

Krishnamurti Foundation India Bulletin

Volume No. 4, Issue 3, July - October, 2007

Rs 25/-

FROM THE EDITOR

This is the fifth talk in the series of talks Krishnamurti delivered at Madras in the winter of 1978-'79. Two major themes run through these talks: first, that religion is an investigation, that the spiritual search begins with the autonomous individual. And second, that religious inquiry cannot begin unless dogmas, conclusions and inherited traditions are put aside. How, the reader might ask, is it possible to unburden the mind of the inherited past? In this talk Krishnamurti proposes what one might call a 'thought experiment'.

Can you find out what your sorrow is? Is it loneliness? Is it that you've not been able to identify yourself with something or other? Is it that you have lost somebody whom you loved, or had great affection [for], or companionship [with]? Is it that you cannot have the power, the position, the prestige of someone who has? Please examine all this, for yourself.

And suggests to the investigating mind that it observe without dividing the subject as agent from the object that is acted on. 'Test it out,' he says.

I lose my son, and I am lost. It's a shock; I'm paralysed for the moment. Then, I realize I've lost something which I have treasured, which I have held, with which I've identified myself – my son. So sorrow is the loss of that. And, so, I then ask, 'Please help me to get rid of my sorrow'. Or, 'I will meet my son next life'. You follow? [It is] the avoidance and the escape from what is actually going on; the observation of what is actually going on when one loses a son, or a husband, or wife, anything that is actually going on. In the observation of that, if there is no division, when the observer is the

observed, then, in that observation, that which is being observed undergoes a radical, fundamental change. Test it out!

Observation of the everyday self in action, or of thought as it moves, is a pre-condition of free inquiry. And freedom, for Krishnamurti, is primary; at the beginning. His thought here is complex, connected with the knack of observing, looking without the subject-object division. When the subject as agent sits in judgement of the thought-emotion as object there is no freedom; 'no freedom to look', is the way he puts it.

The religious spirit Krishnamurti evokes here is 'global' because it is not tied down to group memory or group dogma.

— R.H.

A GLOBAL RELIGION

I would like to talk, if I may, this evening, about a religious mind. Before we communicate with each other about it, I think it would be wise and necessary to go over, a little bit, what we have been talking about during these last four talks here. I think it is fairly obvious for most people who are at all aware of the events that are going on in the world that there is general degeneration. Though there is vast, incredible technological advancement, man has advanced very little. One observes [that] the human capacity [for] affection, love, and all the essential things of human nature, are gradually declining. One can see in every country that one goes to that this is taking place. The problems human beings have, actual daily problems of hunger, beliefs, dogmas and rituals, and of relationship, intimate or otherwise, are again on the increase. [These are] everyday problems that human beings have, not some fantastical, romantic, sentimental problems.

One observes all this in different parts of the earth. All these problems are not of any particular country; they are a global problem, the problem of all mankind. And so our approach must be, surely, not sectarian, not nationalistic, or of a class, or of a particular dogma – communism, socialism or any other political endeavour. One has to find now a global answer, a global outlook, a global action.

And we were saying, too, that every human being throughout the world is the representative of all other human beings. This is not an intellectual concept, to be accepted and worked at, but a reality, an actual fact – a ‘fact’ being that which is taking place now. Every human

being goes through extraordinary agonies: loneliness, misery, confusion, every form of dishonesty – political, religious and otherwise. This is not an intellectual concept, an idea, but a reality that must be not [just] intellectually grasped but understood with one's heart, with one's mind, with one's whole being. Every human being is the rest of the world; he is the world; his consciousness – modified – is the rest of the world's. And so, when one particular human being transforms himself radically, deeply, fundamentally, then he does affect the whole consciousness of mankind. Again this is fairly obvious. There was a Hitler who affected the whole of mankind. He was crazy, whatever you like, but he has affected mankind. So has Karl Marx, so has the Buddha, and so on. So one human being – you – [who] brings about psychological transformation, psychological revolution brings about a change, totally, in consciousness – which affects the consciousness of mankind. We went into all this very carefully.

We were talking, also, about desire, fear and pleasure as, perhaps, the major causes of our confusion, contradiction and conflict. We talked about it last Sunday, if I remember rightly. And we said also, if one may again point out, that we are thinking together, not arguing together, not offering one opinion against another, one particular dogma against another. Rather, as two friends may talk over their problems, we, you and the speaker, are investigating, examining – not accepting, nor rejecting – our whole existence as human beings: Why we human beings live the way we are living, with our confusion, sorrow, misery and all the rest of it, why we accept our daily life of conflict, struggle, in our relationships, why we dominate each other, and so on. We went into all this.

May we, this afternoon, go into the whole question of what is a religious mind? Would that be all right? I am glad you approve. That is not a sarcastic remark; I'm glad you want to go into it.

First of all, in understanding the problem [of] what a truly religious mind is, we must grasp the significance of the word, the meaning of the word, and realize that the word is not the thing. The word 'tree' is not the actual thing that is there. Nor [is] the description, the verbal explanation of what a religious mind is, which we are going to explore today and tomorrow, the described, the actual fact. But words are necessary to communicate. And we all, perhaps, understand English. We are using words without any slogans or jargons – ordinary words with which one is quite familiar.

So we are talking over together, examining together, investigating together – not that I investigate and you listen and agree or disagree with the investigation (which would be absurd). Whereas if we could go together and explore this extraordinary question which has haunted man throughout the ages: What is religion? What is a mind that can hold, or understand, or comprehend the beauty of a profoundly religious mind? Because every form of political organization has failed. They have not solved the problems, human problems. The politicians are seeking power, position; though they pretend, they are not at all concerned with us, with other human beings. Nor have religious organizations ended man's suffering, his agonies, the wars, the appalling chaos that is spreading throughout the world, the semi-anarchy. On the contrary, religions, with their beliefs, dogmas, rituals, and all that nonsense, have separated man. When I use the word 'nonsense' it means 'no sense'.

I believe, [speaking] historically a new culture only can only be born out of a religious mind. And cultures throughout the world are degenerating, disappearing. So religion – we are going to examine the word and the whole sequence of it – becomes extraordinarily important.

And, again, scientists have not solved any of our human anxieties, human relationships. So when one observes all the things that the intellect has brought about, [one sees that it] has only brought greater misery, greater confusion. This is, again, obviously taking place.

So we are, together, going to examine, not only this afternoon but [also] tomorrow afternoon: What is a religious mind? I'm not going to do all the work; you're going to join me; you have to work, too. That is, we are challenging, demanding, asking the brain, the mind, the whole nature of our mind: What is a religious person? One has looked up various dictionaries and they more or less say that originally, etymologically, the meaning of the word 'religion' – in Latin, Greek and so on – was 'to bind'. But many etymologists have denied that. Now they are saying that the meaning of religion implies 'gathering all your energy to discover' – they don't say what [is to be discovered]. 'Gathering all your energy'. We are saying [the word means] 'gathering all your energy to discover what truth is', [to discover] if there is anything sacred in life (not the temples, churches, mosques; they are not sacred; they are illusions created by thought). But there must be freedom, complete psychological freedom, to find out, or to come upon that thing that is wholly, completely, irrevocably sacred, [and] not invented by thought, by man. So, that is the meaning of the word 'religion'.

The word 'mind' includes not only sensory activities, [it also includes] all the emotional reactions, the images, the beliefs, the anxieties, the intellectual capacity to reason logically – reasonably or unreasonably – to be caught in illusion, and to see that one is caught in an illusion, and to be free of that illusion. All that is the mind. Right? Right, sir? When we talk of 'the mind' it includes the brain, which is very, very, very old, ancient beyond memory. And, the brain has been conditioned millennia upon millennia. The genetic conditioning and the cultural conditioning, the social, religious conditioning – that is the brain; it contains all the genetic memories, the experiences, the knowledge of man's existence on this earth. Which, again, is an obvious fact. And tradition – the values, the beliefs, the dogmas, the concepts handed down from generation to generation – is part of that brain, is part of that mind. All the knowledge which you have acquired recently, or through the immemorial past – all that is part of the mind. So we are using the word 'mind' to convey a whole process of the past, with its tradition, with its culture, with its rituals, with all the things man has collected.

We have explained through words what the speaker means by religion and the mind. And we are asking, rather, challenging: What is a religious mind? You are challenging it; I'm not challenging it; I'm not pushing you into a corner to answer. After all, existence, living, is a constant process of challenge. You can duck, or run away, or answer it [the challenge] along a particular cultural tradition. But when you answer according to tradition or culture or environment, then that answer will be very limited. So we are saying that we are asking, we are challenging each other to discover, to find out, by careful observation, by

careful examination, by investigating what-is, whether what-is can be totally transformed.

‘Revolution’ means gathering together certain incidents, concepts, beliefs, and forming a circle. Are you following all this? Physical revolutions – the French or the Communist and so on – are the result of incidents, accidents, concepts, ideas, conclusions, forming a circle. And that is what is called a ‘revolution’. I’ll explain what I mean. Are you interested in all this? Exercise [y]our brains; it’s part of our life, because they are all taking about revolutions. What they mean by ‘revolution’ – the terrorists, even the idealists and the Communists (if they are really serious Communists, not totalitarian slaves but people who are talking, investigating into what revolution is) – generally is ‘working along concepts, conclusions drawn from incidents: social, environmental, religious, political and, thus, forming a circle’. That is, the circle. Begin, and then come back to the same thing: the start.

You start. This is so obvious, isn’t it? Must I explain all this? You start saying, ‘Capitalism, or Socialism is wrong’ You draw a certain conclusion [based on] concepts, [you] work it out and, then, bring people to accept that, which inevitably, bureaucratically becomes the same thing which it was before – which is going round in a circle. I used to have a great many Communist friends at one time. Their idea was thesis, antithesis, synthesis, and from synthesis, antithesis climb, climb, climb, climb – change, always based on intellectual conclusions. The intellect being only a part of our whole mind, such intellectual action must inevitably be divisive, contradictory, destructive.

We’re not talking about revolution in that sense at all. We are talking about revolution in which man, the

psychological structure of man, is radically, fundamentally transformed. That is the only revolution. Physical revolution cannot bring about solutions [to] the ending of man's utter misery. Again, this is proven when you examine all the revolutions – going round and round in circles, [and] coming to the same point. Only different people in different positions.

So we are asking, challenging each other. And I hope you're challenging yourself. I'm not challenging you; the world is challenging you: your husband, your wife ... (Of course, the gurus dare not challenge you!) The world is challenging you; the things that are in the world [are] demanding a real answer. And you can't impose, on this challenge, your own particular ideas. Right? So let's proceed to examine together, think together: **What is the nature of a mind that is profoundly religious? – because religion is the only solution.**

You see, there is so much to investigate, to go into, one doesn't know quite where to begin ... All right, I've got it. Either you perceive, purely, the whole nature and structure of the mind, instantly. We are using the word 'structure' to mean movement; 'structure' means movement in the dictionary. So the nature of the mind and the movement that is going on – not my description of the mind, not my word of the mind, but the operation of your mind: the nature of it, the quality of it, the depth of it, the superficiality of it, whether it lives on opinions, words, superficial reactions, whether it is being driven by a motive (whether the motive be enlightenment or sex or money or power, or wanting to retain what you have). So we are asking, challenging: What is the nature and the movement of a religious mind? Right?

Obviously, to investigate the nature of such a mind – the mind that is whole, that is sacred, that is totally free – to inquire into it, one must begin with having freedom; other wise you can't inquire. Any form of investigation demands that the mind observe either microscopically, or observe the whole human activity outside there or inside. [For that] there must be freedom to look. Freedom – not the freedom that has an opposite. Do you understand? Do you understand what I am saying, what I am trying to explain? A prisoner demanding freedom while in prison is absolutely meaningless. He can imagine it [but] there is only freedom when he leaves the prison. Now most of us are caught in the prison of ourselves. And to inquire into one of the most ancient demands of man – which is, what is it to have a religious quality of mind? – you must have freedom to look. Which means, you don't belong to any religion. Right? You are neither a Hindu, Buddhist, Muslim, Christian, with all their dogmas, images, and all the rest of it. To examine what the religious mind is you don't belong to anything. Right? Are you doing this? You understand, sir, that this is a very serious thing to be gone into. It isn't just a thing to be played around with; not [something to be] made into a philosophy – which is a bundle of theories, concepts. A religious person has no philosophy, because such a mind is with that which is eternally sacred. So that is the first requirement, if you are interested to examine the question of the mind that is religious.

In an investigation of any kind, freedom is utterly important. You can't investigate in freedom now, and go back to your temple. You cannot possibly go back to your tradition, to your rituals, to your *puja*, to all the things, this vast circus that goes on in the name of religion. Now, this is the first thing if you are at all serious: not to belong to any organization, to any sect, group, community. Because to

inquire you mustn't be tied like a donkey; [a donkey] tied to a tether, or hobbled – it can't go very far. So that is the first thing, if you are really serious: There is no guru, no scripture, no ritual – nothing – in order to find out. It doesn't mean that one becomes lonely. It doesn't mean that you have to stand by yourself, against the current. Because mankind is going in that one direction: tradition, accepting the culture [it] lives in. The appalling things that are happening around you – [mankind] accepts that. And when you break away from that, you might feel that you have isolated yourself. You break away from that because that is illusion; that will never, under any circumstance, lead to truth. And the very observation is the operation of intelligence that says, 'That is false.' When you see that which is false, the seeing, the perception, is the operation of intelligence.

Now we will have to, again, explain what the word 'intelligence' means. Are we all communicating with each other, or am I talking and you are just listening? I mean by the word – I won't go into the etymological meaning – not only to read between the lines, between the two printed words, but to see that which is behind the word, to understand that which is not written, that which is not said, without distortion. We will go into that as we go along, because intelligence is the essence of compassion. And there can be no compassion without the ending of sorrow, which we are going to examine as we go along, today and tomorrow. In this examination, in this inquiry, we will also go into the question of what meditation is. That is part of our ancient tradition.

So we said there must be freedom: freedom to observe, freedom to discover that which is false. Commentators are part of the Hindu tradition. The commentators of the

Upanisads, the *Gita* – there are so many commentators. You read them, and they never help you to discover that which is false; the commentators themselves make it false. So, to understand what is a religious mind there must be freedom first. Freedom implies that you are not attached to a thing, but that you observe. You have no opinions, no conclusions, no concepts, but [the] mere observation of what is actually going on. Right, sir? Will you do that? It's our communication with each other.

Who has created the gods, or only the one God, or the representative of God, or the God's son, or all the innumerable gods with their goddesses? Who has created them? We call 'religion' going to the temple, to the mosques, the churches, you know, the whole thing – who has created [it]? Answer it, sir; answer it yourself. Man has obviously created them. Thought has brought this about. God – I'm sure he will forgive us (I am only making a joke of it, please) – God is the invention of man. There are the Hindu gods, opposed to the Christian God, the Muslim God; the Buddhist have no gods but they have their own peculiar Bodhisattvas, and so on. Man has created this out of his sorrow, out of his fear, out of his death, out of his confusion, uncertainty, physical insecurity. Out of this matrix, the things that we have called 'gods' have been born. And these gods have been handed down from generation to generation.

If you reject all that, then you create a god of yourself, your own concepts; you become an atheist, which is another form of godhood. Are you following all this? Because of your own uncertainty, out of your own sorrow, total insecurity, you want something continuous, something that is timeless, something that knows no death. Out of that

longing, you create some marvellous image for yourself, and you say, 'That is Reality'.

So, one has to understand why thought does this all the time. It has done it from immemorial time. You understand, sirs? Every tribe has done this. [From] the moment man began to think, he has created the gods in heaven, or on earth, and worshipped an image, or a tree or a stone, made by the hand or by the mind. Do look into yourself, because any particular religion, any particular tribal religion is not going to answer; it's not going to be the salvation of man. It has to be a global religion.

Freedom to inquire into that which is false. I am not telling you what is false. The observation of what is going on actually, that which is happening now, and seeing the false or the truth in that which is happening now, is to investigate and see that which is illusory, and [to] put that aside, totally. **Right? That is the beginning of freedom.**

Then we talked about fear, desire, [and] **the continuous** demand of various forms of pleasure – pleasure of possession, pleasure of status, pleasure of being somebody, pleasure of identification with a country, with a group, with a conclusion, the pleasure of sex, the pleasure of one's own experience and living in that experience. And [we talked about] ending fear, because a mind that is clouded with fear can never be religious. You understand? Obviously. How can a mind that is frightened, that says, 'I must find some comfort out of my insecurity, out of my confusion'? As long as a mind is frightened, it cannot possibly have the religious quality. Right, sirs? Which means: In the inquiring, are you free of fear? – for otherwise you cannot possibly have a mind that is the essence of religion.

Desire, fear and the everlasting pursuit of pleasure not only create, brings about confusion, but also those are the elements, the qualities, that make up 'the self', 'the me', the centre from which all activities begin. It does not mean that you cannot enjoy the sound of that bird [*sound of birds in the background*], it does not mean that you cannot look at a beautiful sunset or the sky through the leaves. That's not pleasure. The looking – at the sky through the leaves, which is a delight, which is a sense of great depth and beauty – takes place in the instant. When that is over, thought comes along and says, 'What a marvellous thing that is to have had. I want more of it.' Then the 'more' is the pleasure, not the actual moment of the perception of something beautiful, lovely. Do you understand all this? – Not understand verbally, [but] in your heart; you do it.

And, also, to understand the nature and the structure, which is the movement, of a religious mind, obviously must end sorrow. One does not know if you have gone into this question at all. Man has carried this burden of sorrow for millennia; and we still have it. Every human being throughout the world goes through the agony of tears, loneliness, grief, the ending of something. And every human being is caught in it, and doesn't know how to put it away completely, totally. Religions haven't solved this. They said, 'Think about God and forget yourself', or 'The son of God: he helps, he sacrificed, he suffers for you; therefore you don't suffer'. You know all the religious games they play.

So we are asking, *you* are asking, whether sorrow can end, as fear – because fear is part of sorrow, desire is part of sorrow. And if you go into the whole question of the whole movement of pleasure, it is also part of this sorrow; only we want pleasure and avoid the other. So we are asking:

Can this sorrow end, not only your particular sorrow, but the sorrow of mankind? Mankind's sorrow, which is poverty, the utter degradation of poverty, class division, the constant uncertainty of life, the imminent wars, the destruction, the brutality of wars. Man has never stopped wars. Do you understand, sirs, all this? So there is not only your particular little agony, but also the agony of the whole of mankind, of which you are a part. So we have to resolve this. Without the resolution of it there is no religious mind. When there is the ending of that sorrow, something else comes into being – which is not a promise from me. So we have to inquire whether sorrow can end. Which is, can fear end?

Now we'll go into it, bearing in mind that words are not the fact. The word 'sorrow' is not the agony that one has inside. And the description, however great, however subtle, however magnified – that description is not the actual fear. We also have to understand the whole meaning of death because that's part of our life – the ending of the brain cells, the ending of everything that one has collected, gathered, held on [to].

Are you all waiting for me to answer, [to] go into all this?

What is sorrow? What is your sorrow? Don't answer it to me. Can you find out what your sorrow is? Is it loneliness? Is it that you have not been able to identify yourself with something or other? Is it that you have lost somebody whom you loved, or had great affection [for], or companionship [with]? Is it that you cannot have the power, the position, the prestige of someone who has? Please examine all this, for yourself. Is it that you want happiness and you can't have it? You want to be loved, and nobody loves you. Sir, you understand? Is it that you want

to achieve some extraordinary status, and you know that you have not the capacity, the brains, the essential activity, and you cry?

Now, please listen. Either you take one sorrow after another, one grief after another, one particular grief and resolve it – but in the very resolution of it another grief arises – or can you observe the whole nature of this sorrow, as a whole? Do you understand? Not a particular sorrow, because the particular can never lead to the whole; the particular is the broken piece. The broken piece is not the whole. So can you see the truth of that – [that] the particular cannot possibly lead to the whole? You may investigate each particular hoping, thereby, to come to the end of sorrow, [but] that is an impossible thing to do, because one sorrow leads to another. Right? I wonder if you understand all this?

So can you observe the whole nature, the whole movement of sorrow? That is, to observe wholly. I mean by that word 'whole', to have a very clear, logical, sane mind, sane observation, logical, clear, precise; precision not diluted by your prejudice, by your longing, by your motive, so that you can observe without any distortion. Which means: Can you put aside your opinions, your conclusions, or the commentator's conclusion, or the *Gita's*, the *Upanisad's*, the *Bible's*? [Can you] put away all those conclusions, concepts and to observe wholly the whole movement of man's agony and sorrow? You understand? Through the particular to come to the whole is false. Right? So when you see that which is false, that falls away. The very perception of the false is the beginning of intelligence. This intelligence is not yours, or mine, or a particular intelligence. It is seeing that which is true and that which is

false – not the truth according to your conclusion, according to your prejudice, according to your tradition. You must be free of all that.

So, can you observe not only your sorrow but the sorrow of mankind, of which you are a part, as a whole: the sorrow of a person who is physically ill, and the sorrow of a person who doesn't believe in anything? That person who doesn't believe in anything is the same as the man who believes. Don't agree with me, please. This is very, very serious. It's your life.

Now in the same way as we talked about it the other day, can you observe – not a particular fear, but the root of fear? We said the root of fear is time, time is thought, thought *is* fear. Right? We went into that very carefully the other day. And in the same way, this enormous burden of man which is called sorrow – can it ever end? The moment you have a motive that it must end *in order to* have something else, then you are lost. So in observation of this question of sorrow there is no motive. You understand? When there is a motive – motive means movement – when there is a self-interested movement, there is distortion in observation. Right? So when there is no motive in your examination of this enormous burden which man has carried, then is that sorrow different from you? You understand? No, please sir, look at it; go into it. Do you understand? As you are fear, as you are angry, as you are jealous – jealousy is not different from you, your greed is not different from you. Our tradition – not 'our'; not mine [*laughs shortly*] – tradition says, 'You are different from your greed, therefore battle with it, fight it, control it'. We are saying quite the opposite: anger is you; when there is a moment of anger – anger being violence and all that – at the moment of anger

there is no 'you' and that reaction. Then thought identifies itself with that reaction, saying, 'That's anger; I have been angry'. Therefore thought separates itself from that thing which is called anger. I hope you are following all this. We went into it.

So, we are saying: The observer is the observed, the thinker is the thought, the experiencer is the experience; and sorrow is not different from himself. Do you understand? When that takes place: that there is no division between you and that which you are observing – that is, the observer is the observed, the man who has tears, or the woman who cries, is that sorrow himself, that sorrow is not separate from himself or herself – when there is no division, the very observation of that brings about a radical change in that which is being observed.

So is there an observation of sorrow without the observer? Do you understand what I am saying? I lose my son, and I am lost. It is a shock; I'm paralysed for the moment. Then, I realize I've lost something which I have treasured, which I have held, with which I've identified myself – my son. So sorrow is the loss of that. And, so, I then ask, 'Please help me to get rid of my sorrow'. Or [I say], 'I will meet my son [in the] next life'. You follow? [It is] the avoidance and the escape from what is actually going on; the observation of what is actually going on when one loses a son, or a husband, or wife, anything that is actually going on. In the observation of that, if there is no division, when the observer is the observed, then, in that observation, that which is being observed undergoes a radical, fundamental change. Test it out! Because in our inquiry into what is a religious life any form of fear, any form of the activity of will – which is the essence of desire – any form of seeking

pleasure, will distort your observation; distort not *your* observation, [but] observation .

So we are saying [that] there is an ending to sorrow. And when there is an ending to sorrow, out of that comes passion, not lust – passion being compassion. A religious mind, we are inquiring, we are not learning, we are not memorizing – you understand? The sacred books – no, I won't call them sacred – the books say, your traditional books say, 'The perfect man who has attained enlightenment is this, this, this, this character, that character, he is that kind, etc.' They give a complete description of what the enlightened man is. But the description is not the described, so you can throw away all those books. To find out for yourself there must be freedom – freedom from fear.

And pleasure is totally different from the perception of something beautiful, marvelous: a lovely sky, or a single star in the heavens, or a single tree in a field. There is in that great beauty, great love, great joy. But when thought takes over that joy, it becomes pleasure.

So we are saying: There is a total ending of fear and when there is the ending of that fear, there is no illusion whatsoever. And, with the ending of sorrow there is passion, there is that extraordinary sense of tremendous energy – not the energy to do more mischief, but the energy of this great limitless intelligence of compassion.

We have also to go into the whole question of death, and what is meditation, because in the understanding of that the religious mind comes into being. The religious mind comes into being when we understand the whole human existence of relationship in which there is no fear, no domination, no control, when we know what love is ... when there is love.

We will go into that tomorrow. Love has no remembrance; love is not the movement of desire; love is not the activity of pleasure. That's why it is so essential to understand all this, because we have lost that thing. Probably we never had it – that thing called love. We have to stop now because it's time. Right sirs.

– Madras

13th January, 1979

KRISHNAMURTI FOUNDATION INDIA GATHERING 2007

Krishnamurti Foundation India is happy to announce that the next Public Gathering will be held at the Rishi Valley Education Centre in Andhra Pradesh, from the 22nd of November to the 24th of November, 2007.

The intention of the Gathering is to enable interested persons to come together as friends to share, discuss and investigate fundamental questions of life in the light of Krishnamurti's Teachings.

For details please contact, with your full postal address:

The Gathering Committee
Rishi Valley School
Rishi Valley — 517 352
Chittoor District
Andhra Pradesh
Tel: (08571) 280622, 280582
Fax: (08571) 280261

ADDRESSES OF J KRISHNAMURTI SCHOOLS

- RAJGHAT EDUCATIONAL CENTRE Boarding School
Rajghat Fort Ages 7 to 19
Varanasi — 221 001
Uttar Pradesh
E.mail: kfivns@satyam.net.in/
kcentrevns@satyam.net.in/
Fax: (0542) 2430 218
Telephone: (0542) 2430 717
- VASANTA COLLEGE FOR WOMEN B.A. & B.ED.
Rajghat Fort (Humanities only)
Varanasi — 221 001
Uttar Pradesh
Telephone: (0542) 2430 587
- RISHI VALLEY SCHOOL Boarding School
Rishi Valley — 517 352 Ages 8 to 17
Chittoor District
Andhra Pradesh
E.mail: office@rishivalley.org
Fax: (08571) 280261
Telephone: (08571) 280622/ 280582/280044
- THE SCHOOL Day-Boarding School
'Damodar Gardens' Ages 3½ to 17
Besant Avenue
Madras — 600 020
E.mail: alcyone@satyam.net.in
Telephone: (044) 2491 5845
- THE VALLEY SCHOOL Day-Boarding School
'Haridvanam' Ages 6 to 17
17th K.M. Kanakapura Road
Thatguni Post
Bangalore — 560 062
E.mail: thevalleyschool@vsnl.net/
kfibr@blr.vsnl.net.in
Fax: (080) 2843 5242
Telephone: (080) 2843 5240/2843 5241

BAL-ANAND
'Akash Deep'
28, Dongersi Road
Bombay — 400 006
Telephone: (022) 2362 7817

An After-School Centre
for young children

SAHYADRI SCHOOL
Tiwai Hills, Rajgurunagar Taluk
Pune District — 410 513
E.mail: sahyadrischool@vsnl.net
Fax: (02135) 284269
Telephone: (02135) 284270/71/72

Boarding School
Ages 10 to 15

THE OAK GROVE SCHOOL
220 West Lomita Avenue
Ojai, CA 93023, U.S. of A.
E.mail: office@oakgroveschool.com
Fax: (001-805) 646 6509
Telephone: (001-805) 646 8236

Day/Boarding School
Ages 3½ to 17

BROCKWOOD PARK SCHOOL
Bramdean,
Hampshire SO24 OLQ
England
E.mail: admin@brockwood.org.uk
Fax: (0044-1962) 771 875
Telephone: (0044-1962)771 744

Education Centre and
Boarding School
14 years upwards

* * * *

BULLETIN
KRISHNAMURTI FOUNDATION INDIA

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

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

Registered with The Registrar of New 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
27, Neelakanta Mehta Street, T. Nagar, Chennai - 600 017.
Editor: Dr Radhika Herzberger.