

Krishnamurti
Foundation

Bulletin

India, 1973 Number 4



EDITORIAL NOTES

As this is the last issue for this year, we request our readers to renew their subscriptions for the coming year 1974, as early as possible. The subscription amount should be sent preferably by M.O. and those who would like to send the subscription by cheque should kindly add Re. 1/- more towards bank charges.

We are happy to inform you all that Krishnaji will soon be with us in India and he is giving a series of talks. His speaking schedule is as follows:

Friday	2 Nov. 1973	Arrival — Bombay
Monday	5 Nov. 1973	Arrival — Rishi Valley
Monday	19 Nov. 1973	Arrival — New Delhi
	24, 25 Nov. and 1, 2 Dec. 1973	} Public Talks — New Delhi
Tuesday	4 Dec. 1973	Arrival — Banaras
	8, 9 Dec. 1973	Public Talks — Banaras
Tuesday	18 Dec. 1973	Arrival — Madras
	22, 23, 29, 30 Dec.	Public Talks — Madras
Tuesday	1 Jan. 1974	Arrival — Bangalore
	5, 6, 12, 13 Jan.	Public Talks — Bangalore
Tuesday	15 Jan. 1974	Arrival — Bombay
	19, 20, 26, 27 Jan.	Public Talks — Bombay
Wednesday	30 Jan. 1974	Departure for Rome.

For particulars write to:—

Sri R. K. Chari,
Krishnamurti Centre,
B/27 Soami Nagar,
New Delhi—17

Sri R. R. Upasani,
Rajghat Executive Committee,
Rajghat Fort, Varanasi—1

Mrs. Jayalakshmi,
Krishnamurti Centre,
3-C Greenways Road,
Madras—28

Dr. S. Balasundaram,
Principal, Rishi Valley School,
Rishi Valley P.O., Chittoor Dist.
(Andhra Pradesh)

Sri M. K. Anantha Swamy,
Krishnamurti Centre,
Commission & General Agency,
Jayacharamaraj Road,
Bangalore—2

Mrs. Silloo Billimoria,
Krishnamurti Centre,
21 Cuffe Parade, Colaba,
Bombay—5.

A STATEMENT

Towards the end of June of this year representatives of the four Krishnamurti Foundations met at Brockwood Park, England to talk over their present and future responsibilities. We were together for about ten days and during the discussions their responsibilities and functions became clear. It was important to have met and shared together the various problems of the work. We all felt that the Foundations should not be fragmented but work together as a whole, with the same intention and seriousness. This is what we talked about.

As many of you may remember, I was once the head of a world-wide organization founded in 1910 or 1911 with thousands of members in many countries. It was dissolved by me in 1928. I said then that there was no path to truth and that no organization or organized belief as religion can lead man to truth or his salvation. I said then that in all so-called spiritual matters there is no authority, no leader or guru, and that all following perverts the follower. You have to be your own teacher and your own disciple.

After all these years I still maintain this essential truth. Following blindly or according to pleasure or temperament does not bring man to freedom. And without freedom there is no truth. In all these many years of talks and dialogues this has been the principal concern.

Today there are four Krishnamurti Foundations. These are Krishnamurti Foundation Trust Ltd. in England, Krishnamurti Foundation of America, Krishnamurti Foundation India and Foundation Krishnamurti Hispanoamericana. They exist only for simple and obvious reasons. During my lifetime they arrange talks, group discussions, seminars and gathernigs. They are responsible for editing, translating and publishing the books. They are responsible for the care of archives. They produce films, audio and video tapes, see to their distribution and so on.

There are now three schools in India, an educational centre with its school at Brockwood Park in England and there is going

to be an educational centre and school in the United States at Ojai. All these schools function under the Krishnamurti Foundations. It is the responsibility of the Foundations to see that these schools continue if possible after my death. It is very definitely intended that in these schools the teachings which are in no way sectarian — this I would like to emphasize — are to be lived both by the teacher and the student. The schools have importance for they may bring about a totally different human mind.

The Foundations have no authority in the matter of the teachings. The truth lies in the teachings themselves. The Foundations will see to it that these teachings are kept whole, are not distorted, are not made corrupt. The Foundations have no authority to send out propagandists or interpreters of the teachings. As it has been necessary, I have often pointed out that I have no representative who will carry on with these teachings in my name now or at any time in the future.

The Foundations will not give rise to any sectarian spirit in their activities. The Foundations will not create any kind or place of worship around the teachings or the person.

In this chaotic and disintegrating world what is of the greatest importance is how each person lives these teachings in his daily life. It is the responsibility of each human being to bring about his own transformation which does not depend on knowledge or time.

J. Krishnamurti
10 July 1973.

THE TOTAL APPROACH

(Continued from previous issue)

A : Sometimes we are not aware of our own problems.

K : The gentleman suggests that we are not aware of our own problems. Then, Sir, the problem is how to keep awake, how to become conscious of one's own problems. If one is not at all aware or awake, if one does not read the newspapers about the events taking place daily, then there is no problem. One is almost dead. If one is at all conscious of all the things that are going about outwardly as well as inwardly, it is impossible not

to have a problem. Your problem may be an immediate problem with your wife or husband. That is a problem, a problem of relationship. So, it is very difficult, isn't it, not to be aware of one's own problem or the problems that exist in the world; the Communists, the Socialists, the Capitalists and the wrangles that are being fought between the politicians, the wars — all these are problems; but if one says one is hardly awake to any problem, then there is no answer to it. Either one has drugged oneself so thoroughly or one is consciously or unconsciously inducing oneself to be asleep. If one is aware of one's own problem then the question arises, how is one to look at that problem entirely and how to understand that problem? Is understanding synonymous with the total approach or is understanding different from the total approach? When I say, "I understand something", what do I mean by that? When I say, "I understand something" I see clearly what you mean or I understand the whole significance of a conflict. What do we mean by that word "understanding"?

A: The problem is, there is contradiction. How can this contradiction be removed?

K: Wait a minute. We are trying to find out the meaning of that word "understanding", not how to remove contradiction.

A: But, Sir, contradiction being the very basis of things, the problems also are never ending. Naturally when we solve one problem, another arises and it is rather a vicious process.

K: We are trying to understand what the word "understand" means, not the complications of a problem.

A: Understanding means taking up a definite position.

K: The gentleman says, understanding implies taking up a definite position; after investigating and analysing, coming to a conclusion means understanding. Is that what you mean by understanding? If we take a stand, then it becomes party politics and that is disastrous. Sir, there is starvation in this country and in Asia. The Communist takes a position; the Capitalist takes a position; or the Socialist takes a position and from their respective positions they are trying to solve the problem, and therefore they will never solve it. Similarly, if we take a position or

come to a conclusion from which we think, then there is no understanding. The gentleman says, after examining, analysing, exploring, to come to a position and that position, that stand, that conclusion is understanding. I am asking myself, is that so? I do not say it is right or wrong; I want to find out.

A: That is actually seeking a solution. Understanding is just awareness of the various aspects of the situation.

K: The gentleman says, that would be really seeking a solution but not understanding. He says understanding implies awareness of the various aspects of the situation. Now, go slow, Sirs. That is, he is saying that through analysis, seeing the various aspects of the problem and coming to a conclusion is understanding.

A: To some extent, yes, Sir.

K: That gentleman says, it is possible to understand one's relationship to society, to one's family, to one's wife, to one's husband, to one's child or to nature through analysis. I cannot see how that is possible. I may analyse my son, take his different aspects, as the gentleman suggests, look at him when he is playing, when he is sleeping, when he is quarrelling, when he is fighting, look at him in all ways and then come to a conclusion and that conclusion helps me to understand. Is that so? Now, understanding has nothing to do with mentation, analysis. It does not mean intuition. Do you understand my question? We all say understanding comes through analysis, through comparison, through analytical process, through weighing this against that and the coming to a synthetic understanding. Is that so? Or may I have to do all that and go beyond all that? Which means if I want to understand the Communist system or the Congress system or whatever it is, any political system, I look, I observe, I investigate and go beyond it to find out the whole significance. I do not know how you can do that. I am just asking how you come to any understanding. I may come to an understanding with my wife about finance, about household duties, how much she may spend and so on and come to an understanding. Surely, that is one type of understanding. But we are talking of an understanding which is entirely different. There it is a matter of convenience, matter of adjustment, conclusion, but surely,

there is an understanding which is not mere mentation, mere conclusion.

A : Certainly conclusion is quite different from understanding. To understand a problem is, so to say, to take it to one's self, to be seized of it.

K : The lady suggests conclusion is not understanding. Understanding comes about when you take the thing to one's self. Please, let us bear in mind what we are discussing. We are discussing how to face a problem totally, approach it entirely and thereby understanding it. Now, we are asking ourselves, what is this understanding.

A : When a person can look at a problem without projecting his own self into it, understanding comes about.

K : The gentleman says, if you look at a problem without projecting your own prejudices, then understanding comes about. Sir, a mind that has come to a conclusion, is it capable of understanding?

A : Impossible.

K : I have come a conclusion that a certain system will resolve poverty—Communist, Socialist, this or that. I have come to that conclusion and from there I function; from there I act; from there I plan. Please follow me. If I have come to a conclusion, is there further thinking about it? You may not accept this but I think you will see the truth of this if you investigate. So we are trying to find out what is this quality which brings about understanding.

A : Understanding is certitude in the whole being, either in your mind or in your soul or in both; but it is always a certitude, a certainty.

K : The gentleman says, understanding implies certainty. Now, just a minute. When am I certain about something? Certainty implies conclusion.

A : The test of understanding would be lack of contradiction.

A : Not necessarily.

K : He says, when there is no contradiction, that is a state of understanding.

A : The precise meaning of understanding is the total grasp of something.

K : That is so. Now, how does that total grasp come about? Through conclusion, through analysis, through discussion, through argumentation.....

A : Total grasp comes through love.

A : Through intuition.

K : I ask a question and you give me a reply — 'Through love', 'Through intuition'. I do not know what these two words mean. You have not even considered my question and you are ready with an answer. Let us look at our difficulty. We are not trying to find an answer or a definition but to feel the quality of understanding. We must be very clear if we are at all to find out what that word implies and that is the reason why it is not to be brushed aside quickly. One can see that the word is not the thing. The word 'understanding' is not the quality of understanding. We must be able to separate the word from the quality and that is going to be very difficult because most of us are entangled with the word and from the word we look at the meaning. If we are able to separate the word and then try to find out what this quality of understanding is, then perhaps we will come to it much closer.

A : When we perceive the truth of a statement in ourselves, then we say we understand.

K : The gentleman says, when we perceive a truth in ourselves then we say we understand. What is the state of the mind that says, 'understand'? The gentleman says, 'I see something valid. I see something true and then I understand'. Now, what is the state of the mind that says, 'understand'?

A : It has no problems; it has no contradictions.

K : Have you examined your mind when you say that?

A : Yes, what do you mean by the state of the mind?

K : Have you listened to my question, Sir? We are now trying to find out the state of the mind that says 'I understand something', the state, not the 'something'.

A : This is simply a state of sympathetic enlightenment.

A : Understanding means a perception of a situation, devoid of all past experiences, future hopes and fears.

A : You asked about the state of the mind. The state of the mind is that it is perfectly open, with no pre-conceived notions or prejudices.

K : The gentleman says that the condition of the mind which understands is that it has no prejudices.

A : That is a state where there is awareness without resistance.

A : Understanding is when something takes meaning in my mind.

A : Understanding cannot be verbalised.

K : The gentleman says, and perhaps that is the truth, that understanding cannot be verbalised. Many of us have expressed in words what we mean by understanding. Surely, what you have put into words is not the state of understanding. Words do not indicate that state of mind that understands. So, understanding is really, if one looks into it, an immediate perception without innumerable analytical explanations and so on. An immediate perception of something, not verbally coming to a conclusion about something, is understanding.

Let us leave that for the moment. We will approach it presently.

The next stage is, how to approach a problem totally. Because the questioner at the beginning said, 'In one of your talks you said the problem ceases only when you approach that problem with your whole being totally.' Now the questioner wants to know how to approach a problem totally. Now we are not examining the problem; we are not examining the word 'understand'; we are now trying to find out the total approach. Don't give explanations; don't say the total approach is this or it is not that. Then we will get lost. May I put a question? Have you ever approached a problem totally? Have you ever said, this is the total approach?

A : No, because we have no conception of the totality.

K : The gentleman says, as we do not have a conception of

totality, therefore we have never approached a problem totally. Sir, look at it. The gentleman says, because we have no conception of the whole, the total, therefore we cannot approach the problem wholly. If you had a perception of the whole, will that not be a conclusion with which you are approaching the problem? Wait for a moment. Has it ever happened to you — the feeling of a total perception of something?

A: We can't remember that, Sir.

K: I will explain a little more. Is hate a total approach? I hate somebody; is that a total approach? I dislike somebody or I love somebody, is that a total approach? Let us explore it. We are now trying to find out what is a total approach to a problem — the total apprehension, the total awareness, the complete perception. Will I have a total perception of the wheel by merely putting the spokes together? Or do I have a feeling of the wheel and then the spokes come in? I am asking myself, do I know of a total approach to something? Have I ever experienced that?

A: Sir, that question cannot be answered.

K: We are going to answer it, you will see in a minute. The gentleman says, the question cannot be answered and I said I will find out; don't take a stand. Now, when do you respond totally with your senses, with your mind, psychologically, emotionally, physically, mentally and totally? Sir, we do have experiences when we respond physically, emotionally, mentally and totally, when the whole being responds. Have you not experienced that? When you respond to something fearful, your whole being responds, is it not? When there is a snake, a fire, passion, there is complete response either through fear, through hate or through love. There is a total response.

A: Are you sure it is a total response?

K: I am not sure of anything, Sir. The gentleman wants to know if I am sure of that. I am merely asking, have we not experienced that feeling of total response? It is not that I am stating that it is so. Sir, is this not a fact that when you are angry with me there is a total response? Afterwards you may regret, afterwards you may be afraid, afterwards you may say, "I should not have done that" but at the moment of anger there

is a total response; at the moment of intense experience there is a total response. That we all know, surely.

A : My question is, can this intensity be completely intense? How do we know?

K : The gentleman wants to know if this intensity can be completely intense and how we know it. I do not know. Sirs, look, we are trying to find out what is the state of mind that approaches totally a thing, a problem, anything. When we see a snake, we respond with the whole of our being.

A : Respectfully, if I may say, Sir, probably it is just the reverse. In anger, in ecstasy, it is only one aspect that gets the upper hand; the other totality does not come in.

K : The gentleman says that when one is angry, there is only partial response; the other totality does not come in. I do not know what he means by the 'other totality'. What we are trying to find out is what this total approach is, because that may be the approach that will perceive the problem. We have tried different ways of resolving a problem; analytical, inferential, coming to a conclusion, thinking from a conclusion and we have made various efforts to get rid of the problem and yet the problem remains or multiplies. So I have suggested that there is a possibility of approaching the problem totally and the gentleman asks, what is the feeling of that approach. It is a serious question and let us find out. He does not want me to instruct him how to get that total feeling. He wants to find out. So it is no good telling him "this is it and this is not it" and confusing him. We must help him to discover it for himself. Is not that so?

A : There cannot be a total approach to any problem with our mind.

K : The gentleman says that there can be no total approach with our mind. Therefore it implies the mind cannot approach a problem totally and most of us do not approach a problem with our mind. Don't we?

A : We think so but we do not approach.

K : Sir, I have a problem. I hate somebody. How am I to approach this problem? If I like hating the person, that is very simple. Then there is no problem. But the problem arises when

I hate him and at the same time I do not want to hate him. Then I am caught in this hate and non-hate. So there is a conflict, perpetual conflict, sorrow, misery, in myself, not in the person I hate. So I ask you, how am I to be free of this conflict? I hate and at the same time I do not want to hate. So, you tell me, look, see if you can approach the problem totally. And I ask, what do you mean by total approach. I do not know what you mean. I only know a partial approach, a contradictory approach, a biased approach, an approach from a conclusion that I must not hate or must hate. So I do not know what this total approach is. I do not argue; I do not say, this is a total approach or this is not a total approach.

A: Total approach is devoid of attraction and repulsion.

K: The total approach is devoid of attraction and repulsion. Where have I defined it? The question is about understanding the total approach.

A: The total approach is intense concentration of an unconditioned mind.

A: The difficulty is that we do not consider a problem as so urgent that its solution is imperative.

A: We have to approach the question in a negative way, by finding out what is not a total approach.

A: Total approach is understanding. Understanding is complete agreement with. Agreement with is the business of identification and business of identification is not self-conscious but objective-conscious.

K: Look at my difficulty, Sir. You have verbally told me what this total approach is. He put it in one way, you put it in another way and another gentleman puts it in another way but at the end of it all I do not get the feeling. So, do not give explanations. I want to find out what it is. I want to feel out and I want to taste this. What you are doing is verbally feeding me but I am hungry for food, not for words. I am hungry, to find out what this total approach is. So, help me to find out, gentlemen. Tell me what it is. It is like telling a hungry man what lovely things there are in the hotels, in your house. I say, that is very nice but I am still very hungry.

(To be continued)

J. Krishnamurti

April 1, 1973
Malibu, California

FREEDOM AND RELATIONSHIP

For several days there had been smog; you couldn't see the city across the bay and the distant hills were covered by it. The seas had not a ripple, it was like a vast lake and the islands were invisible. The hills behind the house were dull but this morning after a wind in the night everything became clear. You could see the islands, the city across the bay, the hills were bright with mustard flowers, the air was sharp and there was that peculiar light of California. In the soft breeze the flowers and leaves were gentle in their motion but what was extraordinary was the hills. The night wind had swept away every vestige of polluted air and now every fold of valley and canyon was clear. It was really an extraordinary morning of great purity, stillness and beauty.

Freedom is not something that you set out to find. It isn't a thing to be cultivated. It comes naturally through negation of what it is not. It is not a reaction and this is a basic thing which must be understood. The reaction to what is is a continuation in a different form of what is. It may be modified, it may be structured differently, it may be rationalized and made to function but this is not freedom. This reaction may take the form of opinion, evaluation, of judgement, but this is not freedom. The reaction to an old order, to tradition, to various forms of authority is not freedom. The reaction of one's particular tendency, idiosyncrasy or characteristics, which are the response of one's conditioning, is not freedom. Having been told to restrain, to control to obey and the reaction to that of going off in different directions, pleasant and unpleasant, neurotic or rational, is not freedom. Going from one orthodoxy to another, from one belief to another, from one authority to another — however

pleasant — is not freedom. The exchange of one ideology for another is in no way freedom. To do what one likes is an imagined freedom. To assert one's own individuality and the identification of one's desires with something that is romantically or mystically great is not freedom.

Freedom is the understanding of all this not only verbally but actually transcending all this. That is why it is so important to observe clearly these repetitive reactions in the guise of freedom and experience. Through negation of these reactions and in transcending them one is confronted with the actual, the what is. The what is is relationship.

Relationship is society — this society which man has put together. As you and I have put this society together we are responsible for the society. It is our society, not theirs. It is not only created by your parents, you also are responsible for it. You as a human being are creating this society and you are part of this society. So you are the society, the world.

It is your relationship with another, your behaviour, your conflicts, your ambitions, your competition that has brought about this structure in which we live. Again this is very important to understand. Understanding is not at the intellectual or verbal level. Understanding is action. It is not understanding first and then action afterward. They are simultaneous, they go together. This relationship is not only with your intimate friend or with your neighbour but with the man you never see who may be thousands of miles away.

The responsibility of relationship is enormous. You cannot live without relationship; life is relationship. However much one may want to isolate oneself for neurotic reasons or for some form of specialization one is still in relationship. So relationship is of the highest importance. There is no relationship if your daily activity is centred around your own egotistic activities. There is no relationship if you build a wall around yourself because you have been hurt or because you cannot have what you want or if you are trying to fulfil yourself in a particular activity. There is no relationship if you are tethered to a strong belief or a conclusion given either by another or one you have put together yourself. There is no relationship if you

belong to one group as opposed to another or if you have committed yourself to one course of action based on some rational or irrational conclusion. There is no relationship of you have an image about yourself or about another. This image may be your knowledge, your experience, and these images, either traditional or your own, separate you from another. Where there is separation of any kind, national, religious, economic or social, there must be conflict, conflict in yourself and so with the world.

Where there is conflict there is no relationship. Love has no conflict. When love becomes pleasure, there begins conflict. Desire is not love and in the fulfilment of that desire love is denied.

Relationship is not only with human beings but with nature, with that tree and with that animal. But when we lose contact with nature we also lose contact with men. When you lose contact with those birds — with those shy and timid quails — then you lose contact with your child and the man across the street. When you kill that animal to eat you are also cultivating insensitivity which will kill that man across the border. When you lose contact with the enormous movement of life you lose all relationship. Then you, the ego with all its fanciful urges, demands and pursuits becomes all-important and the gulf between you and the world widens in endless conflicts.

So relationship and freedom go together. The denial of what is not relationship and the negation of what is not freedom brings about an action of total responsibility and this is love.

A letter addressed to the Krishnamurti Foundation Schools.
Copyright Krishnamurti Foundation Trust Ltd. London.
All rights reserved.

FREEDOM AND DISCIPLINE

In understanding freedom one understands also what discipline is. This may seem rather contradictory because we generally think freedom means freedom from all discipline. What is the quality of mind that is highly disciplined? Freedom cannot exist without discipline; which does not mean that you must first be disciplined and then you will have freedom. Freedom and discipline go together, they are not two separate things. So what does 'discipline' mean? According to the dictionary, the meaning of the word 'discipline' is 'to learn' — not a mind that forces itself into a certain pattern of action according to an ideology or a belief. A mind that is capable of learning is entirely different from a mind which is capable only of conforming. A mind that is learning, that is observing, seeing actually 'what is', is not interpreting 'what is,' according to its own desires, its own conditioning, its own particular pleasures.

Discipline does not mean suppression and control, nor is it adjustment to a pattern or an ideology; it means a mind that sees 'what is' and learns from 'what is'. Such a mind has to be extraordinarily alert, aware. In the ordinary sense 'to discipline oneself' implies that there is an entity that is disciplining itself according to something. There is a dualistic process: I say to myself, 'I must get up early in the morning and not be lazy', or 'I must not be angry'. That involves a dualistic process. There is the one who with his will tries to control what he should do, as opposed to what he actually does. In that state there is conflict.

The discipline laid down by parents, by society, by religious organisations means conformity. And there is revolt against conformity — the parent wanting one to do certain things, and the revolt against that, and so on. It is a life based on obedience and conformity; and there is the opposite of it, denying conformity and to do what one likes. So we are going to find out what the quality of the mind is that does not conform, does not imitate, follow and obey, yet has a quality in itself which is highly disciplined — 'disciplined' in the sense of constantly learning.

Discipline is learning, not conforming. Conformity implies comparing myself with another, measuring myself as to what I am or think I should be, against the hero, the saint, and so on. Where there is conformity, there must be comparison — please see this. Find out whether you can live without comparison which means, not to conform. We are conditioned from childhood to compare — 'You must be like your brother, or your great-aunt'; 'You must be like the saint', or 'Follow Mao'. We compare in our education, in schools there is the giving of marks and the passing of examinations. We do not know what it means to live without comparison and without competition, therefore non-aggressively, non-competitively, non-violently. Comparing yourself with another is a form of aggression and a form of violence. Violence is not only killing or hitting somebody, it is in this comparative spirit, 'I must be like somebody else., or 'I must perfect myself'. Self-improvement is the very antithesis of freedom and learning. Find out for yourself how to live a life without comparing, and you will see what an extraordinary thing happens. If you really become aware, choicelessly, you will see what it means to live without comparison, never using the words 'I will be'.

We are slaves to the verb 'to be' which implies: 'I will be somebody sometime in the future'. Comparison and conformity go together; they breed nothing but suppression, conflict and endless pain. So it is important to find a way of daily living in which there is no comparison. Do it, and you will see what an extraordinary thing it is; it frees you from so many burdens. The awareness of that brings about a quality of mind that is highly sensitive and therefore disciplined, constantly learning — not what it wants to learn, or what is pleasurable, gratifying to learn, but *learning*. So you become aware of inward conditioning resulting from authority, conformity to a pattern, to tradition, to propaganda to what other people have said, and of your own accumulated experience and that of the race and the family. All of that has become the authority. Where there is authority, the mind can never be free to discover whatever there is to be discovered — something timeless, entirely new.

(Extract from the Impossible Question by J. Krishnamurti)
Copyright Krishnamurti Foundation Trust Ltd. (London) 1973

KRISHNAMURTI FOUNDATIONS

- INDIA
Krishnamurti Foundation India,
Rishi Valley School, Rishi Valley P.O.,
Chittoor District, Andhra Pradesh.
- ENGLAND
Krishnamurti Foundation England,
24 Southend Road, Beckenham, Kent BR3
1SD England.
- U.S.A.
Krishnamurti Foundation of America,
P.O. Box 216, Ojai, California 93023, U.S.A.
- PUERTO RICO
Fundacion Krishnamurti Hispanoamericana,
P. O. Box 1782, Hato Rey Station, San Juan,
Puerto Rico 00919, U.S.A.
- Associated Committees
- AUSTRALIA
Mr. H. S. English and Mr. R. Bennett,
Krishnamurti Books, c/o P.O. Box 308,
Manly, N.S.W. 2095.
- BELGIUM
Comte and Comtesse Hugues van der Straten
Ponthoz,
Mr. R. Linssen,
145 Avenue des Dames Blanches, Brussels 15.
- BRAZIL
Instituicao Cultural Krishnamurti,
Avenida Presidente Vargas, 418—Sala 1. 109,
Rio de Janeiro — Estado Da Guanabara.
- DENMARK
Krishnamurti Komiteen,
Skodsborgvej 339. 2850 Naerum.
- FINLAND
Miss Karpio and Miss Puolanne,
Krishnamurti — Kirjat Pihlajatie 32 A 8,
00270, Helsinki 27.
- FRANCE
Association Culturelle Krishnamurti,
76119 Varengeville/Mer.
Mlle Pascaline Mallet, President.
- GERMANY and
Mr. E. Kanther, D-8919 Raisting,
Wielenbacher str. 6. Germany.
- AUSTRIA
Mr. E. M. Krauss, Gerhardstrasse 18, D-23
Kiel, Germany.
- GREECE
Dr. I. Demetriades — Bacha,
40 Ekklision Str. No. 26, Nea Smyrni,
Athens.
- ICELAND
Mr. S. Halldorsson, Bakkastig 1,
Reykjavik.
- INDONESIA
Mr. M. Dalidd, 14 Djalan Sinkep, Malang.
- ISRAEL
Mrs. M. Bat-Yosef, 37, Harav Berlin Street,
Jerusalem 92501.
- ITALY
Mr. Giorgio F. Barabino, 8 Via di Montoro,
00186 Rome.
- NETHERLANDS
Stiching Krishnamurti Nederland,
Meetings, secretary, treasurer: Karel van
Gelderlaan 16A, Oosterbeek 6120,
Bookorders, Bulletin: Welkamperweg 93,
Hoenderloo 6736.
- NEW ZEALAND
Mr. Ray Falla, Box 22451, High St. P.O.
Christchurch.
- NORWAY
Krishnamurti Biblioteket, Uranienborgvn
11c, Oslo.
- SOUTH AFRICA
The Misses Shepherd, 24, Kildare Road,
Durban.
- SWEDEN
Krishnamurti Center,
Reginsvagen 4, 161 41 Stockholm Bromma.
- SWITZERLAND
Mr. and Mrs. Edgar Graf (German and
Italian speaking), 6986 Novaggio.
Mr. A. Schweizer (French speaking)

BOOKS BY KRISHNAMURTI

Rs.P

5-40

The Penguin Krishnamurti Reader (1970)

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)

Foreign price

£ 0-80

Foreign price

£ 1-70

Panch Samvad

1-00

(Marathi translation of *Five Conversations*)

Jeevan Bhashye

12-50

(Marathi translation of *Commentaries on Living — 2nd Series*)

Dyanavasthetil Sphurane

0-75

(Marathi translation of *Meditations*)

Arindadanindrum Vidudalai

5-00

(Tamil Translation of *Freedom from the Known*)*Published by Maharashtra Rashtrabhasha Sabha*

Samskritka Prasna

7-50

(Hindi translation of *This Matter of Culture*)*Published by M. Seshachalam & Co.*

Dhyana vahini

1-00

(Telugu translation of *Meditations*)

Sambhashanalu

3-50

(Telugu translation of *Conversations*)

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 411, 029, for Krishnamurti Foundation India.

Correspondence address: Mrs. Sunanda Patwardhan