

Krishnamurti Foundation India Bulletin

Volume No. 8, Issue 3, July - October 2011

Rs25/-

FROM THE EDITOR

In his famous speech of 1929, dissolving the Order of the Star, Krishnamurti told a story that he was to repeat through every decade of his long life.

You may remember the story of how the Devil and a friend of his were walking down the street, when they saw ahead of them a man stoop down and pick up something from the ground, look at it, and put it away in his pocket. The friend said to the Devil, 'What did that man pick up?' 'He picked up a piece of Truth', said the Devil. 'That is a very bad business for you, then', said his friend. 'Oh, not at all', the Devil replied, "I am going to let him organise it."

The story, which he occasionally referred to as a joke, serves to illustrate his rejection of spiritual organisations. He explains the radical act – he does not want followers because authority has no place in spiritual matters; there may be some who understand him, but these will be 'very, very few'. 'So', the rhetorical question, 'why have organisations?' is repeated several times.

Despite these early rejections of spiritual organisations, early in life Krishnamurti established schools in Varanasi and in Andhra Pradesh under the banner of 'The Foundation for New Education' and, in 1968, he allowed the setting up of organisations that bore his name. In this issue of the *Bulletin*, we explore the seeming paradox implicit in his beliefs and actions; we look at his treatment of concepts that are of concern to social organisations, concepts such as justice, equality, authority, co-operation. His elucidation of these concepts uncovers common ground between spiritual organisations and secular ones, and the justification for

establishing schools and setting up foundations stands on this shared ground. Justice and equality are possible to achieve; they are properties of individual human beings; they become embedded in social organisations only by extension – when individuals in search of truth come together as ‘friends’ to form organisations. His arguments against the value of working together in utopian projects or commercial ventures notwithstanding, Krishnamurti held that it was possible to come together as friends to bring about a ‘radical change in society’.

Krishnamurti’s message has depth because it explores an array of associated concepts, straddling both spiritual and secular worlds. He is a spiritual philosopher whose message has depth, is internally consistent and, most importantly, relevant to the times in which we live.

R. H.

ARE SUCH ORGANISATIONS NECESSARY?

Let us examine the question of organisations. There is rather a nice story of a man who was walking along a street, and behind him two strangers were following. As he walked along, he saw something very bright, picked it up and put it in his pocket. The two strangers observed his action, and one said to the other, 'This is a very bad business for you, isn't it?' The other, who was the Devil, replied, 'No, though he picked up truth, I am going to help him organise it.' Can truth be organised, or through any organisation can you find it? Must you not go beyond and above all organisation and beliefs to discover truth? Why do these so-called spiritual organisations, churches, exist? They are built around beliefs, dogmas, and so on, are they not? Beliefs and organisations are ever separating people, keeping people apart, as the Hindu and Muslim, as the Buddhist and the Christian. Belief, in any form, political or religious, throws up a barrier between man and man, inevitably bringing conflict and misery. Though the adherents of organisations and beliefs talk of brotherhood and love, they are the very people who will encourage and connive at the destruction of others.

Are such organisations necessary? Do you understand what I mean by 'organisations'? I am referring to the psychological, so-called spiritual, religious organisations. Are they necessary? They exist on the supposition that they will help man to realize Truth or God or what you will. They exist for propagandistic purposes, for conversion, for increase of membership, and so on; you want to tell others what you think or what you have learned or what appears to be the true. And can truth be propagated? If truth is propagated it ceases to be the true. Truth is to be experienced not according to any belief or pattern, and if experience is organised it ceases to be the true, it becomes a lie, so a hindrance to reality. The real, the

immeasurable, cannot be formulated; the unknown cannot be measured by the known. When you measure it, it ceases to be the true; it is a lie and only a lie can be propagated. Organisations that are supposed to be based on the search for the real, when they become propagandists' instruments, cease to be of any significance ... [and] all so-called spiritual organisations become the means of exploitation. Such organisations become like any other business corporation, with buildings, investments, which become all-important. Truth is not to be found through any organisation; truth comes into being when there is freedom. Belief in any form is the craving for security, and he who is seeking security cannot discover truth.

Whether I am a Messiah or not can be answered simply: I have never denied it and I do not think it matters very much what I think about it. What is important is to find out for yourself if my teachings are the truth. Do not judge by labels, do not give importance to the name; and whether I am the World Teacher or the Messiah or something else is of the least significance to you. If the name has become important, then you will miss the truth. One will assert that I am, and another that I am not, but your conflict, confusion, and sorrow are not solved by any of these assertions and denials. It is important, very important, to be earnest after the search of truth, for it gives freedom from strife and pain. The truth of my teachings can be discovered in your daily life, and truth is not distant but very near. The intellectual will not find it for he is caught in the net of his own knowledge which prevents his understanding; the man of devotion will not find it for he is caught in the confusion of his own image and emotion. He who is earnest will understand it.

*Madras
December 7, 1947*

JUSTICE HAS NO SELF-INTEREST

J KRISHNAMURTI (JK): What do you mean by ‘injustice’, Sir? You are rich, I am poor; you have an excellent brain, and I am dull. Society is so structured that people on top keep other people down. Where do you start looking for ‘justice’?

JAGANNATH UPADHYAYA (JU): We look for equality of opportunity. There is no final definition of equality.

JK: You treat your servant as a servant; face it.

ACHYUT PATWARDHAN (AP): A man beats his wife, and she may not be able to do anything about it. There is tremendous injustice in the world.

JK: I want justice, equality, and society, the environment, politics – everything – denies that. The gurus deny it, but I want justice. Where am I to find it?

AP: There are ‘untouchables’ who are treated inhumanly; they live in so much poverty, squalor.

JK: Please, do not speak about the ‘untouchables’. Do not consider the untouchables [separate from the] others.

First of all there is no equality. Where is the source in me which is destroying the sense of equality and inequality? Where do I find the source, so that I can deal justly with others? And then, if I convey this to all of you, it will become collective.

I want to find out where equality is. There must be equality – but where is it? There must be justice.

I am saying to you, Sir, I know the details of all that is happening. I have travelled more than you have. I [have seen] the brutality, the killing, etc., that's going on in this world.

Where do I find equality, justice, happiness for all mankind?

AP: It is, perhaps, a wrong question, Sir. I ask: How do I work for that?

JK: If I have the jewel, then I can share it.

JU: Since 1947 we have learnt that institutional efforts at working at and bringing order and justice are self-defeating. What is the alternative? I searched for 40 years. There were hundreds of people who followed me, and now they say, 'You have let us down'. You see, I have done nothing except this – working to bring about order and justice – and I have failed.

JK: Would you admit that institutions cannot alter [this condition]? Would you admit that revolutions have not brought it – justice – about? Social service has not done anything; nor has sympathy. None of that has brought it about. I want to find out whether it is possible to bring about equality and justice – [not] through any organisation, through any group activity, through any religion; I would not touch them under any circumstance!

JU: How does collective action come? You are not open to that form of action.

JK: Collective activity has not produced the result.

Sir, what is the difference between one national army fighting another national army?

JU: You've said that 'one individual changing will correct the collective'.

JK: That is not my point.

Would you, please, let go of your position for a moment? Do not stick to your position. This is a dialogue. If you say, 'It must be like that', the conversation ends.

JU: I can only leave my position if a new path, a new hope, is shown.

K: I see the truth in the false. The false has to be seen as false. I want to find out the way – a way – to deal with this problem. Do not say, 'Harijans' or 'This, that, and all the [rest]'. I take all that for granted. All the known paths – including the collective – have failed to bring out equality, justice, etc. If you do not accept that, then we cannot proceed.

Can I act – as a human being – justly? Can I act – as a human being – with another human being with equality? *That* is my question. Do not say, 'It is impossible'. There is only compassion; *that* is the only basis for equality, justice.

AP: I have no compassion.

JK: Find out. I do not say, 'I have no compassion'. Compassion does not require a bank account; it requires application. You are rejecting it because you say, 'My bank account is not [big. I am not], rich.

AP: If I do not have compassion, how does it come?

JK: It comes. I can lead you to it.

AP: I do not see how.

JK: I see that you don't have it, and that is why there is injustice. I say that compassion is intelligence, and that intelligence is justice. If I say that truly, I have the sense of compassion. That may affect the society, but 'society' can never be changed.

You think 'compassion' is something not reachable by human beings. I say that this is so because you have built this imaginary compassion, and you are trying to find imaginary steps to it.

JU: So your compassion is total without any quality or action.

JK: Intelligence is intelligence; it is not the partial intelligence of thought. It is intelligence, and, when it comes to us, we cannot hold it.

Justice has no self-interest. And if you have shown lack of intelligence of your action so far, move away from self-interest. When I say this, you are stuck.

Sir, self-interest is inequality. Self-interest is total injustice. We may change there, outside, without change here, inside.

I have met Kings, Prime Ministers, and others, but have never felt 'equal' or 'unequal'. As long as there is self-interest, there will be injustice, there will be no equality, and there will never be freedom.

JU: Why do you give talks and have dialogues?

JK: Have you asked a rose how it flowers? Have you asked the rose why it is there?

AP: It is its *dharma*.

JK: I can tell you what we talked about this afternoon. I said: Self-interest – deal with it. I want Pandit-ji to travel the same path. I want to do the same with everybody. But you say, ‘I am married; if I have no self-interest, I will lose my job’, and so on. I say, ‘If you lose your self-interest, you will have your job – a better job’.

JU: What interest does Achyutji have now which creates the centre of self-interest?

JK: He has been a socialist, and that tinges his outlook. I have been a royalist, and that tinges my outlook. It is all part of self-interest.

Madras
January 14, 1985

YOU MUST GIVE SOCIETY SOMETHING IN RETURN

QUESTION: *While talking about right means of livelihood, you have said that the professions of the army, of the lawyer, and of government service, were obviously not a right means of livelihood. Are you not advocating sannyasi-ism, withdrawal from society, and is that not running away from social conflicts and supporting the injustice and exploitation around us?*

J KRISHNAMURTI: To transform anything or to understand anything you must first examine what-is, then only is there a possibility of a renewal, a regeneration, a transformation.

Merely to transform what-is without understanding it, is a waste of time, a retrogression. Reform without understanding is retrogression, because we do not face what-is; we cannot act without first observing, discussing, and understanding what-is. We must examine society as it is, with its weaknesses, its foibles; and to examine it we must see directly our connection, our relationship with it, not through a posedly intellectual or theoretical explanation.

Now, as society exists at present, there is no choice between right livelihood and wrong livelihood. You take any job you can get, if you are lucky enough to get one at all. So, to the man who is pressed for an immediate job, there is no problem. He takes what he can get because he must eat. But to those of you who are not so immediately pressed, it should be a problem, and that is what we are discussing: what is the right means of livelihood in a society which is based on acquisition and class differences, on nationalism, greed, violence, and so on? Given these things, can there be right livelihood? Obviously not. And there are obviously wrong professions, wrong means of livelihood, such as the army, the lawyer, the police and the government.

The army exists, not for peace, but for war. It is the function of the army to create war, it is the function of the general to plan for war. If he does not, you will throw him out, won't you? You will get rid of him. The function of the general is to plan and prepare for future wars, and a general who does not plan for future wars is obviously inefficient. So the army is not a profession for peace, therefore it is not a right means of livelihood. I know the implications as well as you do. Armies will exist as long as sovereign governments exist, with their nationalism and frontiers; and since you support sovereign

governments, you must support nationalism and war. Therefore, as long as you are a nationalist you have no choice about right livelihood.

Similarly, the police. The function of the police is to protect and to maintain things as they are. It also becomes the instrument of investigation, of inquisition, not only in the hands of totalitarian governments, but in the hands of any government. The function of the police is to snoop around, to investigate into the private life of people. The more revolutionary you become, outwardly or inwardly, the more dangerous you are to government. That is why governments, and especially totalitarian governments, liquidate those who are outwardly or inwardly creating a revolution. So, obviously, the profession of the police is not a right means of livelihood.

Similarly, the lawyer. He thrives on contention; it is essential for his livelihood that you and I should fight and wrangle. (*Laughter*). You laugh it off. Probably many of you are lawyers, and your laugh indicates a mere nervous response to a fact; and through avoidance of that fact, you will still go on being lawyers. You may say that you are a victim of society; but you are victimized because you accept society as it is. So, law is not a right means of livelihood. There can be a right means of livelihood only when you do not accept the present state of things; and the moment you do not accept it, you do not accept law as a profession.

Similarly, you cannot expect to find right means of livelihood in the big corporations of business men who are amassing wealth, nor in the bureaucratic routine of government with its officials and red tape. Governments are only interested in maintaining things as they are, and if you become an engineer for the government, you are directly or indirectly helping war.

So, as long as you accept society as it is, any profession, whether the army, the police, the law, or the government, is obviously not a right means of livelihood. Seeing that, what is an earnest man to do? Is he to run away and bury himself in some village? Even there, he has to live somehow. He can beg, but the very food that is given to him comes indirectly from the lawyer, the policeman, the soldier, the government. And he cannot live in isolation, because that again is impossible; to live in isolation is to lie, both psychologically and physiologically. So, what is one to do? All that one can do, if one is earnest, if one is intelligent about this whole process, is to reject the present state of things and give to society all that one is capable of. That is, Sir, you accept food, clothing and shelter from society, and you must give something to society in return. As long as you use the army, the police, the law, the government, as your means of livelihood, you maintain things as they are; you support dissension, inquisition and war. But if you reject the things of society and accept only the essentials, you must give something in return. It is more important to find out what you are giving to society than to ask what is the right means of livelihood.

Now, what are you giving to society? What is society? Society is relationship with one or with many; it is your relationship with another. What are you giving to another? Are you giving anything to another in the real sense of the word, or merely taking payment for something? As long as you do not find out what you are giving, whatever you take from society is bound to be a wrong means of livelihood – this is not a clever answer – therefore you have to ponder, enquire into the whole question of your relationship to society. You may ask me in return, ‘What are you giving to society in order that you be clothed, given shelter and food?’ I am giving to society that of which I am talking today – which is not merely the verbal service any fool can give. I am giving to society what to me is

true. You may reject it and say, 'Nonsense, it is not true'. But I am giving what to me is true, and I am far more concerned with that than with what society gives me. Sir, when you do not use society or your neighbour as a means of self-extension, you are completely content with the things that society gives you in the way of food, clothing and shelter. Therefore you are not greedy; and not being greedy, your relationship with society is entirely different. The moment you do not use society as a means of self-extension, you reject the things of society and, therefore, there is a revolution in your relationship. You are not depending on another for your psychological needs – and it is only then that you can have a right means of livelihood.

You may say this is all a very complicated answer, but it is not. Life has no simple answer. The man who looks for a simple answer to life has obviously a dull mind, a stupid mind. Life has no conclusion, life has no definite pattern; life is living, altering, changing.

There is no positive, definite answer to life, but we can understand its whole significance and meaning. To understand, we must first see that we are using life as a means of self-extension, as a means of self-fulfilment; and because we are using life as a means of self-fulfilment, we create a society which is corrupt, which must begin to decay the very moment it comes into existence. So, an organized society has inherent in it the seed of decay.

It is very important for each one of us to find out what one's relationship with society is – whether it is based in greed (which means self-extension, self-fulfilment, in which is implied power, position, authority), or if one merely accepts from society such essentials as food, clothing and shelter. If your relationship is one of need and not of greed, then you will find

the right means of livelihood wherever you are, even when society is corrupt. So, as the present society is disintegrating very rapidly, one has to find out, and those whose relationship is one of need only, will create a new culture, they will be the nucleus of society in which the necessities of life are equitably distributed and are not used as a means of self-extension. As long as society remains for you as a means of self-extension, there must be a craving for power, and it is power that creates a society of classes divided as the high and the low, the rich and the poor, the man who has and the man who has not, the literate and the illiterate, each struggling with the other, all based on acquisitiveness and not on need. It is acquisitiveness which gives power, position and prestige, and as long as that exists, your relationship with society [will result in] a wrong means of livelihood. There can be right means of livelihood when you look to society only for your needs; then your relationship with society is very simple.

Simplicity is not the ... the putting on of a loin cloth and renouncing the world. Merely limiting yourself to a few things is not simplicity. Simplicity of the mind is essential, and that simplicity of the mind cannot exist if the mind is used for self-extension, self-fulfilment, whether that self-fulfilment comes through the pursuit of God, of knowledge, of money, property or position. The mind that is seeking God is not a simple mind, for its God is its own projection. The simple man is he who sees exactly what-is and understands it; he does not demand anything more. Such a mind is content, it understands what-is – which does not mean accepting society as it is, with its exploitation, classes, wars, and so on. But a mind that sees and understands what-is, and therefore acts, such a mind has few needs, it is very simple, quiet; and it is only when the mind is quiet that it can receive the eternal.

Poona
October 17, 1948

THE SPIRIT OF CO-OPERATION

One of the basic problems confronting the world is the problem of co-operation. What does the word 'co-operation' mean? To co-operate is to do things together, to build together, to feel together, to have something in common so that we can freely work together. But people generally don't feel inclined to work together naturally, easily, happily; and so they are compelled to work together through various inducements: threat, fear, punishment, reward. This is the common practice throughout the world. Under tyrannical governments you are brutally forced to work together; if you don't 'co-operate' you are liquidated or sent to a concentration camp. In the so-called civilized nations you are induced to work together through the concept of 'my country', or for an ideology which has been very carefully worked out and widely propagated so that you accept it; or you work together to carry out a plan which somebody has drawn up, a blueprint for Utopia.

So, it is the plan, the idea, the authority which induces people to work together. This is generally called co-operation, and in it there is always the implication of reward or punishment, which means that behind such 'co-operation' there is fear. You are always working for something – for the country, for the king, for the party, for God or the Master, for peace, or to bring about this or that reform. Your idea of co-operation is to work together for a particular result. You have an ideal – to build a perfect school, or what you will – towards which you are working and, therefore, you say co-operation is necessary. All this implies authority, does it not? There is always someone who is supposed to know what the right thing to do is and, therefore, you say, 'We must co-operate in carrying it out'.

Now, I don't call that co-operation at all. That is not co-operation; it is a form of greed, a form of fear, compulsion.

Behind it there is the threat that if you don't 'co-operate' the government won't recognize you, or you will be sent to a concentration camp, or the Five Year plan will fail, or your country will lose the war, or you may not go to heaven. There is always some form of inducement, and where there is inducement there cannot be real co-operation.

Nor is it co-operation when you and I work together merely because we have mutually agreed to do something. In any such agreement what is important is the doing of that particular thing, not working together. You and I may agree to build a bridge, or construct a road, or plant some trees together, but in that agreement there is always the fear of disagreement, the fear that I may not do my share and let you do the whole thing.

So it is not co-operation when we work together through any form of inducement, or by mere agreement, because behind all such effort there is the implication of gaining or avoiding something.

To me, co-operation is entirely different. Co-operation is the fun of being and doing together – not necessarily doing something in particular. Do you understand? Young children normally have a feeling for being and doing together. Haven't you noticed this? They will co-operate in anything. There is no question of agreement or disagreement, reward or punishment; they just want to help. They co-operate instinctively, for the fun of being and doing together. But grown-up people destroy this natural, spontaneous spirit of co-operation in children by saying, 'If you do this, I will give you that; if you don't do this, I won't let you go to the cinema', which introduces the corruptive element.

So, real co-operation comes not through merely agreeing to carry out some project together, but with the joy, the feeling of

togetherness – if one may use that word – because in that feeling there is not the obstinacy of personal ideation, personal opinion.

When you know such co-operation, you will also know when not to co-operate, which is equally important. Do you understand? It is necessary for all of us to awaken in ourselves this spirit of co-operation, for then it will not be a mere plan or agreement which causes us to work together, but an extraordinary feeling of togetherness, the sense of joy in being and doing together without any thought of reward or punishment. That is very important. But it is equally important to know when not to co-operate; because if we are not wise we may co-operate with the unwise, with ambitious leaders who have grandiose schemes, fantastic ideas, like Hitler and other tyrants down through the ages. So we must know when not to co-operate; and we can know this only when we know the joy of real co-operation.

This is a very important question to talk over, because when it is suggested that we ‘work together’, your immediate response is likely to be, ‘What for? What shall we do together?’ In other words, the thing to be done becomes more important than the feeling of being and doing together; and when the thing to be done – the plan, the concept, the ideological Utopia – assumes primary importance, then there is no real co-operation. Then it is only the idea that is binding us together; and if one idea can bind us together, another idea can divide us. So, what matters is to awaken in ourselves this spirit of co-operation, this feeling of joy in being and doing together, without any thought of reward or punishment. Most young people have it spontaneously, freely, if it is not corrupted by their elders.

This Matter of Culture, Chapter 15

THERE IS CO-OPERATION ONLY WHEN YOU AND I ARE AS NOTHING

QUESTION: *You say there can be co-operation only when you and I are as nothing. How can this be true? Is not co-operation positive action, whereas 'being as nothing' is almost unconscious negativity? How can two nothingnesses be related, and what is there for them to co-operate about?*

J KRISHNAMURTI: The state of nothingness must obviously be an unconscious state. It is not a conscious state. You can't say, 'I am as nothing'. When you are conscious of being as nothing, you are then something. This is not a mere amusing statement, but this is a fact. When you are conscious that you are virtuous, you become respectable; a person who is respectable can never find what is real. When I am conscious that I am as nothing then that very nothingness is something. Simply because I have made that statement, don't accept it.

There can be co-operation only when you and I are as nothing. Find out what it means, think out and meditate about it. Don't just ask questions. What does that state of nothingness mean? What do you mean by it? We only know the state of activity of the self, the self-centered activity. Whether you are following some guru, Master, that is all irrelevant. We only know the state which is self-action, and that obviously creates and engenders mischief, misery, turmoil, confusion, and non-cooperation. And then the problem arises: How is one to co-operate?

We know now that any co-operation based on an idea leads to destruction, as has already been shown. Action, co-operation, based on an idea is separative. Just as belief is separative, so is action based on an idea. Even if you are convinced, or millions are convinced, still there are many to be convinced and, therefore,

there is contention going on all the time. So, we know that there cannot be fundamental co-operation though there may be superficial persuasion through fear, through reward, through punishment, and so on - which is not co-operation obviously.

So, where there is activity of the self as the end in view, as the utopia in view, that is nothing but destruction, separation, and there is no co-operation. What is one to do if one is really desirous, or one wants really to find out, not superficially but really, and bring about co-operation? If you want co-operation from your wife, your child, or your neighbor, how do you set about it? You set about by loving the person. Obviously!

Love is not a thing of the mind; love is not an idea. Love can be only when the activity of the self has ceased to be. But you call the activity of the self 'positive'; that positive act leads to destruction, separateness, misery, confusion, all of which you know so well and so thoroughly. And yet, we all talk of co-operation, brotherhood. Basically, we want to cling to our activities of the self.

So, a man who really wants to pursue and find out the truth of co-operation must inevitably bring to an end the self-centered activity. When you and I are not self-centered, we love each other; then you and I are interested in action, and not in the result, not in the idea but in doing the action; you and I have love for each other. When my self-centered activity clashes with your self-centered activity, then we project an idea towards which we both quarrel; superficially we are co-operating, but we are at each other's throats all the time.

So, to be nothing is not the conscious state, and when you and I love each other, we co-operate, not to do something about which we have an idea, but in whatever there is to be done.

If you and I loved each other, do you think the dirty, filthy villages would exist? We would act; we would not theorize and would not talk about brotherhood. Obviously, there is no warmth or sustenance in our hearts, and we talk about everything; we have methods, systems, parties, governments, and legislations. We do not know that words cannot capture that state of love.

The word love is not love. The word love is only the symbol, and it can never be the real. So, don't be mesmerized by that word love. It is not something new. That state can only come into being when the activity of the 'me' has ceased, and in that cessation of the 'me', you are co-operating with what is to be done and not with any idea. Don't you know all this, sirs? Don't you know that when you and I love each other, we do things so easily and so smoothly; we do not talk about co-operation; we do not talk about a system of how to do a thing and then battle over the system and forget the action. You smile and you all pass it by. We have grown old in our cleverness and not in wisdom.

Madras
February 10, 1952

ADDRESSES OF J KRISHNAMURTI SCHOOLS

RAJGHAT EDUCATIONAL CENTRE
Rajghat Besant School
Rajghat Fort
Varanasi — 221 001
Uttar Pradesh
E.mail: rbskfi@gmail.com
Fax: (0542) 2430 218
Telephone: (0542) 2440336, 2440717

Boarding School
Ages 7 to 19

VASANTA COLLEGE FOR WOMEN
(Admitted to the Privileges of
Banaras Hindu University
Assessed & Accredited by NAAC)
Rajghat Fort
Varanasi — 221 001
Uttar Pradesh
Telephone: (0542) 2441187
E.mail: vasantakfi@rediffmail.com

B.A. & B.ED.
(Humanities only)

RISHI VALLEY SCHOOL
Rishi Valley — 517 352
Chittoor District
Andhra Pradesh
E.mail: office@rishivalley.org
Fax: (08571) 280261
Telephone: (08571) 280622/280582/280044

Boarding School
Ages 8 to 17

THE SCHOOL
'Damodar Gardens'
Besant Avenue
Madras — 600 020
E.mail: alcyone@satyam.net.in
Telephone: (044) 2491 5845

Day-Boarding School
Ages 3½ to 17

THE VALLEY SCHOOL
'Haridvanam'
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

Day-Boarding School
Ages 6 to 17

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.

**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 _____

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 Prajñā 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 Newspapers 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.