

# Krishnamurti Foundation India Bulletin

---

Volume No 4, Issue 1, Nov. 2006 - Feb. 2007

Rs25/-

## FROM THE EDITOR

Buddhist schools of philosophy held that the *manas*, a Sanskrit word that roughly translates as the 'mind', is a sense, on par with the visual and the auditory senses. The Buddhists are at pains to explain that perception (both inward and outward) is unattached to words; a 5th century philosophy illustrated the point this way: 'One sees red, not "this is red"'. For the *Yogasutra*, on the other hand, the *manas* is a constructive faculty engaged in discursive acts of choice and invention; therefore "shot through with words".

The introduction given above helps lift Krishnamurti out of the obscurity academic philosophers attribute to his discourse by establishing a line between his thought and that of Indian philosophers. Krishnamurti's quest in this talk is to demonstrate to his audience that perception can be detached from processes that overlay it, prominent among which are the image that one has of oneself; this image, sometimes referred to as 'the observer', is built over time, infused with memory, and is clothed in words.

For those who have an interest in philosophy, it is worth noting that this is the first time Krishnamurti uses the term 'enlightenment' in the series of talks delivered in Madras in the winter of '78 and '79, two of which the *Bulletin* published earlier this year. The word is used most prominently at the talk's end, after a microscopic examination of what occurs in the time gap between noticing an emotional problem, such as being hurt, and acting on it. Krishnamurti suggests that 'that very perception is instant action'; and that enlightenment lies in that interval. So in conclusion, he can say, 'You won't find

light, enlightenment, at the end of time; you'll find it where you are now'. A human being can thus turn its back on humanity's dismal past, and a future philosopher in the Krishnamurti lineage may add, 'One sees hurt, not "I am hurt"'.

Someone once asked Krishnamurti, 'Is there anything sacred?' His answer, after some hesitation was, 'What-is is sacred'. If enlightenment can be found 'where you are now', then the distinction between the truth of the world and transcendental truth disappears.

R.H.

## THE NATURE OF TRADITION AND CULTURE

May we go on with what we were talking about the last two times that we've met here? We were saying that we must think together – not what to think but how to think. And we are, as we said previously, taking a journey together, sharing the problems, the various incidents and happenings in our daily life. And we're not concerned with theories, probabilities, suppositions, but with what is actually going on. The word 'actually' means that which is happening, happening now, externally, outside of us, but also inwardly. And we said: one can have correct examination inwardly only when we understand what is happening outwardly; **because examining ourselves, our attitudes, our prejudices, one can deceive oneself enormously. But if we approach it from the outward world, then perhaps, we shall have clear observation of ourselves.**

We said, also, that **the society in which we live is created by us, by every human being, not by some divine edict; the society in which we live is the expression of our greed, our ambition, our sense for power, violence and so on.**

And also, we pointed out the other day, if you don't mind my repeating it again, that this is a serious gathering. I mean by that word 'serious', weighty, heavy – not casual, not something that you come to on a pleasant evening, sit under a tree and listen to; rather, that we are sharing together our investigation. Our concern, as we pointed out the other day, is that our society is so corrupt, so dangerously violent, that unless every human being, each one of us, radically, brings about a revolution in himself, there is no possibility of bringing about a change in the world. That's what we talked about. Perhaps you might remember it.

You may not agree with what we are talking about. Or you may agree. Agreement or disagreement is irrelevant; we are not dealing with opinions, ideas or speculative philosophy. We are dealing with what is actually going on in our daily life because, as we pointed out, we must begin near to go very far. But most of us start with theories, abstractions that are very far; and therefore valueless, irrelevant. So, I hope that we are clear on this point: that we are not concerned with philosophy. Philosophy as it is understood now being a series of suppositions, theories, concepts, conclusions [whereas] the word actually means 'the love of life', 'the love of truth'.

This afternoon, if I may, I would like to share together, talk about, investigate, the nature of culture and tradition. So, first, why are human beings throughout the world caught up in tradition, whether it is the tradition of a day or a week or three thousand years? Why? The word 'tradition' means 'something handed down from generation to generation'. Etymologically, the word also means 'betrayal', 'treason'. Certain values, certain beliefs, ideas, rituals, concepts, are given, handed down, from generation to generation. This has been going on for century upon century, like a steamroller flattening the human being with these values, conclusions and so on. And, when those values, conclusions, concepts, principles and so on are thrown aside, as it is happening now, we are back to where we started. We are violent, greedy, anxious, insecure, uncertain, confused human beings. That's what's going on actually. Right? When traditions, which held human beings along a certain groove, are thrown overboard, as they are being done now, we are where we started. Perhaps we have more comforts, more bathrooms, we have more transportation and communication and so on. But, as human beings, we suffer, we are envious, we are violent; utterly insecure; there is a great deal of fear. The world is

becoming more and more dangerous. All this is a fact. This tradition implies – does it not? – a process of evolution: from the wheel to the jet plane, there's been evolution. It's taken many, many, many centuries for the wheel to come to the jet. And, in this tradition, there is so-called culture.

The word 'culture' implies 'to cultivate, to grow, to blossom, to flower' – the human mind as well as the human heart. Have we, as human beings living in a certain tradition, flowered, morally? Perhaps intellectually, we have – more or less. That is, we spin a lot of words, theories, principles, ideals, and try to live up to them – which is an intellectual process. Culture, as we pointed out, implies the freedom of man not to be steamrolled by centuries of tradition – in that there can be no culture. That's obvious. **Where the mind is following tradition, rituals and all the rest of it, in that there can be no possibility of the human mind and human heart growing, developing.**

**Technologically, we have advanced tremendously; that [advance] is based on the accumulation of knowledge; but morally, so-called spiritually, we are almost savages, with a lot of superstition, ideals, principles which have no meaning whatsoever. That is the state of our daily life. Technologically we are excellent, at least we try to be. And, we've never challenged ourselves: whether it is possible to live ethically at its highest. When one sees what is happening in the world and in ourselves, it's our greatest challenge, that each one of us cultivate in freedom. (Long pause.)**

Is freedom a matter of time? Time being division in movement; time is movement. Obviously. And in that movement there is division as yesterday, today and

tomorrow; the yesterday meeting the present, modifying itself and proceeding to the future – this is the movement of time in which there is division. To get from here to there, it takes time. From the wheel to the jet has taken centuries – time. So there are two different kinds of time: the biological time and psychological time. The time that a child, through adolescence, grows up to a man, and so on – that takes years; like a seed planted, it takes time to become a tree. And we are questioning whether there is psychological time at all? – that is, psychological evolution, to become or to be. I hope we are communicating with each other. I think it is rather important that we understand this question – it is really quite extraordinary if you come to think of it. We have depended on time, we thought our whole human progress is a development in time. Technologically we have achieved great varieties of excellence, and to achieve that one has to have enormous amount of time.

All accumulation of knowledge is time. We are asking whether there is psychological time at all, that is, psychological evolution, that is: 'I will be something; I will achieve goodness'. The very word 'achieve' implies time: 'I am not this but I will be that,' both in the business world as well as in the so-called world of spirit, mind. Is it that we have seen a seed grow into a tree and have accepted that as a process of growth in time; and therefore move with that concept, with that understanding, into the psychological field? You are following all this? Psychologically we think we are growing, we are developing, we will become something. We are questioning that very concept, very idea, very feeling – 'that we will be'. Right? All organizations are based on this, both worldly as well as so-called religious: 'Give me time, I will achieve

enlightenment' – through practice, through systems, through mechanical processes. You come with the same attitude, the same approach to the psyche which you apply to achieve [something] in the [business] world, [and in] the mechanical world.

There is no psychological evolution at all. Right? Please, don't accept what is being said, or deny; listen first. You may have your own opinions, your own conclusions, your own beliefs, your own way of approaching the problem of time, but since you have taken the trouble to come here, obviously you have to listen to what the other fellow has to say. Listen, not casually listen, or listening, interject your own opinions, your own comparative values, and so on. Just listen. Then, after having listened, you can begin to examine. But you cannot examine before you have listened. That implies giving attention, not partial attention, attending one minute or a few minutes, and then thinking about something else. Right? Which implies: Attention needs freedom – because if you are investigating, there must be freedom to observe. Right? I hope we are actually doing this – not accepting what is being said, and turning it into a theory or an idea. But actually listening to find out for yourself whether evolution, gradual growth exists or not, psychologically.

And if it does not, then how do we deal with a problem, with a reaction, with, for example, fear? You're following all this? We must be very clear in this matter.

Time is fear. Time is pleasure. Time is sorrow. And, is love involved in time? Are you following all this? We are denying altogether the total acceptance, up to now, of psychological evolution. We are going to examine that.

There is no need to examine the wheel and the jet. That's fairly clear, that's obvious. The whole of science is based on the accumulation of knowledge. And not being burdened with that knowledge, you examine more and acquire more knowledge, and you are all the time adding more and more and more knowledge – knowledge being the past. Now, we are asking, is time, as movement in division, necessary? Right? Please understand this carefully: Time is movement with divisions, yesterday, today, tomorrow; or, time immemorial; time which has no beginning; and time that may end.

Eternity is out of time, that which has a continuity is not eternal; it's still part of time. You're following all this? If one observes oneself as a human being – because we as a human being – we are the representative of all mankind: we suffer, we go through all kinds of tortures like every other human being; we are poor; we are rich; we are greedy; we suffer; we are lonely; we have no love. All that is the rest of mankind. So, you as a human being are the rest of mankind. This is not an intellectual concept. You can turn it into an intellectual concept but, like any other theory, it has no value. But if one sees the truth of it, the actual reality of it, with your heart, with your mind, then a human being becomes an extraordinarily serious, committed human being – not an individual, because we are not individuals. 'Individual' means 'indivisible', not broken up, not fragmented. And most human beings are fragmented. Right? So we are not individuals at all. Because we have a name, we have a bank account, or a car, or wife or house, we call ourselves individuals. I think that is wrong usage of the word. We are human beings like every other human being living in the world, with enormous problems – our relationships are very complex, our sorrows are limitless, and so on.

So, when we realize that we are the world and the world is us – realize it, not intellectually play with words – one has a tremendous responsibility. And that's why perhaps we avoid that responsibility by calling ourselves individuals. And being a representative of all mankind, as each human being is, when that human being psychologically transforms himself it affects the whole consciousness of mankind. Please listen to all this. Don't accept it; look at it. Examine it. And the speaker is only concerned with that, not with theories and so on. That is, is it possible for human beings, not through evolutionary process, not through time, but fundamentally, radically, basically to change, totally? Because that is our challenge, because traditions have gone, religions have no meaning any more; institutions have their limited place but cannot possibly transform men; no government can possibly change man – they may improve the outward circumstances, but deeply they cannot, as it has been shown in Russia, and all the rest of it. We don't have to go through all that.

So, understanding all that, we are asking: is there a possibility of transformation of man, in which time as movement, with its division, has no place? You have understood my question? Because our whole ethical, moral and so-called spiritual world is based on time. In the business world, in the political world, unfortunately the hierarchical system exists, the pecking order. And in the so-called world of the mind and heart, we have also this pecking order. This is so obvious. And, is it possible for a human being psychologically to change fundamentally, without having time at all? You understand sir? This is a very important question to ask – you may not find the answer, but one must ask it. Right? Because we have lived for a million years, probably more or less the same [way] psychologically. There's been tremendous technological revolution and

progress. So, let's find out if it is possible for a human being to be free totally of this idea of psychological evolution, which involves time. Right?

Can we examine it together? That is, your tradition says: take time. Right? Your whole scripture, religion – everything is based on time. Our brains work in time. We are conditioned by time; and we are asking a question which puts aside time, which totally denies evolution. Right? So we are going to investigate whether a human being can really bring about this radical change, in which time is not involved at all. Right? Are we meeting each other? That is, are we sharing this thing together, are we deeply interested in this question? Or, are you just waiting for me to examine it, explore it, investigate it, and you say, 'Yes, that's possible.' Or, 'That's not possible; I have different opinions and conclusions' – and go away? Which implies, that you are not really sharing in the problem at all. We have lived for over a million years and more, and we are practically the same as we were, psychologically, inwardly. Right? And, is it possible to reverse the whole process?  
(*Short laugh.*)

How do you examine? What is the capacity of the mind that is capable of investigating something which appears totally impossible? – [Can] a mind which is so heavily conditioned by time to which a new kind of proposition is put [investigate]? Is it capable, first of all, of receiving the problem, receiving the question? Or, being so heavily conditioned it's incapable of even hearing it?

So, what is actually going on with each one? Do you hear the question and make it into an abstraction? – which means avoidance. Or, being so heavily, traditionally conditioned, you

say, 'Sorry, I'm not going to even listen. It does not mean a thing to me'. Or you have the quality of mind that says, 'Let's go into it – not theoretically, but actually?' That is: Can fear, which is one of the reactions from immemorial time, totally end, without involving time at all? Is that clear? (Perhaps fear is a little more complex, we'll take it up a little later.) A human being is hurt from childhood, both physically as well as psychologically. Listen to it carefully. Can that hurt, the inward hurt, which expresses itself outwardly by withdrawing, by resisting, by wanting to be more violent to another, which has been gathered, which has been kept cherished, almost loved, can that hurt be totally abandoned instantly, without time? Right? You see the fun of it? It is not fun, it is really very, very serious if you go into it; but the very question is challenging; and therefore demands your attention, demands your care; it demands your response totally to it.

We are hurt from childhood, inwardly, psychologically, inside the skin as it were. The consequences of that hurt are resistance; building a wall round oneself; a withdrawal to not be hurt [any] more; the fear of getting hurt more and more. The consequences are violence, having no actual relationship with another – because you might get hurt and so on. One sees the consequences very clearly. Now, can all those consequences, which is the beginning of the hurt, end? To find that out – are you waiting for me to answer it? To find that out, and go into it very deeply: 'What is hurt?' You say, 'The "me"'. 'The me' is the image that you have created about yourself, or that society has imposed on you. The society is your relationship with another, which is of your making. So you are hurt because you have an image. The image is the symbol, the idea, the name, the form, the whole structure of the psyche. Right? That gets hurt. And our

conditioning is to get over that hurt: gradually do it, go into it, examine it, analyze it, find the cause and the action – which all takes time. Right?

Now, is it possible not to have an image about oneself at all? Then there is no hurt. You understand? Right? Is it possible? As long as you have an image, the image that one builds up for oneself from childhood right through old age and death, there must be hurt. As long as that image exists – that you are a very powerful person, dominant, aggressive, beautiful, clear intellect, and the rest of it – there must be hurt, superficial or very, very deep. Right? Now, seeing the truth, that as long as you have an image about yourself you are bound to be hurt; seeing the consequences, that you are violent, that you are becoming more and more dull because you are withdrawing; seeing that the image is hurt; seeing the truth of it, not just the intellectual concept of it – the very perception is the very ending of the image. Right?

So, we have to examine what we mean by perception, seeing. We see the things around us, and we name them because that's part of our training, part of our conditioning: the moment you see this thing you call it 'a tree'. It is the action of knowledge operating in perception. You're following all this? Is there a perception, without the accumulation of the past? – To observe without time? Right? That is, when we observe, we observe not only visually, optically, but when we observe ourselves (if you have ever done it, which I doubt – most of you don't, I am pretty sure) if you observe yourself, in that observation, there is the observer and the observed, the one who witnesses and the observed – which is the thinker and the thought. Right?

The thinker is the thought. There is no division between the thinker and the thought. You will not accept this. Examine

it, please. The thinker is the result of many, many, many incidents of thought – which is the past. The thinker is put together by thought. So, thought is the thinker. Right? There is no division between the thinker and the thought. That division is created by time, which is the movement in division. You are getting all this, sir? No? Right sirs. At least I must see somebody who says, ‘Yes, I’ve got it.’

**QUESTIONER (Q):** I’ve got it.

**K:** No, no, you can’t get it as quickly as that.

You see, what we are trying to point out is: Our conditioning, through the millennia, has been to make an effort, conflict. Conflict, effort, involves time. Right? Of course, because it is a division in time. Right sir? So there’s always conflict, from childhood till we die, there is always struggle, struggle, battle, because of this division in time. Right? (I’m glad there is at least somebody who is seeing this.)

And, is it possible to act without effort, without time? That is, to perceive, and that very perception is action, not idea and, then [an] interval and action – which is the division of time. In that division, various other incidents take place: if I have to go from here to there, things are happening. So, when there is the division in the movement of time, other incidents take place, which we call problems. I hope you are getting all this. Right sir? We are asking: Can the brain, which is so conditioned by a million years, perceive? – and that very perception is instant action – because we have no time. We are decaying, we are degenerating, we are corrupt, and if you allow time, you will become more and more degenerate – which is what’s happening.

When you say, 'I will not degenerate but I will regenerate', you've lost it. So we are asking, What does it mean to perceive? You understand my question sir? Is there a possibility of this perception of the image which gets hurt; and to see the danger of having an image, both biologically as well as psychologically? To see it instantly. The very seeing is the ending of the image. Which doesn't allow time. You've got it sir? Please, intellectually even grasp it.

If you have grasped it verbally, which is the intellectual process, and what the watching with the intellect does, [you see that] the moment you have grasped it intellectually, it has already become an idea. Right? Of course. It's already become an idea; therefore, you've moved away from perception. I wonder if you see this. So, perception implies the comprehension of the word (the word has a relative value, which is the understanding of the intellect), and being aware of that and not letting it wander off into an idea. Perception implies the operation of the intellect, the whole reactions at their highest level, and seeing what is exactly the truth of an image; and therefore the ending of it. Are you doing it or are you playing with words?

We are saying something that goes totally contrary to everything that you have accepted. So don't let what you hear become a tradition; then you are lost. But, if you actually listen (because what we are saying is the truth): As long as you have an image created by your society, by your colleges, universities, by your relationship with another and so on and so on, that image is going to get hurt, as and that hurt expresses itself in various forms – trying to dominate people, trying to withdraw, and so on and so on. Seeing, listening to the truth of that, listening with all your capacity, your intellect, every nerve listening, then that very listening

is the perception and ending of it. – Which has no time. You understand this? That is, violence is one of the inherited responses from the earliest of times. Right? Man has been violent from timeless time. We have done everything to be free of that violence. We have invented non-violence, an idea which goes overboard. We have tried every way – to be gentle, to be kind, to be generous; and yet in our hearts, in our relationships with each other we are very violent people.

Religions have said, ‘Try; work; forget yourself. Don’t be violent. Don’t kill’. But from time immemorial we are still doing the same thing. So we say, ‘It’ll take time to dissipate this violence’. Such a deception! You follow, sir? We have taken over a million years, and we haven’t got rid of it. We think that in another million years we will be rid of it; in the meantime let me be violent. That’s a game we play. So we’re saying: Is it possible to end that violence, instantly? That means the understanding that psychologically, inwardly, there is no time at all, that you don’t ‘become’. You follow sir? You don’t ‘become’, you don’t achieve enlightenment. – Which is the whole movement of time.

So, we are saying: observe violence, which is to be angry, to hate, to be jealous, and don’t escape into a non-violent movement, which is the opposite. So, when you observe the fact, there is no opposite. Are you following all this? I observe violence in me. I am violent. Why should there be non-violence? That’s my conditioning. Right? That’s my hope. That’s my intellectual concept – one day to be non-violent. So the fact of violence, the fact, has no opposite. Right? Do you see that? If you see that, you’ve finished. You understand? Because all our education, all our religion, everything traditional has said: Work at it, gradually get rid of it – which is movement in time, which is division. Time

is division. So when there is an observation of violence, only violence, the observer who is watching the violence – you follow? – that very observer is violence. Right? Right? So the observer is the observed. (Are you getting tired?) You understand sir? The moment you have a division [there] is movement in time; and therefore there must be effort. – Which is: the observer thinks he is different from the thing he observes. And so the very division brings conflict, conflict, suppression and all the rest of it. But when the observer realizes [that] that which he is observing is part of himself, there is no division, there is no duality at all. Right? So, can you see this fact – that you are violent, and the fact has no division? (*Long pause.*)

So, what has taken place in the mind? What has taken place in *your* mind, when you are only observing the fact, and not inventing the opposite? You understand? – That you are jealous, that you are envious. That's the fact. And the observer is the observed. – Which is envy. So there is no conflict or suppression with regard to a particular reaction. The reaction is a fact. Now, can the mind totally observe this reaction – which is a fact called 'jealousy'? You get it sir? Observe, without any movement of time. The moment you have the movement of time, you have brought about division. Is this *actually* taking place?

We are saying: You eliminate totally every form of conflict, in which you have been conditioned for millennia. To live without a single conflict means to live without a single problem. I wonder if you understand this. You may have technological problems: how to go to the moon; it took them a long time, three hundred thousand people, I believe, working at that one thing. It took many years. But, if we understand the nature of time, the whole structure of time,

psychological as well as physical time, then we relegate physical time to its proper place: 'I have to catch a bus, train, aeroplane, go to the office, and so on'. But psychologically there is no time. – Which means to live a life without a single problem. Have you ever gone into this question? Meditation isn't a problem. You are all making it into a problem: how to sit, how to breathe, you know, the system, the methods, the various gurus offering various tricks, and all that. What is a problem? Please apply it. Test it in your life, and you'll see it'll work. What is a problem? A problem is something that you have not resolved. We are not talking about mathematical problems, scientific problems, biological problems. We are talking about psychological problems between human beings, the problems that exist in our relationship with another, husband, wife – you know, and all the rest of it. A problem implies a non-resolution of it. Now, can you resolve that problem as it arises, and end it – not carry it over, even for a day?

See what happens: A problem continued makes the brain dull, actually. You can test it out for yourself. The brain's activity is made slower; because it is burdened, it makes itself incapacitated. It has no capacity of elasticity, when you carry over a problem for many, many, many years, or even for a week. So the question is: Can you end the problem as it arises? You understand? Are you interested in all this? Sir, do it. Don't accept words, but actually test it. – Then it's worth it. But if you say: 'Yes, nice idea, nice thing, but I can't do it.' Or, say: 'Tell me how to do it.' There is no 'how', because 'the how' implies a method, a system – somebody to tell you what to do. If somebody tells you what to do, you are back in the old game of tradition. Right? So, a mind that is clear has no tradition.

One has a problem; problem implies that which has not been thought out, investigated, resolved. Our problems exist in the field of relationship, between man and woman, sexual, non-sexual, the communication between man and man and woman and man – the whole field of it, not just one particular problem, either sexual or this or that. We are dealing with the whole human problem, in relationship, not a particular problem. Because, if we are examining only a particular problem, then we are dealing with a part and not with the whole. Is that clear? Come on sirs. We are dealing with the whole problem of human relationship: with the boss in the factory; when you come home, with your wife, with your husband. Sex, non-sex, domination, wanting to possess, attachment – all that implies problem. First of all, why do we have problems? Why do we live with problems? You understand? Is it that we are lazy? Is it that we have accepted as the norm of life to have problems? Or, is it that for millennia we have problems, [so] why not now carry on? – Which means, the mind, the brain has accepted problems as part of life. Right?

Refuse to accept problems. You understand? Challenge the brain and the mind to have no problems. No, don't agree, sir. You have to do it. – Which means, the problem arises, as it inevitably will, unless you have real love in your heart, not sexual love, not love of power, position and all that nonsense. (I won't go into that, that goes off somewhere else.)

How to deal with a problem, without allowing a single second of interval? We'll go into it. A problem arises as long as there is a centre. Right? As long as there is the centre, there must be circumference, diameter, the whole circle. The whole circle is our problem. Right? To have no

centre is to have no problem. Please sir, see what is involved in it, not just shake your head and say: Yes, I agree with you. That has no meaning. But see what is implied in it. First of all, the depth of it, the beauty of it, the rationality of it, the sanity of it – that as long as there is a ‘me’ with a centre, I must have problems. Right? They may be very dangerous problems, destructive problems or superficial problems. And as long as there is a problem, there is no love. But, of course, that does not exist, so we can skip that. We’ll come back to it later.

So, is it possible to live in the world, in the modern world, having a wife, husband, children, going to a job and all the rest of it, without having a centre? You understand, sir? See the fact; the fact that as long as you have a centre, there must be problems. And if you say: ‘That’s my life, to have problems’. Perfectly right, carry on. But if you say: ‘Problems are most destructive, not only to the brain but [to] the wholeness of the mind that’s fit, alive, active; because every problem is like a blanket that smothers’, you see the fact that [to have] the centre is to have problems. Right? Not only hear it, but see the truth of it. Then what takes place?

A mind, a being that has no centre and has to live with a wife and a husband, and the whole culture (no, not culture, I won’t call it culture) the whole world. – Which means you are acting every minute. Life is action. Right? But when you act from a centre, you are introducing the whole problem. I wonder if you see the framework of it, the wholeness of it. That is, the mind that has functioned with a centre has created innumerable problems, politically, economically, socially and, in intimate or not intimate relationships. Having a problem is the most destructive way of living; it

destroys the youth of the brain, the youth of the mind. If you listen to it and see the truth of it – it is over. There is no ‘how’. There is only the act of listening.

The word ‘tradition’ means ‘to hand down from generation to generation values, rituals, dogmas, beliefs, gods, pooja’ – the whole thing that man is caught in. Nothing can flourish in that tradition. It’s like a steamroller going over human beings. If you accept that, all right. Live with it, and be happy with it. But you are not going to answer the challenge of the world, the global challenge, which is that man must free himself of everything to flower. Flowering can only take place in the soil of human relationship. Right sir? Not somewhere else in the Himalayas or in some monastery. Even there, he is in relationship with his fellow beings. And culture, which is to grow, to develop, to have the highest excellence ethically, is not possible when your mind has become merely a machine. – Which tradition does. And, tradition has said: Accept time. Then, somebody comes along, like me, and says: Don’t. You won’t find light, enlightenment, at the end of time; you’ll find it where you are now.

— Madras  
6th January 1979

## OBITUARY

### **Padma Santhanam 1921-2006**

Mrs Padma Santhanam, a senior Trustee of the Krishnamurti Foundation, India, passed away on September 3, 2006. Padmaji, as she was known, was a member of the Foundation for more than twenty years. During that long period, she gave unswerving support to Krishnamurti and his work. She was responsible for the founding of The School, KFI, (Madras) and remained its guiding spirit until the very end. Hers was a life of service dedicated to women and children. Her noble presence will be greatly missed.

R.H.

**KRISHNAMURTI FOUNDATION INDIA**  
**BULLETIN**

Please note that the editorial matter in this *Bulletin* does not reflect any official position of Krishnamurti Foundation India. The Editor is responsible for selecting materials to be printed in the *Bulletin* and for any editorial comments on these selections.

Copyright Notice: Passages from Krishnamurti are protected under International Copyright Laws and may not be reproduced in any form without prior written permission from the copyright holders. For materials prior to 1968: Copyright © Krishnamurti Foundation of America, Box 1560, Ojai, CA 93024, USA. All rights reserved. For materials from 1968 onwards: Copyright © Krishnamurti Foundation Trust Ltd., Brockwood Park, Bramdean, Hampshire SO24 OLQ, UK. All rights reserved.

Krishnamurti Foundation India  
124, 126 (old 64-65) Greenways Road, Chennai 600 028, India

**KFI BULLETIN, ENGLISH  
SUBSCRIPTION FORM**

Annual Subscription (India)	Rs 75.00
Annual Subscription (Foreign)	US \$ 5.00
Five-year Subscription (India)	Rs 375.00

(DD or MO, in favour of KFI Publications payable at Chennai, to the address below)

-----

KFI Publications  
Krishnamurti Foundation India  
'Vasanta Vihar'  
124, 126, Greenways Road  
CHENNAI 600 028.

Dear Sir,

Please enrol me as a subscriber/renew my subscription to the 'KFI Bulletin' for the present year/five years.

Name (in block letters) \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

PAYMENT ENCLOSED (Rs 75/Rs 375/US\$5)

BY D.D. No \_\_\_\_\_

DATED \_\_\_\_\_ ISSUED BY \_\_\_\_\_

**KFI BULLETIN, HINDI  
SUBSCRIPTION FORM**

Annual Subscription (India)	Rs 100.00
Annual Subscription (Foreign)	US \$ 5.00
Five-year Subscription (India)	Rs 250.00
Five-year Subscription (Foreign)	Us \$ 25.00
Life Subscription (India)	Rs1000.00
Life Subscription (Foreign)	US \$ 75.00

Please send DD or MO in favour of KFI Study Centre payable at Varanasi, to the address below:

J. Krishnamurti Prajna Parisad  
Krishnamurti Foundation India  
Rajghat Fort  
VARANASI 221 001

Dear Sir,

Please enrol me as an annual subscriber/five-yearly subscriber/ life subscriber for the *Parisamvad*.

Name (in block letters) \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

PAYMENT ENCLOSED (Rs 100/Rs 250/Rs 1000/US \$ 5/US \$ 25/US \$ 75)

BY D.D. No \_\_\_\_\_

DATED \_\_\_\_\_ ISSUED BY \_\_\_\_\_

Registered with The Registrar of News Paper for India  
Under No: TNENG/2003/12845

---

Published by G. Rajeev on behalf of the Krishnamurti Foundation India,  
124, 126 (old 64-65) Greenways Road, Chennai – 600 028.  
Printed by N. Subramanian at M/s Sudarsan Graphics Offset Press,  
27, Neelakanta Mehta Street, T. Nagar, Chennai – 600 017.  
Editor: Dr Radhika Herzberger.