

BULLETIN

KRISHNAMURTI
FOUNDATION
INDIA

1983

2

INDIA	Krishnamurti Foundation India 'Vasanta Vihar', 64-65, Greenways Road, Madras-600 028.
ENGLAND	Krishnamurti Foundation Trust Ltd., 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 (Spanish America)	Fundacion Krishnamurti Hispanoamericana. P.O. Box 1782, San Juan, Puerto Rico 00919-1782 U.S.A.
CANADA	Krishnamurti Educational Centre of Canada, 538 Swanwick Road, R.R. No. 1, Victoria, B.C. V8X 3W9. Associated Committees.
AUSTRALIA	Mrs. Mavis Bennett, Krishnamurti Books, P.O. Box 655, Surfers Paradise, Queensland 4217.
BELGIUM	Comte and Comtesse Hugues van der Straten Ponthoz, Mr. R. Linssen, Domaine du Bercuit, 211, 5980, Grez-Doiceau Dutch Speaking Committee, p/a: Catoor Monica, Mortierstr II; Poesele-Nevele, 9850.
BRAZIL	Instituicao Cultural Krishnamurti, Avenida Presidente Vargas 418-Sala 1.109, Caixa Postal 1827-ZC-00, Rio de Janeiro Estado Do Rio de Janeiro.
DENMARK	Krishnamurti Komiteen, Skodsborgvej 339, 2850 Naerum.
FINLAND	Krishnamurti-Kirjat, Eerikinkatu, 26-A 9, 00100 Helsinki 10.
FRANCE	Association Culturelle Krishnamurti, 73, Rue Fondary, Paris 15C. Mlle Pascaline Mallet, President.
GERMANY and AUSTRIA	Mrs. I. Von Massenbach, Ganghoferstr 7, D-8031 Gernlinden, Mr. Manfred Schneider, D-6072 Dreieich-Gotzenhain, Albert-Schweitzer-Strasse 1.
GREECE	Dr. I. Demetriades-Bachas, 26, 40 Ekklision Str. Nea Smyrni, Athens.
ICELAND	Mr. S. Halldorsson, Bakkastig 1, Reykjavik.
INDONESIA	Mr. M. Dalidd, 14 Djalan Singkep, Malang.
ISRAEL	Mr. Avraham Jacoby, Aneveim Street, No. 7, Shicoon-Mizrh, Rishon-le-Zion, Israel.
ITALY	Dott. Ing. Giovanni Turchi, Via Garofalo 19, 20133 Milano.
NETHERLANDS	Stichting Krishnamurti Nederland, Secretary : Lage Duin 19, 2121 CC Bennebroek, Bookorders, Bulletin: Weikamperweg 93, 7351 TG Hoenderloo.
NEW ZEALAND	Mr. Ray Falla, 9, Ulm Place, Christchurch 6.
NORWAY	Krishnamurti Biblioteket, Post Box 1703, Vika, Oslo 1. Norway.
PORTUGAL	Nucleo Cultural Krishnamurti, Av. Leonor Fernandes 36, 7000 Evora.
SOUTH AFRICA	Krishnamurti Learning Centre of Southern Africa, 113. Ninth Avenue, Durban.
SPAIN	Krishnamurti Informatcion, Calle Canada 45-47 Barcelona 2.
SWEDEN	Krishnamurti Center, C/o. Englund, Storskogsvagen 45 14400, Ronninge.
SWITZERLAND	Krishnamurti Freunde der Schweiz (German and Italian speaking) Mr. Franz Haller, Bachstrasse 18, 5303 Wurenlingen Miss Gisele Balleys (for the Suisse Romande), Rue Encyclopedie 6 bis, 1202 Geneva.
SRILANKA	Krishnamurti Centre, Sri Lanka, 23/3, Mirihana Road, Nugegoda.

FROM THE EDITOR

This is the second issue of the Bulletin for this year. It has twenty eight pages instead of the usual thirty two. Our readers may remember that the last issue had four pages extra. We would like to bring it to your notice that the three issues of the Bulletin are published in the months of April, July and October. From October to February, Krishnaji is in India, giving talks in various places and so for a period of nearly six months, no Bulletins are published. As we receive letters from January onwards regarding the publication of the first Bulletin of the year, we thought a clarification was needed on the timing and release of the Bulletins.

We would like to inform our readers that we will not be receiving any financial help from our previous donor towards the cost of production of the Bulletins from this year. We take this opportunity to express our deep appreciation for the generous donation he has given us so far. We now appeal to our subscribers to send at least Rs. 100 each as donation so that the Bulletin will not run at a loss. We look forward to your help. In this issue, apart from a Letter to the Schools the first session of a seminar held in Madras last year has been published. The second session will appear in the third Bulletin.

Our readers will be happy to note that Krishnaji's talks in New York and San Francisco earlier this year were very well attended. The halls were overflowing and there was much interest.

A SEMINAR IN MADRAS

Session - I

Pupul Jayakar : Over the last few years, there has been a deepening crisis which faces the future of man and the human mind. The human mind seems to be incapable of comprehending or holding the many demands and pressures which have been generated by society, by technology, by its non-capacity to understand. For many years, Krishnaji has been speaking of the break-through in human mind, of an ending to this endless stream of consciousness and the emergence of a capacity of perception which, acting simultaneously with all the senses together, can lead to a perception, which would break through the limitations of the human mind and make it possible for it to mould the demands of the future before us. I think Krishnaji has started the movement for new discoveries in the processes of time and man as the creator of time within the mind. Could we discuss mind and time as consciousness, the nature of time as it is created by the mind, and whether it would be possible to end this?

Krishnaji : Shall we begin, Sir?

Dr. P. K. Sundaram : Sir, are we discussing the subjective perception of time in the psychological sense or are we also discussing the objective time, mathematically calculated by a clock? These two times are obviously different from one another, time measured in physics, time measured in the psychological states of mind. Are we going to concentrate only on the psychological measurement of time, if there could be a measurement like that at all?

Achyut Patwardhan : Our normal concept of a continuum is that the past creates the present and the present modifies and

creates the future. In this cycle, time is the factor which seems to imprison us in a circuit of our own making. Now I thought that when Pupulji suggested that we take up time, the idea was she also mentioned a breakthrough, that it is possible for us to perceive actually that we are making time, that each one of us is making time.

Pupul Jayakar : Obviously you can't keep the two fields absolutely apart. But time in the sense of thought, and any understanding of that, needs much more than a discussion of this nature. The only thing that a discussion of this nature can bring us to is time as manifested in the process of becoming and that element of the human mind which is caught in becoming, creating the future and the past, and sliding over to the present.

Dr. Rupert Sheldrake : Surely it is not just the human mind alone that is caught in the process of time, but the whole natural world as well. Animals and plants are equally caught in the process of time; they may not be aware of it.

Pupul Jayakar : How would you define time, how would you open up that word "time"?

Dr. Sheldrake : In most cases in the natural world, these things are moving towards a goal; it is towards a maturing; a growing towards a more mature form and reproducing themselves. This is usually a process of development towards a goal, which is usually repetitive. And I must say this process of becoming this process of development from one stage to another or goal usually takes sometime, the way a hen's egg develops into a chicken, the way a seed grows into a tree. This is the natural process of time in the natural world.

I would like to ask Dr. Sudarshan whether there is a connection between psychological time and objective time.

Dr. George Sudarshan : Krishnaji, with your permission, could I wait a while to catch my breath. Let the discussion go on and I'll join in, a few minutes later.

Pupul : Taking up what you said about the process of becoming, surely there is a difference between the baby becoming the man and that which says "I am this' and I'll become that"? One is a biological state and the other has no reality at all.

Dr. Sheldrake : I think the psychological state is based on biological state, and in many cases is an extension of it. It seems to me that the process of becoming is not very different

from that of the psychological process of achieving a goal. It seems to me that the seed becoming the tree is not very different from the psychological desire to achieve the goal.

Pupul Jayakar : It is difficult to accept that, is it not?

Dr. Sheldrake : I cannot let that question go. It is so obvious, this process of becoming among the primates etc; there is the strong movement towards growing to more mature forms, a development towards a goal. This process of becoming, of development, from one stage to another, the way a hen's egg develops into a chicken, the way the seed develops into a tree or a plant is obvious. These are processes of becoming which are natural processes, which belong to the natural world. This process of becoming is obvious where living organisms become, achieve, the purposeful activity being based on growing towards a goal. This you can see happen psychologically as well.

Dr. Ravi Kapur : Can we put it this way? Whatever is objective becomes subjective, real to us, through ourselves. The objective becomes real through the subjective understanding of it, involvement with it, and if we could extend our subjective time, extend our awareness, then that which is very limited because of our very limited consciousness, expands. If we could do it, then the expansion which overtakes our subjective time would also be seen as overtaking the objective as existence. What has been seen as serially developing might then be observed as being existent at the same time.

Dr. Sudarshan : I think the progression in the physical sciences has been from static configurations to dynamic cycles, dynamic processes. Initially you see things as they are, but really as they are not, because you see only static things but it takes a certain amount of time, it takes motion itself, movement itself as part of the functioning, as one of the qualities of the universe; and then you realise that in a certain sense you have not been seeing things until you see them moving. In fact, the great achievement of Newtonian physics was the recognition that motion with constant speed, constant velocity, was not to be explained; motion with constant speed was a quality of the system. Hence the space of motion of a single particle instead of a three dimensional space, it really becomes a six-dimensional space because you have to have at each point not only the point itself but the flow of that point. So it is more like a

streaming of a fluid rather than static objects that are remaining. As time goes on, you begin to see more of the thing. We do this everyday by common sense. You look through the window and then say there is a tremendous wind; you don't see the wind; wind can't be seen. But what you see are the effects of the wind in terms of the motion of something or another. Then you say "I see it is a very strong wind". So, by and large, the progression is from substance to process; that process itself becomes one of the constituents of our physical world, and what the 20th century quantum theory has taught us, is that this joining together is not an adornment but in fact substance itself is in the nature of process, that in fact there are only processes; technically speaking only operations, no quantities, they are not ordinary numbers. And, of course, consequent on the thing is the revision of our understanding of what is the nature of the world, what can be said about it, but process or movement is itself a part of the physical world as you see it.

Pupul Jayakar : May I ask you how do you relate this to that inner time which is contained in jealousy, greed, envy, etc; the fact of greed and jealousy and the non-fact of wanting to be free of it? Take all this thing in which the whole process of becoming is contained. How would you relate what you are saying now to this very instant of existence in which it is contained?

Dr. Sudarshan : That is a tall order for me to fulfil, but I will try to do something; part of the thing to see — physics as normally understood, and therefore chemistry and so on, contain two kinds of time; one kind of time which is the clockwork time, which is time by means of which the celestial bodies move, in which there is an unfolding or re-expression, paraphrasing continually going on of the initial condition. But nothing has been gained and nothing has been lost in the sense that given the present configuration you can go back, you can conceive of a situation in which the motions are reversed and every one of the previous configurations are retraced. It is a movie which is running backwards and for the celestial bodies when the movie runs backward, nobody knows the difference, because they look about the same. There is a second kind of time which occurs in physical sciences and this is the time which is relevant for the second law of thermodynamics, in which things do take

place and the future and the past are different and if you run a film of those processes backwards you will know that something is amiss, as the glass falling down and breaking into parts, ice in a glass of water which is melting, these processes are directed times rather than non-directed times.

It appears to me that contemporary physical science is lacking in another kind of time which is running in the opposite direction. This is the time of insight, understanding or total comprehension of the time or the processes which what shall I say is the victory over the 2nd law of Thermo-dynamics.

The second law of Thermo-dynamics says that things run down, that what has happened can never unhappen, and therefore by definition one yearns back for the earlier times when these things did not happen. If you believe in contemporary physics one would say, well, that's all that happened, there is no way of mending things. The past is always better than the future, because the past had a dynamics from which the future could be obtained but the future does not have the potentialities of going back into the past. The past cannot become the future again. In the earlier one, the past and the future were co-extensive, that there was really nothing that was taking place whereas the dynamics of insight, the dynamics of love, the dynamics of coherence, the dynamics of things coming together, that which is still becoming one, is not part of the physical science. There is no way in which physical science knows how to talk about something which was not known, being known and that time stream, if it is introduced, that is part of the common everyday experience; if that stream is also introduced, then we have three different kinds of time which are all running. And I don't really know that I would like to identify psychological time because it is the psyche which seems to be involved in both the running-down as well as the running up, as well as the unification, the disintegration and the fragmentation on the one hand and the becoming whole, being made whole on the other hand.

Achyut Patwardhan : Sudarshan, before you arrived, two questions were raised in response to Pupilji's introduction of the subject. Our learned professor said that the becoming process is beginning with the animal world, with the plant

world, and that time as such applies as much to the plant world and to the animal world and probably to the world of the earth, geological world etc. because it is all a process of change and change is time. That is as far as I understood it. If I am wrong, he will kindly correct me. Professor Sundaram said that there are two parallel processes : One is the process of materiality of which you have spoken and the other is the psychological process and the two never meet and the two are independent of each other. And we must be very clear in our mind if there is any inter-relation between the two or if the two must always move parallel, but never meet each other. I hope I am not misinterpreting.

Radha Burnier : Is change time or is time the consciousness of change motivating that change in a particular direction? Is change by itself time?

Dr. P. K. Sundaram : That depends upon the definition which we offer. According to Dr. George Sudarshan, the processes of motion thought of in physical terms, I think they themselves constitute the change. I would for example rather deny that there is a thing which holds the change together or even gives a direction to it. The changes themselves constitute the time process. Change is the process, process is the change. There is no other way in which you can measure time at all except in terms of the processes.

Radha Burnier : Speaking about psychological time, when there is a process which means there is a change, does that amount to psychological time or is time in the psychological sense, the consciousness of the process and the directing of it, the motivating of it?

Dr. P. K. Sundaram : When we talked about the psychological time, I may be permitted to mention, we wanted to distinguish between biological process of time and the physical process of time in the outside, and the psychological process of time on the other. When we talked of the latter, we are talking about all the mental functions, functions of consciousness for example. Then we come across a peculiar factor added on to the dimension of time, namely, memory. The very activities involve memory. Thought processes can never be understood except in terms of memory and therefore it has got a history — it can go back and forth. It is in a sense reversible. It is not possible except in very

exceptional circumstances in physical time. In the second law of Thermo Dynamics, probably there is a going back to the original condition and things like that, but so far as psychological time is concerned, there seems to be a process where we have a process, at the same time we have got a substantial permanence about it, both these going on together in which case alone we can speak of a direction and dimension given to these processes.

Pupul Jayakar : May I ask one question? I would imagine that in a discussion of this nature, we are only concerned with time in relation to human condition, to the problem of sorrow, to the problem of the deep ache which is within us which we cannot answer. None of the solutions of the physicist, none of the solutions of the biologist will alleviate this tremendous anguish within us. I want to talk about that time, and the quenching of that time. Isn't that the central predicament?

Dr. Ramachandra Gandhi : It seems to me we are doing great injustice to objective time also; it is not all that chronological and I don't think it is all biological time either. There is something altogether mysterious about time, about an age, about an hour, about a year. It is also the "other" greater than this — this is a timelessness to time. This is true of out there — for instance the subjective time of memory and nostalgia. It is as reprehensible as concentration on chronological time and I think one has to be liberated from both. And I think one tends to give more marks to psychological time and poor marks to objective time and I think this is a mistake. The one unified time of our experience is other than both; ofcourse it includes both and is deeper than both and that is where creativity comes; not only the creativity of arts but of living, and of being. If I may borrow a current theme of Krishnaji, the absence of greed is what makes possible the perceptions of unified time. But subjective time need not be worshipped. There should not be an idolatry of subjective time, a knocking down of objective time, but perhaps a celebration of both.

Krishnaji : I would like to say I am the past, the present and the future, both biological as well as psychological. I am the result of yesterday, today and tomorrow. I am the creator of time, both outwardly and inwardly. And I am stuck in that place. I am caught in this time and that time includes my greed, my envy, my ambition, all the agony, pain, wounds and sorrow. I am all

that. My question then is, is time going to dissolve all that or is there a totally different factor which will dissolve it instantly? That is my question. Will memory absolve my conditioning or an altogether new factor is necessary that will wipe away the past? I am the result of time, both outward and inward time, biological and psychological. And time is thought. Time is movement. My whole consciousness is the product of time and the content of my consciousness is time. Greed, envy and all the rest of it, is put together by thought and thought has created the future — "I am not but I hope to be". I have no other answer except this eternal time movement. I think there is a totally different approach to this, which is, can there be an end to thought, which is time? Otherwise, I am going from experience, knowledge, memory, thought, action; from action, I learn more and keep on this cycle. That is how we have lived and we will continue in that way. Therefore there is no escape from this. One is a slave to time. And is there a movement totally apart from time? Otherwise, I am doomed, human beings are doomed to keep on this cycle of experience, knowledge, memory, thought, action and from there begin. Is it possible to move away from that altogether and I think that is creation, not this eternal cycle. There, in that, you can invent, you can produce a new jet or a new computer or a new cruise missile but you will always be in that circle of knowledge, action. Would you agree to that?

Dr. Sudarshan : I completely agree with you. It is only the human condition in relation to perception that is relevant. But what I would like to urge on you however is when I talked about the external world, when my friends talked about the external world, it is that the external world is the world of our perception. Occasionally we might depute somebody else to perceive for us but we perceive them perceiving. In other words, it is only in relation to what we see. The second thing that I wanted to say was that there is one common thing between greed, anger, jealousy, envy, hurt and time because time always requires past. A system which has no past has no time. Time is always and if you look at a watch, or if you look at any other mechanism with the measurement of time, it is the comparison of configuration. Configuration requires past in relation to each other. It also requires not only the present configuration but the reference configuration and the present configuration. So you have to

have in a sense two different conditions which are continually contrasted with each other. How does envy occur, how does hurt, anger, occur? They always involve what is and your ideal, your idea of what should have been, what should be, what was, what you thought was, what you have kept in your mind as what was the past.

Krishnaji : What should be is non-real. What is, is real.

Dr. Sudarshan : I agree. And therefore only to the extent that one has perceptions that there is no time. This is not to say that there is no movement because Dr. Kapur brought up this point that in fact the perception of the world contains movement. Movement by itself is not time. Time becomes associated with movement when you break up motion and see it as if it is a succession of events.

Krishnaji : I am just saying, if I may, there is no duality. There is only "what is". I don't know how to dissolve or transcend "what is"; I invent the "what should be" and my invention then becomes a contradiction to what I am, to what is, and there is a battle between these two and that is my life. That is the life of every human being practically. So could we only see, observe what is and not what should be?

Radha Burnier : It is not correct for us to say that there is only "what is". There is "what is" and what we think there is.

Krishnaji : Of course the idea and a fact. The idea is an abstraction of what is. I don't make an abstraction, I am just observing what is. In that observation, there is no time. That is the whole point, which means the observer is absent. The observer is the past. Is that at all possible?

Pupul Jayakar : If I may say, I observe the microscope. In the same way as I observe the microscope, do I ever observe the movement of greed, jealousy? First of all we have to start from the duality of that. You can't jump. You can't leap. So I say it is not possible to jump into your statement.

Krishnaji : I am greedy. That's a fact. I am violent; the non-violence does not exist. There is only the fact that I am violent. Now, how do I observe that fact? Is it a reflective observation or pure observation in which there is no remembrance, there is no past entering to correct or direct the observation?

Dr. Kapur : I have not had the experience of what I am going to say but I can believe that it is possible to reach that pure

observation and when we reach that pure observation, then violence disappears.

Pupul Jayakar : The moment you say this, then I will ask you "how"? You cannot make a statement like that.

Krishnaji : I think the question of "how" is a mistake. The "how" implies a system, a method, a practice — that is time. So the "how" to me is a distraction away from observation. When that observation is very clear, non-personal, the past does not direct observation. The observation itself in which there is no observer and the observed, only such pure observation dissolves that which is.

Pupul Jayakar : I just want to ask something : With what instrument does one observe?

Dr. Ramachandra Gandhi : In so far as one observes with any instrument at all, I would be suspicious of both the observed and the observation. It is only when we acknowledge the right norms, call it suddenly, call it instinctively, call it anything, that it must be without the mediation of any instrument. It does not mean we come to a stop there. It is that the right modes and right alterations and preservations suggest themselves. It is so simple. It seems to me in life when there is absolute ruthless honesty an acknowledgement of, whatever, without even the desire to alter the state, the serious alchemy of change or preservation that if you examine it in the narrow range and distinction of the common substance of yoga, I think we see something, but we lose something. What we lose is the quality of suddenness, an instantaneousness.

Pupul Jayakar : When I say what instrument one uses when one perceives, one has to ask, is it an exterior thing or interior? Because we do divide the world into the exterior and the interior.

Krishnaji : I question whether there is the outside and inside or is it a going out and coming in? It is like a tide.

Pupul Jayakar : How do we see it? You must first see how we see it.

Krishnaji : If I may ask most politely, do you see as two different things as outer and inner, or they are inter-related like the tide going out and the tide coming in? It is a constant movement, in and out, and thought has captured it and separated itself and made it not dynamic but a sterile thing, and kept to this

division — the outer and the inner. You are asking how do I see it.

Pupul Jayakar : I see that those things which I try to avoid, suppress, discipline myself against are a movement which takes place within myself which then expresses itself in action.

Krishnaji : I don't see it in myself. Sorry.

Pupul Jayakar : You don't. All of us feel that if we are greedy we don't want to be greedy. I am talking of the actuality as it operates. How do we see it? Do we see it as a tide where the centre from which it is directed has ceased to be? Because if there is a tide, then the centre has ceased.

Krishnaji : No. I said too that this tide has been captured by thought because the idea that it is a constant movement is frightening. It brings you a sense of instability, insecurity. Therefore thought brings this extraordinary movement, of outer and inner like a marvellous tide. Thought then makes it into an idea and captures it, and it becomes the self, the 'me' which is separate from the outer.

Dr. Kapur : Krishnaji, even theoretically, if we could still that thinking process, then this interior and the exterior would disappear, and with that, the greed will disappear. It sounds simple but isn't that so?

Krishnaji : But it is very complex.

Dr. Kapur : The idea of it is very clear and that is what it should be. It is an answer to the "How".

Pupul Jayakar : I would ask are we prepared to do it, end it?

Dr. Kapur : But there is no choice.

Pupul Jayakar : If you say you are prepared to end it, it means you are prepared to end totally the sense of division. That is a very, very big statement to make.

Dr. Kapur : Indeed it is. But if there is no choice to that statement, that is the only statement one can make.

Pupul Jayakar : That is right.

Dr. Ramachandra Gandhi : We acknowledge that which is out there, and that which is within us, that which inheres in a very simple way. I only want to add a few words. It must not be imagined that human beings are without the resources.

Pupul Jayakar : I am not questioning that. I am saying that the statement is one thing and doing it is another.

Krishnaji : May I ask? Why do we use the word "choice"? — choice between what?

Dr. Kapur : There is no choice. We create choice also by making comparison.

Krishnaji : Are you saying there is no choice?

Dr. Kapur : I am saying there is no choice.

Dr. Ramachandra Gandhi : Seeing is still a temporal metaphor and I feel worried about that and I hope Dr. Kapur would help me out. It seems to me that any suggestions about seeing or doing something is still within the matrix of happening and it can only be totally, suddenly, absolutely and wholly. These are some of the metaphors that suggest themselves. I am not sure I have understood yoga properly : the language for manipulation, however subtle, is not the language of reality. I don't wish to be unjust to the yogis but the idea that a language has come into being is open to distrust.

Dr. Kapur : I think there are many problems with which we have to live with, than the problem of reality as it is, in terms of experiences. If we can convert this word "stillness" in terms of experience, I would go about like this. When the emotions are running fast, when the fluctuations of my emotions are running fast, then there is a greater consciousness of your separation from the outer. It is an experience with all of us. The more the emotions run, the more you are separated. The more the emotions adopt the quality of sameness, the greater is the proximity of inner and the outer. If we took it to its ultimate end, one would imagine that — because I am not able to experience it yet fully, though I have as you said at times experienced it — the inner and outer can disappear. I would add up to it an extreme degree of fear situation, an extreme degree of anger situation even. Any of these emotions when they are allowed continuity for a time, the inner and the outer disappear.

Pupul Jayakar : One of the major difference between what Krishnaji says and what has been usually understood as yoga is the place of the senses. It is a crucial element in his approach and if we could explore or look into that, it would be worth while. Now, Krishnaji has always said that, that movement of total being, or total seeing, or holistic seeing, or ending of everything takes place when there is the simultaneity of all the senses operating at their highest level. Perhaps there may lie the real answer. The answer may not be to try and find some

kind of entry point but to see how the senses operate and whether it is possible for a human being placed in the condition as we are, to change the way of operation of the senses, simultaneously.

Dr. Kapur : I hope Krishnaji refreshes us again with what he has said before. I would like to make just one point — I don't think that suppression of senses is what is being discussed or what I am asking you to do. I am talking about comparison on which the senses are based; you don't sense anything unless you make a comparison. There is no sensation without comparison. If there is cutting down of that comparison, whether the senses then have dwindled away or they all have reached the same level means the same thing. I have no difficulty in totally accepting what Krishnaji is saying.

These are the difficulties with words. I wish I could say it without words, let it happen and that is by not letting "me", happen. The absence of the "I" is what I mean.

Krishnaji : We will stick to the "I" ness. Suppose, I am full of that "I" ness, full of this self-centred observation of life and you are giving me a lot of explanations, analysis and I am still where I am at the end of it. How do you bring about a disappearance of the "I" ness in me?

Dr. Kapur : First of all by cutting down the "how" as you said earlier.

Krishnaji : The problem in front of me is a tremendous problem. This "I" ness is so extraordinarily important. It controls, shapes, directs everything, my relationship with another and so on. And you have explained the causation of the self, of this "I" ness. I accept the explanation, I accept the analysis, I accept all the rational explanation; at the end of it, I am where I am..

Dr. Kapur : If we really want to do it. . . .

Krishnaji : No. Don't say "if".

Dr. Kapur : We want to know it. We want to be without this I'.

Krishnaji : Why?

Dr. Kapur : Because . . .

Krishnaji : The moment you say because, there is causation.

Dr. Kapur : You are right. Ultimately if we wanted to really feel it, there will be no dialogue.

Krishnaji : I did not mean it.

Dr. Kapur : But in the process of reaching that stage, the "I" would be removed by a reverant acceptance of "what is".

Krishnaji : I am faced with this problem, a very complex, destructive and enchanting and embarrassing problem and in that there is vanity and all the rest of it. I am faced with this problem and that is the "I"ness which separates you from me and the whole mess. That is the problem I am faced with. How do I approach the problem? That is more important than the problem itself. How do I approach it? Now, "how" not in the sense of a system, but in what manner I receive the problem, what is my condition that receives the challenge of this problem; what is the state of my mind that says that I have to answer this question? So what is my approach to it?

Dr. Kapur : Could I respond to that question? I am just a beginner in this process. The first level would be to see really that there is a problem, to agree with yourself that the problem exists and exists all the time and to feel sufficiently miserable about the problem.

Krishnaji : I don't have to be miserable, unhappy; it is a problem. It is there hitting me in the face.

Dr. Kapur : I am suggesting an approach which may be right or wrong, but my approach would be this : Most of us cannot solve this problem because we partially accept this problem. At other times, we try to overlook it. I think the first approach would be to accept this problem and feel sufficiently miserable because of it and then to develop sufficient amount of desire to get rid of the problem.

Krishnaji : That means involving time.

Dr. Kapur : In the beginning yes, and having reached the first stage, one goes further.

Krishnaji : I question all that. I want to find out what is my approach because I feel the approach is more important than the problem. What is my approach? It is either to escape from it, rationalise it and try to resolve it somehow — analysis, whatever it is. So can I approach the problem free from all this conditioning because my conditioning is going to find the answer or direct the answer to the problem. If I am free from my conditioning, then I can approach it freely and dissolve it immediately.

Pupul Jayakar : It is a terrible paradox, because if you are free of the conditioning, then there is no problem at all.

Dr. Sudarshan : It seems to me that in all this discussion, there are two bad habits of language which seem to come out. One is the habit of using bad physics. We all do this, namely when we want to talk about some process which is sequential but not temporal, we talk about "when". When we are talking about a higher state of awareness, a more complete state of awareness, an inclusive state of awareness, we talk about it as being bigger. So we make metaphors, which are taken from the world of everyday mechanistic phenomenon. The other bad habit is about the timeless, when the timeless happens. A more serious problem is the fact that we act as if there is only one time and only one set of happenings and everything must be set in that time. In fact we are translating between different conventions, between different systems and my own experience seems to have been to say that it is not a sequential process. It seems to be a continual process and time is not a one dimensional thing but a many splendoured thing and I don't like the word switching back and forth because it seems to give it a greater reality and I know you are allergic to referring to the Upanishads and so I won't mention that, but there are times which are interwoven with each other and it is not possible to talk about a process. It is not that it is unprofitable to talk about the process but any talk about the process is incomplete. An essentially incomplete thing cannot ever be explained, how it is that what one did not know you know, or if you have known it, how could you ever drop off from it, and the problem reappears in miniscule but well defined forms in other branches of knowledge, in everyday limited experience.

Krishnaji : If I may point out, I am violent, not off and on, but there is in me this sense of violence, deeply rooted. Sometimes it bursts, sometimes it is latent but it is there. My problem is can it ever end completely or is it a process of time, gradually, eventually to end?

Dr. Sudarshan : I would be forced to answer yes and no at the same time because if you say can you ever end, the question is do you ever have a recollection of a situation or do you have the image of a situation when you were free of it? It is an image but nevertheless it is there.

Krishnaji : You can't say image, when you are not free of it.

Dr. Sudarshan : But if you are in it, then there is no discussion, there is no question; one does not even ask the question

Krishnaji : Suppose I am violent, I must find an answer non-analytically why it exists, whether it is possible to be totally free from it, not having remembered and the remembrance continuing; even the remembrance ending.

Dr. Ramachandra Gandhi : Will you accept the following response, not an answer to your question? One can totally reverse something only if that thing is in a fundamental sense unreal, in some fundamental sense one is free of violence. It is unreal because they go now and come back later. I would be grateful for a response from you to this — that something like bondage, can it be totally got rid off? It has been said here that it has gone and it is back tomorrow whereas it seems to me an illusion shattered and shattered for ever.

Krishnaji : I don't accept there is something fundamentally free.

Dr. Ramachandra Gandhi : I did not say fundamentally free, I said fundamentally unreal.

Krishnaji : I only know the fact that I am violent. That is all I know.

Dr. Ramachandra Gandhi : You asked the question whether it is possible to be free of something completely.

Krishnaji : I said it is possible to be completely free of it.

Dr. Ramachandra Gandhi : Is it ever possible to be completely free of something, which is in its essential nature, unreal?

Krishnaji : If I said one is completely free of it, it will not be true. Alright, sir take this question of suffering which Mrs. Jayakar raised earlier. Man has suffered inspite of every religion, every analysis. There seems to be no end to suffering, not only global suffering, human suffering, personal suffering but this immense suffering of man. What is my relationship not only to the global but to my own suffering? Or is my suffering just a series of incidents which I remembered, which gave me happiness and therefore I suffer; a continuous recollection of what has been? Now I am left lonely, miserable and therefore I suffer. I can find a dozen explanations for all this suffering but at the end of that explanation, I am left with that thing, with all the aches in it.

Dr. Ramachandra Gandhi : If at the back of that suffering, say is attachment and if I don't realise that this attachment is made up of the stuff of which dreams are made of, it will never go.

Pupul Jayakar : One very interesting thing emerges — does this river of sorrow have an existence in itself or is it the base of an illusion? Has it in itself an existence of its own or is every manifestation of it rooted in some aspect which is basically illusion?

Krishnaji : Are you saying it is an illusion, the basis is an illusion?

Pupul Jayakar : I am asking you, is it an actuality?

G. Narayan : What is being said is, unless I see the essential unreality of something, it always comes back. So the crucial thing is the perception that something is essentially unreal and therefore without foundation. Supposing I say something is essentially unreal, it can be in the theoretical realm but actually something which is happening is real. So again there is a split.

Dr. Ramachandra Gandhi : Why should I not acknowledge the actuality in denying the reality of it? I don't deprive it of its actuality. But this is not without cause or without foundation.

Pupul Jayakar : It is very interesting. Sir, sorrow is actual. There is the actuality of sorrow. Then the question arises has this sorrow a reality, not an actuality but a reality? If it is based or arises out of an illusion in itself, then it can completely be ended but if it is of the essence of reality, it will rise up again. There is a difference between actuality and reality.

Dr. Ramachandra Gandhi : Something that was mine has gone away. Now, if I regard something that was mine, if it goes away today, it will come back tomorrow but the illusion that it was ever mine, if I don't ever get rid of this, it will come back.

Pupul Jayakar : That is the real problem.

Krishnaji : I have been attached to my son desperately for various reasons. I am attached to him and suddenly he has gone and I am in sorrow. You can't ask, is that an illusion, or has it any basis in reality? This is all just words.

Dr. Ramachandra Gandhi : I don't say it is an illusion at all. The sorrowing is not illusion but it is in so far as it is of the nature of fundamental complaint against words

Krishnaji : May be. I don't know.

Pupul Jayakar : If you want to say that it does not arise out of an illusion which is attachment, then it can never end.

Dr. Sudarshan : It seems to me it is very much like the question of when are you truly in love and it is said that the first time you

fall in love, you are sure that it is the last time you fall in love, and the last time you fall in love, you realise that that was truly the first time you fell in love. In the same sense, the question of recognising something to be without foundation, unreal etc, is a statement in big terms until I see a particular thing I don't know. It is a formally undecidable proposition. And if it is seen, then ofcourse it is gone.

Krishnaji : If I see, it is finished.

Dr. Ramachandra Gandhi : But what do you see? As you effectively pointed out the other day that if you wish to be rid of it, then if you have not seen its foundationlessness, then it would be of short duration. Even if it is of fairly long duration, it will be private to you.

Pupul Jayakar : Krishnaji, would you say sorrow can end completely? In the very nature of that statement is sorrow something which is not of the nature of existence?

Krishnaji : What is the nature of existence? My existence is sorrow.

Pupul Jayakar : Can you end existence?

Krishnaji : Yes, the existence that we know of ends. My existence is attachment, jealousy, greed, all that. That is my life, that is my consciousness. If I end all that, my existence as I have known is not.

Dr. Ramachandra Gandhi : There must be a price that must be paid for the permanent ending of this little "me" and those of us who don't want to pay that price, they will never end it. This must be faced.

Dr. Kapur : Quite right, sir.

Dr. Sudarshan : I enter a minor, dissenting opinion that an impression is created that once this is accomplished then you can go round and say "look, I have graduated". It is not an ending because in a certain sense each time the situation arises you have another me which has to be destroyed, which has to be given up, and it is not a case of my giving myself up, but see when that happens. So one should not talk about it as if it is a purposive action; it is a caliberation, it is a way of testing, making sure that things have ended. In fact you don't even have to make sure because when it happens, that particular "I", and that particular sorrow, and that particular greed, and that particular anger and the desire to end that anger all of them

have disappeared because it looks very much like trying to correct something which happened in a film.

Pupul Jayakar : I have a feeling that you can never attack the "T" frontally. Most of us try to attack the "T". It is like shadow boxing. There is only a fraction which manifests itself and the ending of that;

Dr. Ramachandra Gandhi : The dream thief cannot be got rid off by inventing a dream policeman. We have to wake up.

Krishnaji : Sir, what will make me wake up? I am not awake. I am drugged, I have worked. I go to the office from morning till night. I am exhausted, I am bored, lonely, I have sex, I have got so many problems, and you are talking to me about something which I don't understand. This is my existence, my miserable, confused, absurd, existence and I am asking you, please, help me to get out of this. All you are giving me is some other thing which I don't want.

Dr. Ramachandra Gandhi : I love you. I listen without interpreting, interfering with some neat, sliced solution; you come to me and tell me that the run-away trouble is the "T"ness or whatever it is. You come and say "help me" — I listen with absolute attention and that itself is a cure.

Krishnaji : Sir, I am not asking you personally — have we ever ended anything without any motive, without any cause, just say "over"? I am attached to my wife; you know all the implications of attachment — fear, loneliness, anxiety, jealousy, agony, all that. When you end without any cause, then there is something totally new which takes place.

Dr. Kapur : We wake up or go to sleep for that matter.

Krishnaji : Don't bring in sleep.

Dr. Ramachandra Gandhi : When we call it a day beyond stretching a particular point, we put an end to this being awake; and also when we wake up. . . .

Krishnaji : When we wake up, we have begun again.

Dr. Kapur : Could I make a comment, Gandhi? The sleep is giving up after exhaustion from the day's greed. It is not a conscious giving up.

Krishnaji : Sir, we are educated from childhood to be something — B.A.'s, M.A.'s, P.Hd.'s, doctors, scientists, surgeons, something all the time. We are conditioned to that. I don't want to be like you. You may be god almighty or the incarnation of divinity or

the greatest genius. I don't want to be like you. I don't compare myself with you, not that I am vain; I am not. I say why should I be like you? I have no desire to be like somebody else nor the desire to be myself. I don't know myself. So I begin to investigate what I am, not what I should be.

Pupul Jayakar : Sir, you may not answer this question, but if I may ask, is there an ending of personal sorrow?

Krishnaji : Is it sorrow, not my sorrow or your sorrow?

Pupul Jayakar : There is an ending of sorrow.

Krishnaji : Compassion is possible only when there is the ending of sorrow. If you end sorrow, the feeling of this extraordinary weight of it, the depth of it, the great beauty of it, when that is ended, that ending is the passion of compassion. It is not my ending and then I am compassionate. It is compassion and that compassion has its own intelligence, and that intelligence acts.

Dr. Ramachandra Gandhi : It is not a personal sorrow that ends but the sorrow of the personality and that is surely a very good means that it is not a temporary, adhoc ending of sorrow. One has achieved the logical ending of sorrow. That would not be the ending of sorrow but the sorrow of personality which surely is good news and I think for that we should be self aware.

Krishnaji : Sir, our intelligence is the intelligence of thought, but it is not compassion which has its own intelligence.

5-1-1982

5th January 1982

LETTERS TO THE SCHOOLS

As we have pointed out, we are deeply involved in our daily life as educators and human beings. We are first human beings and then educators : not the other way around. As a human being, with a special profession of education, the teacher's life is not only in the classroom but is involved with the whole outer world as well as his inner struggles, ambitions and relationships. He is as conditioned as the student. Though their conditioning may vary, it is still a condition. If you accept it as inevitable and abide by it, then you are further conditioning others. There are many who accept this, trying to modify their limitations, but as educators you are concerned, are you not with bringing about a different social entity — a future generation which perceives the futility of wars — organised murder; a generation which is concerned with global interrelationship, without nationalistic isolation; a generation which is involved with truth. Surely this is the function of a true educator.

The human consciousness is conditioned. Any thoughtful man would accept this fact but many of us are not aware of this and perhaps neither is the educator. To become aware of his conditioning and investigate whether it is possible to be free of its limitation, is one of the functions of a teacher. So we have to go into the question of what it is to be aware, to concentrate, to give total attention. It is very important to understand the meaning of these.

Awareness implies sensitivity : to be sensitive to nature, to the hills, rivers and trees around one; to be aware of that poor man walking down the road; to be sensitive to his feelings, his reactions, to his appalling and degrading poverty; to be sensitive

to the man who is sitting next to you, or the nervousness of your friend or sister. This sensitivity has in it no choice; it is not critical. There is no judgemental evaluation. You are sensitive to the cloud about which you can do nothing. Is this sensitivity the result of time and practice? If you allow thought and practice, then that very thought and practice kills sensitivity. Learn to observe sensitively; learn what sensitivity implies; capture it rather than cultivate it. Don't ask how to capture it : grasp it. In the very perception you are sensitive. There is no resistance in sensitivity. Sensitivity is to the immediate and limitless.

Concentration is the process of resistance. Every educator knows what it means to concentrate. The educator is concerned with stuffing the brain with knowledge of various subjects so that the student will pass examinations and get a job. The student also has this in his mind. The educator and the student are encouraging each other in the form of resistance which is concentration. So one is building the capacity to resist, to exclude and gradually become isolated. Concentration is the focussing of one's energy on the blackboard or a book and avoiding distraction. The very word "distraction" implies concentration. Actually there is no distraction. There is only resistance which is called concentration. So in this there is conflict, struggle and resistance. This resistance inevitably will bring about the limitation of the brain, which is our conditioning. To perceive this whole movement with sensitivity is to move into a different area — which is to be attentive.

What is it to be attentive? If we really grasp the significance of sensitivity, of awareness, the limitation of concentration — not intellectually or verbally — but the actuality of such states, then we can ask what it is to be attentive. Attention involves seeing and hearing. We hear not only with our ears but also we are sensitive to the tones, the voice, to the implication of words, to hear without interference, to capture instantly the depth of a sound. Sound plays an extraordinary part in our lives : the sound of thunder, a flute playing in the distance, the unheard sound of the universe; the sound of silence, the sound of one's own heart beating; the sound of a bird and the noise of a man walking on the pavement; the waterfall. The universe is filled with sound. This sound has its own silence

when all living things are involved in this sound of silence. To be attentive is to hear this silence and move out of it.

Seeing is a very complex affair. One sees casually with one's eyes and swiftly passes by, never the details of a leaf, its form and structure, its colours, the variety of greens. To observe a cloud with all the light of the world in it, to follow a stream chattering down the hill; to look at your friend with the sensitivity in which there is no resistance and to see yourself as you are without the shades of denial or easy acceptance; to see yourself as part of a whole; to see the immensity of the universe — these are observation : to see without the shadow of yourself.

Attention is this hearing and this seeing and this attention has no limitation, no resistance, so it is limitless. To attend implies this vast energy : it is not pinned down to a point. In this attention there is no repetitive movement; it is not mechanical. There is no question of how to maintain this attention, and when one has learned the art of seeing and hearing, this attention can focus itself on a page, a word. In this there is no resistance which is the activity of concentration. Inattention cannot be refined into attention. To be aware of inattention is the ending of it : not that it becomes attentive. The ending has no continuity. The past modifying itself is the future — a continuity of what has been and we find security in continuity, not in endings. So attention has no quality of continuity. Anything that continues is mechanical. The becoming is mechanical and implies time. Attention has no quality of time. All this is a tremendously complicated issue. One must gently, deeply go into this.

1st November 1982

J. Krishnamurti

BRAIN AND ORDER

J Krishnamurti

We are going to think together to find out whether our energy is always limited or whether there is an energy which is limitless. Because, now our energy is limited by our action, by our education, by our narrow nationalism, by our beliefs, by our gods, by our religions; it is all canalised. When energy is limited, its activity must also be limited and therefore in that there is a great deal of conflict, which is a waste of energy. We are going to find out if it is possible for human beings to act so that their action is not fragmented, broken down. We are concerned with our daily life, what is actually going on inwardly, inside the skin, as also what is happening outward. The outward and inward are like the tides of sea going in and going out. Our brains have extraordinary capacity, untold capacity, as you can observe in the technological field what human beings have done — the atom bomb, the surgery, medicine, transportation and so on. The brain has extraordinary capacity and that capacity is narrowed down by our tradition, by our books, by our beliefs, by our constant battle with each other. So this vast energy is brought down into a small narrow groove. It took energy for you to put aside some time to have leisure to come here. When we talk, when we see, when we think, all that demands energy. Everything that we do demands energy. But this energy instead of flowering, increasing to vast degree, is brought down to a small area which is our daily miserable, conflicting, contradictory life. As long as we live narrowing all our energy to a self-centred activity, life must become tortuous, full of anxiety, greed, sorrow because we are reducing this vast energy to a small narrow little groove. Is it possible to release this little energy?

First, we must find out what is order. The housewife wants order in her kitchen. She wants order and the businessman wants order so that his investment, his earning and so on is safe and he says please give me order, security. We translate order into security. As long as we are secure, have a job, money, we think that we bring about order. We want order. Now, the brain can only function excellently when there is order, when there is no self-contradiction, when there is no sense of competition, when there is no striving, struggling. The brain demands security in order to function efficiently. I do not know if you have noticed that there is disorder in your daily life. You find some kind of order is being established. Haven't you noticed all these things? We are going to find out whether there is absolute order, irrevocable, immovable order. Or there is only order which is limited, convenient, comfortable, safe and all that. We are now asking what is order, because without order the brain cannot be secure. When there is disorder, the brain is all the time trying to create within this disorder some kind of order because it can only function in complete order at its highest excellence. This is so.

We are asking, what is order. We accept order as following certain direction, certain ideas and so on. Order according to the totalitarian people is accepting authority, whether that authority is of the marxist or of the pope or of your guru or the authority of the books. You think there will be order by following any accepted authority, not only outwardly but also inwardly. Our brains are trained to accept authority. What happens? When you accept authority so that there can be order, your mind is not actively alive to find out. Your brain becomes dull, which is what is happening in this country. Order based on knowledge — knowledge being limited — will also be limited. See the fact of it. If I base my desire to have order according to what I have already known, or according to certain sanction which is based on knowledge, order will inevitably bring about disorder. So any order based on knowledge must inevitably bring disorder.

Is there order which is not based on knowledge? It is very important to find out. As we said, energy which is expended on the accumulation of knowledge and the energy expended on that knowledge in action, which we think brings order, will

invariably bring disorder. This is a fact. We are asking : is there order beyond the accumulation of knowledge? Look, mathematics is order based on knowledge. Order according to science is based on knowledge. Political, economic investigation is again based on knowledge, and all order which is based on knowledge, whether it is personal ambition and so on, is limited. So is there an order which is so absolute, which is not based on human accumulation of knowledge, memory? If there is, then the brain is so completely secure, it can act at its highest excellence. We are going to find out if there is an order beyond that. Now, what do you mean by that word "order"? Order implies a state of mind which not merely acts where thought is necessary, but also be free of that so that it is an order of the universe. Sir, the universe which is the rising of the sun and the setting of the sun, the new moon and the full moon, the bright star — they are in complete order. If the sun does not begin to rise tomorrow, for the next few days, we will all be dead. There is order in the universe. And that order is not based on thought. See the beauty of it. Nature is not put together by thought. Thought has out of nature created various things, the table, chair, so on. But the earth, nature, stars, the beauty of heavens, is not put together by thought. There is total complete order.

Now, we are going to find out if in our daily life such absolute order can come into being. We accept disorder, not only outwardly but inwardly; corruption is disorder. The lack of efficiency in the highest places is disorder. When there is quarrel between two people that is disorder. When man treats woman as though she was a mere chattel, as it happens in this country where you don't respect a woman, that is disorder. And without creating order between man and woman you want to find out absolute order. Without understanding disorder, you can't possibly understand order. We are saying action is what is taking place now, whether that action is based on the past, past memories, past knowledge, past incident, past suffering or acting according to a future concept, future ideas. Are you acting according to what you have already known, or acting according to some concept, ideas, pre-meditative results, or observing what is going on and acting immediately?

Action means order not based on memory. There is such an action which is so absolute, which is correct, precise, unchangeable. That can only take place when you realise that the past

meets the present, modifies it and becomes the future. That is what you are doing. You are living all the time within this area, within this movement — past meeting the present, modifying itself, proceeding; that is what you call time. Now is there an action which is not based on this? Is there an action which brings absolute order? Meditate to find out how you live your daily life, whether there is an action or only postponement or action based on remembrance. Then you realise that postponement and remembrance will invariably bring about contradiction and therefore conflict. We are asking can one live in this world — this world being our jobs, family, children, pleasure, pain, all the nonsense that goes on around us in every department, especially in the religious world — can we live a life of action? Life is action, life is relationship. Can we live and act without the whole movement of the past changing itself in the present and moving, you understand? Can there be an end to it? Is there an action which is so immediate that it doesn't allow time? Is there an action which is not within the field of time?

We are saying there is an action which is totally unrelated to knowledge. Knowledge being limited your action then becomes limited. Whereas if you observe, observe not only with your eyes, but listen, learn — all that is movement of complete perception. Your learning is limited because you are not observing, you are not listening. You don't put your whole mind, your body, your senses, your heart to find out. We are saying that there is that vast capacity of the brain, mind, astonishing capacity, unlimited capacity, and that capacity, that tremendous energy is now limited and so brings disorder — disorder between people, between groups of people, between community, between this guru and that guru, between their beliefs. We are now expending our energy in disorder. I am pointing out that there is order, total complete order, which is the order of universe when you understand the whole movement of knowledge and enquire if there is action, if there is order, beyond all knowledge, beyond all experience. For that you have to find out, you will have to observe yourself — how you observe nature, how you observe your wife, your friends, your children, observe — and in that observation there is great care, great affection and from that affection, attention, there is immediate action.

AUDIO AND VIDEO CASSETTES :

A wide range of Audio tapes of Krishnaji's Public talks, talks to the children in the schools and Public discussions are available for sale with the Foundation. Given below is the list of recent tapes :

AUDIO CASSETTES :

1977-78	Rishi Valley	3 Public Talks
1978	Ojai	6 Public Talks
	Saanen	7 Public Talks
	Brockwood	4 Public Talks
	Varanasi	3 Public Talks
1978-79	Madras	6 Public Talks
	Bombay	4 Public Talks
	Ojai	6 Public Talks
1979	Saanen	7 Public Talks
1979	Brockwood	4 Public Talks
1979-80	Madras	6 Public Talks
	Bombay	5 Public Talks
1980	Ojai	6 Public Talks
	Saanen	7 Public Talks
	Brockwood	4 Public Talks
1980-81	Sri Lanka	4 Public Talks
	Madras	6 Public Talks
	Bombay	6 Public Talks
1981	Ojai	6 Public Talks
	Amsterdam	2 Public Talks
	Saanen	7 Public Talks
	Brockwood	4 Public Talks
	Delhi	4 Public Talks
	Varanasi	3 Public Talks
1981-82	Madras	6 Public Talks
	Bombay	6 Public Talks
	Delhi	4 Public Talks
1982-83	Calcutta	4 Public Talks
	Madras	4 Public Talks
	Bombay	4 Public Talks

THE AUDIO CASSETTES ARE PRICED AS FOLLOWS :

Sony C-90 (Imported Cassette)	Rs. 75/-
Coney C-90 (Indian)	Rs. 55/-
Only for recording a Cassette	Rs. 35/-

VIDEO CASSETTES :

$\frac{1}{2}$ " Video Cassettes in colour on the V.H.S. system are available for sale.
For one Cassette containing two talks, Rs.800/-