

Krishnamurti
Foundation

Bulletin

India, 1973 Number 1



EDITORIAL NOTES

We are all very happy to have Krishnaji amidst us in India after a lapse of nearly two years.

He gave four talks in Delhi on the 11th, 12th, 18th and 19th November 1972. The main theme of his first talk was the role of thought. He said. "Thought is measurement, measurement is time, measurement implies comparison, imitation, conformity and is, therefore, mechanical. The whole culture of the world is based on thought — all the myths of the gods, whether Christian, Hindu, Buddhist, or Muslim, are based on thought. Thought is the factor of division, both outwardly and inwardly and in order to find out the whole structure and the meaning of thinking, one has to understand how there is fragmentation in one's life. One fragment takes the authority to order the other fragment. The authority is called the Atman, the soul, the higher soul, the higher consciousness that takes charge of the other fragment. But the bigger fragment is still a fragment. So unless there is a radical change at the very root of our consciousness, there will be no change at all."

He explored further as to what place thought has in relationship. He said "What place has thought in the relationship between you and your wife? Relationship implies a timeless actuality between two people, which is love. Relationship implies a timeless movement between two people.

Subscribers

We hope our subscribers — both Indian and Foreign — will understand our need to receive as soon as possible the subscription amount due for 1973. As mentioned earlier the amount should be made out in the name of "Editor, K.F.I. Bulletin". We request them to renew their subscription for 1973 before the end of March 1973, to enable us to send them the April issue.

THE PROBLEM AND ITS RESOLUTION

(Continued from the previous issue — report of a discussion held on Friday, 13th February 1959 at the I.E.N.S. Hall, New Delhi.)

Question : Is it not a fact that a problem remains so, because of some incapacity on our part to resolve it?

Krishnamurti : I am coming to that. First of all, there is ambition and the frustration which that ambition brings about. Frustration is a disturbance. I am ambitious and there is frustration. I am concerned not with ambition but with getting rid of frustration which causes disturbance.

^ I want to be a great man and the desire to be great creates a frustration. I want to get rid of that frustration but I never question the whole problem of wanting to be great.

First, as I said, what is a problem? How is it that we are conscious of a problem? We are conscious of it only when there is a disturbance. As long as I am not disturbed, there is no problem at any level of my mind, at any level of my being or at any level of my living. Therefore, there is no problem as long as I am not disturbed, as long as I am capable of responding totally, adequately, to a change. If I know how to do some mechanical thing, there is no problem. If I know how to administer a bureaucratic government, there is no problem; but being inadequate, when there is a challenge and I do not respond fully, a problem arises. So, inadequacy to the challenge creates a problem and I am aware of that inadequacy through pain and disturbance. Are you aware of your problem of inadequacy, a problem that creates pain, suffering and conflict and you ask yourself, "How am I to resolve this conflict?" Before we enter into that whole field of how to resolve that conflict, I am asking myself whether conflict can ever be resolved.

Question : It depends on what form of conflict it is. Certain forms of conflict can be resolved.

Krishnamurti: I am using the word "conflict" in terms of contradiction within one's own mind, a state of self-contradiction. There is a challenge. Life is putting forth challenge all the time and I cannot respond adequately to that challenge and the inadequacy of that response creates a conflict. Now, I cannot resolve that conflict and so I take a tranquilizer, I take a book, I join a society and repeat certain words or sit in meditation. That way, I am trying to escape from the conflict. But I have not understood the purpose; I have not gone into the question of conflict at all but I want to run away from it. Before I run away, before I take a tranquilizer or before I go to a guru, I am asking myself whether conflict can ever be resolved. You take it for granted that it can be and it will be but I am questioning it.

Question: You find out the cause of the conflict and then get rid of it.

Krishnamurti: A gentleman says, "Find out the cause of the conflict and then get rid of the conflict." You know the cause of the conflict very well; most of us do. If you apply your mind, you know why you have a conflict. You are egotistic, you are angry, you are this, that, and the other. You know the cause and yet conflict comes in. I want you to proceed precisely and vitally. You have to be extremely scientific and precise in your thinking; otherwise you would miss the whole thing. Is it possible to be free from conflict? Life itself is a conflict. If you say that you want to get rid of conflict, then you create a false relationship to life because life may be a series of endless conflicts. Before you seek a solution or an avoidance of conflict, you must find out whether conflict is necessary in life.

Question: It is bound to be because we are inadequate.

Question: We are not going to believe that we are inadequate.

Krishnamurti: Let us look at it the other way. One side of the indication of a problem is sorrow. We all have sorrow of some kind and we want to get rid of sorrow. Life may be a sorrow. It is no good saying that you want to get rid of it. When life is sorrow and when I am part of this life, I cannot say that I will cut my arm and be happy. I cannot say that. I have to accept sorrow. So, is sorrow part of life?

Question : There is something which also tells us that we can get rid of sorrow.

Question : What is the cause of sorrow?

Question : So long as there is attachment, there will be sorrow.

Krishnamurti : You know what it means to be in sorrow, don't you? It is a deep disturbance — emotional, intellectual and physical. You are in sorrow and you want to resolve it. Now, how do you proceed to resolve it? Either you take to drink or you take to a book or you mesmerise yourself into a belief and so on.

Question : Or, you look into the problem.

Krishnamurti : Actually, Sir, what happens to each one of us? We want to escape. That is a fact. Now, could you escape from sorrow?

Question : The moment we accept it as inevitable, we adjust ourselves psychologically.

Krishnamurti : Why should I accept the misery of my life and why should I adjust myself?

Question : My son has died and I have no escape but to accept it.

Krishnamurti : Do you accept it?

Question : I have got to accept it, Sir.

Krishnamurti : We say we have got to accept it. Now, what does acceptance mean? Does it mean avoidance of sorrow, rationalising sorrow? I accept it but that does not solve my sorrow. My son dies and I am in sorrow and I say, "Yes, everything dies, trees die; life is a constant change. I will die. Everything comes to an end." So I rationalise my sorrow but I have not understood it; I have not grappled with it; I have not gone deeply into it. I have merely intellectually rationalised and this process of rationalisation also is an escape. You rationalise; I take a tranquilizer; someone else goes to the temple; another goes to join a certain society which will give him solace. We all escape from sorrow. I want to find an escape which will be satisfactory, which will be certain, which will be continuous.

So most people are concerned with the escape and the way of escape. To them the problem is not sorrow at all but the way to escape. Let us be a little clear and honest in our thinking. The psychological fact is my son dies; I believe in incarnation and I am happy. Now, I am not discussing whether there is incarnation or not. I escape into belief and that belief is like a drug; like Communists escaping into Communism, like the Catholics into Catholicism, and the Hindus and Buddhists into their own beliefs. All are same. So we are concerned with the escape from the problem which creates a disturbance. If we can see that much, then we can proceed.

Question : We want to escape or we want to reconcile.

Krishnamurti : As we said at the beginning, inadequacy of my response to a challenge creates the problem. Having created the problem, I want to escape from it, and the escape becomes very important and not the problem. A happy man who is strong, vigorous, mentally, inwardly, he does not go to a temple. The very existence is reality; we do not want to go into all that. We are miserable, unhappy, worn out, beaten down by society, by neighbours, and we run to the temple, to the mosque, to the church. These are escapes. Our religion is an escape from actuality. I know you do not like this but these are facts. The fact is I want to escape. So I come to you and say, "Please, Sir, do tell me how to escape. Tell me the way and I will practise. I will meditate; I will torture myself, as long as I can escape from sorrow."

We are escaping the reality. I suffer and I want to escape. Before I begin to escape, being fairly intelligent, I ask myself, "Is there an escape"? I know there are escapes — gods, whisky, tranquilizers, Gita, religion, television and so on. They are all on the same level of escape. Before I begin to escape, I must find out if there is such a thing as escape. I know there are escapes but they do not solve my sorrow. So, before I begin to find out the answer to sorrow, before I delve into it, before I go into it, I must stop escaping.

Question : A man knows that his son is dead. He knows that somehow or other that it is the doing of God and he gets contentment in that fact. He or she has found a solution but

yet the body reacts to it. If you use the term "psychological" it includes emotion; that is, emotion as well as intellect. So, "intellectual" would be a better word.

Krishnamurti: Sir, may I say something? The word is not the thing. The word "tree" is not the tree. The word is not the thing which we see. When we say "psychological avoidance of the fact", we know what is the inward nature of that avoidance — psychological, physical or intellectual; we know very well when we avoid. We do not have to use words. I want to go beyond the symbol of words and get at the feeling of avoidance.

Question: Why do we want to do this difficult thing?

Krishnamurti: Quite right. Why is it that we want to do this difficult thing, to face the fact and not escape from the fact? Because I say, the ending of sorrow is facing the fact. The avoidance of fact breeds various forms of confusion and because you are discussing with me, I say, look at the problem; what is involved in it, in avoidance and in escape. You have always the problem left with you. If you say, I will have my problem, there is nothing more to be discussed. But if you say, look here, I have a problem. I want to understand it, I want to resolve it. Then we are in relationship.

So, actually most of us want to escape from the fact and when you are escaping from the fact you cannot look at the fact. It is like this. If you want to listen to somebody who is talking, it is no good you chattering with your neighbour. You cannot listen; you can only listen when you are paying attention. In the same way, you can only give attention to the fact when you are not escaping, and not to escape is the most difficult thing to do.

Question: What is involved in facing the fact or in looking at the fact?

Krishnamurti: I am going to show it to you. Looking at the fact demands several things: first, not to escape and I have explained what it means; it is a very, very difficult thing to do. Then, looking at the fact implies not translating the fact in terms of opinion, in terms of knowledge, in terms of experience, in terms of memory. To look at a fact, to look at sorrow which

is a fact, I must come to it, the mind must come to it without escaping. It must come to it without the desire to translate the fact, to interpret that fact; it must come to it without the experience of previous sorrows; it must come to the fact without the treasure of memory, which is the most difficult thing to do; the mind must come to the fact with an innocence, with a freshness, with an openness. It cannot come to the fact it is escaping, if it is translating, if it is concluding.

So, if I want to look at the problem of sorrow, I must approach it with a freshness of mind and I cannot come to the fact with a fresh mind if I am escaping. And escaping is one of the most subtle things. It is a most difficult and arduous process to stop escaping, to understand it and to resolve it.

Question : Will understanding resolve it?

Question : And what do you mean by understanding?

Krishnamurti : Sir, my son dies and I escape into a belief. That is a crude form of escape. Now, what is involved in this escape? First, it is a tremendous shock to me physically. Secondly, psychologically, inwardly, I am left alone. My son, to whom I have looked to as a means of my continuity has been cut off. So I am insecure. I am not concerned about my son. I am concerned about myself. I am lonely; I am suddenly left alone. All my relationship with the world is cut and I am standing in a wilderness of loneliness. Not to escape but to look at the fact demands an astonishing understanding, a searching enquiry into escape.

Why does my mind escape? It escapes because it cannot face the fact that it is left alone. It must have something on which it can lean. So it turns to a belief, whether it is false, true, whether it has meaning. It is something which gives it comfort. Belief is as good as a drug or as a drink. If I see the truth that escape will not solve my problem, my suffering, then I cease to escape. But most of us are so accustomed to escape, the habit of escape is so strong that it is very difficult to cut it off. And you cannot cut it off for ever until you understand that the mind wants to escape from the fact and why it wants to do so.

Now, what is the state of the mind that has stopped escaping? It is that mind that is going to look at the fact. What is the state of the mind that has stopped escaping through drink, sex, gods, book, a radio, talking? Stop all that. Stop in the sense, understand it, go into it and see what the state of the mind is that can look at the fact without escaping.

Question : Now this attempt to understand itself is the goal, namely, that I want to be free from the problem.

Krishnamurti: As I explained, there is only freedom and not freedom from the problem. "Freedom from" is never freedom. Freedom from something is merely a reaction from that something; it is not freedom. Freedom means something entirely different. It is not a reaction.

We have said that a problem exists only when there is a disturbance. When there is inadequacy of response to a challenge, that inadequacy creates pain and from that pain we want to escape. And so we make the way of escape our problem. We cannot solve the problem as long as we escape. We can understand a problem only when we give our whole attention and we cannot give our whole attention when there are various forms of escape — going to the temple, picking up a book, taking to a drink, turning on the radio, talking or translating the fact or trying to interpret the fact according to our knowledge, according to our information, according to our circumstances. All those are means of escape. And it is one of the most arduous tasks for the mind not to escape and that is really part of meditation.

(concluded).

WHAT IS RELATIONSHIP ?

J. Krishnamurti

The announcement said that the flight had not yet left Milan because of fog and would we all wait patiently for an hour or more; and we waited. We were all going to Rome and there was a large crowd in that waiting room, the very smart, the long-haired ones and the short-haired; a boy had his arm around a girl, completely oblivious to all the others, and another boy with a guitar began to strum on it. Some smoked and there was considerable drinking. It was hot in the room and there was a strong smell of cheap scent.

What is relationship? What relationship have that boy and girl or that smart woman with her husband, that older woman with her son who looked bored and was being taken abroad to be shown the ancient towns of Italy? How can there be relationship between a man and a woman, or anybody, if one is ambitious, self-absorbed in that ambition, utterly self-centred? You can see the hardness in the faces of those whose whole activities go round the 'me' and the 'you'. There may be a physical contact, and probably all relationship, the superficial or the so-called deep, remains there. How can you be related to another if you are suspicious, if you think you are always right and never admit the feeling of being wrong? That man with ancient pride of race or imagined importance, what can his relationship be except physical or superficial? How can two neurotic people, living in the same house, calling themselves husband and wife, have any kind of relationship? There are couples seemingly happy together who have grown close through trouble, sorrow and pain, with many regrets and failures — you would say that they were happy in their relationship, both physical and otherwise, but how can one have any relationship with the other if the 'me' is all-important, if one is jealous, arrogant, the other yielding? Obviously, good relationship cannot exist with any of this.

There are people who are completely absorbed in each other, who do things together with very few outside interests, satisfied to live in the same room, not going out of an evening. Such relationship is perhaps very unusual, but life isn't just good relationship. It is something much more, vastly beyond the self-satisfying movement of happy relationship. To be really related to another is possible only when ambition, suspicion, competition, the sense of possession, with all their bitterings, anger and frustrations, are totally absent.

Such relationship is rare, but without that rarity life is caught in trivialities. Life includes death, love and the understanding of pleasure, and something far beyond all these. The 'truth' of the analyst or the myth in which the religious people wallow has obviously nothing to do with reality. Without coming upon that reality, however good the relationship may be, it must remain superficial, casual, or yielding and resisting. Without that sense of the beauty of the real, relationship becomes inevitably a narrowing process.

But the people in the waiting room, bored, annoyed at the delay, would not want any other kind of relationship than that which they had.

A well-known writer got into conversation with us, and going beyond the casual, we began to talk of serious things, of man's suffering, the incredible mythology of the church and the exploitation of man for so many centuries by an idea which he calls Truth, or God, and of the various political divisions which the writer, as a Communist, maintained were the only solution. Can suffering, we asked, can the conflict of jealousy in love, possessiveness and the demand for power and position be solved by a political dictum? "Oh!" he said, "I am not suffering — they are suffering; this is love, this conflict, this jealousy, antagonism and fear — without these love is not."

Just then the voice on the loudspeaker said we should board our flight. Soon we climbed to thirty thousand feet, and below us was Mont Blanc and presently Genoa, Florence and the curving bays of the blue Mediterranean. It was a lovely day, clear, sparkling and full of light.

(Courtesy, Krishnamurti Foundation, England).

SYSTEM AND INTELLECT

(Authentic report of a dialogue held on 9th January 1971, at Madras)

Questioner A: We were exploring how ideas become more important than words. We make systems of ideas and these systems have a validity and they control facts.

Krishnamurti: Systems are formulas, methods, invented by thought to control fact, to shape fact. What is there to explore?

A: Idea is myth, belief, pattern. Idea without system would be disorder. Systems have come to mean so much to us.

Krishnamurti: Why has the mind accepted systems as a way of life?

A: Is the acceptance of systems the same as accepting formulas? Bertrand Russell did not believe in power but even such a man who saw the danger of power was subservient to systems. We leave one system, the religious, and get caught in other systems. What makes man get entangled? Why does man not free himself when he sees the falseness of systems? When Krishnamurti says that religious organizations do not lead to truth, he is out of all religious organizations.

Krishnamurti: You are asking why does the mind reject one particular system and get trapped in another system? Is it because it has not understood the implications of systems? One drops organization because in that is implied superstition, following. Then one accepts the system given by the guru, because it is easy to follow the guru. Or you have Marxism with its dialecticism, and you follow that because it offers a certain pattern of life which appeals to you. Which means you would rather act with a system rather than with a fact, with 'what is'. You are not generous and so you follow a guru who says "I will tell you a system by which you will be generous" and you follow. In the meantime you are not generous.

A: We move from religious to secular systems. The system

takes you out of yourself. Take the problem of Indian poverty. Even that reality of poverty you face with systems.

R : The 'what is' is not so simple as "I am not generous". It is chaos, conflict, generosity.

A : By adopting a system the mind feels it can tackle 'what is'.

Krishnamurti : I have a system of non-violence and through that concept I hope to dissolve violence. I form a party and all the rest of it. The man who is violent, why does he slip into a system to get rid of violence?

A : Organization can be through violence, organization can also be through non-violence. It is not that idea is by itself violent or non-violent. The problem is with the mind that gets entangled in the system.

Krishnamurti : There is a particular problem related to a situation. I do not know what to do. X, Y, promise that through a system we will resolve it. Are we talking at the level of efficient organizations to carry out social activities or as to why the mind slips into systems?

A : Systems have a very limited validity. Ideas, systems must change with situations. This I can see. The problem arises in the mind which feels helpless with a situation.

Krishnamurti : So being incapable to deal with a given situation, the mind wants a system. Not knowing what to do with a particular fact, with 'what is', not knowing how to deal with it, it hopes to solve it through a system. Is that possible, and at what level?

A : If this is solved, then one's attitude to systems is different. We hope to change only the environment because changing man is different from changing the environmental conditions.

Krishnamurti : System we must have in order to function. What we are concerned with is, with a mind that says it cannot solve problems without a system.

That opens up the whole field, which is, the human mind that has created the environment says, "I will solve that environmental problem through a system." The mind remains the same.

I love man? Or through the system which is invented by my intellect in which there is no life, no love at all? Is the system created by the intellect going to change environment? Do you see the difference?

So, what is important is not the system. The system will operate perfectly when the mind of man changes. Then man will use the system. The feeling of love of man for man cannot be created by the system, but love can use the system. All of us try to change the system without the real thing. System is absolutely necessary at one level. To change a ghetto, there must be men of capacity, organization, etc. What becomes the problem is that a mind which is small, petty, ambitious, greedy, takes over the system. Now is there a system that will soften the human heart which has created the environment? Will you cultivate through a system, the love of man? Obviously, you cannot.

The system is not the problem. The problem is man, not social engineering.

So what will you do? Man has created the environment. Environment is man. They are indivisible. I am the world, the world is me. Absolutely. This is not just an idea, not an intellectual concept which withers away.

The basic fact is that environment is built by me and I am the environment. So I start with this — to change the world I must change. The world is me. I do not divide myself and the rest of the world. The culture in which I have been brought up is 'me' and the 'me' is that culture.

So far we have divided the world as the 'me' and the world. The world is not something separate from the 'me'. The environment, the community, the culture is not something separate from 'me'. Culture is the 'me'.

A: One can see this. It is such rigorous logic.

Krishnamurti: It is not logic. It is the feeling that the world is 'me'. Feel it. Feeling is love. If I have not love, what does all this mean? My question is, can man change? Which is, man being the environmental world, the system, because he invents the systems, can he change? How is the human mind, which is the world, which is the environment, culture, system,

which is the whole content of human existence, how is that to change? If you say it can only change through a system, you are back again to the religious system, the economic system and so on.

A: We are out of that but we have not reached this.

Krishnamurti: That the world is you?

A: There is a certain quality which we do not have.

Krishnamurti: Unless man changes radically, he is going to create a mess. So let us be concerned with ourselves.

How do you get the quality? Sir, put it the other way. The world means 'me'. The world, which is 'me', is composed of extraordinary contradictions, so many terrible things like violence, and how are you going to change that mind? Not being able to change, you go after the systems.

A: There is a tremendous resistance to seeing that I am the world.

Krishnamurti: Because you do not see the danger of the other.

A: Having come so far, we cannot proceed further.

Krishnamurti: Do you know why? Are you sure you do not have an attraction for the system, for time, for method? Can you co-operate without an idea? Co-operation about something is different from the spirit of co-operation.

A: If one comes to this point through intellection, then how does one proceed?

Krishnamurti: You have come to this point fragmentarily. Through a fragment you are trying to look at the whole and therefore you have failed. Intellect is a fragment. You say you have come to this through the intellect, I say you cannot. One spoke does not make the wheel. So do not come to this through the intellect. See that any creation of the intellect is partial. System is the invention of the intellect, and therefore it is partial. You say through the intellect you have come to this. If you have come to this intellectually, you have not come to it at all. It is just like saying I have seen the whole sky through a little hole in the wall and the little hole in the wall is the intellect.

SORROW AND PASSION

J. Krishnamurti

The word "passion" means sorrow. For most of us sorrow is something dreadful to be avoided, a thing that must be put away altogether or something to be resolved; not being able to resolve it, we either worship it, as the Christian world does, or, as it happens in Asia, give it some kind of explanation; they use the word 'karma', indicating that sorrow is the result of past action. But sorrow is something that is always with us, we may not acknowledge it, we may not be acquainted with it, familiar with it, but it is there . . .

One perceives the whole process of sorrow, how we human beings throughout the world have suffered, through wars, through uncertainties, through lack of relationship with another, through the lack of love; and when there is the lack of love, then pleasure becomes all important. Not only is there this sorrow, but also there is the sorrow of ignorance. Ignorance exists even though one may have great knowledge, a good education, be sophisticated, have capacity in the exercise of which one achieves fame, notoriety, money . . . *Ignorance is the utter lack of self-knowing.* Most of us are superficial, shallow, have so much sorrow and ignorance as part of our lot. Again, this is not an exaggeration, not an assumption, but an actual fact of our daily existence. We are ignorant of ourselves and therein lies great sorrow. That ignorance breeds every form of superstition, it perpetuates fear, engenders hope and despair and all the inventions and theories of a clever mind. So ignorance not only breeds sorrow, but brings about great confusion in ourselves. Observing all this, one is conscious of this unending chain of sorrow; we are everlastingly trying to escape from it — we are born with sorrow and die with sorrow. We think that pleasure brings passion; it may bring sexual lust or passion; but we are talking about a passion that is a flame that comes with self-knowing. The ending of sorrow comes with self-knowledge; out of that self-knowledge there is passion.

(From "Talks with American Students" 1968)

STATEMENT

About ownership and other particulars about the journal,
Krishnamurti Foundation Bulletin (Quarterly).

(FORM IV)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Place of Publication | Sangam Press, Ltd.,
17, Kothrud, Poona 29. |
| 2. Periodicity of its
publication | Quarterly |
| 3. Printer, Publisher
and Editor
Nationality
Address | Mrs. Sunanda Patwardhan
Indian
Sangam Press, Ltd.,
17, Kothrud, Poona 29 |
| 4. Names and addresses
of individuals who
own the journal and
partners or share-
holders holding more
than one per cent
of the total capital. | Krishnamurti Foundation
India,
Rishi Valley,
Chittoor District,
Andhra Pradesh. |

I, Mrs. Sunanda Patwardhan, hereby declare that the particulars given above are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

New Delhi
June, 1970.

Sd/- Mrs. Sunanda Patwardhan
(Signature of Publisher)

Yearly subscription: Rs. 6

Single copy: Rs. 2

Correspondence address:

Mrs. Sunanda Patwardhan,
111, Golf Links, New Delhi 3.

BOOKS BY KRISHNAMURTI

	Rs.P.
The Penguin Krishnamurti Reader (1970)	5·40
PUBLISHED BY VICTOR GOLLANCZ LTD.	
The First and Last Freedom (1954)	18·90
Education and the Significance of Life (1955)	17·25
Commentaries on Living: 1st Series (1956)	18·00
Commentaries on Living: 2nd Series (1959)	24·00
Commentaries on Living: 3rd Series (1960)	30·00
Life Ahead (1963)	16·20
This Matter of Culture (1964)	16·20
Freedom From the Known (1969)	16·20
Freedom From the Known (Paperback)	5·00
The Only Revolution (1970)	18·80
The Urgency of Change (1971)	26·00
PUBLISHED BY KRISHNAMURTI FOUNDATION INDIA	
1970-71 Talks	6·00
—do— (Foreign price)	£ 0·40
PUBLISHED BY ORIENT LONGMAN LTD.	
Meditations, 1969	0·75
Conversations, 1969	2·50
Tradition and Revolution (Paperback)	12·50
—do— (Hard cover)	27·50
	Foreign price £ 0·80
	Foreign price £ 1·70
Panch Samvad	1·00
(Marathi translation of <i>Five Conversations</i>)	
Jeevan Bhashye	12·50
(Marathi translation of <i>Commentaries on Living — 2nd Series</i>)	
Dyanavasthetil Sphurane	0·75
(Marathi translation of <i>Meditations</i>)	
Arindadanindrum Vidudalai	5·00
(Tamil Translation of <i>Freedom from the Known</i>)	
<i>Published by Maharashtra Rashtrabhasha Sabha</i>	
Samskritka Prasna	7·50
(Hindi translation of <i>This Matter of Culture</i>)	
<i>Published by M. Seshachalam & Co.</i>	
Dhyana vahini	1·00
(Telugu translation of <i>Meditations</i>)	
Sambhashanalu	
(Telugu translation of <i>Conversations</i>)	3·50

All the above books are obtainable from Rishi Valley, Headquarters of Krishnamurti Foundation, India and also from book shops.

Edited, printed and published by Mrs. Sunanda Patwardhan at Sangam Press Ltd., 17, Kothrud, Poona 29, for Krishnamurti Foundation, India.
Correspondence address: Mrs. Sunanda Patwardhan, 111, Golf Links, New Delhi 3.