



December 2019

## CONTENTS

<b>Doubt is the Essence of Religious Enquiry</b>	<b>Trisha English</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Floriade</b>	<b>Margot Mann</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>'An Experience of Enlightenment'</b>	<b>Brentyn Ramm</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Bullet (Doubt)proof Awakening</b>	<b>Colin Drake</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Nishida on 'Nothing'</b>	<b>Alan Mann</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>The Felt Sense</b>	<b>Christopher Ash</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Only this Emptiness</b>	<b>Bart Marshall</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Krishnamurti with Bohm &amp; Shainberg</b>	<b>Jenny Howe</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Holy Calm</b>	<b>Wm. Wordsworth</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Meetings</b>		<b>10</b>

["Doubt is the Essence of Religious Enquiry" \(J. Krishnamurti\) from Trisha English](#)

I knew it was stupid to get involved, but when reading one of Friedrich Grohe's newsletters which emanates from Switzerland I was tempted to ask his readership (all of them K disciples and many of them professors from various universities who are K followers) what they thought of the following queries. They are questions that my brain refuses to dismiss. I have no axe to grind or particular theories to espouse, I simply wanted to find out if there was any exploration – *genuine* exploration - occurring in connection with K's Teachings. Grohe handed the queries over to his readership and finally a "great scholar, Spanish-Catalonian" (Grohe's definition) was selected to answer them.

*Does anyone know of any objective medical evidence that (K's) process was connected to physical or psychological states rather than a metaphysical belief system?*

The Catalonian sage informed me that the *process* was related to the metaphysical or spiritual realm (but as a fact, not a belief)! The above question is the kind that is barely tolerated by K believers. It suggests I am not only a materialist, but a moron as well. However, in recent times I have come across various accounts of epilepsy, one particular variety, which can apparently produce "symptoms and outcomes" not dissimilar to K's *process*. And then, of course, there is the kundalini explanation from the Hindu scriptures. These aspects deserve a separate paper, so I will be brief and anyone interested can chase them up.

The learned Catalonian scholar cited as “evidence” the many episodes recounted in the biographies of K by Mary Lutyens and Pupul Jayakar. This hardly counts as objective evidence, as far as I am concerned. Both biographies were sanctioned by K previous to publication, with the exception of the biography by Radha Sloss (the daughter of Rosalind Williams) in which she remembers a conversation between herself and K about epilepsy. When she told her father about it later, he advised her never to repeat it or discuss it with anyone again. (*Lives in the Shadow with J. Krishnamurti*, p.61)

Years ago, while in Adyar, India, I asked the librarian if I could see Dr. Roche’s assessment of the process which had been requested by C.W Leadbeater when it first occurred. Dr. Roche was at the time an Initiate in the Theosophical Society. The poor man turned a nasty shade of pale and was clearly shaken by my request. He said that the document had been lost. Undeterred, I asked my friend Joy Mills, a prominent Theosophist and onetime deputy to Radha Burnier, International President of the TS, if she could find it. The answer was negative and the matter forgotten. Ravi Ravindra also asked K about the process and recounts the episode in his book *The Mill and the Mill-Pond: A twenty-Year Conversation with J. Krishnamurti*. Ravindra had asked K at an inopportune moment, when K was apparently having a vision of his dead brother, and K looked sadly and replied: “This is what everyone wants to know. Then they will start imitating it and faking it. No, it cannot be said”.

The Catalonian sage then continued to opine that he found it surprising for someone like me, who claimed to have read all the biographies written about K, to ask such a question especially since many writers (i.e. Lutyens and Jayakar) had written extensively about the event. He went on to cite various metaphysical “experiences” people had felt when in the presence of K. There was one incident experienced by Balasundaram which was interesting. It tells of an occasion in which K touched Balasundaram’s hands and causing him to feel a sense of ecstasy in which he lost his body consciousness. When the moment passed, Krishnamurti looked deeply at Balasundaram and remarked: “Are you happy, now?” (V. Ganesan, *Meetings with Sages and Saints*). The Catalonian sage also recounted his own personal experience when speaking with Krishnamurti and how contact with him changed his life. *All through his life Krishnamurti asked questions of his listeners such as “how did the boy remain “unconditioned?” and I asked, what evidence exists that he was unconditioned, apart from his own assertion?*

I suppose this question arose because conditioning is so all pervasive it is hard to even imagine anyone claiming that they have never been conditioned. Environment, background, economic circumstances, not to mention genetic inheritance and so forth, surely lays down the beginnings of conditioning even if it is later denied. Krishnamurti was always very conscious that he had been born a brahmin. He was taught to dress in an immaculate way – whether Eastern or Western dress – and the deference he displayed to prominent people throughout his life, shows the influence of his mentors Annie Besant and C.W. Leadbeater, as well as the British aristocrats he and his brother mixed with during their adolescence. I was criticised for dealing with this matter in a purely intellectual way without getting the feel of it and further charged with “demanding more ideas as proof”. It was becoming more and more apparent to me, that the Krishnamurti people have a lot in common with evangelical Christians or Moslems. Whereas Krishnamurti always encouraged doubt over belief, and enquiry over dogmatism, clearly the followers of Krishnamurti are not going to tolerate either.

*I also questioned whether anyone consulted a graphologist to look into the original accounts of the process written by Nitya and Krishnamurti. I asked if anyone was prepared to offer an explanation of why the language –*

*particularly that used by Nitya – is so closely linked to the phraseology of Warrington’s account? Wasn’t it Warrington who suggested to Krishnamurti that he go and sit under the Pepper Tree? Rosalind Rajagopal stated in her daughter’s book that she did not remember the incident. Why would such an important event in the life of Krishnamurti be erased, leaving only Warrington, Nitya and Krishnamurti himself, to describe events?*

By now you will be wondering why I haven’t been burned at the stake. I was reminded of Asha Lee’s account of having seen Krishnamurti transformed into the figure of Buddha while she was waiting at K’s bedroom door one morning. I’ve met Asha, she is quite a remarkable woman. I do not doubt she saw something and that in her experience it was something described by her as “beautiful”. Asha brought the matter up with Krishnamurti. He told her “You saw something. Why do you question it?” she replied, “I’m not questioning it because I did see it, but I’m just trying to understand it”. K replied “You saw it, there is no other explanation”. The Catalonian sage was very angry. He asked me if I had insinuated that this experience was produced by a belief system, or by a deluded mind. He also took me to task for mentioning Rosalind. He pointed out that Rosalind forgetting the initial *process* experience was because of her desire to belittle K, or perhaps because the altered state left no trace in her consciousness. (By the way, the devotees of Krishnamurti all seem to hate Rosalind with a frightening intensity. Maybe they believe that sex and sin are synonymous, as they have been categorized by various religions in the past).

The next question was as follows:

*Krishnamurti constantly stated to his audiences that they should “forget the teacher” and concentrate on the Teachings. If the Teacher is so unimportant why did he spend so much time talking about “the boy” and directing people to “write about what it was like to live with him”? May I ask if anyone, who has read all the books published about Krishnamurti, has a view, or evidence, that his apparent introspection about the “boy” and his background, served any purpose other than to “condition” the minds of his listeners?*

The Catalonian sage said the answer was easy. It was because the Teacher lived the Teachings, and so he told people to write about what it was like to be with him. He wrote: “what is important here is (K’s) quality of mind or being, the way he lives, which is not different from the Teachings and so it is universal, not exclusive or dependent on any particular person”. Then I was accused of prejudice and how did I know K was conditioning his listeners. *When anyone, even those of his closest friends, asked him direct questions K would reply “that he wasn’t allowed to lift the curtain”. Then why raise the question at all? And why did he frequently say that if others were interested to explore or to suggest certain things that he would confirm or deny if they were correct?*

The Catalonian sage agreed that this was mysterious but countered with the insight that K had said “water can never find out what water is”. If this is so, then is it legitimate to ask whether human beings can ever find out what they truly are? Surely, this question of “self knowing” was central to K’s teachings? The sage went on to relate an incident mentioned in “*The Open Door*” where K tells Mary Zimbalist. “It is all decided by someone else. I can’t talk about it. I’m not allowed to, do you understand? It is much more serious. There are things you don’t know. Enormous, and I can’t tell you”

*It would appear that Krishnamurti had many views about the Masters, and the heavenly beings who influenced him throughout his entire life. He claimed that people who lived the Teachings could “change” – whether he referred to a genetic mutation, or increased sensitivity and clarity of perception, is never made clear. Am I wrong in suggesting – from the evidence provided about the process – that Krishnamurti did not bring about his own*

*“change” but rather, was manipulated and programmed by people or entities from some metaphysical dimension to undertake the role of The World Teacher?*

If you are thinking that perhaps this stumped the Sage, you are mistaken. He went to great pains to point out that K was “enlightened” from birth and the change was beyond the physical. But then he quoted Jayakar’s biography (beginning Chapter 10) that “Krishnamurti in later years was to say of himself, “Full awakening came in India in 1947 to 1948”. It is worth quoting in full what the Sage had to say: “The *process* and the metaphysical beings assisting him and working on him, as I see it, were not to make him a liberated being, or to produce a fundamental change in him through external means (which, of course, would be contradictory with the Teachings themselves), but to prepare and allow him to be a manifestation of the World Teacher, or that ‘supreme intelligence’ which he said we won’t see again for many hundreds of years”. Do you see the implications of what the Sage has written? He thinks absolutely nothing about mentioning “metaphysical beings assisting (K) and working on him”. But that is my whole point. Who exactly are these “metaphysical beings”? And what do you mean by “working on him”? In Pupul Jayakar’s biography, she tells how Nitya witnessed the extent of the pain suffered by K during the *process*. ( A full and detailed account of the process can be found in Chapter 4.) She believed that the events were a transference of consciousness or awakening of kundalini. But elsewhere Krishnamurti claimed he was not satisfied with this interpretation. So one is left to ask, what was the point of all the suffering visited upon K and if the details are taken as factual, what was the connection with the altered state of consciousness which K frequently exhibited throughout his life? Does it suggest that K’s change or transformation was instigated by something “outside” of human consciousness?

The final question:

*On his deathbed K reaffirmed that he was the World Teacher and no one should claim to be an authority on the Teachings. He further stated emphatically, that no one had changed. Are we to assume from this final statement that Krishnamurti’s life – and suffering – were all for nothing?*

By now the Sage had decided I was not ever going to be saved. He quoted K in San Diego in 1970 as saying: “It doesn’t matter whether you understand or not, I’ll go on, because somebody, some day, will understand this”. And so the Sage concluded with his final comment: “I don’t think we can say that it was ‘all for nothing’”.

So there you have it. Human beings are always looking for answers and for comfort. Some look to Christ, some to the Buddha, some to Brahman, others to Mohammed or to some other supersensible entity. Some look to politicians, some to gurus, others to scientists and so on. For my part, I only know that I don’t know. But one thing is for sure. I am not going to put down one suitcase full of conditioning and pick up another. Life is what it is, and I am merely a manifestation of it and when the time comes Life will leave, and Death will take its place. And according to the great Krishnamurti, Love and Death are the same.

*Trisha English*

## Floriade—A story by Margot Mann

Much to everyone's amazement, Margie said she was leaving town in a couple of weeks to live with a friend in Canberra. Some of those who knew Margie best thought it was a joke when Chloe asked them to a farewell hen party for Margie. No one had realized that she had a love interest. "You've got to be kidding, she would have told me if she had a boyfriend," was a common response. "Margie of all people," said someone. Fighting the tide of disbelief, Chloe said, "It will just be a few of us from the Flora Artistica club," and to a reluctant Margie - "so you'll remember your old friends when you move to Canberra."

At the hen party, Margie showed her friends a few recent selfies taken with a man called Bill and his sister, which revealed that he had very little hair but seemed cheerful enough. Margie said he worked at Parliament House and added that he didn't talk much about his job.

Chloe said come to the party prepared to say why Margie reminds you of a certain flower. There were a few groans at this request but when the time came the guests mostly responded with good grace, their choices generally reflecting the view that Margie was a quiet person who kept her own counsel. Although some of them had known her for a long time, no one knew her very well.

One guest likened Margie to a shy violet, another to a busy lizzie because it was hard to get hold of her. Yet another said she smelled nice, with a subtle perfume like freesias, not strong like gardenias. Someone else thought she looked beautiful but kept her friends at arm's length like a thorny bougainvillea. Chloe said Margie reminded her of a poppy because she never bothered to shave her legs. Shouts of 'unfair' from the others. Chloe laughed and said alright then I'll say I think Margie is like lavender, the sweet smelling variety, which doesn't need much looking after and has healing properties as well as a wonderful perfume. Lizzie said she had been trying to think of a flower which you wouldn't look at twice until it bloomed and then it took your breath away. No one could think of its name. Finally, someone said that Margie reminded her of flowers like primulas and lobelias which self-propagated every year filling cracks and corners with colour and needing no care. A guest commented, "maybe they do need care" and everyone was thoughtful for a moment.

After supper, and more champagne, someone asked Margie how she and her new partner met. Margie tucked a strand of hair behind her ear and explained that when she visited Canberra to see Floriade a couple of months earlier she had twisted her ankle on one of the pebble paths which threaded through the beds of glorious spring flowers. Bill and his sister happened to be standing nearby and saw her fall. Bill quickly helped her to her feet and guided her to a wooden bench where she chatted with his sister while he got them all a cup of tea. "How romantic," murmured Lizzie wistfully.

Margie, encouraged, revealed that Bill was one of the regular gardeners at Parliament House. "He is part of the special duties team co-opted to help prepare for Floriade, and it takes a lot of skill judging when all the blooms will reach their peak, as you can imagine. A couple of years ago one of the other gardeners, not as senior as Bill, caused some headaches by bringing on the yellow snapdragons two weeks early. He said it was an honest mistake but Bill had been very stressed about the whole thing.

"He still believes this guy deliberately sabotaged the display so that he, Bill, would look incompetent." There were some sympathetic noises. "He's actually a very gentle guy, as you would expect of someone working with flowers, and I'm trying to understand why a colleague would want to ruin his career. Bill says he has no idea why, but he must know something..." her voice trailed away. Lizzie said, "Well now he has you." Margie smiled a little and looked down at her hands.

It was very late when Margie answered a call on her mobile phone. No one else took much notice. Lizzie had fallen asleep on the couch and a couple of others were lying on cushions on the floor. "I told Dan I was staying the night," said Josie, the youngest of the group.

Chloe said later she hadn't noticed when Margie left. One minute they had been laughing and singing 'I'm a Lonely Little Petunia in an Onion Patch' and then someone said "Where's Margie?" and there was no sign of her. The potted hydrangea they had given her was still standing in a corner in its pink cellophane wrapping with purple bow. ("The hydrangeas in Canberra are wonderful") It had wilted a bit and needed watering. The florist told Chloe you had to put nails in the soil if you wanted the flowers to turn blue. She had forgotten what would turn them back to pink again.

In the days after the party Chloe tried to contact Margie without success. No one had seen her. A week later she called Chloe. At first Chloe couldn't identify the caller but finally a tremulous voice said, "Hullo Chloe this is Margie." There was a long pause and then the caller continued, "I'm really sorry about the other night. It was so lovely of you to organise a hen party for me and I had such a good time." The voice paused again. Chloe did not speak. "The thing is, um, I won't be living with Bill. I just couldn't bring myself to tell everyone at the party that I'm moving to Canberra next week to live with his sister. She owns that big garden outlet in Canberra and I've been going there every weekend to help her. Are you there Chloe? I've shaved my legs."

*Margot Mann*

### 'An Experience of Enlightenment' from Brentyn Ramm

Hi all, I came across a book by Floras Courtois 'An Experience of Enlightenment' (1986). She describes a mystical experience she had in the 1940's that is startlingly similar to DH (Douglas Harding). She clearly had a headless experience, which she calls 'Open Vision'. A really inspiring book. What is extraordinary is that this occurred independently of any religious or mystical tradition. She hadn't read anything about mysticism or Eastern philosophy when she had her experience and she only discovered Zen later in life. *Regards, Brentyn (Ramm)*

Her search: In a vague groping way I now began to search for some single law, some one basic Reality that permeated all else. (p. 20).

"All I know, the whole world, even the universe, is myself! The answer somehow lies in myself." (p. 24)

It came to me that I had always thought of the center of myself as in my head and the rest of my body as somehow incidental. (p. 28)

I next paid a visit to a professor of philosophy whom I'd heard was a kind and understanding man. When I told him of my intense interest in discovering the nature of Reality he suggested that I take a course in epistemology the following semester. I left his office feeling utterly forsaken, thinking, "I don't want another course. What I want is the thing itself!" (p. 31)

Her mystical experience: The foundations had fallen from my world. I had plunged into a numinous openness which had obliterated all fixed distinctions including that of within and without. (P. 48)

I knew now that eternity is here always, that there is no higher, no deeper, no separate past or future time or place. How could love be other than this all-encompassing Oneness to which we can do nothing but open ourselves? (p. 52)

If I could continue in this state of Open Vision I felt certain that whatever happened, everything would be right just as it was. (p. 53)

Walking along the street I was aware of the street flowing past and beneath me, the trees or buildings moving past all around and the sky moving above as if I were immersed in one flowing whole. (p. 55-56)

At this moment there occurs a 180° turn in the center of Being, bringing with it an instant shift of perspective from within finite, partial form to the infinite ground of Consciousness itself, in which all things may be seen to unfold with incomparable clarity. I believe this simultaneously two-sided nature of perception to be the lynch pin of the enlightenment experience. (p. 86).

Once having learned to be generally quiet and deeply relaxed, then slowly, gently, and without effort, one may learn to release any random, infinitesimal movements of the eyes or throat into a stillness so deep that no eyes, no larynx, seem to be there at all. They have been replaced by total emptiness. (p. 87)

### Bullet (Doubt)proof Awakening from Colin Drake

Any Awakening based purely on an experience is always susceptible to doubt, which is virtually impossible to overcome as spiritual experiences are rarely repeatable, and if clung to cause suffering. Similarly, those based purely on belief, without proof, are equally susceptible; for once doubt has occurred then the belief loses its validity, for without proof this has no firm foundation. However, the discovery that one is Pure Awareness by investigation, see later, is not diminished by any doubts that occur; for these are just seen for what they are, which is ephemeral thoughts passing through Awareness leaving it totally unaffected. Thus, this Awakening is doubt-proof in that doubt loses its power to undermine it, and thus one can have complete 'faith' in it. Not faith as it is usually understood but that which is based on direct investigation of this moment, the outcome of which is reliable as it is readily repeatable every time this investigation is undertaken.

Consider The Oxford English Dictionary definition of faith: 1. Complete trust or confidence in someone or something. 2. Strong belief in the doctrines of a religion, based on spiritual conviction rather than proof.

Both of which are problematic, for in the first case the object of one's faith may prove to be unworthy of the trust, or confidence, with which it is being endowed; and in the second the conviction may be undermined if the belief wavers, which is quite possible due to lack of proof. However, a definition of a more reliable variety is possible, such as 'complete trust or confidence based on one's own direct experience or inquiry'. For, if the outcome of this inquiry (leading to a direct experience) is cogent and readily repeatable, then complete trust (or confidence) in it is fully justified, as it cannot be undermined and will always prove worthy of these.

This is the case with the investigation of one's direct experience, see the appendix, which leads to the conclusion that one's deepest essence is Pure Awareness. For the conclusion, based on the premises given, is completely cogent and every time this investigation is carried out the same conclusion is drawn. Also, any doubt that occurs is easily dispelled by seeing that this is just a fleeting thought occurring in (and seen by) the ever-present Awareness which is necessary for any experience of a thought or sensation. As the thoughts and sensations are a flow of ever changing objects and the Awareness is the constant subject (of these) then it is cogent to conclude that this Awareness is our essence, for it is essential for living, whereas this can hardly be said to be the case for any particular thought or sensation.

Also, this Awareness has been present since you were born and this perceiving presence has ‘seen’ (or experienced) every thought/sensation that has occurred (in your mind/body) since then. As I am sure you identify as having been constantly present since your birth then you must be this Awareness, for every thing appearing in and seen by this (that is every thought and sensation) is just a fleeting object. So the body/mind, which is experienced as this flow of thoughts and sensations, is an ever changing ‘container’ and ‘detector’ of these, and as this is continually changing it is a fleeting expression of Consciousness (in motion as cosmic energy) and thus cannot be the constant essence that you are.

So, once you have discovered that you are, in essence, Awareness itself, then it follows that one can have complete ‘faith’ in this realization as its discovery is readily, and easily, repeatable. This faith is based on the new definition I suggested and does not require ‘trust, or confidence in something or someone’ as Awareness is not a thing, but the ‘constant conscious perceiving presence’ which is required for the perception of anything or anyone. It also does not require ‘belief based on a conviction rather than proof’ for the enquiry, and the experience it engenders, is proof and is readily repeatable with reliable results. So we can have complete faith in the fact that we are Awareness, in essence, for this realization is ‘based on one’s own direct experience or inquiry’.

So, this Awakening by discovering that one is the Awareness (in which thoughts and sensations arise, abide, are spied and subside) is ‘bulletproof’ as doubts cannot undermine it. In fact they strengthen it when they are seen for what they are – ephemeral objects coming and going in the constant subjective presence which is Awareness Itself. For it is the objects appearing in Awareness that make its presence apparent in the same way that the ripples on a lakes surface make that apparent, or in fact as any thing makes the ‘nothingness’ that it appears in apparent – forms and space, sounds and silence, thoughts and no-thought etc. All of which is wonderful in that doubt, the factor that undermines all beliefs (not based on reliable ‘proof’) and many realizations, actually strengthens the realization that one is Awareness Itself!

*Colin Drake*

### [Nishida on Nothing from Alan Mann](#)

Those of us interested in the Metzinger Kitchen version of meditation , (where it is felt that the natural order is in a permanent state of meditation and that our individual attempts at meditating are interfering rather than engaging with this fundamental ‘what-is-ness’), might be interested in Nishida Kitaro’s comments on what both he and Heidegger are trying to describe.

John W.M. Krummel in an article entitled Heidegger and Nishida on the Nothing:

The nothing (mu) is a key concept throughout Nishida’s works. For Nishida beings all have form and the “nothing” signifies their non-objectifiable non-substantial formless ground. It is the most concrete reality, which we “forget” through our constant objectifications and abstractions.

The article is too specialised for condensation into summary, it is itself a summary of two complex perspectives. I think the article’s explanation of mutual negation is relevant to our recent consideration of meditation and similar to, if not quite the same as, the ice-block consciousness we mentioned in NOWletter 214.

*Krummel: One of the important features of this dialectic is the function of mutual self-negation (jiko hitei 自己否定) that permits relationships in*

general. In his (Nishida's) *Ronri to seimei* (「論理と生命」; "Logic and Life") of 1936, for example, the environment conditions the individual and conversely the individual acts upon the environment (Z8 58). Yet this cannot happen without self-negation. Co-relative determination is mediated by mutual self-negation (Z8 19). Mutual self-negation inverts obstructive independence into interdependence (Z8 13). This occurs not only on the part of individuals but also on the part of the universal embracing them. Nishida calls the universal in this function, the dialectical universal (*benshōhōteki 弁証法的一般者*) and equates it with the world's structure. Its self-negation is its self-determination as individuals (see Z8 13, 91). Self-negation thus mediates the dialectic on all levels, as a dialectic of, within, and upon the nothing as its place, whereby the determination is ultimately without determiner, without a self-affirming substance as ground.

So, what relevance does this have to meditation? Nishida's comments on negation indicate a mutual surrender of the individual to enter into wholeness, and of the undivided's surrender of its nothingness so that an integrated wholeness can come about. If meditation is to be about an enlightened or improved individual it is a step in the wrong direction, i.e., not the backward step that Heidegger and Dogen are pointing to. I realise this will only make sense in the light of the complete article which I found at the link below.

[https://www.academia.edu/33530599/On\\_the\\_Nothing\\_Heidegger\\_and\\_Nishida](https://www.academia.edu/33530599/On_the_Nothing_Heidegger_and_Nishida)

Alan Mann

A few notes:

*The Felt Sense— Christopher J. Ash (McLean)*

"The 'felt sense' is a term coined by Eugene Gendlin in relationship to his Focusing Work. It means having a global sense of something. The felt sense is composed of sensations, emotional tones, feelings and intuitive sensing, and can include imagery or words. It is a way of accessing information that is usually unconscious. Focusing is also a process of finding meaning and placement for material retrieved through the felt sense."

- Kittisaro And Thanissara. *Listening to the Heart: A Contemplative Journey to Engaged Buddhism*. North Atlantic Books.

Christopher J. Ash (McLean) Sites: [wholebodymindfulness.com.au](http://wholebodymindfulness.com.au) [ayeartolive.space](http://ayeartolive.space)

*Only This Emptiness—Bart Marshall*

There is a very moving video talk by one of the TAT community number, Bart Marshall, in which he talks about the consequences of a visit he made to Douglas at Nacton. I think he gave it to the TAT 2005 gathering but the content is repeated and extended in an Iain McVay interview at: Bart Marshall 'Only This Emptiness' -

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RCirEL0bchw>

*Krishnamurti with Bohm & Shainberg —From Jenny Howe*

6th conversation TM 1976

K: as long as we live our daily lives within the area of this consciousness - with all its images and the images-maker, whatever we do will still be in that area. Right?

So what happens when there is no movement of thought, which is the image - making, what takes place? When time, which is the movement of thought ends, what is there?

S: Is the death of the self? Is it the end of something?

K: No, no. When thought stops, when there is no image-maker, there is complete transformation in consciousness, because there is no anxiety, there is no fear, there is no pursuit of pleasure, there is none of these things that create turmoil and division. What takes place? I have to find out, for you may be leading me up the wrong path! *Jenny*

*Holy Calm—Wm. Wordsworth*

*Oft in these moments such a holy calm*

*Did overspread my soul, that I forgot*

*That I had bodily eyes, and what I saw*

*Appear'd like something in myself, a dream,*

*A prospect in my mind.*

From The Prelude: Book 2: School-time By William Wordsworth

### Greville Street Meeting Programme

Our next Greville Street meeting will be on Sunday February 2<sup>nd</sup>, assembling at 10.30 for the 11am start.

### Byron Sophia Philosophical Group

Marvell Hall, 37 Marvell Street, Byron Bay, Beyond Sports-Fields

Open Meetings: every Thursday from 1.30 pm to 3.30 pm

Celia – 02 6684 3623 / byronsophia@gmail.com