

# **Krishnamurti Foundation India Bulletin**

---

Volume 18, Issue 2, July to December 2021

Rs 25/

## FROM THE EDITOR

The two dialogues in this issue of the *Bulletin* deal with the seeming paradox of a confused mind trying to work its way out of its own confusion. The underlying question is: Can the mind, itself confused, self-reflexively act to free itself of confusion?

Both dialogues, held twenty years apart across two continents, find Krishnamurti engaged with argumentative intellectuals who challenge some of Krishnaji's basic assertions. Against K's often expressed view that the confusion in the outer world is an outcome of the individuals' inner confusion, that, as he put it, 'the world is the product of my own confusion', Maurice Friedman points out that 'the confusion was going on much before I was born', and that he personally therefore is 'responsible to a very little extent'.

The unnamed interlocutor in the second selection argues that since consciousness of confusion is not identical with the confusion, the mind works in two registers: there is confusion and the consciousness of confusion. The observer is the stabler, more persistent entity able to navigate multiple areas of consciousness.

Krishnamurti works his way through these challenges to communicate that freeing the mind of confusion and understanding it are not separate acts divided into units as subject acting on object. The mind that 'recognizes' confusion is old – because stored knowledge is operating to bring the 'fact' of confusion within an already-known fold. It is a unitary perception, an 'extraordinary non-exclusive attention, [that] begins to unfold the things that are hidden'.

Krishnamurti uses metaphors to illuminate what he means by attention: the confusion is a book he reads with Friedman 'page by

page, paragraph by paragraph'. The reading shows how the confusion is a product of multiple relationships an individual has to 'property, family, ideas', all of which reveal that the mind is a product of the past. Working through each of these contributing factors, each in turn, is an endless process. Hence, the need for a unitary non-exclusive attention.

'What do you do?' he asks the man who believes in a persistent self, if you find yourself lost in the woods. 'You don't go round and round in circles; you stop and look.' This act of looking anew, which Krishnamurti identifies as 'the new brain', begins to operate

when it recognizes that the old brain can't do anything, and therefore the old brain becomes quiet, and the new brain then acts, which is entirely different from the action of confusion.

R.H.

Due to the unclear nature of future circumstances, no definitive decision regarding the annual KFI Gathering can be taken now. Please look up the official KFI website ([kfionline.org](http://kfionline.org)) by September, 2021 for further information regarding the Gathering.

## **EXTRAORDINARY, NON-EXCLUSIVE ATTENTION BEGINS TO UNFOLD THE THINGS THAT ARE HIDDEN**

**J. KRISHNAMURTI (JK):** Before we resume our discussion, I think we ought to be very clear as to why we meet, what the purpose of these discussions is, and from what point of view we are talking these things over. If I may, I would like to restate why we are meeting and from what point of view we are discussing.

First of all, this is obviously not a debating society; so we can easily dispose of that. The second point is: I feel we ought to talk so as to discover the process of our own thinking because, after all, it is we, you and I, who are the problem and not the world. Because, in our relationship with another, we create the world – the economic, social conditions, nationalism, the Hindu or Muslim or Christian society. And as the world is in utter confusion and chaos, and as most of the leaders have failed, it is no good merely salvaging things from the burning house. What we have to do is to see the cause of the fire, why the house is collapsing, why the whole structure of society is disintegrating, not only in India but throughout the world. We have tried various remedies – economic, social, religious, communist, fascist, capitalist – but the various doctors to whom we went have not healed us. We are still in a state of confusion, we are still unhappy. I think we ought to be very clear on that point – that the remedy for the many ailments lies not somewhere else but in us, and the reformation is to be not in society but in ourselves.

Surely, that is the only point from which we should start the discussion. We ought to discuss that point very seriously if you are not clear and from there proceed and not assume that an outside remedy, socialistic or communistic, is going to heal us. It is

extremely difficult to be clear because we look to somebody else to heal us – a guru, a system, a doctor, and so on. The issue is whether any remedy can heal the patient – the patient being myself, you. After all, most of the wars, most of the catastrophes due to wrong thinking, have produced more and more chaos, more and more suffering for man. So we ought to take the whole issue and start from there and not discuss property by itself or loneliness by itself. I cannot see how there can be right thinking and therefore right action if I have no basis for my thinking. After all, if I do not know myself, whatever issues out of me will be ignorance, whatever remedy I apply to society must be useless, whether it be communistic, socialistic, or the capitalistic, or of the left or the right. If I do not know myself, surely there is no basis for thinking at all. I will only be influenced by a system, according to Marx or other people. So, is it not important to discuss and find out, be absolutely, emphatically clear that the house is burning, because it is built on a wrong structure, that the civilization about us which is crumbling is laid on sand and therefore cannot survive, and therefore mere reforms, mere superficial coatings giving it a new colour, a new shape are utterly useless? There cannot be a revolution within the structure of that house.

I do not know if you feel the urgency of this. I feel the urgency most profoundly, and I feel that those of us who sit together to discuss should feel not only the urgency of it, the immediate seriousness of it, but also that those who are trying to resolve the problems of the world should give time, thought, and energy to discover whether the house can be salvaged, the house being the structure of modern society; or whether, if it is collapsing, should any salvage be done; or whether the salvage, the remedies, the clearing of the slums should be left to the others. There must be a few who are creating, thinking of a new structure that will not break at the least pressure. Surely, that is the problem, is it not?

Cannot we first discuss whether there is not an urgency on the part of those who are yet awake, who are not completely asleep, who are not caught up in social activities, whether it is reform, chess, or amusement (to me, they are all the same)? What category of people are we, in what category of activity are we caught? Are we the salvagers, the reformers within the social structure that is collapsing, or are we those who are thinking out the problem anew and therefore creating or bringing about a new structure away from the present crisis? If once we discover that for ourselves without my persuasion, then we will know how to act, then we will know how to salvage, then we will have a basis for action. But without knowing whether to salvage or whether to build a new structure, to discuss vaguely about property has very little meaning.

So, can't we, before we discuss property, before we discuss loneliness and the various escapes, come to grips with all these? From where are you to start? Are you looking for a doctor to heal you – to put it differently – or have you given up all doctors and, therefore, saying, 'I must heal myself; I am humanity'? You are humanity, you and I are humanity; [it is] not some vague entity outside of you whom you are out to save or reform. So we ought to discuss completely to the end and not just leave it halfway, and be so clear that we shall not be confused by the very cunning, by the very learned, by those who have systems to operate.

See, I am very clear on that point because I have thought a great deal about it, not just outwardly, but watching it inwardly. I have thought about it; I have thought to the end of things. So if I think aloud, you will be persuaded by it. And if you can be persuaded by me, you can be persuaded by another and, therefore, persuasion has no value at all. Whereas, perhaps, if we can think it out together very seriously, very earnestly, [if we] talk it over – not dogmatically, not stupidly, not assertively – you and I will know,

without any compulsion, for ourselves. Because, on *that* depends our whole activity, our whole future existence. So, sirs, please, let us be very clear on that point.

**QUESTIONER (Q):** The problem is quite clear to you. You assumed that we feel unhappiness over the present state of things all over the world. Is that unhappiness possessed of anything like an identical character when two people think of it? It is unnatural for thinking to be alike. When we think of a thing, that thought must somehow or other be accompanied by some action which the individual thinks, feels honestly with reference to what others may think or say of it. Most of us were never worried about that unhappiness which now seems to afflict us. Only now, after two great wars, after independence for India, we still have difficulties; we feel as if the flesh is being pinched. All through human history, at all times, mankind in general had not been troubled by any problems. Therefore I suggest the problem of the world is not merely the problem of the individual.

**JK:** So you are saying the world problem is not my problem; the world with all its confusion has nothing to do with me as such. Of course I question that. That is what I want to find out. After all, what is the world? What is the thing that we call the world – the economic, social, religious structure? Somebody has created it – is that not so? Who has created it, except you and I, in our relationship? Is that a disputable point?

**Q:** I am not denying that. What I say is that my contribution to the world confusion is very little, and I am not the cause of the world's whole confusion.

**JK:** The world is the product of my own confusion. After all I am unhappy, and an unhappy man, a confused man, an embittered

man, a man of property, a man of system must create what he is. Now, what is my problem, what is our problem? How to live happily, how to live intelligently, sanely, without conflict with each other, if we can? That is, we want to live without conflict with our wives, with our neighbours. I am confused, unhappy, and I want to solve that problem. Surely, that is the issue. Is that not so?

**MAURICE FRIEDMAN (MF):** The difficulty seems to be this: when I say that the confusion in the world is created by me, I do not exactly understand how I create all this. The confusion was going on much before I was born. How did I create or come into the confusion or contribute to it and will I get out of it when I die? In what way do I become a contributor? – That is the thing that passes everybody’s understanding here. It may be that I have created confusion, but how exactly I have created the confusion I do not know. Or do you mean something like this: A man lives in a subjective world of his own and, as they say, the world is a reflection of the inner sense of man? So each one of us lives in a creation of his own, like bubbles hanging in the sky, and in that sense one is the creator of his own world. Is that the Vedantic idea that we have to take up?

**JK:** I do not know anything about Vedanta and its philosophy. I have a problem to solve, and I want to solve it, the problem being whether I have contributed to this mess in my relationship with another, whether I, as an individual, am responsible for it. That is what I want to know.

**MF:** You are responsible to a very little extent.

**JK:** I do not know. I am going to find out whether it is to a large extent or a little extent or whether I am responsible at all. I want to

find out the truth of that question. I am not going to be satisfied by your assertion that I am or I am not, either according to Vedantic philosophy or any other philosophy. I want to know the truth of it because that will decide my action. Now, to depend on an authority, however sacred, is absurd – isn't it? – because I want to find out something here. I am going to find an answer to it, and to quote Vedanta or Buddha or Marx is utterly futile.

**Q:** Sir, we have already tried to approach the question of confusion in two different ways. When we see the confusion and our relationship to it, there is the approach of social philosophy, which leads to a system of external effort. On the other hand, there is the approach which shows that the confusion is due to something inside me, and this leads to a form of belief, which is an effort to find my relationship to the confusion – that is, to what extent one is the effect, to what extent one is the cause. One leads to religious belief and the other to social systems. It is because both the leaders are at the moment in a blind alley that we are exactly where we started.

**JK:** But I do not accept a religious belief or a social system. I am starting as though I have heard the problem just now. As you explained, if I accept a religious system, or a system of the right or of the left, one leads to religious conditioning and the other to social conditioning. That is obvious. But I do not accept anything, either of the left or of the right: I want to find out. I am the laboratory, and I want to experiment. I want to find out for myself – not according to the left or the right, not according to any belief or system. Now, are you in that position? I am afraid you are not. That is one of your difficulties. You are either religiously committed up to the neck or socially committed up to the waist, because you are never committed wholly. Inwardly, you are more

committed, much more. So my problem is: I want to find out if, in my relationship to another, I am the cause of this confusion.

**MF:** It is obvious that I am the cause of confusion. I am confused and, therefore, I am the cause of confusion. Should I assume that I am the cause of all confusion? There is confusion in me, and I have to discover whether I am the cause of the confusion outside.

**JK:** My problem simply is this: I see there is confusion in the world. Wars, the left fighting the right, the extraordinary schism between religions, the social and economic divisions as nationalism, the caste system, the corruption, the political disgrace – I see this all about me in the world. That is an indisputable fact, is it not? Now, I want to know how it has come into being because I want to do something about it, not just sit on a platform and talk. I want to actively, earnestly do something about it, not just fool around with systems. So I ask myself, ‘How has this come into being?’ You will tell me that it has come into being through a system, the capitalist system, and so introduce another system and [through that] you will solve it. Which means you are emphasizing the system, not man. Therefore, to you, man is not important, but the system is, whether it is the capitalist system, the communistic system or any other system. The system then becomes important to you and not the healing of the patient. That is one way. Or you will say it is due to religion: ‘You do not believe enough, you have lost faith in God’, and so on. And that creates, again, another system. Only you clothe it in religion, give it a religious significance, but it is still a system.

So you give significance to the system, and the patient gets no attention at all. The patient is dying, and I say I want to heal the patient. How am I to do it? I am concerned with the patient. And who is the patient? *I* am the patient. I am ill; I am unhappy; I am

miserable; I am tortured by all this horror that is going on. And I say, 'I must find out how to heal the patient, which is me'. So when I am concerned with a system, I am not concerned with man, which is fairly obvious, isn't it? When the patient is ill, two doctors fighting over which is the best system of healing is not going to cure him. That is exactly what is happening in the world. Whether the system has produced unhappiness or the unhappiness has produced the system – we will leave that aside. So as I am ill, I want to know how to heal myself because you cannot heal me, because you are fighting over a system.

If it is clear, then let us proceed. You and I are confused, and whatever I do, whatever be my action, whatever be my thought, it must still be confused – which is obvious. So I must first cleanse myself, heal myself – which means that I, being a confused, sick person, have no right to go and salvage another. Which does not mean that I am selfish, that I am isolating myself by being engrossed in introspection. I have no right, if I am confused, to lead you into confusion; I have no right to accept leadership and to lead people.

You say you agree, [but] will you resign all your leaderships? You agree verbally, but when it comes to the point, you keep silent. Will you stop preaching, reforming, doing good works? You have to stop because you are confused. When I am confused, I will lead others into further confusion. What I am trying to do is to find out if you and I together cannot heal ourselves completely, because the urgency is imminent; it is demanding an immediate healing, not a healing tomorrow. Because, if I shall be healed day after tomorrow, I am still living with death, with destruction, with confusion. This is not a verbal discussion, not just to verbally fool around. When we say a confused man has no right to lead or to do

propaganda or to help others, when you agree, you are agreeing verbally; but do you realize fully the consequences?

**Q:** I may be confused about certain things, but clear about others. In matters that are clear, I can lead, I can give advice. What do you say?

**JK:** That lady's statement: I am clear in certain things and, therefore, in those things I can help, I can lead; in other things in which I am confused, I am going to keep quiet, I am going to do nothing.

You understand the problem, don't you? Is it not like this: If inwardly, the root, the foundation is shaky, hasn't got substance, then whatever action that comes out of it must also be confused? I may do some actions that are clear, but the root, the basis, is still confused. Being confused, I do not know what you are. I am confused; what shall I do? I know there are slums to be cleared, food to be given, I can do something, I do something. But where shall I lay the emphasis? – that is the problem. Of course I have to go to my office tomorrow, I have to go and earn money, I have to do certain things. But on what shall I lay emphasis? I lay emphasis on clearing up my confusion, which does not mean withdrawing from society into a mountain top. Shall I dissipate my time and energy in social reform, in doing little bits of good here and there? What would you advise me to do?

**Q:** (*Not recorded*)

**JK:** The gentleman says I should do both: do a little reform here and there, *and* ... Either he says it seriously or he is flippant. I take it that he is serious. I am going to take every statement seriously; therefore please be serious. He says they act upon each other,

which is perfectly true; that is, I am aware of confusion only in my relationship with you, with my cook, with my wife, with my servant. I am aware of my confusion only in relationship, whether it be with property or family. Therefore I must keep in contact with property; I cannot withdraw from it. But still on what shall I lay emphasis? I know I am related. I have a room; shall I lose myself in keeping the room in order? I have a family; shall I lose myself in rearranging the family system? Shall I lose myself in introducing new sets of ideas? On what shall I lay emphasis? Because, I am the problem. I am confused, and in my confusion if I lay emphasis on property, I shall not solve the problem of property. Isn't that clear? In clearing up my confusion, I shall help others. We are clearing up little bits of confusion as we go along. Confusion is not an ultimate thing, it is every moment, and we are clearing up as we go along.

So I want to know on what I should lay emphasis. I must be free from the leader, from the religious books in order to be practical. Therefore I must first free myself from the past in order to be practical. That is exactly what we are just trying to do. I cannot be practical all of a sudden because I do not know what to choose from among this messy stuff. I may think about it from moment to moment without prejudice, intelligently, but the very thought is prejudiced. I want to know how to help you. I want to heal you, I want to do something. Are we not caught in this idea that we must do something before we understand? – ‘At all costs, let us be active, for God's sake do something!’

If you want to know on what you should lay emphasis, it means that you lay emphasis on your own confusion and, then, you are not going to lead people. But are you saying that because at present you are not a leader? [But if you are serious], your problem then is that you and I are directly concerned – we are not talking about others for the moment – and that we lay emphasis on the confusion

in ourselves. That lady says, 'I will help where I am clear'. [But] unless I know what the purpose of teaching is, what shall I teach? Surely, if the educationist is confused, what else can he teach except mathematics?

**MF:** It looks to me that we have no time to tackle our own confusion because we are busy. Now, we have no courage to reduce the amount of engagements, to reduce our work. On the contrary, the more I am confused the more work I take up, thinking that by taking up more work or extending the existing work, I will be less confused. But my experience is always that the more work I take up, the more I am confused. Yet I have not the courage to give up that attraction and reduce work to the barest minimum, so that I have enough time and energy left to clear up the confusion. Now, the question is: What will make me give myself a chance?

**JK:** If I give right emphasis, then I shall have time; giving the right emphasis itself creates time. Then I am interested, then I am focussed. After all, if I am interested in making money, I am at it all day long. Even if I go to sleep, I am thinking of how to dupe others; the background is making money because I have laid emphasis on it. Similarly, if you lay [right] emphasis, you will have time; there is instantaneous creation of time. It is not 'how?' to create time, but you have time. When you, as a painter, love painting, then every movement of the tree, every shadow, every flutter has a meaning; you are watching, you are feeling it all the time. Though you are cooking, you are eating, talking, the emphasis is there, on the very act of painting. Similarly, if you lay emphasis on the right thing, you have time. Not that you have to create time. Therefore we must talk this out very clearly and carefully. I am confused, and I have my social obligations, family, earning money, etc. On what shall I lay emphasis? Because, on that my whole life will depend. If I say property, family, idea, I am

going to work those out, then I will give time to it. But if I say my emphasis is this, then I have time, there is instantaneous time. So when Friedman asks 'How to create time?' he is putting a wrong question, if I may say so.

**MF:** Mentally, I know that I should lay emphasis on confusion, but I don't do it.

**JK:** Is that it? We are trying to find out what to lay emphasis on, whether on the confusion in which I live or on the superficial activities that are taking up my time. I cannot stop my activities. I have a family, I have to earn money.

**MF:** My problem simply is this: I know mentally that I am in confusion and that unless I solve the problem, whatever I do is confusion. Yet I have to do things for some reason or the other. In practice I find that I am so engrossed in thoughts that the problem of confusion disappears completely from moment to moment. Therefore I feel I am in confusion only when I come to a meeting or read a book, for a few minutes a day or half an hour a day. The rest of the time is taken up by the happy routine of daily activity. Now, we know we have to shift our attention to our confusion, but we are not doing it.

**JK:** The very idea of shifting is wrong because that implies a time process. Either it is so or it is not so, which is not a dogmatic statement. Either you immediately feel the importance of laying the emphasis or not. If you do not, let us discuss it. Why it is that you don't? – It's because you are not clear in yourselves, it is not strong and vital. I say, 'Lay the emphasis rightly'. You are waiting for an answer. I cannot give you an answer. We can discuss and see the difficulties, and you will find the answer. If I tell you what

it is, you either follow it or deny it, but you are still in confusion, and your problem is not solved.

**MF:** The main problem is that none of us has the ability or the energy to lay the right emphasis. We are simply not sharp enough, quick enough; the situation does not seem to be so overwhelming, so urgent, so burning. We merely think about it slowly, and we are deeply attached to the routine. Mentally we are stimulated, we want to know, and we recognize that there is something wrong with us; we are slightly frightened, and the chance may come when we must do something quickly, but in reality we do not care. In reality we are quite ready to leave things as they are.

**JK:** He says we are tepid, lukewarm. It is not a problem; therefore there is no way out. We are not now discussing how to be active, how to give up this lukewarm-ness. But, as I explained, in understanding the problem we will see the issue more and more. That gentleman says, ‘We cannot be confused about everything. There are certain points on which we are not confused, some technical points: how to build a bridge, how to create a dam, how to produce electricity, and so on’. But we are confused in those things that matter enormously, that is, in human relationships. We are not confused in the production of motor cars, but we are very confused as to who is going to produce it and about the relationship between the boss and the labourer. That is what we are discussing, not the technique. Even there, there are great many disputes. But in everything else we are confused, in things that matter, in our human relationship, and it is that that we are discussing. There is confusion in the world, and there is confusion in me. I do not know who started it; that is not my point yet.

On what shall I lay emphasis – on the confusion outside me or the confusion in me? You will say, ‘Lay emphasis on the confusion

outside if that confusion has produced the confusion inside'. If the outward confusion has produced the inward confusion, then you must alter the outward confusion, you must lay emphasis on the outward confusion. But if you say, 'The inward confusion has produced the outward confusion, or the outward confusion is the projection of the inward confusion', then we must lay emphasis on the inward condition, which is that systems cannot alter human beings. They – systems – can condition them, they can modify them, they can give a coating, but the seed of corruption is in my own being.

So, on what shall I lay emphasis – on the confusion outside me or on the confusion in me? Whether man is made for a system or man makes the system, however good, he will twist it to suit himself, as has been shown over and over again in history. On what do I lay emphasis? See why I am asking the question. I am asking because I am related. I cannot escape from the world activities, family, earning money, and all the rest of it. By laying emphasis on that, I shall get lost. And yet I must give the right emphasis. And I will give the right emphasis to it when I give right emphasis to things that matter. Whenever I give right emphasis, I shall act rightly in my relationship to the outward confusion. If I give wrong emphasis, then the outward confusion becomes too significant and therefore drowns me. Surely, sir, that problem is clear, isn't it? If it is clear, then what happens?

**Q:** Sir, even if I feel the intense necessity of clearing up the confusion within me and the necessity of putting the right emphasis on that which matters, how can I do it when my mind is not clear, when it is full of confusion?

**JK:** Surely, we are doing that now. We are clearing a little bit of our confusion. By talking it over, I am already beginning to see,

and by laying the emphasis I am finding out. I acknowledge I am confused, and I come to you and ask on what I shall lay emphasis. [No], I do not ask for your advice; we are discussing, and by talking over we are beginning to realize, I am laying emphasis on the right thing.

So what shall I lay emphasis on? If I lay emphasis on my inward confusion, then the consequences of that emphasis are very clear. Reform becomes insignificant – not that it is not important; it becomes of secondary importance. Therefore I shall not fight, butcher another because he belongs to the left or to the right. But I shall butcher if I lay the emphasis on the outer. Surely that is clear, is it not?

I am beginning to read the book of confusion page by page, paragraph by paragraph. There is a book of confusion – which is me – in front of me, and I am reading it paragraph by paragraph. The more I know of confusion, the lesser the confusion. The more I know of something, the less confused it is. Take, for instance, the motor. The more I look at it, the more I study, the more clear it becomes. Haven't you tried it? I have, I know what it means. Before it was a puzzle, and by undoing it very carefully I found out how it works. Similarly, here is confusion, and I must know all about it, not just one or two chapters and say, 'I have understood it'. So I must study it. I must approach it from every angle, which is what we are doing. And by doing that, my attention is focussed more and more on the thing that matters – now, not tomorrow. If I lay emphasis on my inward confusion, then the consequences of that are, as I am reading the book of confusion, I must be very tentative in my outward action; obviously. I cannot be emphatic at all. I cannot say, 'That is all right, they all go together'. You know what that means. Your reform then is a tentative reform. Will you have a following if you have a tentative reform? Will you become

a leader if you are tentative about anything? Sir, you don't see the consequences; that is why you agree so eagerly.

My emphasis is on the inner confusion, but if you lay emphasis on the outer, see the consequences of it, the implications of it. Then the system becomes important. When you lay emphasis on the outward confusion, you forget man. You may talk about not forgetting man, but the inevitable consequence will be that you are bound to forget the patient, which is what is happening. Who is interested in man? They are interested in systems, and in the meantime the patient is dying. Again, when you lay emphasis on the remedies, you are not laying emphasis on the diagnosis of the patient. I am still reading the book of confusion. I have just begun, I am just reading the first page of it. I find that when I lay emphasis on the outer, the consequences are that systems, ideologies, beliefs, doctors and leaders become very important, which is what has happened in the world. This is a fact.

But if I lay emphasis on my inward confusion – the second paragraph – in laying emphasis on it, my values with regard to the outer activity undergo a fundamental change; they are completely modified. Though I do not abandon outward activities they have assumed a modification, which means there is a tentative approach, which means reform. When I say 'reform', it is quick, it is a revolution, it is an end. Therefore no government can stand on that position, can be stable. And I discover that a government must be violent in its very nature when it is assertive. When it is tentative, then perhaps there can be no violence. But the moment it is assertive, dogmatic, it has to be violent, and all governments are violent – including yours. Though you may talk about non-violence, the result is violence. Governments have to be violent.

So when I lay emphasis on the inner and you agree, are you in a position, inwardly, practically, directly, honestly, to say, ‘I understand; these outward things in which I am indulging have very little meaning? I have to earn money, but I am not giving my whole heart and soul to money. I am a family man; I know I do not love my family, which is most unfortunate, but there it is, and I have to support them. Without my beliefs I may lead them tentatively’? Are you in that position?

You see, you are now silent. Are you tentative about your little or big fortune? Little fortunes, yes. Where am I by being tentative? No, sir. Therefore do not agree. Which means the little bank account you want to make into a big bank account. The difficulty is that we are not honest in our thinking. I am discovering that I have to be extremely honest if I want to understand confusion. And I cannot approach it with a dishonest mind, with a prejudiced mind – that is, I lay emphasis on my inner confusion, but also lay emphasis on a good bank account. To lay emphasis on the right thing I need an extraordinarily honest mind, not a slipshod mind; I need a mind that is very honest *not* a sincere mind. A sincere mind is no mind at all; a sincere mind is merely stuck in a groove. I have found that also in understanding confusion – that we do not need sincerity. You know the honesty of clear thinking?

**Q:** What is the difference?

**JK:** Surely, there is a great deal of difference. I am using the words ‘sincere’ and ‘honest’. You may find difficulty with the use of the words. A mind which is sincere is sincere to something – perhaps the word ‘loyal’ may be better. But a man who is honest is *not* honest to something; he is not seeking an answer to anything. A man who may be sincere is committed to something; he may be sincere to something, but he is not seeking at all. We pick up

things which do not matter because we are evading the main issue. If I lay emphasis on my inward confusion, then I have to give tentative importance, which is secondary importance, to belief, property, to name. Are you in that position? We are discussing very honestly, thinking directly – are we in that position? But when I lay emphasis on the outer, belief becomes very important, for which I am willing to slaughter millions. The name, my title, what I am, the B.A.s and M.A.s, all the rest of it become important; then my bank account becomes very important. Whereas if I lay emphasis on the inward confusion, then these things assume secondary importance.

Now, on what are you laying emphasis? Don't you know? Does that need a great deal of thinking, sir? There it is, you know it. On what are you laying emphasis? Belief matters very much to you, doesn't it? Doesn't it matter to you very much? Names, titles, degrees – don't they matter very much to you? Doesn't money matter really a lot? So you are laying emphasis on the outer. Therefore systems matter. You may deny the uselessness of systems, but systems matter to you. Leadership matters in no small measure. Earlier you agreed, now you have become silent.

So, sir, that is our difficulty. You are confused, but you don't want to pay the price for it. You want by some miracle to be transformed into clarity. Therefore you are relying on the socialistic system, and if that fails, you will go to the communistic system, and if that fails you will go back to the capitalistic system, and if that fails you will go back to some religious system. In other words, we want some miraculous things to make us clear. So you are really not interested in the inner confusion. Are you, sirs? 'I believe in God', but it is of secondary importance; 'I have a B.A. degree, but it is of secondary importance' – do you say that? Let us be honest and very clear in our thinking.

**Q:** There is a constant conflict of values, which is the nature of confusion.

**JK:** I am not discussing the nature of confusion. We will go into that. We will diagnose the patient afterwards when I have learnt the diagnosis. But I cannot study the patient with half-heartedness; I must give my whole attention to the patient. Those of you who want to keep one foot on this and the other foot on the other, it is your misfortune. But those who want to put both their feet in the other, with those let us proceed.

Now, if I lay emphasis on inward confusion, then I must give my whole heart and mind to it, and that demands an extraordinary pliability, because the confusion is by its very nature swift. Confusion is living; it is not static. I must be as swift as the modification of values, which happens every second. When I am interested in something, I am very swift, am I not? When you are interested in money, your mind is as sharp as a blade. When you are interested in pursuing, giving rein to passion, you know how extraordinarily clever it is. So when you want to understand this inward confusion, you must give your mind and heart to it.

Have you given your mind and heart to it? (Some have? Five out of ten? Many more? I don't believe it!) So, then, what happens? I am giving emphasis to my inward confusion, which does not mean that I withdraw from it. Then I am in a position to find out the whole workings of the thinker, the feeler, the actor, the man who is confused. I am now in a position to investigate every movement of thought. Before I was not, but now I have given my whole being to find out. What does that mean?

**Q:** What do you examine thought with?

**JK:** That we will go into tomorrow. I just want to point out that when you give your mind and heart to something, that very giving itself, that attention, that extraordinary, non-exclusive attention, begins to unfold the things that are hidden. Now I am concerned with understanding the confusion I live in. I have turned over a new chapter altogether. My mind is not distracted. I am really, earnestly concerned with understanding the confusion. Then I want to know the causes of this confusion, which means I must discover the causes. Because, I have finished with all leaders; I have finished with all books: the *Bhagavad Gita*, the *Bible*, Marx, and the psychological books; through with all. See the importance of this. Please understand the importance of laying emphasis on the inward confusion. If you lay emphasis on it, you cannot look to a book, can you? When I give my whole attention to the understanding of my inward confusion, I must not look to a book or to an authority.

In other words, I am alone – not isolated. I am alone with my problem, and that loneliness is not isolation, but in the relationship between you and me I am solving it. (I do not know if I am making myself clear.) If I lay emphasis on the inward confusion, then I have no reference, I have no authority, no guru, no book, because the reference, the authority, the book, the leader, all belong to the emphasis on the outer. Therefore, in laying emphasis on this confusion, I am alone. Not alone as isolation, but alone in my understanding in my relationship with you. I cannot understand this confusion without relationship, but to understand the relationship I must be alone, obviously, which means being uninfluenced. You know how difficult all what I am saying is?

**Q:** In understanding the confusion, should not I have the help of books?

**JK:** I have made that clear. In emphasizing the book or in looking to the book, I am emphasizing the help of another; therefore I have entered into the wrong emphasis. I may look at a book or I may not, but the emphasis has gone out of it. The word is not the thing. The word ‘God’ is not God. If one really understood that, it would have a significance. We will go into it at another time.

**MF:** I do not know if this is the best way of conducting the discussion. We have had already two or three discussions, and they were distressing.

**JK:** They won’t be distressing. At least I am going to stick to them. These discussions are meant to reveal your own self. You can either really utilize them or play with them. And I want to prevent you from playing with them. I am really concerned with those few who say, ‘I want to find out’, and I will discuss with them completely to the end because we will find out what the truth, what the beauty of this confusion is. There is beauty, sir, as we read a few chapters. Then the very confusion undergoes a change. It does not create a sense of horror. As you read, you see the beauty of it, the pattern of it, the extraordinary subtlety of it.

*Bombay, 22 January, 1948*

## ON CONFUSION

**J. KRISHNAMURTI (JK):** Look, I am confused. That's a fact. And I see that whatever action I do, whatever activity I indulge in – whether I commit myself to a political party, communist, socialist – is absurd, because I am confused. And whatever I do in my relationship is still confused. So I say, 'First, I have to learn about this confusion'. Right? I have to learn it; I must know what it is. I can know only what it is when I know how to look at it. Right? I can only look at it if I don't say, 'How terrible! I must change it; I'm frightened of it'. I can only look at it when there is no evaluating or censor in the look. Now, I've learnt that. Can I look at this confusion without the censor? Can I? Do it, sir.

**QUESTIONER (Q):** I think I do, and then ...

**JK:** We will go into it. If I can do that, I am already beginning to understand what meditation is, because I have learnt one of the greatest things. We look at things through tradition, which is: to condemn, judge, accept the censor. I reject tradition. I've learnt that. Therefore I can look at this confusion without judgment. Is this clear? Can we go on with this?

**Q:** This is jumping ahead, but I want you just to keep this question in mind. You think that when one is not censoring, when one is trying to be impartial to the confusion ...

**JK:** Ah, not impartial – you see ...

**Q:** When one is not censoring ...

**JK:** Yes ...

**Q:** I may be all wrong about this. As the confusion is going on, what is not censoring?

**JK:** Is this what you mean, sir? Would there not be confusion as long as there is a censor? Is this what you mean?

**Q:** I am trying to express a moving process – as there is confusion, to try to institute another state of non-censoring.

**JK:** That's right. That is what we are doing now.

**Q:** Well, one is confused all the time. In other words, one wants to constantly have the state of non-censoring, and since one is always confused there must be something that is standing aside from the confusion and looking at it.

**JK:** Yes, I understand, sir, quite.

**Q:** Is there any entity apart from the confusion which can look at it without ..?

**JK:** I understand. That is what I am proposing, sir. That is, is it – the observer – not the very entity that brings confusion? There is no confusion there, and I am different from that confusion. But I am confusion. No?

**Q:** Are there actually different parts of us, inside, which are the confusions, and also the observer which is ..?

**JK:** That's right. That is, some part of us is clarity and the rest is confusion. That is, to put in different terms: There is the observer who is not confused looking at confusion.

Is this all getting too complex? Yes, sir?

**Q:** Do you mean then that whatever we are thinking (it doesn't matter what kind of thought we are thinking) or whatever kind of action we are doing, it is like you sort of just observe that it is there without making any change or anything, but just observing it's there – you know, just like when you go by a store and your shadow happens to be in a mirror when you walk by it?

**JK:** A little more than that, sir. Surely it is much more than that. Now, sir, wait a minute. Let's look at a much simpler issue than confusion.

You are jealous – one is jealous; not you, sir – one is jealous. Is jealousy different from the person who feels it?

**Q:** Yes, jealousy is a word.

**JK:** Jealousy is a word; the word is not the thing. Wait, look at it. Do look at it. Behind that word, the feeling which we call jealousy – for the moment we will give it a name – is that jealousy different from the person who says, 'I am jealous'?

**Q:** That's his thought, his feeling, his emotion ...

**JK:** Isn't the observer, the feeler, the experiencer the same as the experience – here, 'jealousy'?

**Q:** At that instant.

**JK:** At that moment.

**Q:** Yes.

**JK:** That's all I'm saying: At that instant the experiencer is the experienced. Now, wait a minute. So there is confusion. It isn't – I am not confused but there is confusion. I am confusion. No?

**Q:** Why do you reject the word 'impartiality' to describe that observer seeing ..?

**JK:** Sir, impartiality – what does that word 'impartial' mean? – To be neutral?

**Q:** Well, without becoming either the one or the other.

**JK:** Yes, all right – which is what? Because partial, impartial, you know all that ...

**Q:** But can you see with this clear state and still be confused with those outside things?

**JK:** Sir, if you don't mind, we are putting the question differently. Here I am; I am confused. I am asking myself: Is the confusion different from the me that says I am confused?

**Q:** No.

**JK:** No? Is it different?

**Q:** Yes.

**JK:** Yes?

**Q:** Yes, I think it is.

**JK:** Why?

**Q:** Well, I think when you set up the subject-object, when you say, 'I have a mind, I have a body, I have emotions', or, 'I have a mind, and anything that comes from the mind is part of the mind', then you have set up two things, and they are not the same.

**JK:** Therefore, the mind separates it.

**Q:** The mind is not the 'I' that has the mind.

**JK:** Can you have the mind without the feeling, without saying, 'I am not that, I am this'?

**Q:** If you say, 'I am not this, I am not that'...

**JK:** But who is the entity that says that?

**Q:** That is what you find out by meditating. (*Laughter*)

**JK:** Wait. You see, you see! You see how they slip out? (*Laughter*) We escape through a word. I refuse to escape through a word. Yes, sir?

**Q:** It seems that the observer can always be permanent, whereas the states that we call jealousy ...

**JK:** Yes, sir. That is, the observer is the censor.

**Q:** And he can be a permanent ...

**JK:** And he is permanent, for most of us. He is the entity that is judging, evaluating because of his tradition, of his conditioning. If

I was brought up in Tibet, I wouldn't accept certain values as you do here. So the acceptance of that value is the entity who is conditioned, who is the observer – *that* becomes a permanent ...

**Q:** Of course we can't call those states like jealousy or happiness ...

**JK:** No, the censor is what may be called the 'permanent' – let's put it in quotes – he may not be permanent. So, let's come back: Is confusion different from me? Please, find out.

**Q:** Yes.

**JK:** Why?

**Q:** Your confusion is dependent on your awareness of that confusion, and there is always a part of us that is not involved in this confusion.

**JK:** Therefore, you are saying there is a part of me that is not confused and knows what confusion is and what it is not. So you are saying, there is an uncontaminated part which is always clear.

**Q:** I'd rather not use the word 'contaminated' or uncontaminated, because I can't undo it ...

**JK:** I am using that word quickly, sir. There is a part of me which is always clear.

**Q:** Yes.

**JK:** Now, why do I say that? Why do we say that? You know, what you are saying, sir, is put in different words in India. The

‘Higher self’, ‘lower self’, the ‘*atman*’, the ‘ego’ – all these words are used to indicate there is a part which is not this. Right? Do look at it carefully. Look at it, sir. There is a part of me – call it what you like – which is timeless, which is not bogged down. Now, first of all, how do I know it?

**Q:** By experience.

**JK:** Wait, wait. You think about it, don’t you?

**Q:** No, not anymore.

**JK:** Not anymore, but to say there is an entity in me which is not of this quality ...

**Q:** I said it was not confused; I didn’t say it was not necessarily of this quality!

**JK:** ... of this confusion – I am using different words – there is part of me which is not confused. How did that part – please, I am very serious, because this is a very serious question – how do you know that part? Or is it a wish, or you have thought about it and established it as something separate from this? It must be related by thought; otherwise, you couldn’t have it. Wait, see the importance. Just a minute, sir.

Sir, man, throughout the world, has accepted that there is a permanent entity – call it the soul, the *atman*, God, whatever it is. First of all, he establishes that because everything is fleeting, moving, changing, he wants something which is permanent, which is secure, which is whole, which is light, which is not confused, and so on. That means, he must know it through thought. Otherwise, how does he know it? The moment he knows it, it

belongs to the realm of thought. (I am not trying to corner you, sir, please.) And what you can think about is the result of thought, and thought is the past. Thought is *always* the old. So, if you think about something which is clarity, thought has created it, otherwise you can't think about it.

**Q:** I still don't see how your thought process which involves a number of steps really is opposed to what I said.

**JK:** Sir, first of all, I don't know anything about having an entity, a part of me that is clear. I don't admit it. I don't know. I may invent it. I may want it, I may hope for it. It may be something I have sought and created and put in there, but I know nothing about it, I won't even accept it, because that leads to duality.

**Q:** No, I don't think so. It does according to the way you approach things, but as I see it, it is an experience, it is a part of life. As you said, it is life, it is experience. What thinking has encouraged me to do when I find myself confused is to relax the body, because confusion finds itself running through the body in a very physical way – it sets up certain patterns of mind which become familiar and therefore you can let them pass through. So there are a number of things that can be done, practically ...

**JK:** Oh, yes, yes; I know that, sir.

**Q:** ... whereby you resolve the confusion. You see the origin of your confusion. You have done something about it. It goes and becomes rather amusing, usually.

**JK:** But, sir, may I say (I am not talking about you, sir) that one has to doubt every experience? What do we mean by 'experience'? Let's take that one word – what do we mean by 'experience'?

**Q:** That is the part of us ... You said that we must have an experience and we do have that experience – I think *that* is the proof of the permanent part of us.

**JK:** What?

**Q:** The doubting of the experience is that which is permanently clear.

**JK:** No, sir. Please, sir, first find out: What do we mean by ‘experience’? To experience a feeling, to experience a sunset, to experience pleasure – experience, to go through. I have an experience. If I recognize it, then it is an experience. If I don’t recognize it, it is not an experience. Wait, sir; go slow, go slow, go slow. That is, experience involves recognition, otherwise, how do I know that I have experienced?

**Q:** You don’t necessarily have to consciously know that you have experienced in order for that experience to condition your behaviour. In other words, we can experience things through the subconscious without being conscious of it, and our subconscious then determines our behaviour.

**JK:** Sir, wait a minute. The unconscious, the subconscious must also recognize the experience, otherwise, you couldn’t retain it.

**Q:** The subconscious might recognize the experience but the conscious may not.

**JK:** Wait. The unconscious, subconscious, whatever, the hidden part of the mind must recognize every experience, otherwise there is no experience. If I don’t recognize you because I have seen you

yesterday, I haven't seen you. So, recognition is implied implicitly in the whole process of experiencing.

**Q:** There is a difference, though, between conscious recognition and unconscious recognition.

**JK:** I may unconsciously recognize and the conscious mind may not recognize. Or the other way round. But recognition is essential for experience. Go step by step, sir. Therefore, recognition implies the past. I meet you today, otherwise – sir, wait a minute – you have been introduced to me, I know you, we have met each other, and tomorrow I meet you again. I recognize you. That is, the memory of yesterday meeting you remains with me, and when I meet you tomorrow, I recognize you. So, recognition, conscious or unconscious, is essential to experience. Why? Recognition implies the thing that has been. Therefore, I am experiencing with something which I have known. Otherwise, it is not an experience. So when I say, there is a part of me which is not confused, I have recognized it as non-confusion, because I have experienced it. Because I have experienced it, it is already in the past and therefore a contributory cause to confusion. Got it! (*Laughter*)

No, please, we are not being logical. I am just – you see, I am trying to understand this whole process of confusion, whether the mind can ever be free of confusion; not just partly, but without duality. Duality implies confusion.

**Q:** The mind implies duality. Duality seems to me to be implicit in the content of the mind.

**JK:** Is it? We think so. It may not be. And it may be. Therefore, is it possible for the mind to go beyond itself?

**Q:** Then it is not thinking.

**JK:** Ah, no, no. Something else happens. We will go into that. So, I am confused and I am not different from that confusion. Then, what am I to do? See the question, sir? I am confused, and confusion is not different from me who says, 'I am confused.' Right? I am confusion. Then what am I to do, knowing that whatever I do leads to further confusion? Sir, this is what they call in Zen a problem – you are faced with it.

**Q:** A *koan*.

**JK:** *Koan* – that's it. You are faced with this problem. That is, my mind says, 'I am confused', and this confusion is me, is not something separate from me. It also says, 'I cannot act, because if I act, I further bring about confusion'. Therefore, what am I to do? You see the position? I must act; I can't live in confusion. So what am I to do? Please, do remain with this for two minutes. I am confusion. I must act, but whatever I do leads to further confusion. Therefore, what am I to do?

**Q:** Sir, the obvious answer to the question is observe the confusion.

**JK:** No, no. No, no.

**Q:** May I just go back one step?

**AUDIENCE (A):** No.

**Q:** Could you stop giving obvious answers to the questions and just listen?

**JK:** Sir, don't go back. What is the difficulty, sir?

**Q:** I am angry or I am jealous, and in the state of anger or jealousy, I recognize and understand that I am of this thing. But what is it in me that recognizes these things?

**JK:** Sir, then that means you have divided – there is a division between the recognition and the fact. It is the same thing, sir.

**Q:** The understanding that I am confused is not an act of confusion.

**JK:** No.

**Q:** Therefore, there is more in me than confusion.

**JK:** No, sir.

**Q:** That is what I am asking.

**JK:** I know that is what you are asking, sir. That is going back again. Sir, I am confused. I am not different from that confusion. You cannot say, 'My arm is different from me'. I am the arm. The pain which I have – toothache, tummy ache, or whatever it is – the pain that I have is me; it is not something apart from me. So, in the same way, I am confused. Please, do stick to this one thing for a few minutes. I am confused. Not that there is a division between me and confusion; there is only confusion. And there is the realization that whatever one does out of this confusion furthers, breeds, engenders – whatever word – more confusion. And I must act. I can't just say, 'I am confused', and just remain. Therefore, what am I to do?

*(Pause)*

What do you do when you are lost in a wood? Have you ever been lost in a wood? Probably you have never been – too bad!

*(Laughter)* What do you do? You stop, don't you? You don't go round and round in circles – you stop and look, right? Now, you are confused, and knowing that any action furthers confusion, what do you do? You stop. Right? Can you stop? Not say, 'Well, I must find an answer, I must look, I must understand it, I must ...' Chatter, chatter, chatter ... Can you just stop, knowing that whatever you do furthers confusion? Therefore, the very problem makes you stop, doesn't it? No? If you have stopped, then you can look, can't you? That looking is different from the mind that looks at its own confusion. I wonder if you are getting this. I am confused, I don't know what to do, so I stop. Stopping means not asking anybody what to do, not chattering, not trying to escape, not trying to resolve it, because all those actions are part of the confusion. Therefore, as I can't do anything, there is stopping. When there is a stopping, the mind becomes quiet. Right? So, such a quiet mind is not a confused mind. Right?

**Q:** You mean by stopping, not thinking?

**JK:** Not thinking – quite right, sir. I didn't want to use that word 'thinking' because that involves a great deal.

So, as we were saying yesterday, if you were here, the chattering that goes on when I am confused, anxious, is part of the old brain. The new brain is when it recognizes that the old brain can't do

anything, and therefore the old brain becomes quiet, and the new brain then acts, which is entirely different from the action of confusion. I don't know if you are getting this.

**Q:** Where does the new brain come from?

**JK:** Where does the new brain come from? The new brain is part of this whole cerebrum, part of the whole structure of the brain.

**Q:** Why won't it be as dualistic as the old brain?

**JK:** No, it cannot be, because so far we have looked at everything with the old brain, which is always looking with duality. Forget the old brain-new brain; leave that for the moment. When I am confused, can I stop searching, asking, looking? Now, when I am confused, my urge is to find out how to get out of this confusion. But knowing that the urge is part of this confusion, that very understanding of this brings a stoppage – if I can use that word – the whole movement of thought comes to an end. Then I can look and that look is entirely different.

Now, I call this, this whole process – which involves much more in it – the way of meditation. I am angry, jealous, ambitious, greedy, violent, whatever it is – I am not different from violence. Therefore, there is no non-violence. I am violence. The invention of an ideology of non-violence is a dualistic process and, therefore, it has no validity at all. Therefore, I am violence, and whatever I do is violence. Even if I join a pacifist group, I am violent, because I want to be the leader, I want this or that, and I want prominence and all the rest of it. Therefore, I am violence.

So my mind says: As long as I work with violence, there must be duality. And therefore, can I look without violence? And it is only possible when thought comes to an end, which is to stop.

Right, sir? Are you doing it?

*2<sup>nd</sup> Public Dialogue, New York, 11 October, 1968*  
(Previously published in *KFA Bulletin No. 92, 2018, pp. 5-17*)

### OBITUARY

#### **Dr T.K. Parchure (1929-2021)**

Dr Trimbak Krishnarao Parchure, a trained ophthalmologist, who devotedly served Krishnaji as his personal physician died on 10th January 2021. He was born in Nagpur on 23rd June 1929.

Dr Parchure's knowledge of medicine extended far beyond his training as an eye doctor. His diagnostic skills derived from a wide platform of Ayurvedic, Homeopathic and Allopathic disciplines.

After Krishnaji died, he resigned as a trustee of the Foundation, but continued to assist the Foundations in organising the Krishnamurti Archives. A collection of what he considered to be Krishnamurti's essential teachings were transcribed on birch bark, papyrus leaves and acid free paper. He arranged for the collection, which he shared with special friends, to be buried in time capsules in different parts of the world.

He died in Pune on 10th January 2021 and is survived by his wife Vatsala, two sons (Vikram and Vishwas) and grandchildren.

**Statement About Ownership And  
Other Particulars Of The  
Krishnamurti Foundation India Bulletin  
FORM IV**

1. Place of Publication:

Krishnamurti Foundation India  
'Vasanta Vihar'  
124, 126 (Old-64/65)  
Greenways Road  
Chennai – 600 028.

2. Periodicity of Publications:

Once in six months  
(January and July)

3. Printer's Name:

N. Subramanian

Whether citizen of India:

Yes

Address:

Sudarsan Graphics Pvt. Ltd  
4/641, 12th Link Street  
3rd Cross Road, Nehru Nagar  
Kottivakkam (OMR)  
Chennai – 600 041.

4. Publisher's Name:

V. Aravindan

Whether citizen of India:

Yes

Address:

Krishnamurti Foundation India  
'Vasanta Vihar'  
124, 126 (Old-64/65)  
Greenways Road  
Chennai – 600 028.

5. Editor's Name:

Dr Radhika Herzberger

Address:

Krishnamurti Foundation India  
'Vasanta Vihar'  
124, 126 (Old-64/65)  
Greenways Road  
Chennai – 600 028.

6. Name and address of individuals  
who own the newspaper and partners  
or shareholders holding more than  
one percent of the total capital:

Krishnamurti Foundation India  
'Vasanta Vihar'  
124, 126 (Old-64/65),  
Greenways Road  
Chennai – 600 028.

I, Dr V. Aravindan, hereby declare that the particulars given  
are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Dated: July, 2021

Sd/- V. Aravindan  
Signature of  
Publisher

**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 S024 OLQ, UK. All rights reserved.

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

Published by Dr V. Aravindan 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 Sudarsan Graphics Pvt. Ltd, 4/641, 12th Link Street, 3rd Cross Road, Nehru Nagar, Kottivakkam (OMR), Chennai – 600 041.

**KFI BULLETIN, ENGLISH  
SUBSCRIPTION FORM**

Annual Subscription (India)	Rs 50.00
Annual Subscription (Foreign)	US\$ 5.00
Five-year Subscription (India)	Rs 250.00

Please send 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 50/Rs 250/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)	Rs 1000.00
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 Dr V. Aravindan 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 Sudarsan Graphics Pvt. Ltd, 4/641,  
12th Link Street, 3rd Cross Road, Nehru Nagar, Kottivakkam (OMR),  
Chennai – 600 041.