Rupa.

Kreimer, Juan Carlos. (1998). *Krishnamurti for Beginners*. New York: Writers and Readers.

Krishnamurti, J. (2016). *The Krishnamurti Text Collection: The Complete Published Works 1933-1986*. Krishnamurti Foundation Trust. CD-ROM.

Krishnamurti, J. (2011). *The Krishnamurti Reader*. Boston: Shambala

Krishnamurti, J., McCoy, R. ed. (2007). *The Whole Movement of Life is Learning: J. Krishnamurti's Letters to His Schools*. Bramdean: Krishnamurti Foundation Trust.

Krishnamurti, J. (2015). *Unconditioning and Education: The Need for a Radical Approach*. Volumes 1 and 2. Ojai, California: Krishnamurti Foundation of America.

Krishnamurti, J., McCoy, R. ed. (2007). *The Whole Movement of Life is Learning: J. Krishnamurti's Letters to His Schools*. Bramdean: Krishnamurti Foundation Trust.

Krishnamurti, J. (2006). *Inward Revolution: Bringing About Radical Change in the World*. Boston: Shambhala.

Krishnamurti, J. (2005). *Life Ahead: On Learning and the Search for Meaning*. Novato, CA: New World Library.

Krishnamurti, J. (2000). *To Be Human*. Boston: Shambhala.

Krishnamurti, J. (1999). *This light in oneself: True meditation*. Boston: Shambhala.

Krishnamurti, J. (1997). *Unconditionally Free: J. Krishnamurti, 1895-1986*. Ojai, CA: Krishnamurti Foundation of America, Krishnamurti Educational Centre of Canada, Krishnamurti Foundation Trust, Krishnamurti Foundation India, and Fundación Krishnamurti Latinoamericana.

Krishnamurti, J. (1996). *Questioning Krishnamurti: J. Krishnamurti in dialogue*. London: Thorsons.

Krishnamurti, J. (1994). *On Learning and Knowledge.* San Francisco, CA: HarperSanFrancisco.

Krishnamurti, J. (1993). *On Mind and Thought*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco.

Krishnamurti, J. (1992a). *On Freedom*. London: Victor Gollancz.

Krishnamurti, J. (1992b). *On Relationship*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco.

Krishnamurti, J. & Bohm, D. (1991a). *The Ending of Time*. London: Gollancz.

Krishnamurti, J. (1991b). *The Collected Works of J. Krishnamurti*. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt.

Krishnamurti, J. (1988). *The Future is Now: Last Talks in India*. London: Gollancz.
Krishnamurti, J. (1987). *Krishnamurti to Himself: His Last Journal*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
Krishnamurti, J. (1986a). *The Future of Humanity: A Conversation*. New York: HarperCollins.
Krishnamurti, J. (1986b). *Last Talks at Saanen, 1985*. London: Gollancz.
Krishnamurti, J. (1985a). *Letters to the Schools*, II. Chennai, India: Krishnamurti Foundation of India.
Krishnamurti, J. (1985b). *The Way of Intelligence*. Madras: Krishnamurti Foundation India.
Krishnamurti, J. (1983). *The Network of Thought*. Wassenaar: Mirananda.
Krishnamurti, J. (1991). *Exploration into Insight*. London: Gollancz.
Krishnamurti, J. (1978). *Beginnings of Learning*. New York: Penguin Books.
Krishnamurti, J. (1975). *The First and Last Freedom*, Aldous Huxley ed. San Francisco: Harper-Collins.
Krishnamurti, J. (1974). *On Education*. New York: Harper & Row.
Krishnamurti, J. (1973). *Beyond Violence*. London: Gollancz.
Krishnamurti, J. (1972). *You Are the World: Authentic Report of Talks and Discussions in American Universities*. New York: Harper and Row.
Krishnamurti, J. (1970a). *The Only Revolution*. New York: Harper & Row.
Krishnamurti, J. (1970b). *The Urgency of Change*. Mary Lutyens, ed. New York: Harper & Row.
Krishnamurti, J. (1969). *Freedom from the Known*. Mary Lutyens, ed. New York: Harper & Row.
Krishnamurti, J. (1964). *Think on These Things*. New York: Harper & Row.
Krishnamurti, J. (1963). *Life Ahead*. Wheaton, Ill: Theosophical Pub. House.
Krishnamurti, J. (1954). *Krishnamurti's talks, 1953: (verbatim report)*. Ojai, Calif: Krishnamurti Writings.
Krishnamurti, J. (1953). *Education and the Significance of Life*. New York: Harper & Row
Krishnamurti, J. and Skitt, David. (2015). *Can Humanity Change? J Krishnamurti in Dialogue with Buddhists*. Chennai: Krishnamurti Foundation India.
Krishnamurti, J. and Skitt, David. (2007). *Facing a world in crisis: What life teaches us in challenging times*. Chennai: Krishnamurti Foundation India.
Krishnamurti, J., and Khare, Brij B. (1988). *Things of the mind: dialogues with J. Krishnamurti.* Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass
Kucukaydin, Ilhan and Cranton, Patricia. (2012). "Critically Questioning the Discourse of Transformative Learning Theory." *Adult Education Quarterly* 63(1) 43–56
Kumar, Ashwani. (2013). *Curriculum as Meditative Inquiry*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
Lee, Mark. (2017) "A True Art of Learning: Dialogue in Education." *Journal of the Krishnamurti Schools*. http://www.journal.kfionline.org/issue-20.
Lutyens, Emily. (1957). *Candles in the Sun*. London: R. Hart-Davis.
Lutyens, Mary. (1990). *Krishnamurti, his life and death*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
Lutyens, Mary. (1983). *Krishnamurti: The years of fulfilment*. London: J. Murray.
Lutyens, Mary. (1975). *Krishnamurti: The years of awakening*. London: J. Murray.
Meesuaisinta, Metasit, Pathumcharoenwattanaa, Wirathep, and Boonprakob, Pannee. (2014). "The main elements of a transformative learning process to enhance authentic self-

esteem of male violent juvenile delinquents: A systematic review study." *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 152 925 – 930.
Mezirow, Jack, and Edward W. Taylor. (2009). *Transformative Learning in Practice: Insights from Community, Workplace, and Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Mezirow, Jack. (2000). *Transformative Dimensions of Adult Learning*. San Francisco, Calif: Jossey-Bass.
Mezirow, Jack. (1991). *Fostering Critical Reflection in Adulthood: A guide to transformative and emancipatory learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Miller, John P. (2018). *Love and compassion. Exploring their role in education*. North York: University of Toronto Press
Miller, John. (2006). *Educating for wisdom and compassion: Creating conditions for timeless learning*. Thousand Oaks, Calif: Corwin Press.
Miller, John. (2002). "Learning from a Spiritual Perspective" in Morrell, Amish, Edmund O'Sullivan, and Mary A. O'Connor, eds. *Expanding the Boundaries of Transformative Learning: Essays on Theory and Praxis.* New York: Palgrave. 96-102
Miller, John P. (2001). "Krishnamurti and holistic education." *Encounter* 13(4), 36-44.
Miller, John P. (2000). *Education and the Soul: Toward a spiritual curriculum*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
Miller, J. P., & Nakagawa, Y. (2005). *Nurturing our Wholeness: Perspectives on Spirituality in Education*. Brandon, VT: Foundation for Educational Renewal.
Miller, William R., and C'de Baca, Janet. (2001). *Quantum Change: When Epiphanies and Sudden Insights Transform Ordinary Lives*. New York: Guilford Press.
Mohan, V. (2007). *Sociological Thought: In the light of J. Krishnamurti's philosophy*. Charleston, S.C.: BookSurge Publishing.
Momen, Moojan. (2009). *Understanding Religion: A Thematic Approach*. Oxford, England: Oneworld.
Moody, D. E. (2012). *The Unconditioned Mind: J. Krishnamurti and the Oak Grove School*. Wheaton, Ill: Quest.
Mukerji, Jaya. (2006). *Educational Ideas of Dr. Annie Besant and J. Krishnamurti.* Delhi: Adhyayan Publishers & Distributors.
Needleman, Jacob. (2014). *The New Religions*. New York: Jeremy P. Tarcher
Nelsen, R. W. (2017). *Degrees of Failure: University education in decline*. Toronto: Between the Lines
O'Sullivan, Edmund, O'Neill, Eimear, & Hathaway, Mark. (2016). *Transformative Learning: Fostering Educational Vision in the 21st Century*. New York: Zed Books
O'Sullivan, Edmund. (1999). *Transformative Learning: Educational Vision for the 21st Century*. New York: Zed Books
Palmer, P. J. (2017). *The Courage to Teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life*. Hoboken, NJ: Jossey-Bass

Palmer, Parker, Zajonc, Arthur, and Scribner, Megan. (2010). *The Heart of Higher Education: A Call to Renewal: transforming the academy through collegial conversations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Piirto, Jane. (2000). "Krishnamurti and Me: Meditations on His Philosophy of Curriculum and on India." *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, Spring 2000. 109-124.

Plato, and Gill, Christopher. (1999). *The Symposium*. London: Penguin

Rathnam, Anbananthan. (2013). *Whole Teachers: A Holistic Education Perspective on Krishnamurti's Educational Philosophy*. PhD thesis. Toronto: University of Toronto.

Ravindra, Ravi. *Centred Self without Being Self-Centred: Remembering Krishnamurti*. (2003) Sandpoint, ID: Morning Light Press.

Rifkin, Ira. (2008). *Spiritual Leaders who Changed the World: The essential handbook to the past century of religion*. Woodstock, VT: SkyLight Paths Publishing.

Roberts, Bernadette. (1993). *The Experience of No-Self: A Contemplative Journey*. Albany, NY: State University of New York.

Rodrigues, Hillary. (2001). *Krishnamurti's Insight: An examination of his teachings on the nature of mind and religion*. Varanasi, India: Pilgrims Publishing.

Ross-Gordon, Jovita. (2003). "Adult Learners in the Classroom." *New Directions for Student Services*, no. 102, Summer 2003 Wiley 43-52.

Sardesai, Arundhati. (1996). "Epistemology of J. Krishnamurti." *Indian Philosophical Quarterly* 23 (3-4) 455-466

Siddoo, Jagdis. (2005). *Listening Is the Guru: A Diary of Conversations with J. Krishnamurti*. Ojai, CA: Edwin House Publishing.

Simmer-Brown, Judith and Grace, Fran. (2011). *Meditation and the Classroom: Contemplative Pedagogy for Religious Studies*. Albany NY: SUNY Press.

Struif, van der, John and Struif, van der, Cathy; Krishnamurti Foundation of America. (2000). *The Concise Guide to Krishnamurti: A Study Companion and Index to the Recorded Teachings (1979-1986)*. Ojai, CA: Krishnamurti Publications of America.

Sutherland, Peter and Crowther, Jim. (2008). *Lifelong Learning: Concepts and Contexts*. London: Routledge.

Tanaka, Michele. (2015). "Finding Courage in the Unknown: Transformative Inquiry as Indigenist Inquiry." *In Education* 21(2) Autumn 65-88

Tanaka, Michele, Nicholson, Diana, and Farish, Maureen. (2012). "Committed to Transformative Inquiry: Three Teacher Educators' Entry Points Into the Mentoring Role." *Journal of Transformative Education* 10(4) 257-274

Taylor, Edward W, and Patricia Cranton. (2012) *The Handbook of Transformative Learning: Theory, Research, and Practice.* Hoboken, N.J: Wiley.

Taylor, Jill. (2011). *My Stroke of Insight: A Brain Scientist's Personal Journey*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Thapan, Meenakshi. (2001a). "Education and the Purpose of Living: The Legacy of J. Krishnamurti." *Contemporary education dialogue* Vol 5 No 1 Monsoon 2007 pp. 64-77.

Thapan, Meenakshi. (2001b). "Profiles of Famous Educators: J. Krishnamurti (1895 – 1986)." *Prospects*. Vol. xxxi, no. 2, June 2001 253-265.

Tisdell, Elizabeth. (2006). "Spirituality, Cultural Identity, and Epistemology in Culturally Responsive Teaching in Higher Education." *Multicultural Perspectives*, 8:3, 19-25, DOI: 10.1207/s15327892mcp0803_4

Tisdell, Elizabeth. (2003). *Exploring spirituality and culture in adult and higher education*. Plano, TX: Jossey-Bass.

Ullman, Robert, Reichenberg-Ullman, Judyth. (2001). *Mystics, Masters, Saints, and Sages: Stories of Enlightenment*. Newburyport, MA: Conari Press.

Vas, Luis. (1971). *The Mind of J. Krishnamurti*. Bombay: Jaico Publishing House.

Vernon, Roland. (2002). *Star in the East: Krishnamurti – the Invention of a Messiah*. Boulder CO: Sentiment Publications

Wagner, Phillip. "Building and Sustaining Transformative Student Learning Experiences." In Strawser, Michael ed. (2018). *Transformative student experiences in higher education: Meeting the needs of the twenty-first-century student and modern workplace*.

Walker, Foster. (1993). "Education as if Self-Knowledge Mattered." *Paideusis: Journal of the Canadian Philosophy of Education Society*. Vol. 6(2), (Spring) 37-47 [page 47 missing]

Wawrytko Sandra. (2017). "Buddhist Nondualism: Deconstructing Gender and Other Delusions of the Discriminating Mind through Awareness." In Pang-White, Ann ed. *The Bloomsbury Research Handbook of Chinese Philosophy and Gender.* New York: Bloomsbury Academic.

Weeraperuma, S. (1998). *J. Krishnamurti as I Knew Him*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Wells, G. (1999). *Dialogic inquiry: Towards a socio-cultural practice and theory of education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

White, John, ed. (1984). *What is Enlightenment? Exploring the goal of the spiritual path*. Los Angeles: Jeremy P. Tarcher, Inc.

Williams, Chris. (2015). *Jiddu Krishnamurti: World Philosopher*. Sydney NSW: Sydney School of Arts and Humanities.

Young, Dan. (2000). "Education and Method Zero." *Journal of Thought*, Vol. 35, No. 3 (Fall 2000), Caddo Gap Press pp. 95-105.

Appendix A: Selected Krishnamurti dialogue transcript, with commentary

J. Krishnamurti Second Seminar in Ojai 22 March 1981

The Krishnamurti Foundation Trust archives identifies the text that follows as a transcription of an audio recording of a dialogue session held March 22nd 1981, at Pine Cottage, in Ojai, California, and as the second of four special seminars sponsored by university educator Brij Khare. A digital audio file indicates the dialogue took place in a time of just under fifty-nine minutes. I am using the official Krishnamurti Foundation Trust transcript but I have numbered each speaker's contribution and I have included the initials of the participants, as found in Khare's published transcript. Also, I have divided the dialogue transcript into segments of exchanges and added my commentary about examples of strategies and techniques Krishnamurti used in this dialogue. My commentary is marked by *italics*, and appears below the relevant segment. In this dialogue Krishnamurti engaged with six students from California State University, San Bernardino. Their names and initials are listed below. Krishnamurti's contributions are noted by "**K**."

Erik Lenz	**EL**	Pre-law
Ernest Mason	**EM**	History
Pete Perkons	**PP**	Psychology
David Schoen	**DS**	Political science
Elise Traynum	**ET**	Political Science
Rebeccah Warren	**RW**	Psychology

1. Brij Khare: Krishnaji, this morning we have a few college students with us and I'd like to introduce them to you. On your left we have Eric Lenz (noted as EL in the Khare edition of the book).
2. Krishnamurti: How do you do, sir?
3. Pete… I am sorry, David Schoen (DS), and Rebeccah Warren (RW). And on your right, we have Pete Perkons (PP), Ernie (Ernest Mason: EM) and Elise Traynum (ET).
4. K: How do you do, sir?
5. PP: Morning.
6. PP: I would like to open this discussion by asking you, since you have reflected a great deal on the individual dynamics of thinking, my interest is how does this apply to the social realm? It seems to me that we spend a lifetime of thinking great thoughts. We live mediocre lives. We're multiplying by a billion times on the planet and we have mediocre societies. Would you care to reflect on that?
7. K: What is mediocrity?
8. PP: Not living to our potential.
9. K: Again, what is a potential?
10. PP: I am not sure of that answer.
11. EM: I would think that it's achieving perfectibility.
12. K: Is – if I may – is perfection achievable? Or it is an **ideal** to which you are **struggling**?

Krishnamurti probes for precision here. He wants to make sure the question is clear. He is also avidly precise. He wants to understand what the participant means by mediocrity and so he simply asks "what is mediocrity?" It seems he wants to get a sense of the mind of the questioner, to understand the question completely, and to use that as a starting-off point for the dialogue. Krishnamurti listens intently, then he asks another question "what is potential?" Krishnamurti encourages continued sharing through dialogue and responds to the participant's stated uncertainty with his own notion of what potential is. This is how Krishnamurti moves the dialogue forward. He takes the participant's comment and massages the question, like kneading dough. He moves the dialogue forward by introducing the notion of "struggling" to achieve an ideal.

13. PP: Are you saying that our condition is, in essence, a continuous **struggle** for it?

Here this participant seems to have an insight into the question itself when he asks: "Are you saying that our condition is, in essence, a continuous struggle for [perfection]?"

14. K: Yes. Partly that and partly also our conditioning accepts ideals, and so striving towards those ideals, constantly. And so we live in struggle, conflict, never achieving that which is projected by thought.

Now Krishnamurti replies with an answer to a clarification question. Krishnamurti takes the participant's use of the word "condition" and restates this as "conditioning," connecting the notion of conditioning with the striving for ideals and with living in struggle and conflict. This keeps the dialogue relevant to the question posed by the student, while at the same time tying Krishnamurti's explanation to all that has come before. The dialogue began with mediocrity and unmet potential. Here Krishnamurti picks up on the participant's use of the word "struggle," and uses it to move the dialogue forward, explaining how conditioning makes people strive towards ideals and how that striving creates struggle and conflict.

15. PP: Then the human condition, in essence, is the struggle and the struggle is the beauty of the existence.
16. K: Yes, but either you accept the conditioning, as some of the philosophers do – accept it and modify it and change it but remain in that condition – or break through that condition. I should think mediocrity is to live in that conditioning. And to break through that conditioning is not to be mediocre.

*Krishnamurti points to two choices as possible responses to recognized conditioning: "… **either** you accept the conditioning… [**or**] break through that conditioning." And Krishnamurti offers his view that accepting a conditioned life leads to mediocrity, whereas breaking through conditioning does not.*

17. RW: Should breaking through that condition be a goal? Should that be our goal? Should breaking through our conditioning be our goal?
18. K: Again, if I may point out, why do we establish a goal? What is an end, what is the purpose? Why do we project these things and then try to achieve them? Why?

Krishnamurti probes; asks more questions; perhaps helping to clarify the thinking process for participants. In Krishnamurti's approach, precision is important for the group to arrive at a meeting of the minds, where participants feel fully engaged in a dialogue of shared understanding. Krishnamurti here poses his own questions in response to this participant's questions. This participant is seeking answers, as if from a guru, but Krishnamurti rejects such an attitude, which would contradict his approach's shared understanding style. While this participant wants a pat answer about how to proceed to achieve what Krishnamurti proposes, Krishnamurti responds with four "why" and "what" questions. And he brings the dialogue back to the notion of projection, a term commonly associated with psychology. But I infer from

Krishnamurti's earlier statement that "we live in struggle, conflict, never achieving that which is projected by thought" that Krishnamurti is here using "projection" as a metaphor for taking an image of a future state, and using that image as the goal to strive for. What Krishnamurti suggests is that people create an image of what they are striving for – what they want to become – and project that image into the future, striving towards these goals they imagine.

19. ET: That's part of our conditioning. We are conditioned in the society to strive to something. Even to strive to… not only to your highest potential but now we're trying to be conditioned to strive to our highest potential to achieve within our self. It's like we continually are in a struggle to attain a goal of any kind.
20. K: Who has projected the goal?

Now this participant articulates her understanding of what Krishnamurti has just pointed to. But Krishnamurti is encouraging further – deeper – examination of the question; perhaps wanting an elaboration of the question: "How to break through that conditioning?" Krishnamurti associates conditioning – as he means it – with the projection of goals – the concept of "becoming" something other than what you are now. This is how Krishnamurti facilitates and leads the dialogue. He directs the flow of discussion, while taking on a minimal air of authority, and without giving too much away too soon. Krishnamurti's dialogue approach is like jazz or dance improvisation. But this is not collective improvisation – Krishnamurti leads and facilitates a kind of communal conversation; a shared dialogue.

21. ET: We do.
22. K: Society.
23. ET: Ourselves.
24. K: Ourselves.
25. EL: Our parents.

From this brief exchange, participants seem to be fully immersed in the dialogue and participating with enthusiasm. While these American university students often contribute brief responses to Krishnamurti's questions, at other times they offer a well thought-out and independent explanation, as in the comment about the source of conditioning in society, above.

26. K: Our parents, our religions, our philosophies – all that has helped us to project an ideal, a concept, a goal towards which you are all striving. Right, sir?

Krishnamurti keeps the discussion on topic and returns participants to the flow of thought he would like them to inquire into by restating his notion of projection. He paraphrases, using a variation of words, but still uses that key concept that he has introduced earlier – projection. And this allows him to summarize what has been concluded so far, while opening a space for going

deeper with the inquiry. He takes one participant's comment about the struggle to attain goals, and connects goals with their cause: parents, religions, and philosophies (he could have said beliefs perhaps), suggesting that parents, religions, and philosophies influence people to project ideals, and as a result they then set goals to achieve those ideals.

27. EM: Are you saying that because we are so goal-oriented that our pursuit should be balanced more with…
28. K: No. We never 'are'; we are always becoming. And in this becoming, either successfully, financially, morally, ethically, aesthetically, or trying to achieve heaven – if I may use a religious word – it is always becoming something. And is there really a becoming at all? I am a student in a school, I can become M.A. and B.A., PhD and so on. Psychologically, is there a becoming at all?

*Here Krishnamurti displays his improvisational skills [in dialogue, Krishnamurti is always improvising; he does not use notes], as he takes advantage of the participant's use of "we **are** so goal oriented" to make the point that striving for a goal is a permanent state – there is always another goal to strive for, so that we are always in a state of becoming something. Psychologically, Krishnamurti says, we never **are** ourselves. Krishnamurti also shows no reluctance to make a correction when he feels it is necessary. And, he actually interrupts the participant. Of course, choosing well when to probe with more questions, as opposed to correcting and interrupting, is one of the skillful aspects of Krishnamurti's dialogue and deep inquiry approach. Krishnamurti's final question in this exchange, "psychologically, is there a becoming at all?" follows his explanation with the question that succinctly points the dialogue in the direction Krishnamurti wants to take it. He emphasizes the notion of **psychological** becoming. No doubt Krishnamurti realizes someone can change, and become, in a sense, a different person. But what he wants to point out is the necessity of examining the distinction between material and practical becoming, on the one hand, and psychological becoming, on the other. Certainly, someone can achieve a goal and become somebody else, with higher status, well-being, wealth. But Krishnamurti asks, though one can become a changed person materially, has one undergone any psychological change?*

29. ET: The question I had asked has to deal very much with becoming in essence to time, especially in a college atmosphere. In college you are always confronted with, 'Well, you have to succeed in order to go one step further.'
30. K: Further – yes.
31. ET: And you're continually judged, you are continually bombarded with information and knowledge, and it actually stifles your becoming, you know, your fullest.

32. K: There is a becoming in knowledge, isn't there? The more knowledge, the more.
33. ET: Yes.
34. K: But at what level are we discussing this, having a dialogue? At the level of achieving more, accumulating more knowledge, at one level, and the psychological level also are we achieving the same thing? I don't know if I'm making myself clear.

Krishnamurti's approach invites a conversation, and here he finds a conversation partner, when one of the participants wants to clarify her understanding of Krishnamurti's point about "becoming." First, Krishnamurti agrees, and encourages her to continue talking. And so, rather than provide an answer of clarification, Krishnamurti allows her to clarify her thinking for herself. His question "at what level are we discussing this, having a dialogue" confirms Krishnamurti's commitment to the shared dialogue approach. In addition, as far as the ***content*** *of the dialogue is concerned, Krishnamurti finds it necessary to make the distinction between* ***becoming*** *as a way to accumulate knowledge, on the one hand, and* ***becoming*** *psychologically, on the other hand. Another feature of Krishnamurti's approach demonstrated here is that Krishnamurti shows vulnerability and expresses uncertainty, when he says "I don't know if I make myself clear."*

35. EM: Yes, you do make yourself clear. That is… one of my concerns is that in the pursuit of… through the orthodox educational processes I find myself in with the outgrowth of nothing but knowledge, of data gathering, where I do not find the entire whole that obviously I am pursuing, because it doesn't give me the satisfaction that I am looking for.
36. K: So, can knowledge ever be complete, about anything?
37. Several: No.
38. K: No. So knowledge always goes with ignorance.

In this exchange, participants seem enthusiastic and involved. When a participant mentions his dissatisfaction with the state of his education, Krishnamurti improvises, asking if knowledge can ever be complete about anything. He alludes to the flaw in seeking knowledge for the sake of knowledge, but he pounces on the opening offered by the participant's admission that he (the participant) finds himself "… in with the outgrowth of nothing but knowledge… I do not find the entire whole that obviously I am pursuing." Krishnamurti finds, at this point, an appropriate moment to introduce his notion of the relationship between knowledge and ignorance, moving the dialogue forward by introducing the radical idea that knowledge and ignorance always go together. Krishnamurti takes the lead in this dance of dialogue, steering the group in the direction he wants to go.

39. PP: What you are saying then is that we select. We select on what we become, in essence.

40. K: And also, I am asking if there is a becoming, psychological becoming at all.
41. PP: I think there is.
42. K: Let's examine it, sir.
43. ET: I don't think so. I don't think so. I think that psychologically you are always in a position to aspire to become. You don't reach that point and it cuts it off.
44. EL: You are always striving for something.
45. RW: You are always striving.
46. RW: So you always have goals.
47. ET: Even psychological goals.
48. K: The whole implication of becoming implies time.
49. ET or RW: Yes.
50. K: Is there psychological time at all? As there is acquiring knowledge, there is time. If I was to learn a language, I need time. It may be a month, it may be six years, six months, but I need time. To learn to drive a car you need time.

This exchange demonstrates another strategy of Krishnamurti's dialogic approach. When a participant says, "what you are saying then is that we select," Krishnamurti replies with "and also I am asking…" in a way that invites dialogue, and then he directs focus when he restates the question concisely: "I'm asking if there is a becoming psychologically? Is there a becoming at all?" And then, Krishnamurti demonstrates another aspect of his approach, which is the respectful attitude he has for participants, when he says "let's examine it, sir." Not only is his respect for participants apparent in his use of the honorific "sir," but his respect for the shared dialogue approach comes out in the use of the first-person plural "let's." As if on cue, and beckoned by Krishnamurti's invitation, four participants (of the six) then inject their brief comments, which help to move the dialogue forward, and also indicate enthusiasm and a shared understanding. Krishnamurti listens intently and hears what they are saying, and then takes his original question about 'becoming' and adds another element to the discussion, that the notion of becoming implies time. In this way, Krishnamurti keeps the focus on the concept of psychological becoming, which means striving for something to take place in the future.

51. EM: But aren't you addressing the limitations of man's ability to comprehend this knowledge of language or such? It takes time.
52. K: Time. But inside, psychologically becoming, that also implies time. And is there such time, psychologically?
53. DS: It seems in becoming you would already have to have set out what you want to become.
54. K: That implies time.

While comfortable with a casual conversational approach, Krishnamurti accepts responsibility for maintaining focus. He wants to direct the listeners' attention to the concept of 'time,' because of the effect time has on psychological striving to become a different person. What Krishnamurti posits is that in striving to become something different in the future, people develop the concept of past, present, and future time. In between his statement above that 'the whole implication of becoming implies time' to his response just above 'that implies time' Krishnamurti allows for the free flow of questions in the improvised dance of dialogue. And yet, he does not let the dialogue divert too far from its present focus. Krishnamurti encourages participants to examine their own striving to 'become,' to investigate how such striving might affect them, psychologically. Krishnamurti's invitation is explicit and direct: "… psychologically becoming… implies time. And is there such time psychologically?" And he does this without having prepared or planned in advance. Krishnamurti's approach is like improvisational dance. (Those interested in adapting Krishnamurti's approach in practice will likely, over time, develop a balance between improvisation and planning that they find most suitable to their content and that helps them feel most comfortable with their own unique and personal approach.)

55. DS: Right. And you are trying to follow a pre-ordained path, which may not be a real one.
56. K: Sir, look at it practically. Suppose I am… there is little self-knowledge in me, about myself, and in studying myself I require time. Either I study some philosopher, psychologist and so on, or I study myself. To study myself can only take… that study can only take place in relationship. I can't go by myself and study myself. Right? All that requires… we think all that requires time. I question that. That's all.

Here Krishnamurti seems to be improvising again, with an analogy to explain what he means and to engage the participants. He uses a first-person voice: "suppose I am," and "about myself," and the first-person plural combined with the first-person to exude an attitude of inclusivity, when he says "we think all that requires time. I question that." But perhaps his unplanned improvisation is not completely thought out until just before he says "that's what I am trying to get at," five questions and answers further on. But, instead of judging this particular improvised analogy as clumsy, as some more critical readers might do, or as an example of lack of preparation, I see it as an acceptable, though at times risky, feature of Krishnamurti's improvisational style. Eventually, an interpretation of Krishnamurti's notion of 'time and becoming' reveals itself through this improvised dance of dialogue. Exemplified here is one of Krishnamurti's strengths as a facilitator; a strength probably developed through years of practise; a strength in finding the right balance between telling versus listening, and between directing versus sharing, a balance he seems comfortable with. When discussing difficult concepts, he first engages participants by prodding and asking, to clarify problems at their deepest layers. He also coaxes participants to reflect on, and relate, their experiences and thoughts to the problem and concept being examined. Then he brings in an example about what it takes, in his view, to study oneself and understand the process of thought, essential for attaining greater self-knowledge. Krishnamurti proposes that self-

knowledge can only be gained through observation and in relationship, but he questions that doing this kind of observation in relationship requires time, because, for Krishnamurti, relationship is fresh from moment to moment.

57. EM: Along that line and in my own personal pursuit of the centrality of the presence I find that I am totally being conflicted or impacted by the conditioning processes that are acquired through the institutional educational system.
58. K: That's right.

Krishnamurti agrees, appreciating this participant's contribution. Krishnamurti's affirmation serves here as well-placed encouragement for this participant, and a positive signal to the group, as this participant shares his own experience and reveals the tension he feels between his desire to live in the present, on the one hand, and being subject to contradictory conditioning influences, which involve becoming and time, on the other.

59. EM: My question is: how do I achieve this centralisation of subject? I have tried it for several years and repetitious-wise invariably I am being impacted by the conditioning processes.
60. K: So what is conditioning? I am brought up as a Hindu or a Buddhist or a Christian with their superstition, with their dogmas, with their rituals, with their nonsense, and that has conditioned me also. Poverty has conditioned me, climate, food, clothes – all that has brought about a certain restriction. I am a nationalist, or I am a scientist. So all those factors contribute to this conditioning. And I am aware of this. I am aware that I am conditioned as a Hindu or a Buddhist, whatever it is. And to be free of that conditioning, that's fairly simple. I am no longer Hindu. It is stupid to belong to any category of that kind.

While agreeing with the participant about the problem of conditioning processes, Krishnamurti now moves the dialogue forward by asking "what is conditioning," and keeps this focus with his suggested response, that once people become aware of the conditioning processes that affect them, they could simply stop being subject to those particular conditioning processes. Once a person realizes, in other words, the existence and effect of conditioning processes – those related to religion, economic background, nationalism, and occupation, for example – she can free herself of the effect these processes cause. For Krishnamurti, "that's fairly simple. I am no longer Hindu. It is stupid to belong to any category of that kind." To belong to any of these categories, as far as Krishnamurti is concerned, is stupid.

61. RW: To want to not belong to a category of that kind is a goal in itself, though.

62. K: No. It is a… No, there is no… It is a fact. If I am a nationalist I contribute to war. One of the reasons for war is nationalism. Right? And that is a fact. So that is not a goal. I see the consequence…
63. RW: But to want to not be there is a goal.
64. K: No. I see the consequences of nationalism and it's finished.
65. DS: Is that why you are saying then there is no time involved?
66. K: That's what I am trying to get at.
67. DS: It just happens when you see the problem.

As far as Krishnamurti is concerned, shaking off the constraints of psychological conditioning requires only the awareness of the existence of conditioning processes, and the consequences of these conditioning processes, such as nationalism, for example, with its potential consequence, war. And the participant – fully engaged in the conversation – has seen this as fact rather than as a goal to strive for. What Krishnamurti demonstrates here is another feature of his approach, which is that he facilitates and instigates insight in the minds of participants, not by telling them what to think; not by explaining; not by transmitting information or knowledge; but rather as an integral component of the shared dialogue approach. He asks questions, prods, gives examples, and occasionally elaborates on his concepts. But for the most part, he facilitates a change in the mind of participants, an insight. What I see here is that this participant, in this exchange, seems to have had such an insight, a kind of revelation; a realization of present fact. And this participant shares his insight when he proclaims: "It just happens when you see the problem."

68. K: If you see clearly the consequences of nationalism, for example...
69. Q (?): Then you just walk out.
70. K: Finished.
71. Q (?): Step out of it.
72. K: It is a danger. Like if I am religiously inclined towards Buddhism and see the consequences of all that, or a Christian and so on, it is not a goal, it's seeing the results of all that, how it divides man.

This is an example of how Krishnamurti's approach often leads to insight, through a shared deliberation, directed by a skilled facilitator who does not take on an air of authority, and who at the same time engages with the participants as one equal member of the dialogue group. Of course, in reality, Krishnamurti is not an equal member of the group, for he is the one the others have come to dialogue with. But what is relevant for Krishnamurti's approach is that he does not assume any authority over how problems are resolved. Krishnamurti's approach is a question-answer, question-answer shared dialogue. And because facilitator and participants examine freely the problems posed in the dialogue, in an open and collaborative atmosphere, often this

approach brings clarity and insight where there had been confusion before. As for the thematic content, the point made at this stage of the dialogue is that simply being aware of the harmful consequences of conditioning processes and conditioned beliefs – "seeing the results of all that, how it divides" – that such an awareness can bring an end to the affect these conditioning processes have on the person's thinking.

73. PP: Is not our language and our very biological limitations, do not they dictate how we react to our environment, how we understand it?
74. K: Yes.
75. PP: Therefore, do we not all understand our environment a little bit differently? We do not have a common perception at all times.
76. K: Can't we?
77. PP: I am wondering in terms of my sitting here in this very civilised place and I am looking at the African bushman, his realities of life are totally different.
78. K: Surely.
79. PP: They are conditioned differently.
80. K: But it is still conditioning.
81. PP: Yes, it is. Is all conditioning bad?
82. K: What do you call bad?
83. PP: Well, the conditioning of the bushman ensures that he survives.
84. K: Yes. And also, the conditioning here is also to survive.
85. PP: Yes, it is. Do I need to escape that conditioning?

In this exchange, we have an example of a participant challenging Krishnamurti's contention that conditioning processes must cease to have an effect before people can live without conflict. Conditioning processes could be viewed as adaptations to constraints on survival. "Is all conditioning bad" asks PP. Krishnamurti refuses to supply an answer, perhaps because the question of whether conditioning is all bad takes the dialogue far from its current focus. What Krishnamurti does in response is to ask another pointed question, asking what PP means by "bad." He knows the importance of digging deeper into the PP's "conditioned" interpretation of what conditioning entails. And though an African bushman may be conditioned differently from an American, Krishnamurti notes it is still conditioning, and it is still related to survival needs in both cases. So, here we see another technique of Krishnamurti's approach; a question is asked, an answer given, another question asked, and another answer given; all leading eventually to a refined understanding of what Krishnamurti means by conditioning, and the role it plays in the self-concept and in society. Following on differences in conditioning, PP then asks if he should escape his own conditioning, wondering perhaps about how he personally might benefit from

"escaping" his own conditioning. Understandably, he does not perceive a need to escape from what, to him, is necessary for survival. So, PP at this point has not accepted, or is not sure about, Krishnamurti's radical notion that conditioning is a danger, and "seeing the results of all that, how it divides man." This shows that Krishnamurti's approach is open to doubt, as exemplified here by PP. Such openness to doubt is integral to Krishnamurti's approach, for two reasons. First, to encourage understanding, doubt needs to be dealt with openly, and deliberated upon. Second, participants are asked to arrive freely at their own insights, rather than adopting Krishnamurti's views and conclusions.

86. K: No, no, just a minute, sir. Both demand security, safety, a sense of protective life. Whether the person is highly civilised, sophisticated or the bushman, their demands are the same. You maybe have much more sophisticated… and so on and so on, and the other fellow says, 'No, I just need something to eat.' But both demand security. Your security, one's security may be very, very… you know all that; or the other fellow says, 'It's not good enough, I don't want all that, it is too difficult.' So the demand for security is common to all of us.

Krishnamurti needs to make a course correction, and he does not hesitate to use the word "no" twice, and to call for a pause to examine the question more closely. The doubt raised by the participant concerns good and bad conditioning, and conditioning across cultures. Krishnamurti connects the notion of conditioning processes with the need for security, which he says is a need common across cultures. And because the demand for security is common to all, there is no point in investigating whether there is a choice between good or bad conditioning. This is another technique of this approach; establishing connections between related concepts that initially seem unrelated. Krishnamurti here articulates the connection between conditioning processes and the need for security, rather than expecting participants to realize this connection on their own. Thus, Krishnamurti makes a deliberate choice to express his idea so as to avoid having the dialogue veer off course.

87. EM: But we now have progressed to the point where we begin to observe the competition that all of us have; there is the dual competition of playing the game, of wanting to pursue the centrality of the presence, but living in an environment that is highly competitive.
88. K: Yes.
89. EM: And obviously in a day-to-day conflict we run into these daily conflicts with our personal thinking.
90. K: Is competitiveness a danger, to man, to society – and is society different from man? You follow?
91. PP: Competitiveness is…

92. K: Why do we compete?

Note how Krishnamurti affirms the concern expressed by one of the participants, who says how difficult it is to be present with what happens moment to moment while living in a competitive society. Krishnamurti agrees, but he also asks questions to keep the dialogue focused. Here we see Krishnamurti holding a space open for participants to stay engaged and contribute to a shared dialogue. In this exchange, for example, a participant helps to move the discussion forward, taking off from the theme of conditioning and how it relates to the need for security, on one hand, and connecting that to the competitive nature of society, life, and education, on the other. But even though Krishnamurti prefers and encourages a shared dialogue, he controls its direction. He steers the dialogue back to conditioning when he asks "is competitiveness a danger, to man, to society – and is society different from man?" But then he asks, immediately following that and without waiting for a response, "why do we compete?" One reason Krishnamurti may have chosen to do this, perhaps, is to keep the dialogue focused on conditioning, by going more deeply into the notion of competitiveness.

93. PP: It is a sword with two edges. One brings war and the other brings progress. It is a paradox. Competitiveness obviously advances civilisation.
94. K: What do you mean by progress?
95. Q (?): Progress?
96. K: More bathrooms?
97. PP: More, better things.
98. K: What is that?
99. PP: Our very society here is based on better and better living.
100. K: Wait, just a minute. Better of what? Better bathrooms, better communication, better transportation.
101. EL: Like medicines, better medicines.
102. K: Better surgery and so on, so on.
103. EL: Better living conditions.
104. K: Yes.
105. PP: But we also built better bombs.
106. K: Yes, that's just it. When you talk about progress, what do you mean by that? Progress physically – and is there such a thing, psychological progress? We haven't changed very much, psychologically. Inwardly we are as brutal as that bushman.
107. RW: We just have fancier means of expressing our brutality.

108. K: Yes.

In this exchange we see how Krishnamurti inquires into the precise meaning attributed to certain concepts. Once a participant introduces a new concept, in this case – progress – Krishnamurti probes for greater precision. Progress is nebulous and abstract, but the group needs to develop a common understanding of progress so that the dialogue can have meaning. For Krishnamurti, an important question is whether there is such a thing as psychological progress, for it seems to him that "inwardly we are as brutal as that bushman." He goes back to the participant's earlier analogy of the bushman as part of a different culture, with different conditioning processes. The key word there is "inwardly." Krishnamurti aims for precision in language, as he points out the distinction between psychological progress, on the one hand, and material progress, on the other. Of course, it is difficult to tell if the group had reached a shared understanding. Also, we do not know if participants were still unsure or confused. But this is a moment when Krishnamurti seems ready to move forward with the dialogue.

109. ET: I am concerned with… I'd like go back to what you said a little bit ago about dropping out – dropping out of the goal-seeking such as to be a Hindu, a Buddhist, Christian or whatever. Now, I don't see the practicality of interfacing in a society as a person without goals. It's such a goal-oriented society. And if I was to achieve this, this inner harmony, naturally I would like to have all achieve it. So, you know, that in itself seems like a type of conditioning – to bring everyone else to the point where I am.
110. K: Are you different from me, psychologically?
111. ET: I think I am.
112. K: Are you? Is that so? Are human beings living in the Far East or here or in Europe psychologically different?
113. Q (?): Maybe.
114. K: They suffer, they go through agonies, uncertainties, insecurity, great deal of fear, like the rest of them here. Aren't we psychologically, essentially similar, basically?
115. ET: Well I guess so. Yes.
116. Q (?): Yes.
117. PP: Basically, we are, but when we're put within the cultural context, we are different.
118. K: What is the… who has created this cultural environment?
119. PP: Individuals banding together, obviously.
120. K: That is so. We have created it, we human beings. We can tear it down or transform it. And physical revolution, like the communists, you know, physical revolution has never

changed, transformed man. So, there is only psychological revolution that will transform man. And apparently, we seem to forget that entirely.

In this exchange we see an example of participants questioning Krishnamurti's propositions. But, Krishnamurti brings it all back to his proposition about the individual and society, which is that human beings everywhere suffer psychologically in a similar way. He asks – he does not claim – "Aren't we psychologically, essentially similar, basically?" To this question, a participant suggests different cultures make for different individuals. And at this stage, Krishnamurti uses another question to help make his point; again, he does not declaim this – he asks: "Who has created this cultural environment?" There is no escaping the conclusion that it is individuals who create different cultural environments. And, from here, Krishnamurti moves the dialogue forward by reiterating a notion he has expressed earlier – that physical revolutions do not lead to effective transformation; only psychological revolution transforms man. This is an example of how Krishnamurti's approach invites and provides for, as much as can be sustained, an open and free flow of ideas in a shared investigation, but also restrains excessive off-topic excursions. Krishnamurti facilitates and directs, keeping the dialogue focused on central themes, without relying too heavily on his innate authority as facilitator (his rhetorical ethos). In Krishnamurti's approach, the facilitator takes control, navigates, and sets course, but also invites participants to come along in a process of shared inquiry, rather than leading participants down a particular path. One way to establish and maintain this kind of control, as shown here by Krishnamurti, is to use questions, elaborations, modifications, repetitions, paraphrases, and restatements of the problem under investigation, which encourages participants to examine problems closely, with inward reflection. It seems Krishnamurti realizes that some extent of control is necessary for the dialogue to stay focused. He asks "are you different from me, psychologically?" and follows up with "are human beings living in the Far East or here or in Europe psychologically different?" And then he elaborates with "they suffer…like the rest" and "aren't we psychologically essentially similar, basically?" With this approach to the problem, Krishnamurti encourages the kind of reflection expressed by the participant who concedes: "Well, I guess so. Yes." And then Krishnamurti moves the dialogue forward when he follows the participant's "but when we're put within the cultural context, we are different" by prodding for deeper inquiry, asking "who has created this cultural environment?" And, at just the appropriate place in this exchange, Krishnamurti restates the problem, to keep the dialogue firmly in focus: "… physical revolution has never changed, transformed man… there is only psychological revolution that will transform man." What this exchange demonstrates is how Krishnamurti's dialogue toolbox includes questions and statements appropriately worded, but also injected into the mix at just the right time. Krishnamurti's questions put at the right time in the dialogue often challenge participants to examine questions with a different perspective and seeing it in a new light. And that, seeing a problem in a new light, often offers an opening for insight to arise.

121. PP: Would you reflect on ethno-centrism, then? Obviously each culture thinks that it is the best. How do you reconcile competing systems?

122. K: Why do you want to compete with each other, one system against another system?

123. PP: I am reflecting on a reality of the world.

124. K: Sir, what is the reality of that world?

125. PP: We think that we have a better system because we have so-called popular democracy.

126. K: Yes.

127. PP: Communists think that they have a better system because they supposedly take care of the needs of everyone in their society.

128. K: Not necessarily.

129. PP: Not necessarily. And we do not necessarily have a popular democracy.

130. K: Certainly.

131. PP: Yet in our ethno-centricity we think we do. We act as if we do. We build bombs in the name of it to protect ourselves.

132. K: Yes, sir, the good old game. We know all this.

133. PP: This is where the competition lies. The competition is a collective. Collective effort individually…

134. K: Collective effort to be what?

135. PP: To maintain our system.

136. K: No. Maintain security.

In this exchange, what begins as a dialogue involving two students with Krishnamurti has now become a dialogue between PP and Krishnamurti. From "Basically we are, but when we're put within the cultural context, we are different" to his comment below "I am reminded the 15th of next month I have to pay taxes," this is one participant engaging in dialogue with Krishnamurti, though I would expect that the whole group is engaged attentively. We see here another feature of Krishnamurti's approach, in that he does not shy away from engaging in dialogue with one person at a time in the presence of a whole group of participants. I think that Krishnamurti prefers to allow, as much as is practical, a free flow of dialogue without restricting or limiting discussion. In this exchange, he responds with a variety of questions of his own, mining for the thinking buried deep in the participant's question, digging to understand this participant's view of the world. To the participant's question "How do you reconcile competing systems?" Krishnamurti follows with his own question "Why do you want to compete … one system against another system?" And then with the participant's reply "I am reflecting on a reality of the world," Krishnamurti seizes the opportunity to dig deeper into the participant's conditioned view of the world by asking pointedly "what is the reality of that world?"

We see here how Krishnamurti leads in this dance of dialogue. Krishnamurti listens attentively, while encouraging the participant to more deeply examine participant's thought process, revealing layers of conditioning processes. "Yes," and "not necessarily" and "certainly" and "we know all this" all indicate Krishnamurti is attending to every word spoken by this participant. And then he takes advantage of the participant's mention of "competition" and "collective effort" to lead the dialogue back to the central. Asking "collective effort to be what?" elicits the participant's "to maintain our system," which gives Krishnamurti the opening to follow up with the correction: "No. Maintain security." Now the dialogue is back on course, connecting the individual's need to maintain a sense of security, on one hand, with how this need creates or leads to conditioned thinking and beliefs, on the other.

What this exchange shows, then, is Krishnamurti striving for the right balance of questioning, listening attentively, and leading the dialogue forward. For educators who value student participation and prefer collaborative learning, this exchange is a good example of how to promote collaboration through dialogue. From words alone, we gather that Krishnamurti is participating attentively, mentally noting the gist and direction of participants' comments and questions, but never losing sight of the problem being investigated. He does not challenge this participant, but rather responds with his own questions. And he does this twice. Krishnamurti brings the discussion back to competition, and to systems, through questions and brief interjections. He agrees or injects a minor comment, indicating a simple "yes," or "not necessarily," or "certainly," thus inviting the participant to continue. What this shows is how this approach encourages participants to examine Krishnamurti's propositions and questions in a way they can reflect on ways these concepts influence their own life experiences. Krishnamurti's question, "collective effort to be what?" brings focus back to the individual self. So far, this participant seems to not have grasped the thrust of Krishnamurti's contention that the only efficacious revolution is an inward, psychological, revolution. But we can see in this exchange another example of the collaborative nature of Krishnamurti's approach. While it seems likely that different participants may come away from the discussion with a different understanding, as well as with their own thoughts about changes they might want to make in their lives, if any, nonetheless, participants in this kind of dialogue approach are more likely to feel content at having been full and equal participants.

137. PP: Yes, but we…

138. K: Essentially security. Don't use 'our system'.

Krishnamurti, as we see in this exchange, corrects when appropriate. Over decades of developing his dialogic approach, he has arrived at a comfortable balance between when to correct course by interfering with the flow, on the one hand, and when to let the dialogue flow freely, on the other. He seems to choose carefully what comments to modify or correct for the sake of keeping focus. Krishnamurti must have felt it necessary and appropriate at this point to interfere and correct for the participant's use of the phrase "our system." Krishnamurti possibly feels "our system" connotes

a collectivity, but he would rather emphasize his contention that real change comes only from individual psychological change, not from changes to systems or collective groups.

139. PP: I agree with you, but I am also… I am qualifying only to the extent that I am saying that we do it within our cultural system. We say our cultural system is the security system and so I find it a paradox that we simply cannot agree on a functional system that would do away with ethnocentricity.
140. K: But why are we so concerned with the system?
141. Q: Because the system will not leave us alone.
142. K: Won't it?

Krishnamurti deftly uses questions here to encourage close examination of conditioned thinking. While he prefers dialogue over debate or argument, and since he has earlier suggested "don't use 'our system,' he reiterates the point with his question "why are we so concerned with the system?" Faced with this participant's adamant persistence that "the system will not leave us alone," Krishnamurti questions this notion of "the system" by bluntly asking "won't it?" In this way, he shows, on the one hand, that he is immersed in a shared dialogue, but on the other hand, he takes care not to neglect his responsibility as facilitator to direct the dialogue without veering too far off course.

143. PP: No, not really. I am reminded the 15th of next month I have to pay taxes. In a very real way the system will not literally leave us alone.
144. K: I know everybody is filling the papers. (Laughter)
145. PP: Yes.
146. K: I am the only person that is not doing it. (Laughs)

This brief exchange demonstrates that, though on the whole Krishnamurti's attitude is quite serious, he is also open to injecting humour when it flows naturally. In this exchange at this moment, he has perhaps noticed participants preoccupied with having to pay their income taxes soon, and he sees the humour in the fact that this mundane matter is of no concern to him. Krishnamurti shares this with the group, and it seems appropriate here, as the participant offers proof that the "the system will not literally leave us alone" because everyone must file income tax returns by April 15th. Krishnamurti points out how different his own personal situation is, suggesting, perhaps, that while others are required to prepare and file income tax returns, this requirement of the "system" does not apply to him. Krishnamurti's disclosure offers a different perspective; that there is a different way of looking at the impact the "system" has on people.

Merely making this distinction, Krishnamurti opens up the possibility that there is another way to look at the tension between individual and society. His disclosure of an example from his own life injects a little naturally flowing levity that fits neatly in his improvisational approach.

147. EM: And along that, in a same line and addressing what you mentioned earlier, we do not have a psychological commonality. We just do not have it, from a realistic standpoint. We do not try to achieve common goals in that area.
148. K: So each one thinks he is a separate entity.
149. RW: Yes.
150. K: And each one says, 'My security is far more important than the security of the common, of the whole.'
151. Q (?): Exactly… (inaudible)

This exchange, with three different participants, shows how Krishnamurti applies his back-and-forth question-response technique. Vibrancy permeates the discussion here, even as participants express doubts about Krishnamurti's propositions. One participant doubts the notion that there is in society a psychological community; that people do not strive to achieve common goals. Krishnamurti agrees, but adds a clarification about how individuals see themselves as separate. As the participant accepts Krishnamurti's modification, Krishnamurti adds a further modification about the relative importance individuals assign to their own personal security. And at this point, this questioner expresses his full agreement. Now Krishnamurti has the opening to move the dialogue forward. Krishnamurti displays his skill at conducting a shared talking-through of problems. These participants express their doubts. They are, to some extent, debating, and questioning Krishnamurti. But both of these kinds of responses seem integral and welcome aspects of Krishnamurti's approach, and do crop up in small group encounters.

152. K: So is there – again, question – an individuality at all?
153. DS: It is only in thought.
154. K: Yes.
155. DS: That we think that we are separate.
156. K: We think we are individuals. Right? Is that so?
157. DS: Not really.
158. K: No.
159. EM: Are we saying that from the basic state of man that we are really in actuality common?
160. K: Yes, sir.

This exchange shows how Krishnamurti's approach in this dance of question-response, question-response, occasionally instigates insights in participants. What this last question suggests is that EM has had the insight that there is a consciousness common to all humanity. And since Krishnamurti encourages participants to examine for themselves their own conception of separate individuality, here at just the right moment, he confirms what the participant suggests, and then adds "We think we are individuals. Right? Is that so?" So, we see that Krishnamurti is open to respond to doubts. While one participant disagrees with Krishnamurti's notion of common consciousness, EM does seem open to this notion, when he asks "Are we saying that from the basic state of man that we are really in actuality common?" While Krishnamurti is relatively unattached to any particular learning outcome, his approach opens space for insight. What he suggests is that unacknowledged conditioning is a barrier to having a felt sense of commonality in peoples' lives, but whether participants arrive at this kind of sense of commonality through this kind of dialogue with Krishnamurti, or whether they have considered it only on an intellectual level, is hard to gauge in this and any other dialogue.[11]

161. EM: And the only reason that we see this diversity is because through our continual, through humanity's progress in conditioning we find ourselves in an artificial…

162. K: Obviously. As we said, psychologically, whether we live in India or in Asia or this part of the world, psychologically we are similar. Basically, fundamentally we are similar. You may have white skin, I may have black skin, somebody yellow, and so on, so on. Culturally we may be different. Religiously maybe we're different, but basically, we go through agonies, tortures, uncertainties, despair, great sense of sorrow – we go through all that. So that is the commonality.

163. EM: Well then, basically, if we do recognise that as the commonality...

164. K: Not 'recognise'; it is a fact.

Here EM connects the perception of a separate self with the notion that conditioning influences create that perception. Possibly, EM was about to refer to an artificial state of mind, a state that results from the "conditioned" notion of a separate self. Krishnamurti agrees emphatically ("obviously") and elaborates on his notion of commonality. While people have unique personal features and preferences, psychologically people are similar. Krishnamurti suggests that common to all people are feelings of despair and sorrow. Here, then, is an example of another technique, where Krishnamurti seizes the moment and improvises with his own emphatic modification response. "Not recognize; it is a fact," he says. This modification combines with contributions from

[11] Note that, my thesis proposes that applying Krishnamurti's approach to dialogue in higher education can be adapted to foster shared group understanding and a kind of thinking-together on a strictly **intellectual** level as well, which seems a common-enough aim of a great deal of higher education practice. And, while transformative education, as envisioned by Mezirow and others, encourages a psychological transformation (as does Krishnamurti), I propose that Krishnamurti's approach actively fosters personal transformation.

participants to move the dialogue forward to a point where psychological commonality gains greater acceptance with the group; more than an intellectual possibility, but as a fact.

165. EM: Fact. Then what is the basic nature of man? I mean, what is the real nature of man?

166. K: So, the real nature of man is this. To find out much further and deeper one has to be free of all this.

167. PP: Then in essence they are individuals who achieve it. They are free in an un-free world.

168. K: They are no longer individuals. You see, we are still thinking in terms of 'me' separate from everybody else. Right? Psychologically I am you, basically, whether I live in Russia or, you know, freedom in this country. If I am a Russian I go through all kinds of trouble.

It seems that here this participant is trying to appreciate the full impact of Krishnamurti's conception of the relationship between self and society. For most people, accepting Krishnamurti's notion of "I am you" requires discarding conditioned ways of perceiving reality. "Psychologically I am you" reflects Krishnamurti's reality, and a fact he encourages participants to feel, beyond the limited intellectual level of understanding. No doubt, by this time, Krishnamurti is well aware of how difficult it must be for people to change; to understand what he says; to assimilate what he says; to live with this awareness as fact. He senses, probably, that participants feel skepticism, doubt, or confusion. But it seems this is the whole point of Krishnamurti's approach. His dialogic approach helps some participants (or all, or none) gain insight into the nature of their own psychological reality, and as a consequence to look at it with fresh eyes. Perhaps over the years of speaking with groups, he has developed these strategies and techniques to form an approach that is the one most likely to instigate insight.

169. PP: Does the ego have no purpose then? The ego is important, it provides survival for this body here.

170. K: Now what you mean by the ego?

171. PP: The ego.

172. K: I know.

173. PP: The self-importance.

174. K: Self-importance.

175. PP: Yes.

176. K: What is the self?

177. PP: The self is a finite body that contains a mind that… (inaudible)

178. K: Just a minute, sir. Let's examine it; the self. What is the self? The 'me', the ego, the whole structure on which thought moves – what is that?

Krishnamurti's focus is on the psychology of the individual, but he probably does not want to rely on terms associated with Freudian psychology. Using only two questions and two concise comments – strategically placed – he redirects the dialogue from "ego" to "self." And when the participant engages in this dance of dialogue, but falls short of what Krishnamurti says about the "self", Krishnamurti suggests a pause. Here again, as part of his approach, he engages in dialogue rather than telling the group what he has to say about the self. He repeats his earlier question, because he feels it has not been fully examined. "What is the self? The 'me', the ego, the whole structure on which thought moves – what is that?" With this series of questions, Krishnamurti moves the dialogue toward a deeper examination of the meaning of 'self', suggesting participants pause for closer reflection as a prelude to this deeper examination. He politely suggests: "Just a minute, sir. Let's examine it."

179. PP: It is me. That is the only way I know how to define it.

180. K: Yes.

181. PP: They are fine academic words, but in essence it is 'me'.

182. K: It is 'me'. What is that 'me' composed of?

183. PP: I have a great number of feelings, I have great number of thoughts.

184. K: Yes, great number of thoughts, reactions.

185. PP: Like I said, I feel, I react emotionally to…

186. K: Desires, fears.

187. PP: Yes.

188. K: That is, the 'me' is my consciousness. Right?

189. PP: Yes.

190. K: And the content makes up the consciousness.

191. PP: Yes.

192. K: So, what are the contents of my consciousness, common consciousness?

193. PP: Basically, we all share the same content.

194. K: Exactly.

Here Krishnamurti engages participants by using questions, affirmations, modifications, corrections, and clarifications, all intended to help participants move toward a shared understanding and appreciation of his concepts. Once it becomes evident that the moment of understanding has arrived, all he does is to simply exclaim "exactly." Krishnamurti's approach, then, shown here, includes first a "yes" to agree with the participant who says "it is 'me'," and

Krishnamurti agrees again but asks "what is that 'me' composed of?" With this question, he coaxes participants to dig deeper, to examine more closely their thinking, and to reflect on conditioned beliefs. Then, when PP says that his 'me' is composed of many thoughts and feelings, Krishnamurti repeats the participant's response by way of further encouragement, but adds one more significant word, "reactions." And when PP says "I react emotionally," thus following Krishnamurti's lead, Krishnamurti moves the dialogue forward by suggesting that emotional reactions are conditioned by desires and fears. The participant agrees, again, and Krishnamurti now extends the inquiry by asserting that the 'me' is my consciousness, which elicits another "yes" from PP, thus allowing Krishnamurti to propose that consciousness is made up of its content. Now Krishnamurti has another "yes" from the participant, which offers him the opening to ask "what are the contents of my consciousness, common consciousness?" What we see here, then, is that with this step-by-step, skillfully facilitated dance of question-and-answer, and with the apt insertion of a well-placed hint, the addition of the adjectival "common" to describe consciousness, Krishnamurti's technique has elicited the insight from the participant that "basically we all share the same content." And at this moment participants are aware at a deep level that psychologically, basically, all people have a similar content of consciousness, and therefore are also, basically the same though also separate individuals.

195. PP: Do we have then... does that lead to the assumption that we have a collective consciousness?

196. K: Obviously. Not 'collective', it is common consciousness.

197. Q (?): Common consciousness.

198. K: I suffer, I am anxious, I am terribly depressed, neurotic, suffer, and my friend in India goes through the same thing, or in Japan. So our consciousness with its content is common to all of us.

Here the participant takes the lead in this dance of dialogue, with a question that asks for confirmation and clarification. Krishnamurti modifies and corrects the participant's language, by noting his preference for "common consciousness," instead of "collective consciousness." Krishnamurti then offers a real-life example, one related to what had been put forward earlier about cultural conditioning influencing groups of people in different ways. "Our consciousness with its content is common to all of us," Krishnamurti says. At this moment, the group is back to a point Krishnamurti made earlier, except that now participants are perhaps more open to seeing this point more clearly, now that they have heard Krishnamurti's example about friends in India or in Japan. Krishnamurti's approach thus seems at this stage to have accommodated participants to an appreciation and understanding of his propositions that had earlier seemed contentious. Now Krishnamurti's notion of common consciousness receives acceptance as fact.

199. EM: But why do we, when looking inward trying to address this consciousness, why do we conclude in our personal observations, or solutions, that they are so diversified, that our answer to what we are inwardly is not what we observe?

200. K: That is, sir, consciousness is put together by thought. Right? Would you agree?

I see another technique of Krishnamurti's approach in this exchange. EM asks a well-thought-out and relevant question, and Krishnamurti responds by elaborating and moving the dialogue forward, taking the inquiry further, deeper; toward examining the nature of thought and its role in creating the content of consciousness. Note how in this thinking-together, collaborative approach, Krishnamurti invites participants to reflect and further examine his contention for themselves, by simply asking if participants agree: "Right? Would you agree?" He does not suggest what or how they should think about the content of consciousness.

201. EM: Yes.

202. K: So we are to inquire into the whole problem of thought. What is thought? What is thinking? Why have we given such extraordinary importance to thought? Thought has built the great cathedrals, great architecture, painting, poetry, and also thought has created all the illusions in the cathedrals. Right?

203. RW: Right. We think thought ensures our survival. We think that if we don't have thought as a species we'll die.

204. K: No.

205. RW: I think that is right, though.

206. K: We are inquiring aren't we: what is thinking? Which has made all this world[12], the light, that electricity. What is thinking?

Now that RW engages with Krishnamurti's examination of thought and thinking, Krishnamurti asks a series of questions to move the dialogue forward toward investigating the meaning of thought more deeply. And in the midst of this series of questions he inserts a most radical proposition: "Thought has built the great cathedrals, architecture, painting, poetry, and also thought has created all the illusions in the cathedrals." So, while he acknowledges that thought

[12] NOTE: Curiously, Khare's transcription, as published in *Things of the Mind*, (p. 58), reads instead: ""We are inquiring, aren't we? What is that thinking which has made all this **war** or the blight of the cities? What is thinking?" I have listened to this segment of a copy of the audio recording held at the Krishnamurti Foundation Trust in England several times and have not been able to discern which version is consistent with what Krishnamurti actually said. Still, it is interesting to note the gap in meaning between the two versions and to keep in mind we are dealing here with spoken discourse, not written text. As far as I know, Krishnamurti has not had a role in editing either version.

has created great works, Krishnamurti points out that thought has also brought about illusions about what it has created. Here he introduces a twist on the theme of thought; that thought also leads to "illusions in the cathedrals." Krishnamurti engages this participant in an inquiry in to what thought is, asking questions while also injecting a series of clarifications: "What is thinking?" Thought has made everything in the world, he says. But what is thought? Krishnamurti does not want to flatly say what he knows to be the meaning of thought. One of his facilitation tools is to ask probing questions intended to elicit more careful and deeper examination of a problem. Another tool he uses is gentle coaxing. Krishnamurti's approach seems intent on developing shared understanding. And though he facilitates and directs, Krishnamurti also relies a great deal on improvisation. Krishnamurti seems to facilitate with an attitude of openness to learning along with the participants, with no attempt to transmit traditional knowledge of any kind. He does not read from prepared notes. He does not rely on a lesson plan. No doubt he knows his subject well, as by the time of this dialogue (1981), he has had decades of opportunities to develop, adapt, and hone his approach. As facilitator of a collaborative approach to dialogue, Krishnamurti relies on improvisation, albeit a directed or guided kind of improvisation, rather than seeking to achieve certain learning outcomes. Krishnamurti's improvisational style seems to balance the choreography of improvisational dance, or the structure of improvisational jazz, on the one hand, with a controlled and directed approach.

207. EM: Thinking to me is the mental processes through which I operate as me, being impacted by external stimuli and intuition or intuitive thinking from within. Those are the mental processes that I consider to be in the realm of thinking.
208. K: Yes, sir, but what is – all right, let's put it round the – what is thought? What is the source of thought? Why have we given such extraordinary importance to thought? Thought has created nationalities. Thought has created God. Sorry! Thought has created all the rituals, the dogmas, and divided man: 'I believe in this, I don't believe in that.' 'I believe in Jesus.' 'I don't believe in Jesus.' Thought has divided man, essentially. Why? So one has to inquire into what is thought.
209. PP: At a very basic level it is reaction to our environment.
210. EM: It is language.
211. K: Yes.

212. PP: And our language shapes how we think about our environment.

213. K: Yes, yes. But go behind that, go further, a little further. What makes you think?

214. PP: Because I have to survive.

215. K: No, no – thought. Thought. What makes you... What is thought?

216. EM: Thought is the impulse coming from history, from events of the past that you have experienced.

217. K: That mankind has experienced.

218. EM: That man has experienced.

219. K: Man has experienced.

220. EM: And as a result of…

221. K: Which means what?

222. ET: It means that's part of conditioning.

223. K: No, no, don't reduce to… Knowledge. Right? You said 'the past'. Man's past is the story of man as knowledge, as experience, stored up in the brain as memory. That memory, when there is that memory, and the reaction to that memory is thinking. So thinking is a material process.

As the group grapples with the question "what is thought," we note Krishnamurti's dialogic approach as collaborative but always subject to his direction. One consequence of this approach, demonstrated in this exchange, is how time-consuming it can be, compared with traditional approaches to transmitting knowledge. And sometimes his approach can be frustrating and confusing to participants. Another aspect of Krishnamurti's approach we can note here is that he sheds an attitude of authority, even as he probes, coaxes, encourages, prods, and sometimes points the group in the direction he wants to take. But he rarely lays out his ideas one after the other, and he rarely tells the group what he thinks, and when he does this it often comes after the group has taken some time to examine a problem.

Eventually, when he deems it necessary, Krishnamurti states an essential proposition. In this exchange, for example, we can see how, eventually, the group has collaboratively arrived at an appreciation of Krishnamurti's notion that thought is a material process emanating from "knowledge, as experience, stored up in the brain as memory." But what specific strategies and techniques has Krishnamurti used to bring this particular group to examine and think through the problem? He starts with the simple, broad question "what is thought?" intended probably as a rhetorical jumping off point. Then he asks another question, without waiting for a reply to the first one. Then he asks "what is the source of thought," to zoom in further. From there the question "why have we given such extraordinary importance to thought" seems a logical progression. And now, without waiting for any response Krishnamurti indicates why thought has become so important. Thought, in Krishnamurti's view, creates nationalities, God, rituals, and dogmas, which

are beliefs that divide people into separate groups. Then Krishnamurti explains why it is essential to understand what thought is. "Thought has divided man, essentially." Why has this happened?

He allows this question to linger for the time being, perhaps to give participants a chance to reflect. And then, he poses his own conclusion: "One has to inquire into what is thought." So, what does Krishnamurti do in this exchange? He starts with a broad question, as an introduction to the problem he wants to investigate together with the group. He then follows up with another less broad question, and then he asks a question that puts the problem of thought into a context of serious importance, to justify a thorough examination of the problem at its core, at its deepest layers. And then he states what he sees as factual reality – that thought creates beliefs, and these beliefs divide people into separate groups. And he explains why it is so essential to understand the process of thought. At that point, Krishnamurti invites responses and discussion, simply by pausing. He indicates this pause and invitation for feedback by restating the simply-put broad question from the beginning, "what is thought?" Then, after a participant connects thought with language, Krishnamurti prods and coaxes with "yes, yes. But go further… What makes you think?" Soon Krishnamurti repeats (for the third time) his original question, "what is thought?" And when a participant connects thought with the past, among other things, Krishnamurti grabs the word "past" and elaborates upon it. He now has what he needs to conclude this exchange with the statement that past is "knowledge, experience, memory, and the reaction to that memory is thinking. So thinking is a material process." He has made his point.

224. PP: You mean it's an electrochemical process.

225. K: It is a material process.

226. Q (?): Yes.

227. K: And that has created all this misery in the world – wars, you know, the whole modern system is based on that. Even the ancient system was based on that.

228. EM: But pursuing that further, that historical knowledge that you have inside of you is there, it's not something that you can…

229. K: You are the story of mankind.

230. EM: Right.

231. K: And it is there.

232. PP: I am not sure if I understand what you are saying. Are you saying that we represent a prototype of the product of the …?

233. K: No, no, not prototype. I am saying thought is the response of memory. Right? Memory is knowledge. Knowledge is experience. From the most primitive to the most highly sophisticated, highly educated, is still memory, knowledge. So thought is always incomplete. Right?

Here, Krishnamurti moves the dialogue forward by sharing his conception of thought – that thought comes from experience, knowledge, and memory – but then he makes the radical pronouncement that thought is always incomplete. Krishnamurti shows another technique of his approach. He balances engaging participants in a collaborative dialogue toward a shared understanding, on the one hand, and the need to interrupt the flow, to interfere, when he finds it necessary to clarify key concepts and to correct course, on the other. Note the result of Krishnamurti's approach here. As he clarifies, corrects, and elaborates, PP feels comfortable enough to express confusion and to seek further clarification, as he struggles to absorb what he has just heard. Krishnamurti's approach is open to questions for clarification; but, of course, this also means that time and space are needed for these questions to be considered. The other point about this aspect of Krishnamurti's approach is that participants need to feel comfortable expressing doubt or confusion. In this exchange, for example, PP says "I am not sure if I understand what you are saying," and Krishnamurti responds casually, at first rejecting PP's use of "prototype", and then redirecting the dialogue to the notion of "knowledge is experience." Krishnamurti then introduces a new element to the examination of thought. "So thought is always incomplete." With this radical declaration, Krishnamurti makes time and space for comments by asking: "Right?"

234. PP: I guess what I am really thinking is this: that of necessity we are species-specific. We can only react in certain combinations of ways to our environment because we are species specific. Therefore, our commonality of reactions seems that there is a collective thought, collective memory. Is that really… is that what you are saying?

235. K: Yes.

236. PP: All right.

237. K: My language is not… just ordinary language. Yours is educated, specialised language. If we forget your speciality and my whatever it is, we meet on common ground as human beings, not as a specialist or not – we meet on common ground. The common ground is we both think.

In Krishnamurti's view, people use what he calls educated and specialised language, but his language, on the other hand, is ordinary language. What he seems to be suggesting is that for people to meet on common ground and to arrive at a shared understanding they are better off relying on ordinary rather than on specialized language.

238. PP: The one difference may be that you are using a language or your reflections on life and I am using the language of the conditioning of the system.

239. K: (Laughs) Perhaps.

240. ET: How can one go about divorcing oneself from thought, from memory?

241. K: No, no, no – thought is you.

Krishnamurti corrects ET's statement that a person can separate her thought from her memory. Krishnamurti wants to prevent confusion over the notion that people could observe their thoughts and their memory as separate from their self-concept. He does not suggest people can do away with their conditioned thinking, but rather that they see it for what it is, without judging the content of their consciousness as good or bad, without condemning what is in the mind, and without trying to change what is in the mind.

242. ET: Or you say we should take it a little further past memory to really realise the self is…

243. K: No.

244. ET: I don't understand.

Krishnamurti's declaration that one cannot ignore memory and simply come to a different sense of self calls for Krishnamurti to respond to a sincere admission from ET that she does not understand. For Krishnamurti, conditioning results from knowledge, experience, and memory. And though Krishnamurti uses everyday language, some participants might find parts of what Krishnamurti says perplexing. At such moments, Krishnamurti elaborates and explains. He recognizes moments when complex and abstract concepts need to be elucidated, and his approach involves knowing when to distinguish between such moments where elucidation is needed, on the one hand, and those moments when he can direct the dialogue forward by eliciting participant engagement, on the other. The problem of conditioning and its causes fits in the former category rather than the latter.

245. K: Thought has put together the 'me'. Thought has put together my consciousness. I am afraid, the whole… my consciousness with its content is the movement of thought. Obviously. Fear of death, fear of loneliness – all that is the product, the movement of thought. So I have to understand, one has to understand and explore what is thought, which is common to all mankind.

In this exchange, we see another aspect of Krishnamurti's approach. Since he does not rely on advance preparation and does not use prepared notes, he simply spills out statements and responses as improvisation. Part of his improvisational approach involves, as we see in this exchange, Krishnamurti reiterating or rephrasing statements he has made earlier. Here, for example, Krishnamurti re-establishes the connection between thought, consciousness, and the self. For some participants these three concepts, and the way Krishnamurti weaves them together, can come across as complex and abstract, and therefore difficult to understand. Educators adapting Krishnamurti's approach will have different ways of dealing with this kind of complexity. Some may want to say something like "We will get back to that point," or "It will become clear as we go

on." But, because his approach involves a shared thinking-through of a problem in an improvisational style, Krishnamurti gives the best response he can come up with. He has a certain skill that helps him explain, restate, and summarize the problem. Here, for example, he uses fear as an example. But he makes a point to conclude this exchange by reiterating that "one has to understand and explore what is ***thought****, which is* ***common to all*** *mankind."*

246. EM: So obviously what you are advocating is the reorientation of thought?

247. K: No. See the limitation of thought.

248. EM: Self-awareness.

249. K: Partly. See the limitation of thought and whether, if it is limited, whether there is something limitless, whole.

250. PP: I suspect that you are saying that the vanity of mankind regarding thought is too great, that we think we can solve everything with thought, and it's not true.

251. K: That's right. You haven't solved a thing.

Krishnamurti adjusts; he makes a slight correction. It is not about a reorientation of thought, but about seeing the limitation of thought. In other words, he wants to make it clear that a person cannot reorient or change the way she thinks, but what she can do is to be aware of the limited utility of thought; that thought is always incomplete. Also, Krishnamurti uses the simple and blunt "no" when appropriate. And, to encourage participant contributions, he affirms a relevant comment, as when he says "partly." Also, he does not hesitate to indicate full agreement when a comment nicely rephrases Krishnamurti's thinking, as when he says "that's right." Not only that, he makes a point of repeating the participant's choice of words. PP says "we think we can ***solve*** *everything with thought, and it's not true," and Krishnamurti replies, "that's right. You haven't* ***solved*** *a thing." Krishnamurti's point has been emphasized; thought cannot solve problems.*

252. ET: But how do we get past that? [*Khare's version has this here (p. 61): "How do we get past that, then? I don't understand."*]

253. K: Wait, we will go into that. First, let us see how extraordinarily limited thought is and how thought has bound us, shaped us, our thinking, life, our relationship with each other. All our education is the cultivation of thought. And we are trying to resolve the problems which thought has created by thought. And so it is hopeless. I don't know if I am making myself clear.

Here we see another technique of Krishnamurti's approach. He redirects the inquiry by deflecting ET's question. Though PP acknowledges Krishnamurti's point when he says, "we think we can solve everything with thought, and it's not true," in contrast, ET suggests looking for a way to get past the limited nature of thought, and asks, "how do we get past that?" Krishnamurti seems to

have decided that this is not the moment, however, to allow the dialogue to veer off into looking for a way around the limited nature of thought. With "wait, we will go into that," he deflects her question, and whether Krishnamurti returns to this question later or not is not important. But he wants to devote more time to investigating the limited nature of thought, and he wants to draw the link between thought and relationship. Also, in this exchange, we see that Krishnamurti confesses that he is not sure if he is being clear. Thus, his approach includes a responsibility to facilitate the dialogue, and part of this responsibility means accepting his own limitations around the use of language and his ability (or his recognition of the practical limitations of language) to articulate clearly what he means to say. Expressing these limitations makes participants more comfortable engaging with Krishnamurti in a shared dialogue rather than feeling as though they are simply there to absorb his pronouncements as authority.

254. PP: You mean, if I experience my being the way I am as honestly as I can and you experience the way you are as honestly as you can, then we should have more commonality than difference, by far. Right?

255. K: Not only commonality, but we see the action of thought. Thought has created me as a Hindu, you as a Christian. Forgive me if you are not a Christian. You as a Christian – thought has divided us. I am a communist, you democrat – again, thought. I follow Marx, Lenin; they have become my gods. Yours become Jesus. The same movement is going on. So thought has divided man.

Krishnamurti agrees with PP and moves the dialogue forward. But Krishnamurti prefers precise and careful use of language, which is essential for developing a shared understanding. And so, while Krishnamurti welcomes the useful rephrasing suggested by PP – that people have more in common than they have differences, Krishnamurti proposes greater precision when he says "not only commonality, but we see the action of thought." It is one thing to be aware of differences in the way people think, but what is essential, in Krishnamurti's view, is that "we see the action of thought." Krishnamurti stresses, as part of the need for greater precision, that it is the consequences of thought, in action, that people should be aware of.

256. PP: Of course, the paradox is that we use thought to reflect on the paradox itself.

257. Q (?): Right.

258. K: Therefore… No, we are using words to communicate about thought.

259. RW: We are thinking about thought.

260. K: Yes. We are using words to communicate. So, if we see actually, not theoretically, that thought is limited, thought is the most dangerous instrument that man has – sorry to…

Krishnamurti's approach includes using "no" when appropriate. Here he corrects the participant's comment about thought and points out the obvious need for words in communication. And he says "right" and "yes" to encourage participants to engage, but he also modifies participants' comments when he feels he needs to. Here, Krishnamurti modifies PP's statement that "we use thought to reflect …" with "yes, we are using words to communicate." Perhaps Krishnamurti wants to push beyond intellectual theory toward factuality. But he seems to recognize the potential impact of what he has just proclaimed, that "thought is the most dangerous instrument that man has," and that leads to Krishnamurti's polite "sorry." He seems aware that his statement about the danger of thought is hard for these participants to grapple with, because they feel they must rely on thought for their very survival, so how could they possibly accept the fact that thought is the most dangerous instrument? What I sense in this exchange is another aspect of Krishnamurti's approach – empathy. Krishnamurti's approach comes from a loving attitude toward participants, and empathy flows from that loving attitude.

261. PP: I have no problem dealing with that. I agree with you.
262. K: Then what shall we do? Let's stop there for a minute. What shall we do?
263. PP: Then we must look inside ourselves beyond thought.
264. K: Therefore, what do you do?
265. PP: Why not stop it?
266. K: No, no, wait, don't come to any conclusions.
267. Q (?): All right.
268. K: What do we do? If we both of us see, or some of us see, that thought has created such chaos in the world, such violence, such brutality, such agony in the world, then what shall we do? How shall we go beyond thought? Not stop it, because thought is necessary to communicate.

One interesting aspect of Krishnamurti's approach is how he uses questions to gently prod participants with his skillful use of patterns, such as the one he uses here: a question; a request to pause; and then a restatement of the question. This rhetorical pattern indicates the significance of the question and the need for pause and reflection in its careful examination. One of the more active participants expresses full agreement with Krishnamurti's radical proposition about the danger of thought and this gives Krishnamurti an opportunity to suggest a pause and to pose a key question for the group to reflect on: "Then what shall we do? Let's stop there for a minute. What shall we do?" And to give full weight to those concepts and problems he feels need to be examined carefully before moving on, he says "no, no, wait, don't come to any conclusions." He cautions against relying on reactive or automatic possibilities for solutions to a problem. For Krishnamurti, thought cannot be stopped. Thought is necessary for people to communicate. So, when PP suggests stopping thought, Krishnamurti asks participants to refrain from coming to

predetermined conclusions. Conclusions, in Krishnamurti's approach, do not have a rightful place in dialogue when deep reflection is what is required.

Krishnamurti also demonstrates here how adept he is using a combination of questions, instructions, declarations, and pauses in a way that puts participants at ease. In this manner of speaking, even if people see Krishnamurti as having innate authority, they are less likely to feel pushed into accepting his contentions untested. He uses questions and declarations in a way that seems to instill in participants the sense that they have been guided in a shared dialogue, rather than having been told what they need to know.

Krishnamurti's approach intends to instigate insight, an awareness that comes to consciousness as participants engage in the dialogue. But attentive engagement does not necessarily require spoken contributions because insight could come in a variety of settings, including when a participant listens attentively in the dialogue, absorbs what she hears, and observes the content of her consciousness as the dialogue progresses. Or, in other cases, insight comes when a participant shuts out the dialogue. For example, when the dialogue hones in on concepts of thought and conditioning, a participant might reflect inwardly on her own experience and memory of an event. In reflection, she might note that her reaction to the event at the time involved a certain conditioned response. And, as a result of that reflection, in the middle of the dialogue perhaps, she might now for the first time realize the fact of Krishnamurti's notion that "thought is the most dangerous instrument… man has."

269. PP: I am thinking stopping in the sense that you said quiet your mind and listen to yourself.

270. K: No, wait a minute, let's go slowly, let's go slowly. What shall I do? I see thought is really basically the most dangerous instrument I have.

271. PP: I am not sure. I am here to learn so I will listen to you.

272. K: No, no, don't listen to me.

Krishnamurti's approach involves removing as much as possible participant reliance on his authority. It will not do to accept anything he says at face value as though declared by some external authority. "No, no, don't listen to me," he emphasizes. But Krishnamurti does not hesitate to slow down the dialogue or to ask for a pause when he feels participants need to examine a question more carefully and deeply. "Wait a minute, let's go slowly, let's go slowly," he says. Krishnamurti interrupts the flow of discussion when he feels the dialogue might otherwise veer away from its focus. The central question that needs more careful and deep reflection at this point in the dialogue is what to do when thought is seen as "the most dangerous instrument." And note how Krishnamurti connects the abstract and radical notion of the danger of thought with real life. He injects a question, one that suggests a potential life situation. At the same time, he makes this inquiring injection with the use of the first-person pronoun "I". What shall I do, he asks. "I see thought is really basically the most dangerous instrument I have." Here is a question not meant to be rhetorical. Krishnamurti provides an example to help elaborate on the notion that thought is

dangerous, and he prods participants to reflect closely, deeply, on the problem of thought and its consequences. Krishnamurti probably senses that if he were simply to say what he knows to be true, that participants would be less likely to come to their own insight into the problem. And so Krishnamurti coaxes and prods, encouraging inward reflection. Notably, though, Krishnamurti says "no, no, don't listen to me," a request some would find hard to adhere to. On the one hand, Krishnamurti requests and suggests an attitude of attentive listening. On the other, as we see here, he warns against listening to what he says. But perhaps we need to appreciate the limited precision of language. On one hand, to listen involves hearing as a sensual activity, as in listening to music or to someone speaking. In contrast, in a different context, to listen to someone means to rely on what someone else says as authority in taking action or thinking in a particular way. It is this latter meaning, I expect, that Krishnamurti opposes, and his "no, no, don't listen to me" should be taken to mean as a suggestion to listen attentively to what he has to say, but then to reflect on what he says and decide for yourself how to respond.

273. EM: I would think of analysing it from that nature, that you would immediately begin to recognise the requirement to either control or to orient thought.

274. K: Now, who is the controller?

275. EM: The consciousness.

276. K: Consciousness is put together by thought.

277. ET: You do the same thing. You're the controller.

278. EL: You can't control it with more thought because that just makes...

279. K: Controlling thought…

280. RW: Thought is perpetuating itself.

281. EM: But we are not saying that they are inseparable.

282. K: No, we are saying that thought creates the thinker, the thinker then separates himself from thought, then the thinker tries to control thought. But thought is the thinker.

Here is an exchange that shows how this approach, skillfully facilitated, can foster a shared appreciation of complex, radically novel concepts. Four different participants engage with Krishnamurti in exploring the complex nature of thought. As a first step, Krishnamurti uses a question – "who is the controller?" and follows with a declaration that "consciousness is put together by thought." Then, after several brief comments from participants, Krishnamurti corrects the last comment, and summarizes his notion of thought, while using the first-person plural pronoun "we." "No, we are saying that thought creates the thinker, the thinker then separates himself from thought, then the thinker tries to control thought. But thought is the thinker." Krishnamurti leads and directs the dialogue, while still engaging participants in a shared experience. Though Krishnamurti is the facilitator and director of the dialogue, my impression is that participants come away feeling they have been engaged in a meaningful

encounter. One of the ways Krishnamurti helps to engender this kind of feeling is by repeating participants' words, when appropriate, in his own statements. So here, for example, he takes the participant's verb "control" of thought, converts the verb into the noun "controller," and asks "now, who is the controller?" In this way, Krishnamurti exemplifies his approach of thinking together through problems, in that he integrates the participant's contribution with his own. At the same time, he also builds trust and an affinity with the participants, which enhances the collaborative nature of the approach, because he shows that he is open to relying on participants' contributions.

283. PP: I think therefore I am?

284. K: That's… (laughs)

285. EM: The eternal paradox.

286. K: No, I wouldn't call it a paradox, sir. There is no thinker without thought.

Krishnamurti corrects when he feels an unnecessary term such as "paradox" enters into the dialogue. He expresses his correction politely. He wants to make it clear that "I think therefore I am" is not inconsistent, as he sees it, with "There is no thinker without thought." There is no paradox here at all, as far as Krishnamurti is concerned.

287. EL: You can stop thought.

288. K: No – who is to stop it?

289. RW: The thinker. The thinker.

290. K: Who is the thinker?

291. RW: He controls the thought. (Laughs) It goes around and around. (Pause)

Here we have another example of the collaborative nature of Krishnamurti's approach. Participants seem to gradually come to appreciate and absorb Krishnamurti's radical proclamation about the danger of thought. With "it goes around and around," RW has had an insight into Krishnamurti's notion of the problem of thought.

292. PP: There is a real difficulty. I don't think we understand the source of thought.

293. K: Yes. We must be very clear on that point. Experience. I want to be a carpenter. I go to the… I apprentice myself to the master carpenter for several years. I acquire a great deal of knowledge about wood, instruments, the texture of the wood and so on and so on. I have acquired a great deal of knowledge. I have become a good carpenter. That is basically based on learning, experience, accumulated knowledge, stored up in brain as memory, and I utilise that memory, skilfully if I can. That is one factor. Psychologically, in my relationship

with my friend, with my wife, whatever it is, I do exactly the same thing. Right? I built an image or picture, or knowledge about my wife, or my husband. So I act upon knowledge, with knowledge. And that knowledge is a material process, obviously.

Krishnamurti's "yes" affirms that PP has realized an important problem; how hard it is to understand the source of thought. And he then takes the time and effort to elaborate, because as he notes, "We must be very clear on that point." Looking at how Krishnamurti elaborates on his conception of the problem, I note two stages. First, Krishnamurti positively acknowledges the comment "I don't think we understand the source of thought," as a bridge to an analogy. He then develops an analogy to demonstrate the contrast between thought used to gain knowledge about how to be a carpenter, based on learning and experience, on one hand, with thought used to build images about relationships, on the other. Knowledge gained in learning how to be a carpenter is necessary for someone to be a good carpenter. But, because this process of thought has become habitual, people use the process, psychologically, in relationships also, and it is in relationship where thought builds images of those in relationship, such as a spouse, for example. And that is where the danger lies.

294. PP: Then one of the problems is how valid, how valid is the knowledge, how valid is the experience?

295. K: That's right. None, except in a certain direction. I need a great deal of experience, knowledge to go to the moon, but in my relationship with my wife or husband, with my whatever it is, why should there be knowledge? I don't know if you are following all this.

Krishnamurti agrees but modifies. The problem is not so much that knowledge needs to be validated, but rather that knowledge is only useful when applied in a "certain direction." He reiterates the distinction he has made earlier, but this time injects another comparison, that of the thought process used for knowledge needed to go to the moon, as compared with knowledge in relationship. And now he must make his point, which is that he questions why knowledge should be implicated in relationships, such as those with a spouse. So, this kind of elaboration relies on analogy and comparison. But note how Krishnamurti applies this common enough dialogue tool in his collaborative approach. He engages with PP, who has contributed to the dialogue, by affirming PP's, and builds on it with his own modification. He then opens space for further participant contribution, but when none is offered, he presents concrete examples, and again allows for further comments. But then, only when none are offered, he moves the dialogue forward with his own pointed question. In this exchange, Krishnamurti's question hints at the answer, a way of asking a question designed to help them reflect for themselves on the problem of thought.

296. PP: I follow you. I follow you. [Khare: "I'm following it."]

297. EM: That I recognise that in looking for the validity of knowledge in our diversification of perceptions we view that validity in different ways.

298. K: Do we? It may be our prejudice. We are not meeting. Sorry, I am not meeting your point, probably.

PP agrees with Krishnamurti, but EM does not. One theme that has characterized this particular dialogue so far is Krishnamurti's notion that people share a certain common consciousness. Krishnamurti objects politely to suggestion that different people view the validity of knowledge in different ways. But he introduces that objection with a question. For Krishnamurti, people have prejudiced (conditioned, perhaps?) ideas about different kinds of knowledge. But note how, while he questions this participant's assertion that "we view the validity in different ways," Krishnamurti apologetically acknowledges his failure to "meet" this participant's point. Krishnamurti accepts the disagreement and acknowledges it, but he also probably wants to diminish any hint of conflict that could lessen the collaborative nature of the dialogue.

299. PP: But is not prejudice born of experience, that validates it?

300. K: Sir, what is experience?

301. PP: Unfortunately, I can only think of the very dictionary definition of experience.

302. K: Yes. Which is what? I know it. Go ahead.

303. PP: That, what you are driving at, that is meaningless in…

304. K: No. What is experience?

Krishnamurti's approach is a dance of question and answer. He is at ease with participants' expressions of doubt. He has earlier asked participants not to accept anything simply as a consequence of what he says. And he responds to this participant's doubt-filled question concerning prejudice born of experience with a question of his own: "What is experience?" This is an example of another feature of Krishnamurti's approach, which is an emphasis on the use of precise language. Besides emphasizing precise language, he also encourages reflection about concepts in a way that could lead to an insight, a new way of looking at concepts and their concrete implications. In this exchange, PP mentions the dictionary definition of experience, and Krishnamurti invites him to go ahead and say what that is. Krishnamurti does not want to provide the easy answer, to simply say what he knows. He engages with PP in dialogue, and the group as a whole, by inviting discussion on the meaning of experience, as he prods for deeper reflection and greater precision.

305. PP: All right, let me be illustrative. If I go home and my wife puts a cold dish on the table and I don't like cold dishes, my experience says that I had a cold dish, I anticipate then that this may happen again.

306. K: Yes.

307. PP: I am becoming prejudiced in that sense.

308. K: Yes.

309. PP: Now, it happens several other times. Now my experience tells me that this is the norm. Therefore, I have a prejudiced view of my wife, in this particular realm.

310. K: Which means what?

Krishnamurti engages with PP's example. Note his two "yes" affirmations to encourage frank contributions. But Krishnamurti also stops PP when he feels the need to keep the dialogue focused and moving forward. While his approach is designed to be collaborative, Krishnamurti still takes responsibility for facilitation, direction, and leadership. And to foster shared understanding, Krishnamurti here feels it is important to clarify, asking PP to elaborate on what he means with his example of becoming prejudiced to the norm of his wife's cooking.

311. PP: She is a bad cook. (Laughter)

312. K: I hope not.

313. PP: She is hopeless. Is not that experience valid?

314. K: Wait. No, we are not talking 'validity of an experience', we are asking: what is experience?

With the risk that the group could lose sight of the central topic under discussion, Krishnamurti wants to hold focus. He says "wait," and then repeats the question: "We are asking: what is experience?" While the question he repeats is his own earlier question, this time he leads with the collective pronoun "we," affirming his commitment to a collaborative approach.

315. PP: Experience is precisely… it's the past.

316. Q (?): …(inaudible), it is past, it is history.

317. K: History. Right? Which is what? Knowledge.

Three different participants now take up the challenge posed by Krishnamurti's question. When the third participant injects the word "history" into the dialogue, Krishnamurti uses it to move the dialogue forward. He takes the contribution from the participants – that experience is past, and history – and Krishnamurti adds that the past and history are two components of knowledge. So, we see here how Krishnamurti facilitates and directs the dialogue. One of the ways Krishnamurti moves the dialogue forward here is by posing the question, "which is what?" Krishnamurti wants the group to examine more deeply the connection between experience, knowledge, and memory. "History. Right? Which is what? Knowledge." Here Krishnamurti uses the participant's word "history" to declare the fact, as he sees it, that history and the past are both components of

knowledge. This exchange shows how Krishnamurti, though he uses a collaborative approach, does not neglect his responsibility as facilitator to keep the dialogue moving forward.

318. Q (?): Yes.

319. K: Which is memory. Now, to experience implies recognition of that experience.

320. Q (?): Yes, it does.

321. K: Which means memory operating.

322. Q (?): Yes.

323. K: So you never experience anything at all. I won't go into all that for the moment. Let's leave all that.

Krishnamurti senses perhaps that his proposition "so you never experience anything at all" needs further examination and reflection. The group seems to find this proposition far-reaching, so he takes a step back for a pause. "I won't go into all that for the moment. Let's leave all that." Krishnamurti likely prefers not to put off a subject for later on in the dialogue, but in this exchange, we have an example of what seems an appropriate departure from this preference. Since Krishnamurti's approach is founded on improvisation, perhaps he occasionally proposes what could be hard for the group to absorb. "So, you never experience anything at all" might be too radical a pronouncement for this moment and this group. In his role of dialogue facilitator, though, Krishnamurti seems to appreciate both the necessity for the pause, as well as the appropriateness of setting aside further dialogue about this somewhat complicated proposition.

324. K: We are trying to understand the process of thought. Right? Because thought, as we said, is really such a dangerous movement in relationship. Life is relationship. Right? And there, thought is creating havoc. Not going to the moon, not having electricity and so on and so on. In relationship it is creating havoc. Right?

Krishnamurti brings the group back to focus on thought, an important point for him to emphasize here because when thought enters into relationships, it creates havoc. But he asks the rhetorical "right?" to, at least symbolically, invite response and consideration. For Krishnamurti, throughout the dance of dialogue, his approach depends on questions, reflections, suggestions, propositions, and responses. Krishnamurti prefers to lead a shared thinking-together over telling participants what he knows. Another aspect of his approach, seeking comment by asking "right?" occasionally, suggests that he relies on this question to gauge participant understanding or acceptance of his propositions. At the same time, asking "right?" tempers somewhat the impact of such a radical statement, in the way is invites participants to reflect and comment. Krishnamurti, it seems to me, prefers that each participant arrive at her own answers through inner reflection, without reliance on external authority, not even the innate authority that he carries himself.

325. Q (?): Yes.

326. K: So, what shall we do with thought? Then you say control thought. The controller is put together by thought.

327. Q (?): Yes.

328. K: So the controller is the controlled. Right? So we reach that point, then what happens?

With expressed agreement from participants, Krishnamurti follows up with a practical but rhetorical question "what shall we do with thought?" and returns to the notion proposed by a participant earlier: that thought can be stopped, or controlled. Here Krishnamurti returns to a place where the dialogue left off earlier, and he answers his own rhetorical question. He wants to focus here on the fact that to control thought there must be a controller; and that the controller is constituted by thought. So the controller and the controlled are one and the same entity, which is the mind, or thought.

329. PP: There seems to be a paradox.

330. K: No. Don't let's use [the] word 'paradox' all the time.

331. PP: There is a paradox, at least in terms of the thought that we are trained, that the approach, our very logic systems will not…

332. K: Wait. What is your approach to this problem? Just a minute. To this problem that thought has become the most… psychologically a dangerous instrument. Because it has divided man, belief, your belief, my belief, I believe in God, you don't. You follow? It has divided man and destroyed man. It is destroying man. Right? And if that goes on as it is now we are going to destroy ourselves completely. Perhaps a few will survive, and so on. So we have to act. We have to do something about it. Not theoretically, but actually in life we have to do something. What? That's my point. You follow?

Krishnamurti gently corrects course here. "Paradox" is not a word he wants in the dialogue. While paradox seems an important concept in Western philosophy, it does not seem to have a place in Krishnamurti's approach, concerned as it is with the self as his subject matter. But as this participant continues to use "paradox," Krishnamurti interrupts the participant. So, in this exchange, what Krishnamurti shows is that even in his collaborative approach, at some point, rare as it may be, he cuts short the free flow of discussion. Perhaps, since he has already asked "don't let's use [the] word 'paradox' all the time," Krishnamurti feels he must be more forceful now that the word has been used again. For Krishnamurti's approach to be effective, skillful facilitation is an essential ingredient needed to move the dialogue forward and avoid a runaway free-for-all. Krishnamurti, though, does not simply interrupt and declaim his own thoughts. "Wait. What is your approach to this problem," he asks. But without a pause, he states (or restates) his main point concerning the danger of thought. "Thought," he says, has become the most…

psychologically… dangerous instrument … It has divided man and destroyed man … So we have to act." And then he adds emphatically: "Not theoretically, but actually in life we have to do something. What? That's my point." Thought in relationship is dangerous because it is based on the past; on beliefs that divide people into groups of believers capable of destroying each other. What seems very subtle and yet integral to Krishnamurti's approach is that to keep the dialogue moving in the right direction, at just the right moment he states or restates succinctly the nature of the problem. We have to act, he declares, but what should we do? And here again, Krishnamurti closes this segment with "you follow?" In this way, Krishnamurti displays an appropriate extent of control over the direction of the dialogue. Here he uses the first-person collective pronoun "we," recruiting all the participants to come along in a shared understanding of the problem.

333. EM: I would say that, recognising where we are at the moment, that we must basically consider that as the thinker we need to eliminate memory.
334. K: Ah, you can't eliminate memory.
335. RW: How?[13]
336. K: Because otherwise I can't go home.
337. EM: Reorient memory.
338. K: Then who is to orient that memory? Thought again.
339. EM: The memory, to me, obviously is the core of our subject right now.
340. K: Memory is then; we live in the past.
341. EM: Yes.
342. K: So we look at life through a process which has been… a process which has accumulated knowledge, experience – experience, knowledge and memory. We are back again in the same circle.

With this engaging exchange, we see how Krishnamurti's approach helps to develop shared understanding, without foisting a particular his view on the participants, and in an atmosphere of openness that encourages participants to contribute their thoughts toward shared understanding. For example, when EM says "as the thinker we need to eliminate memory" he demonstrates the development of his own thinking through the course of this dialogue, when he articulates his understanding of the dangers of thought and memory. Krishnamurti is careful not to reject completely EM's contribution, but rather he says politely "you can't eliminate memory." EM then tries his own modification when he proposes that rather than eliminate memory, people need to reorient memory. Krishnamurti modifies further, this time by asking the question that brings the discussion back into focus. And this time, he does not pause for a response, but rather he provides the simple answer: "Who is to orient that memory? Thought again." And he restates

[13] [in Khare: "Why?"]

his notion of memory as dangerous; dangerous because memory as knowledge means living in the past. He then sums up in one concise sentence his proposition about life lived through a process based on experience, knowledge, and memory. So here we see another technique in Krishnamurti's approach, though probably not unique. He uses repetition, restatement, and paraphrasing. He skillfully asks questions; makes statements, corrections, and modifications; and repeats statements at appropriate moments in the dialogue.

343. PP: Are you saying it is an act of faith?

344. K: No. That is the last thing. Just wait, sir, go into it a little slowly.

345. PP: All right.

346. K: That is, we act this way: experience, knowledge, memory, thought, action. That is the chain in which you are caught. And we think that is perfectly all right. It is respectable, accepted, traditional, normal, healthy. But see the danger of it. So, seeing that, what happens? You stop there, don't you?

At this moment, Krishnamurti perhaps senses that participants seem eager for, and anticipating, a tidy conclusion from him, but he is reluctant to supply one. Also, And, possibly he also senses that he could have done better at facilitating a shared understanding, so he takes a step back, in a way, by noting that everyone gets caught up in the chain of "experience, knowledge, memory, thought, action." Krishnamurti now moves the dialogue forward when he cautions "but see the danger of it," and then follows up with the question "what happens?" He then supplies the answer, but presents it in the form of another question, "you stop there, don't you?" Here Krishnamurti shows another feature of his approach. While he is improvising, in a collaborative way toward a shared understanding, Krishnamurti seems to be also aware of time constraints and participants' capacity to appreciate the thrust of this subject matter. Krishnamurti's dance of dialogue has its limitations, and at certain moments, Krishnamurti will push the dialogue forward by telling what he knows. But when he does this, he often follows right away with questions that invite reflection, comment, agreement, disagreement, or doubt. What Krishnamurti shows here is how he starts with a brief statement of the problem, as if coaxing participants to learn new dance steps. But at the same time, he also shows his preference for dancing together, though he is always leading.

347. EM: As a self-awareness of the danger of memory?

348. K: Of this. Of this.

349. EM: Of this, of this cycle.

350. K: Stop. Stop there.

351. EM: We must stop.

352. K: Stop there.

353. Q (?): Yes.

354. K: You stop there.

355. Q (?): Right.

356. PP: At which part do you stop it?

357. K: There.

358. PP: Just that.

359. Q (?): Just stop it.

360. Q (?): Now your mind is silent.

361. K: Sir, look, sir, just a minute.

Krishnamurti here senses confusion after he says "but see the danger of it… You stop there, don't you?" … people get caught up in the chain of "experience, knowledge, memory, thought, action," he says. But Krishnamurti recognizes that participants might not have realized what he means by "you stop there, don't you?" and so he suggests a pause here, "look, sir, just a minute."

362. Q (?): I am following you, but what happens now?

363. K: You have been to museums, I'm quite sure, and you see a picture by… a painting by Michelangelo or somebody and you look at it. If you begin to compare that picture with the other picture, you are not actually seeing the picture. So you put aside, if it is a good museum, you see only one painting on a wall. Right? You sit there and look at it, get the whole feeling of that picture – the painting, the shadows, the light, the colour, the beauty and so on. You look at it. We are doing the same now with regard to thought. You don't say, 'Well, I am going to move somewhere else.'

In an effort to alleviate participants' confusion, Krishnamurti elaborates on his statement about the danger of thought, with an analogy. He takes an abstract concept – thought – and compares the way people look at thought, on one hand, with the way people look at a painting in a museum, on the other. What Krishnamurti suggests is that when looking at a painting in a museum, a person will take the time to fully absorb what she sees and to appreciate all it has to offer, rather than quickly glancing at the painting and moving on to the next. "You see only one painting on a wall," he says, and "you sit there and look at it, get the whole feeling of that picture." What Krishnamurti seems to be proposing here is that when examining the process of thought and the chain of "experience, knowledge, memory, thought, and action," people should do so with the kind of intensity they might devote to a looking at a beautiful painting in a museum.

364. RW: Does looking at thought stop it?

365. K: Looking at the whole painting of thought, whole map of thought, the whole movement of thought. Just look at it without trying to understand it, without trying to go beyond it, suppress it and all the rest of it. Just look.

366. PP: That idea sounds very akin to gestalt – the whole is more important than the parts. Is that correct?

367. K: That's right. So what happens then? You see, we are not actually doing it, we are theorising upon it.

368. Q (?): Yes.

369. K: That is the difficulty.

*Krishnamurti here extends his analogy. With "looking at the **whole painting of thought**, whole map of thought, the whole movement of thought," what he suggests is that people who recognize the danger of thought see it only on an intellectual level, and neglect to move beyond just making a mental note of what they have recognized. The natural next step is to do something about it; if there is a danger, then surely, he suggests, something must be done to evade this danger. So, while Krishnamurti agrees with the participant's comment about the whole and its parts, he then proposes a way to clear up the confusion, when he asks "so what happens then? You see, we are not actually doing it, we are theorising upon it." Without laying out any answers, Krishnamurti proposes what he sees it as the appropriate attitude: "Just look at it without trying to understand it, without trying to go beyond it, suppress it and all the rest of it. Just look." Perhaps the analogy breaks down here somewhat, since some people observing a beautiful painting in a museum will have some judgment, opinion, or view about it. Krishnamurti's suggestion is to "just look at it without trying to understand it… just look." What we see, then, in this exchange, is that Krishnamurti speaks from his own perception of reality, as he must, in order to propose for participants a different way to observe the thinking process and the rest of the chain of experience, knowledge, memory, thought, and action. And this presents another feature of Krishnamurti's approach, which is that he sometimes describes his own experience, perhaps to show that he is capable of disregarding theoretical analysis, but also that he rejects any external authority in choosing how to act. In addition, we have an example of another feature of Krishnamurti's approach, where he develops a theme collaboratively as far as he can take it to a shared understanding, and if the dialogue does not arrive expeditiously at a shared understanding, he then provides his own response to the problem. So, here, Krishnamurti has led the group in a dance around the theme of thought and the danger inherent in thought, but at this moment in this exchange, he simply tells the group how to look at the danger of thought, "without trying to understand it." Krishnamurti supplies the answer to his earlier question "you stop there, don't you?"*

370. PP: Yes. We think in very discrete units.

371. K: We don't say, 'This is a fact. I am going to look at it.'

372. PP: There are implications for education in that realm.

373. K: Yes, sir.

374. RW: For everything.

375. K: Thought has created the society in which we live. Society is an abstraction. The actuality is relationship between man and man. In that relationship thought enters.

This exchange shows how Krishnamurti's approach promotes understanding of complex concepts. One participant mentions gestalt and Krishnamurti keeps the group's focus moving forward when he brings up theorising about thought instead of facing the need to do something about it. Then PP comments that people think in discrete units, and he and RW note that there are implications of recognizing the danger of thought in education, and also for everything in life. At this point Krishnamurti sums up the main theme of the dialogue: Thought creates society; but society is an abstraction; actuality is found in relationships; and thought enters into relationships; and thought in relationship is based on the distorted past, thus inhibiting genuine relationship based on the present.

376. PP: Do I understand you correctly, that we can experience our fellow man the same way as we can experience the pain?

377. K: Yes, sir. Yes, sir.

378. Q (?): Yes.

379. K: That involves love. I won't go into all that for the moment. So what shall I do? I have to come to a point where I see thought is necessary in a certain direction, and I see thought as the most dangerous thing in relationship. I am stuck there. If I go to some priest he will begin to talk about Jesus or Krishna or somebody else. Again, the structure of thought. He's working with thought. So I discard all that.

When PP notes that people can experience another's pain as their own, Krishnamurti avidly agrees. And he returns to the question of what people should do when they become aware of the danger of thought in relationships. In this way, Krishnamurti moves the dialogue forward by pointing out that while thought is necessary for day-to-day living and accomplishing great things, by contrast, in relationships, it is most dangerous. And yet, the way Krishnamurti describes it, people often get stuck with their thinking, even in relationships.

380. PP: This is like looking for a solution outside of yourself.

381. K: Yes. I discard all that. I discard essentially authority. The priest, you know, all that stuff. So what takes place then?

382. ET: You look to yourself.

383. K: No, wait. No. You haven't done it therefore you… Do it and see what happens actually.

Krishnamurti affirms with "yes" PP's restatement of the problem, and then elaborates with "I discard essentially authority," substituting "authority" for "outside of yourself." This moves the dialogue forward by rejecting authority, and then Krishnamurti develops it further when he asks "so what takes place then?" Here, we see an example of the collaborative nature of Krishnamurti's approach, and how it encourages thinking together through a problem. He invites participants to reflect on the problem he has enunciated by asking "What takes place then?" ET suggests that if you cannot rely on external authority, then you look to yourself. But Krishnamurti sees the need to take the time to explore what it means to actually reflect on personal experience without any authority. In other words, he wants to stress the importance of actually looking to yourself rather than to an external authority, and that participants should reflect and examine for themselves their own thought process and then observe their thinking to see what happens. Krishnamurti feels he needs to make this correction for the sake of pointing out to the participants that it is not helpful to simply state the intellectual conclusion that "you look to yourself." It needs to become an actual activity of the mind.

384. PP: But then your existence validates your being.

385. K: So what happens, sir? Are you frightened of your security?

386. PP: Most of us are, yes.

387. K: Yes, that's it. So unconsciously fear says, 'Don't enter into this realm. Keep out of it.'

388. EM: So what you are addressing is then that we need to be concerned with complete analysis of our inward self so that we don't find ourselves in the position of going through this eternal cycle.

389. K: Yes, sir. But not through analysis. (Laughs)

Krishnamurti uses questions to move the dialogue forward. "So what happens, sir? Are you frightened of your security?" With this, Krishnamurti encourages participants to go deeper into the danger of thought in relationship, that, according to Krishnamurti, flows from peoples' desire for security, which in turn leads to fear. While agreeing with EM's comment with "yes, sir," he corrects EM by pointing out that looking inward does not involve analysis. Gentle laughter seems appropriate here, to blunt Krishnamurti's serious attitude around precise use of language, since he does not mean to chastise the participant for his particular use of language.

390. RW: Analysis is thought. That's just more thought.

391. EM: Ah, that's thought. Right. I see, I see. Yes. We have passed that.

392. K: Just observe. Not what you observe reduced to an abstraction called an idea.

393. EM: I see. We are really at a plane where thought is not being used as a process.

394. K: That's right, sir.

395. Q (?): Right.

396. K: Only observation.

This exchange highlights an important technique Krishnamurti uses. With skilful facilitation, he fully engages participants and stimulates collaborative inquiry. Three participants express their new understanding of concepts they have encountered earlier as vague and abstract. Now they seem to have arrived at the insight that analysis is "just more thought," an insight expressed completely by EM when he exclaims: "Ah, that's thought. Right. I see, I see. Yes." Krishnamurti offers agreement along the way, suggesting "just observe," and "only observation." No more needs to be said, as it seems the group has arrived collaboratively at a shared understanding of one of Krishnamurti's radical assertions.

397. EM: Only observation.

398. K: Like a good scientist just observes. The thing he is observing is telling the story.

399. EM: The difficulty I have is that one day we may be sitting around discussing this to the level that we have gotten; the next day I find myself in the artificial society of competition where I have this eternal thought process and all…

400. K: I don't enter into that.

401. EM: You don't enter into it.

402. K: That's the difference.

Krishnamurti's approach now seems to have accomplished significant learning. In less than an hour of dialogue, participants have come to a new way of looking at relationship. However, as noted by one of the participants, the difficulty is that although participants seem to have developed an understanding beyond what they started with, they later have no choice but to thrust themselves back "in the artificial society" and rely again on their "eternal thought process." But the question of the temporality of insights gained through Krishnamurti's approach will have to be left for another day. Krishnamurti says "I don't enter into that." Here he uses the first-person voice, and it seems appropriate near the conclusion of this dialogue. Krishnamurti leaves the participants with an example of how he himself observes without the distortion caused by the chain of thought process. Furthermore, his dialogic approach has succeeded in instigating insights.

403. EM: Well, the obvious question is: how can we that are in the…

404. K: …survive.

405. EM: How can we survive? Yes.

406. K: I think if we don't make survival as the most important thing, we survive.

407. (Pause)

408. Finished, sir.

Krishnamurti completes EM's sentence, perhaps sensing what EM wants to say, or substituting Krishnamurti's preferred language. But, also, by this time, Krishnamurti may be feeling a sense of completion, and that this is an appropriate place to end the dialogue, since much time and energy has been spent examining several complex subjects, and also because this seems a point of climax in the dialogue. He makes a final point about not making survival the most important thing in life, sensing the direction of EM's question before the final word has been said.

So, we have, in this final exchange, a culmination of a collaborative dialogue using Krishnamurti's approach; an approach both unplanned and improvised, and yet, when skilfully facilitated, capable of instigating meaningful insights. True, as an approach designed to instigate meaningful insights, it is not much concerned with transmission of knowledge. But that is the central strength of Krishnamurti's approach. Insight helps people absorb some of the most complex and abstract subject matter, a most desirable aspect of knowledge transmission as well.

Appendix B: Table of dialogic strategies and techniques

	Strategies and techniques in March 22, 1981 dialogue	Example(s) from appendix A [noting paragraph numbers]	Effect on Krishnamurti's dialogic approach
1	Krishnamurti prefers using precise language	Paragraphs 12, 16	Helps develop shared understanding; keeps the focus on the theme
2	Uses probing questions	12, 20, 36, 215, 221	Engages participants; helps elucidate concepts; encourages reflection and reconsideration of concepts
3	Krishnamurti agrees, comments, elaborates, modifies	14, 16, 229 - 235	Helps direct and control the flow; keeps the focus on the theme
4	Uses polite language	18, 42	Builds rapport; conveys a collaborative attitude; fosters shared understanding
5	Relies on collaborative attitude of inquiry	20 - 38	Builds rapport; conducive to shared understanding; promotes reflection and insight
6	Constantly invites feedback	32, 34, 36, 50, 52, 56, etc.	Builds rapport; conveys a collaborative attitude; promotes shared understanding
7	Occasionally recaps discussion on a theme	26, 40, 48	Keeps the focus on the theme; re-engages participants; checks for understanding; re-affirms important concepts; develops shared understanding
8	Uses a variety of questions	28, 34, 36	Encourages close examination of a concept or theme; engages participants

	Strategies and techniques in March 22, 1981 dialogue	Example(s) from appendix A [noting paragraph numbers]	Effect on Krishnamurti's dialogic approach
9	Krishnamurti is not averse to saying "no"	36, 233, 241, 243, 282, 286, 288, 330	Maintains focus; prevents confusion;
10	Krishnamurti is not averse to expressing his limitations and difficulty communicating complex concepts	34, 253	Builds rapport; indicates a collaborative approach; diminishes his inherent authority; participants feel more comfortable and more likely to engage
11	Krishnamurti often affirms participants' language and modifies it	40 – "become" modified to "becoming"	Enhances rapport; moves the dialogue forward; contributes to shared understanding but with language Krishnamurti feels is more precise or relevant
12	Uses inclusive language	42 – "let's" 69 – "we"	Builds rapport and conveys a collaborative attitude
13	Uses concrete examples	56 – "suppose I am"	Elucidates abstract concepts; promotes shared understanding; fosters engagement
14	Krishnamurti improvises	55, 56 – takes the comment about finding a path and redirects by way of improvisation to the theme of knowing oneself	Keeps the focus on the theme of self-knowledge; prevents confusion and enhances shared understanding
15	Balances talking and telling with listening, and balances directing the dialogue with collaborating with participants	56 – "I question that" introduces his thinking, without telling participants what to think	Develops the dialogue as collaborative; promotes shared understanding
16	Encourages participants to reflect on their own personal experience	61 – 71, 86	Emphasizes self-knowledge and reflection; enables insight

	Strategies and techniques in March 22, 1981 dialogue	Example(s) from appendix A [noting paragraph numbers]	Effect on Krishnamurti's dialogic approach
17	Refrains as much as possible from telling participants what he thinks, but explains when necessary	72 - seeing the consequences of conditioning	Promotes shared understanding; moves the dialogue forward; limits his inherent authority
18	Not overly concerned with transmitting knowledge, as such	72 -84	Conveys a collaborative attitude, where participants and Krishnamurti together explore and discover new ways of looking at concepts
19	Invites and accepts scepticism and challenges to his contentions	75 - 90	Diminishes Krishnamurti's authority and helps sustain a collaborative attitude and shared understanding
20	Allows participants to connect related concepts through reflection during the dialogue	61 – 71 (DS) 188 – 197 (PP)	Shows a collaborative attitude and develops shared understanding; encourages and fosters insight
21	Not attached to achieving a desired or planned learning outcome or change in the participants	Whole dialogue	collaborative dialogue preferred; enhances shared understanding; fosters insight; promotes the free flow of ideas; encourages scepticism
22	Krishnamurti modifies, corrects, questions participant's comments	179 – 178; 245 - 251	Reinforces Krishnamurti's non-authoritative approach, while still maintaining control, focus, and direction
23	Krishnamurti blends questions, affirmations, modifications, corrections and clarifications	179 - 198	Engages participants; promotes a collaborative attitude; prevents digression; holds the focus
24	Invites and is open to feedback throughout	200, 206, 208, 215, 221	Builds rapport; engaging and collaborative; non-authoritative; promotes

	Strategies and techniques in March 22, 1981 dialogue	Example(s) from appendix A [noting paragraph numbers]	Effect on Krishnamurti's dialogic approach
			shared understanding; accepts collaborative attitude
25	Coaxes and prods participants to examine concepts in a different light	215	Engages participants in a collaborative effort aimed at shared understanding; fosters self-reflection and insight
26	Resists telling the group his interpretation of concepts that need to be examined more closely	206 – 233: here, Krishnamurti does not say what he thinks about "thought" until the group has examined the concept together for some time	Develops shared understanding; constructs meaning collaboratively; engages participants in dialogue; fosters insight
27	Balances continuing the flow of inquiry together, with holding the focus by interrupting occasionally	253, 258	Holds the focus theme; stays in control; moves the dialogue forward
28	Krishnamurti is aware of, and responds to, the level of engagement by the participants; he pauses, recaps, and takes a step back if needed to consider how engaged participants are	253, 262, 266, 270, 332	Sustain rapport and demonstrates an empathic attitude; diminishes the extent of Krishnamurti's inherent authority; enhances a collaborative attitude
29	Invites feedback especially when he states a bold and radical proposition	233, 288, 290, 293	Reduces his inherent authority; enhances shared understanding

	Strategies and techniques in March 22, 1981 dialogue	Example(s) from appendix A [noting paragraph numbers]	Effect on Krishnamurti's dialogic approach
30	Krishnamurti clarifies complex concepts when asked directly, often using a concrete and simple example	245 - following ET's "I don't understand"	Builds rapport by showing empathy and responsiveness; enhances shared understanding and collaboration
31	Cautions against hasty conclusions when he feels close examination and deeper inquiry is called for	233, 241, 266	Hold the focus and controls the flow of dialogue; prevents confusion; adds to shared understanding
32	Combines a variety of language expressions, such as questions, suggestions, and declarations	268 - 279	Makes for a more engaging dialogue; builds rapport; helps participants feel at ease
33	Leads in a dance of questions and answers, addressing participants' scepticism, doubt, and confusion	295 - 324	More engaging, collaborative; directs the flow; fosters shared understanding; promotes insight
34	Krishnamurti repeats, paraphrases, and restates important questions	324 - 332	Holds the focus on the theme; moves the dialogue forward; fosters a new way of understanding complex concepts; promotes insight