

# On Thought and Memory: Jiddu Krishnamurti

Daryl Sherriff

## Abstract

This paper comprises a short introduction to one aspect of the work of Jiddu Krishnamurti. The main concern is to outline a distinction between factual and psychological memory that Krishnamurti brings our attention to. The first of these, factual memory, it is pointed out, is essential for us to be able to perform the tasks that make everyday life possible. Psychological memory, in contrast, involves recording away the pain and pleasure of certain experiences along with the memory of those experiences. These psychological memories interfere with future experience and become a cause of conflict in the world. Recognizing this is the first step in bringing about a reduction in such conflict.

In this paper I would like to examine one very small aspect of the work of Jiddu Krishnamurti, a man who dedicated his life to understanding the workings of the human mind and one who worked tirelessly to make that understanding available to anyone who would take the trouble to listen. He was without doubt a truly remarkable person, as anyone who has ever come into contact with any of his works will readily testify. The sincerity of his endeavour leaps from every page and his direct and illuminating approach to important questions makes him a delight and a challenge to read. At the same time, however, his thoroughly iconoclastic treatment of every issue he considers makes him impossible to classify within a tradition of enquiry that currently has a place in the academy. The closest perhaps is philosophy, but then this is somewhat of a personal observation and is certainly not one that Krishnamurti would endorse. He would find the modern approach to philosophy with its preponderance of theories anathema to the kind of understanding he thought was important.

## Philosophical Underpinning's

One difficulty with the work of Krishnamurti, in a philosophical sense - which is to say, more correctly, in the sense of academic philosophy - is that it is difficult to provide grounds or an underlying rationale for what he says. There are no fixed premises which form the basis of a particular position; no set tenets which can be examined and argued about because he continually cuts the ground from under our feet.

On reading Krishnamurti, it might at first look as if he is presenting an empirical theory of a kind, something that can be measured against the facts, something that can be somehow ascertained to be true. The reality is, however, that this is not the case even though he is certainly dealing in facts, because much of what Krishnamurti takes to be important stands outside of experience as we usually conceive it. In fact the very stuff of modern philosophy, its discussion of categories and concepts, its concern for theory and argumentative persuasion, while valid and useful in certain respects, is in its very dependence on concept formation and concept appraisal, an obstacle to the kind of understanding he considers so important.

In one sense Krishnamurti does not take on philosophy as such at all; he doesn't even take on particular claims by a particular philosopher within the tradition. He is not providing a counter argument to some theory already being proposed. And with much of philosophy Krishnamurti would have no grouse; philosophical underpinnings in the realm of science and logic, for example, for him would make a certain kind of sense.

For the most part, Krishnamurti is concerned with human consciousness, with our understanding of self and an examination of the supreme importance that thought has in our lives and in the

workings of our minds. He is concerned to point out that there are times where thought is an extremely useful and necessary tool and times when it is quite misleading and perhaps ultimately dangerous. The very essence of what many think of as self, Krishnamurti sees as nothing more than a construction based on thought used in a very wide sense of that term. And, in a sense, it is this that he wishes to bring to our attention.

But in talking in this manner I have already done Krishnamurti and the type of enquiry he was involved in a great disservice because at bottom what he is addressing has nothing whatsoever to do with him at all. There is no Krishnamurti theory, no Krishnamurti idea, fundamentally no Krishnamurti philosophy at all. At each and every stage it becomes clear to anyone involved in the questions that, admittedly, Krishnamurti may bring to our attention, that the pursuit and struggle with the problem is ultimately left with you or I even though such problems, such questions, can never be considered personal in the usual meaning of that term.

It is perhaps in this respect that what Krishnamurti touches upon can be said to affect the philosophical tradition of the academy. The taking up of the problem, of staying with it and sweating over it is also of central importance in the history of philosophy. And in so far as we, personally, do not get tangled up or enmeshed in it, the philosophical spirit of enquiry is at its most meaningful.

No one who has read any of Krishnamurti's writings can fail to observe the profound level of enquiry involved in them: the attention to each and every possibility and the complete absence of any kind of self-concern. And it is this that necessitates that the enquiry be taken very seriously indeed, even if that very enquiry must resist the desire to categorise and conceptualise in terms of a structure that is ultimately familiar to us. It is the willingness to look at the questions that is important, coupled with a willingness to go wherever that might lead.

And if that leads to a different understanding of human kind and all that the world, the universe, is, then the enquiry demands that we pursue it. If in the process we come to a clearer awareness of the possibilities for human kind, then which one of us would be ready to rule that out in advance? We take up the enquiry, in a sense, because there is no alternative. We take it up because it presents itself to us, because it is what it is. If this enables us to appreciate the limits of this wonderful tool called 'thought', then let us welcome it. We should be neither discouraged nor dismayed, invigorated or captivated by our enquiry but we must, at the very least, not be unwilling from the outset to go wherever it may lead nor try to close off anything we cannot immediately explain. All enquiry must begin without presuppositions and with a serious and open mind. The enquiry suggested to us by Krishnamurti demands no more nor less than this.

With this then as our background I invite you to consider an introduction to one very small aspect of the work of Krishnamurti, but one which is of fundamental importance. I am thinking in particular about what he has to say about memory.

## **On Memory**

We should be clear from the start that Krishnamurti is adamant that we need a good memory. We need one to enable us to do all of the ordinary things that make life possible. We need memory to speak a language, to find our way home, to cook a meal, drive a car, operate the TV, and to do any one of the innumerable tasks we engage in everyday. And to a large extent there is nothing particularly controversial about this. We wouldn't even be human beings if we didn't have memory. We use memory everyday and without it life as we know it would be impossible.

So why then, if he seems to think it is so important, does Krishnamurti in so many of his writings seem to play down the role of memory in our lives and speak of the dangers of memory? What exactly is he trying to draw our attention to?

I think the answer to this runs as follows. Krishnamurti, while recognising the necessity of memory in the proper functioning of our lives, wishes to point out that there are certain memories,

memories which affect us deeply, that seem to bring about conflict in each one of us, conflict of a serious on-going kind. And the consequence of such conflict, of course, is that it affects not only you and I, but through each one of us generates conflict in the world. These memories which have a more personal ingredient than perhaps a memory about what day it is today are more psychological in nature in that they seem to affect our sense of 'self'. And it was with helping us to come to some understanding of this 'self' that K was occupied for most of his life.

Most of us in our everyday life have not even considered this aspect of memory let alone considered whether what Krishnamurti has to say here has any great significance or not. But on hearing of it, on having it brought to our attention, on being asked to consider if it might not be destructive, many people I feel sure would recognise the importance of the points Krishnamurti is putting to us and the value of trying to come to some understanding of them.

We shall come to specific examples of what Krishnamurti was talking about very shortly but it should be clear to anyone from the outset that in order to get clearer about these issues we first need to confront them. In a trivial sense this is of course true of anything that we have not, up to now, considered, but the fact that what Krishnamurti is talking about affects the lives of all of us makes it all the more incumbent on us to examine it.

At this point let us look at some of the things that Krishnamurti actually says about memory and the importance of it for functioning efficiently.

And yet, one must have memory, one must have a *very good memory* to remember certain things, to be a good technician(1974,155).

You can observe this in your daily life. You develop memory through a technique, because that technique gives you a good job. And that cultivates a memory because *memory is necessary* to function efficiently in a particular job. That memory you must have obviously; otherwise you cannot function ("Talks, India 1966",95).

*Memory is necessary* to function in daily life; technologically, educationally, reading, learning a language, driving a car and so on ("2<sup>nd</sup> Public Talk Brockwood Park,1976",44).

The past is necessary: otherwise you would not know where you live, you would not know what your name is, or be able to go to the office, or recognize your wife, husband, your friends, your children, so to speak. The past is memory, and *memory is essential*. You cannot put it aside ("Verbatim Report, India 1962",69).

We need *memory* in order to ride a bicycle. I need memory in order to talk in English and so convey something to you,.....I need memory to function in a factory, in business and so on ("1<sup>st</sup> Public Dialogue, Saanen,1973",67).<sup>1</sup>

We see that there is no doubt in Krishnamurti's mind that memory is important, that it is necessary for our everyday survival and involvement in life. From a simple task of boiling some water on the stove to a more complex one of writing a computer programme, memory is absolutely essential. We simply cannot function without it. So it is very important to establish at the outset that Krishnamurti is not denying that memory plays an important role in our lives. On the contrary, as we have just noted he recognizes its basic importance, and I think most of us would have been very surprised if he had said otherwise.

However, just because he recognizes the fundamental value of memory in certain cases, or at a certain level, this does not prevent him on countless occasions of talking of the dangers of memory,

<sup>1</sup> The italics throughout represent my emphasis.

of memory which is detrimental to our lives as human beings. This aspect of memory, which Krishnamurti often refers to as 'psychological' memory may at first be less familiar to us than the simple examples of memory outlined above. But there should be no doubt that it is this aspect of memory - the memory that carries great danger - that Krishnamurti is concerned we should fully understand. He asks:

What do we mean by memory? You go to school and are full of facts, technical knowledge. If you are an engineer, you use the memory of technical knowledge to build a bridge. That is factual memory. There is also psychological memory. You have said something to me, pleasant or unpleasant, and I retain it; and when I next meet you, I meet you with that memory, the memory of what you have said or have not said. So there are 2 facets to memory, the psychological and the factual. They are always interrelated, therefore not clear-cut. We know that factual memory is essential as a means of livelihood. But is psychological memory essential?(1954,209).

Without factual memory, I cannot build a house or build a bridge, I cannot have any verbal communication with others. What do we mean by psychological memory? Why do you remember an experience? Why do you not remember all experiences? Generally pleasant experiences are remembered and the unpleasant are put away, though they may still be there in the deeper layers of consciousness ("Report - Madras,1948,Verbatim Reports,1948",41).

Krishnamurti introduces us to what he calls two facets of memory, the factual and the psychological. The first of these is, perhaps, readily understandable while the second may be less clear, less easy to understand. Psychological memory, if we may call it that, is not simply concerned with events but involves some kind of personal evaluation. Something over and above the mere recording of the event is going on here. Another example may make this clearer:

Look, sir, you call me an idiot. What has taken place? I hear those words, I translate those words, and the memory, or the image that I have about myself, that image is hurt, isn't it? Right? That image has been created by me, by a series of incidents that has given me the image which says "I am a great man", or "I am this". And you call me an idiot and I don't like it, I am hurt. The image is hurt. Right? And that hurt is part of the image which is created by thought, that thought is the response of memory. So memory says, "I have been hurt". The image, the memory, the greater image of myself as being somebody, and that image has been hurt. That has left a mark on my mind. So when I meet you next time you are my enemy, I don't like you ("1<sup>st</sup> Public Dialogue, Saanen,1973",14).

So Krishnamurti draws a distinction between factual memory, which is important for everyday functioning and psychological memory which involves the leaving of a mark of some kind on the mind. In the example just given someone is called an idiot and doesn't like it. Both of these things are recorded as memory - the fact of being called an idiot and also the response or reaction to that. That reaction of pain or hurt is still present as memory whenever the two people involved meet again and will be the cause of problems or conflict.

But Krishnamurti is not simply talking about memory related to insults or other negative aspects of behaviour. He also exhorts us to be aware of our responses when someone praises or flatters us. To see what he means here and to further understand what he means by psychological memory or marks of memory, consider the following:

Every experience leaves a mark, a residue, a memory of pain or pleasure. The word

'experience' means to go through something. But we never 'go through' something, so it leaves a mark. If you have a great experience, go through the greatness of it completely, so that you are free of it, then it does not leave marks as memory.

Why is it that every experience that we have leaves a remembrance, conscious or unconscious? - because it is this that prevents innocence. You cannot prevent experiences. If you prevent or resist experience, you will build a wall around yourself, you isolate yourself; that is what most people do.

One must understand the nature and structure of experience. You see a sunset such as it was yesterday evening - lovely, the light, that rose - coloured light on the water and the top of the trees bathed in marvellous light. You look at it, you enjoy it, there is great delight and beauty, colour and depth; a second later you say, "How beautiful it was". You describe it to somebody, you want it again, the beauty of it, the pleasure of it, the delight of it. You may be back tomorrow, at that time and hour and you may see the sunset again, but you will look with the memory of yesterday. So the freshness is already affected by the memory of yesterday. In the same way, you may insult me, or flatter me; the insult and the flattery remain as marks of pain and pleasure. So I am accumulating, the mind is accumulating through experience, thickening, coarsening, becoming more and more heavy with thousands of experiences. That is a fact. Now, can I when you insult me, listen with attention and consider your insult, not react to it immediately, but consider it? When you say I am a fool, you may be right, I may be a fool, probably I am. Or when you flatter me, I also watch. Then the insult and the flattery leave no mark. The mind is alert, watchful, whether of your insult or flattery, of the sunset and the beauty of so many things. The mind is all the time alert and therefore all the time free - though receiving a thousand experiences(1972,24).

Krishnamurti is suggesting something extremely interesting. We store away our experiences as memory and these memories profoundly affect subsequent experiences. This affects our ability to see and function in the world without conflict. I record the insults and the flattery and all of the other reactions to everyday events and happenings. And of course, the insult may be accurate. I may indeed be a fool - but is it necessary to record it as pain, something that will reappear in all future dealings with the person who uttered it? Is it necessary to record how 'wonderful' I thought the evening's sunset was so that that memory may intrude on future viewing, or will be a memory I look at from time to time almost in the way that one looks at photographs of the past.

Supposing you insulted me yesterday, why should I carry that burden today? Or you may have flattered me; why should I let it influence me today? Why cannot I finish with it immediately, whilst you are insulting me or flattering me? That would mean that I would have to be extremely awake and sensitive as you talked, alert to both your insult and your flattery(1970,19).

Krishnamurti is primarily concerned with experiences which affect us psychologically, which have a bearing on what we see as 'self', and in this regard he talks about experience leaving marks, memories of pain or pleasure. A plus or a minus is somehow added to the experience and becomes part of it so that a residue remains which will affect future conduct or action in the world. The suggestion is that we have not really 'gone through' the experience completely and left it behind. Something remains, a positive or negative reaction that gets stored away. If we could only go through the experience without a 'personal' reaction, as it were, the only thing that could remain would be the factual memory of the event. And that, of course, would be quite harmless.

There are thousands of things that happen everyday that we simply don't seem to remember, things or events which we don't have any reaction to, where nothing seems to remain at all. I take

the daily newspaper from the letter - box, I make a cup of tea, a slice of toast. I get on a train and sit down. Out of the window I see a variety of things. Do I remember these things happening later in the day? Do I remember similar things happening last week? Not in the ordinary run of things, certainly not usually with any specific interest. Most of these things come and go and nothing more than, at most, a simple factual memory of them happening remains. But this is not so with the things that affect us, the things that we somehow get entangled with, the events we view through the image of pleasure and pain.

The word 'experience' means to go through something and finish with it and not store it up, but when we talk about experience we actually mean the opposite. Every time you speak of experience you speak of something stored up for which action takes place, you speak of something which you have enjoyed and demand to have again or have disliked and fear to have repeated(1971,169).

The things we have enjoyed are remembered favourably and the things we have disliked are remembered, if at all, with a mark of disapproval or pain. We pursue with vigour the things we like and seek to prolong the enjoyment for as long as possible. These experiences remain important to us and we are ever seeking to reinvent them. But in so far as we fail to do this there is always pain and disappointment and the prospect of such pain and disappointment is inherent in the very pursuit, the reenactment of the old actions.

In our understanding of the questions Krishnamurti raises there are two important points that he suggests we keep in mind. These are closely related. First, he exhorts us to be very sure that we see these things directly for ourselves and secondly, that in so far as we do so, it will be obvious to us that we are dealing in fact rather than theory - in what is seen to be the case rather than in what is explained to us as being the case. With regard to the psychology of the mind Krishnamurti insists that there can be no imparting of knowledge from one person to another.

It isn't that the speaker tells you what to do, what to think, he has no authority, he is not going to tell you what to think and what to do, he has no philosophy. But together we are going to find out for ourselves, not dependent on anyone, including the speaker, find out for ourselves how to live in this mad confusion, how to live peacefully, and that peace can only come about if there is a light in ourselves which can never be destroyed by another, by any environment, by any accident, by any experience ("1 st Public Talk, Saanen,1970" 5:30).

So all this brings us to a certain point, which is that one must be a complete light to oneself. We are not. We rely on others. As you are listening, you are relying on the speaker to tell you what to do. But if you listen very carefully, the speaker is not telling you what to do; he is asking you to examine, he is telling you how to examine and what is implied in the examination. By examining very carefully, you are free of all dependence and you are a light to yourself. That means you are completely alone ("Talks, India,1966" 41).

Is it possible to be a light to oneself, and not depend on a single person? Of course you can depend on the milkman, on the postman, on the policeman,.....but inwardly, psychologically, to think clearly for oneself, to observe one's own reactions and responses. And ask if one can be completely a light to oneself ("1 st Public Talk, New Delhi,1982" 22:15).

Being a light to oneself, seeing directly for oneself, may not be easy because so many things we

have already learnt may stand in the way. Not the least of these may be our tendency to function in the realm of theory or the hypothetical. This will undoubtedly have played a part in most of our education to date. However, while this may be perfectly valid in the sciences or where we are working methodologically, when we are investigating the workings of our own minds, when we are looking to understand ourselves, Krishnamurti advises us to be wary of this tendency.

I think this is important, this question as to whether you find merely what you have been told, which therefore is not your discovery, or whether you discover for yourself. If you find out for yourself what the mind is, from there you can proceed; but if you are accepting a theory, a communication about the mind, then you are dealing second hand and what you find remains merely a theory, it has no value at all(1969,101).

For Krishnamurti then, there would be little value in our saying that we understood the distinction between factual memory and psychological memory in theory. To talk theoretically, to talk in terms of supposition, to talk in terms of what might be, according to Krishnamurti has no bearing on what is happening in the mind. Seeing directly for ourselves is vitally important.

But this is no easy thing for most of us. We have spent our lives trying to grasp the points that people make, trying to grasp distinctions, because we are so often encouraged to look at things intellectually. So much so that we develop a certain prowess for it and become very good at making and grasping distinctions. In the present case this could lead us to say that we have understood completely what is being said when actually we may not have done. And, of course, if we think we have when really we haven't, we can't possibly be aware of it, such is the nature of the deception. The fundamental requirement is that each one of us looks at what is going on in our own case. To check if the cake is actually burning, we have to look at the cake. It's a case of something actually going on in practice.

We might say that the point about factual memory is readily understandable and perhaps it is. What about psychological memory? Do we see it happening - the recording of pleasure and pain, the reaction of plus or minus? And again, this is not do you grasp it as a possible or plausible explanation. It's do you see it happening as in 'Is the cake burning?'<sup>2</sup>

Now, of course, even if we do see it happening, this is not the end of the matter. Just seeing it happening will not necessarily stop it happening. Nothing can be stipulated in these situations. But seeing it happening, being aware of the process, watching the movement, already constitutes something of a change and opens up new possibilities. All we can do is stay with the watching, the looking, and observe as carefully as possible. And this is already to be in a different state.

We must be clear that Krishnamurti is not offering a formula for changing ourselves. In fact he abhors such suggestions. All he asks people to do is to be serious in their enquiry. Serious and open without any expectations and without forming conclusions about what is seen. And this is perhaps just the opposite of how the vast majority of us go about our daily lives for the most part. We are so often fixed and limited in our dealings with the world. We move from opinion to opinion or conclusion to conclusion as we either articulate or defend a certain view of things, already formed. All of which is clearly based on the past.

At this point the main thing we need to note is that Krishnamurti is pointing out that theoretical enquiry is completely unhelpful in coming to an understanding of what is going on in one's mind. We must be ever aware of the tendency to drift into the theoretical which, of course, also includes trying to interpret what others say in this regard. It follows from this that there is clearly a danger in trying to annotate Krishnamurti, in trying to explain what he wants to say in other words, in ways that might seem 'easier' to understand. Anyone engaged in serious enquiry has to be very clear

<sup>2</sup> At this stage someone might want to object, might want to challenge what is being said. Someone might say that this point of view is not correct, for example, or say that other people have said different things. For Krishnamurti these interjections would be theoretical ones. He would insist that we can only deal with facts.

about the dangers of that. But surely that is possible. This includes, as we have noted, being very clear about the dangers of theorizing when we should be engaged in practice. However such wariness about theory does not mean that we cannot discuss, question and even argue about the questions Krishnamurti raises. Of course we can, but we must do it in a clear and simple manner and ever be on our guard. We cannot be disorganized in our approach. Our approach must be rational, logical, sane and thorough. And above all, must be based on the facts, on what is seen firsthand. So we have to be very clear about the questions we are asking and we have to look very clearly and precisely at what is going on.<sup>3</sup>

So on one level it must be recognized that we can view the apparatus of Krishnamurti's thought on a theoretical level. We can point out the questions he is asking and show how they set the scene for a certain type of enquiry. We can look at what he focuses on, on what he draws our attention to and, to a certain extent, how he does that. We can also spell out very precisely what Krishnamurti is not asking us to do, an aspect that cannot be over stated. The groundwork can be clearly and validly expressed. As can be seen from our outline of what Krishnamurti says about factual and psychological memory. However, after laying bare the basic framework, after posing the appropriate questions, each one of us is on our own. All discussion stops and we have to look for ourselves. Because it is only in so far as we see for ourselves that we can ever find out if what Krishnamurti says is anywhere near the mark. Which would not, of course, mean that Krishnamurti is right. It could, at best, only mean that what he said was right and that is completely independent of Krishnamurti, the man. Which is precisely why Krishnamurti tells us that we have to discover it for ourselves. And that, without doubt, is a very real challenge.

Let us now remind ourselves about something we have already considered:

Now, can I when you insult me, listen with attention and consider your insult, not react to it immediately, but consider it? When you say I am a fool, you may be right, I may be a fool, probably I am. Or when you flatter me, I also watch. Then the insult and flattery leave no mark. The mind is alert, watchful, whether of your insult or your flattery, of the sunset and the beauty of so many things. The mind is all the time alert and therefore all the time free - though receiving a thousand experiences(1972,24).

Can we indeed go through the experience so that it doesn't leave a mark of pleasure or pain? In the first instance can we see that that is what is going on? Can we see the problems that it brings for us, the trouble and upset it causes? Can we be free of it? It clearly seems to be a mistake. But will recognizing what is going on actually stop it? No one can answer for another, but whatever happens it needn't stop us from continually watching out. And the interesting point is that anyone beginning to do this is already behaving in a different way, is already in a different relationship with the world. What then happens will simply be a question of carefully watching what does happen.

### Concluding remarks

This has been a short introduction to what I feel is an important distinction that Krishnamurti makes between what he himself calls *factual* and *psychological* memory. The suggestion, as we saw, is that very often something other than the simple facts about a particular experience gets recorded away. With most of us, as something is experienced some kind of evaluation process is going on; we judge the particular experience in either a positive or negative light and then record that evaluation away to memory. These, as Krishnamurti would call them, *psychological* memories impinge on subsequent perception or experience in a direct and influential manner. Future

---

<sup>3</sup> How we look is extremely important and is a point which requires further explanation. However that would take us beyond the confines of the current paper.



experience or perception is thereby powerfully and adversely affected by the filter of past memories through which the world is now viewed. And this means that the past taints future perceptions, or more specifically, present ones, ensuring that one can never see things as new.

It is perhaps easy enough to understand the distinction on an intellectual level. Most of us will undoubtedly look at it in this way. And then we may consider whether we choose to accept it or not. To decide this last we may consider arguments in its favor and try to evaluate their particular merits. But for Krishnamurti to understand simply at the intellectual level in this regard is meaningless. He is simply not interested in persuading people to accept a particular form of argument. He is not concerned with presenting a list of reasons that might persuade or convince someone of the correctness of his position for the simple reason that, for his part, he has no position. Seeing the truth of what is said is not a matter of choice. Careful observation of what goes on in our own case should be enough to reveal that we do form these evaluations and record away the psychological memories. Observation alone is enough to see it in action. And one sees, too, the harm that such memories cause. Recognition of all this taking place is a fundamental requirement of the possibility of change. Again, this is something we have to see for ourselves.

These, Krishnamurti would say, are the facts about us and it is in this sense alone that he exhorts all of us to stay with and deal with the facts when we are concerned with an understanding of the self.

The distinction between factual and psychological memory is not, as Krishnamurti himself says, one of complete separation. Each psychological memory has a factual component as anyone willing to take up the challenge can observe for themselves. And perhaps, up to this point, insofar as a dichotomy of a kind has been presented, we are on familiar, or at least acceptable, academic ground. A distinction has been made and grounds for the distinction have been offered. It is not Krishnamurti's purpose to argue any further than this. Some may say that this disqualifies Krishnamurti's work from being described as philosophy in a strict academic sense. At one level, I would not argue with that, but at another it seems clear that Krishnamurti has brought to our attention something of such tremendous importance in connection with understanding the self - something that goes much further even than the insights endowed to us by Socrates - that it would be folly to deny, however it is classified, that it enriches our understanding of who we are. For Krishnamurti, once the distinction has been understood and appreciated, all argument, as it were, ceases. We are then left to the task of ascertaining the facts of the matter for ourselves. And this means observing what actually does take place.

### Works cited

- Krishnamurti, Jiddu. *The First and Last Freedom*. London: Gollanz and Harper, 1954.
- *The Urgency of Change*, London, Gollanz and Harper, 1971.
- *The Brockwood Park Talks and Discussions, 1969*, London, Servire, 1970.
- *Krishnamurti On Education*, New Delhi: Orient Longman, 1974.
- *You are the World*, New York: Harper and Row, 1972.
- *Talks and Dialogues, Saanen 1967*, London: Servire and Arkana, 1969.
- "1<sup>st</sup> Public Talk, New Delhi, 1982" *The Krishnamurti text collection & the complete published works 1933 - 1986, CD ROM*, The Krishnamurti Foundation Trust, Brockwood Park, UK, 1991.
- "Talks, India, 1966" *The Krishnamurti text collection & the complete published works 1933 - 1986, CD ROM*, The Krishnamurti Foundation Trust, Brockwood Park, UK, 1991.
- "Report - Talks, India, 1965" *The Krishnamurti text collection & the complete published works 1933 - 1986, CD ROM*, The Krishnamurti Foundation Trust, Brockwood Park, UK, 1991.
- "2<sup>nd</sup> Public Talk, Brockwood Park, 1976" *The Krishnamurti text collection & the complete published works 1933 - 1986, CD ROM*, The Krishnamurti Foundation Trust, Brockwood Park, UK, 1991.

- “1<sup>st</sup> Public Talk, Saanen,1970”*The Krishnamurti text collection & the complete published works 1933 - 1986,CD ROM* , The Krishnamurti Foundation Trust, Brockwood Park, UK,1991.
- “Verbatim Report, India 1962”*The Krishnamurti text collection & the complete published works 1933 - 1986,CD ROM* , The Krishnamurti Foundation Trust, Brockwood Park, UK,1991.
- “1<sup>st</sup> Public Dialogue, Saanen,1973”*The Krishnamurti text collection & the complete published works 1933 - 1986,CD ROM* , The Krishnamurti Foundation Trust, Brockwood Park, UK,1991.
- “Report - Madras,1948,Verbatim Report,1948”*The Krishnamurti text collection & the complete published works 1933 - 1986,CD ROM* , The Krishnamurti Foundation Trust, Brockwood Park, UK,1991.
- The Krishnamurti text collection & the complete published works 1933 - 1986, CD ROM* , The Krishnamurti Foundation Trust, Brockwood Park, UK,1991.

E - mail: [sherriff@fukujo.ac.jp](mailto:sherriff@fukujo.ac.jp)