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The aim of this paper is to introduce the reader to J. Krishnamurti's phenomenological psychology. The present author considers that Krishnamurti has made a number of important observations of psychological states which have been overlooked by psychologists and that these observations have relevance to psychology in general as well as clinical psychology in particular.

The intention in this paper is to set down a clear, reasonably comprehensive summary of Krishnamurti's contribution to phenomenological psychology. This will be done with a minimum of interpretation, because Krishnamurti's statements are attempts to describe psychological facts rather than theories. He takes extraordinary care with the choice, use and meaning of words. He carefully avoids conceptualizing and theorizing, and any procedure which takes him away from these facts. Since he is not developing a specific theory or set of theories, his statements do not require interpretation. The words speak for themselves. Obviously, words and descriptions evoke images and concepts, but Krishnamurti rightly stresses that these are not the thing described, in the same way, for example, that a map is not the terrain it depicts.

BIographiesal DATA

Jiddu Krishnamurti (Jiddu being the family name) was born into a southern Indian Brahmin family in 1895. Krishnamurti's
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mother died when he was nine years old, and at the age of fourteen he was adopted into the Theosophical Society by C.W. Leadbeater who predicted he would be the "World Teacher" OT "New Messiah." In 1911 he was brought to England to be privately educated and to be groomed for this role.

Between the 17th and 20th of August 1920, at the age of twenty-seven, Krishnamurti underwent a period of spontaneous altered states of consciousness which completely changed his life. These experiences were marked by a number of physical symptoms—intense pain in the neck and head, trembling, shivering, moaning and vomiting—and dissociated, regressed or trance-like states. A letter which he wrote shortly afterwards includes the following extracts:

I came to myself about noon each day. On the first day while I was in that state and more conscious of the things around me, I had the most extraordinary experience. There was a man mending the road; that man was myself; the pickaxe he held was myself; the very stone which he was breaking up was a part of me; the tender blade of grass was my very being, and the tree beside the man was myself . . . I was in everything, or rather, everything was in me ... (Lutyens, 1975, p. 158).

When asked during a television interview in what way this early experience had changed his life, Krishnamurti interpreted what he underwent at that time as an inward cleansing, "a purification of the brain" and an experience of "wholeness" (Krishnamurti, 1984).

Initially, there appeared to be little outward change. In his public talks he continued to use Theosophical language and imagery. However, during the next eight years his public statements began to reflect the direction in which he was heading, for example, stressing the importance of achieving a freedom from preconceptions, formulas and authority, emphasizing the need to "take a leap into the dark" (Lutyens, 1975, p. 195) and describing the Theosophical spiritual Masters as "only incidence" (p. 242). In August 1929 he renounced the title of "World Teacher." The following year he resigned from the Theosophical Society.

THE ESSENCE OF KRISHNAMURTI'S PHENOMENOLOGICAL PSYCHOLOGY

Following these early years Krishnamurti's teaching has been based on a careful observation or awareness of the workings of
the mind—the way that thoughts and images as well as conditioning and memory, fear and desire, create an inward and outward state of fragmentation which destroys the wholeness of relationship. From his observations Krishnamurti has noted that we cannot arrive at understanding through creeds and dogmas, philosophical inquiry or psychological techniques, but only through an awareness of the content of our mind as it is mirrored in relationship; through an observation and understanding which does not involve intellectual analysis or introspective dissection.

Krishnamurti rejects external and internal authority in the form of experts and gurus, beliefs and ideas, and in his talks and writings he repeatedly stresses the necessity of a heuristic psychological approach: "We cannot depend on anybody, there is no guide, there is no teacher, there is no authority, there is only oneself and one's relationship with another and the world, there is nothing else" (1969, p. 116). "You have to... be your own teacher and pupil" (1977, p. 36) and "you are the teacher, and the taught, and the teaching" (1977, p. 37). As Henry Miller rightly remarked: "Krishnamurti... throws the questioner back on himself, forces him to seek the answer in himself" (1963, p. 166). Apart from a central emphasis in his talks and writings on finding out for oneself, Krishnamurti repeatedly focuses on the nature of a number of psychological states or processes. These include awareness, thoughts, images, feelings (pleasure, anxiety, fear), attachment, security, conditioning, conflict, learning, memory and intelligence. These processes or states are interrelated but will be discussed here under specific headings.

AWARENESS

Awareness is a state of mind or consciousness in which there is attention. This awareness is not the product of thought or images. It is unconditioned. Awareness does not repress or suppress, does not struggle or concentrate, analyze or divide; it is open to the here and now, effortlessly, choicelessly, observing the totality of "what is." In this state it is possible for learning to take place. Learning about oneself involves daily observation of thoughts, feelings, inner motives; "watching, but not self-centred watching, just watching like you watch a bird, or the movement of a cloud... " (1976, p. 297).

When there is complete attention, the observer as thought does not exist. There is no separation between the observer and the observed. To understand this statement the reader might find it helpful to reconsider the description given earlier of the altered...
state of consciousness which Krishnamurti underwent when he was twenty-seven—the experience that he was the road mender, the pickaxe, the stone the man was breaking, etc. Such experiences are usually misunderstood as the person "identifying" with the thing observed. Krishnamurti has been at pains to emphasize that he is not talking about identification; one is not the thing observed; rather there is no division between the observer and the thing observed—they are one and the same. Phenomenologically this is an accurate description. What is observed exists only within the field of my conscious awareness. It is not separate from myself, the observer. I, the observer, and what I observe are one and the same. Both are part of the same phenomenological field or mind. Therefore, the division between the observer and the observed is an illusion.

Krishnamurti has this to say of the observer:

The observer is always casting its shadow on the thing it observes. So one must understand the structure and the nature of the observer. . . . We must examine what the observer is: it is the past with all its memories, conscious and unconscious, its racial inheritance, its accumulated experience which is called knowledge, its reactions. The observer is really the conditioned entity. He is the one who asserts that he is and I am. In protecting himself, he resists, dominates, seeking comfort and security. The observer then sets himself apart as something different from that which he observes, inwardly and outwardly. This brings about a duality and from this there is conflict, which is a wastage of energy. To be aware of the observer, his movement, his self-centred activity, his assertions, his prejudices, one must be aware of all these unconscious movements which build the separatist feeling that he is different. It must be observed without any form of evaluation, without likes and dislikes; just observe it in daily life, in its relationships. When this observation is clear, isn't there then a freedom from the observer? (1977, p. 306-7).

In the same volume he states: "The brain can learn, can acquire knowledge technologically, but when it acquires knowledge psychologically then the knowledge asserts itself in relationship as the 'me' with its experiences, its will and its violence. This is what brings division, conflict and sorrow to relationship" (1977, p. 279-80).

THOUGHT

Krishnamurti states that thinking derives from accumulated memories, knowledge and experience. Initially thought may have arisen through conditioning or in response to a particular
challenge. A similar challenge in the present will trigger the same or a similar response. Thus thinking or thought has its roots in the past. It is bound by what was, rather than what is. "Therefore, when you try to understand activity in the present, with the past, which is thought, you don't understand it at all; then there is fragmentation, and life becomes a conflict" (1976, p. 273). Being a response of the past, thought distorts the present. While thought does not distort when functioning rationally in the many practical functions of living and technology, it is in the psychological realm that it creates problems. It is thought which seeks repetition of pleasures and, in remembering pain or facing uncertainty, produces fear. It is thought that has put together the "me" with its memories, its separateness, aggressiveness, ambition, competitiveness, imitation and fear. Thought says, "I had that and I would like! not like that again," or "If I am to be happy I must have this, and I must be that."

Among other things, Krishnamurti raises two questions concerning the nature of thought. Firstly, since thought is old-having its origin in learning or knowledge-is it possible for thought to discover anything new? Or, put another way, do we make discoveries only when investigating without thought? Secondly, can thought be completely silent and function only when necessary such as in certain tasks of work, living and technology? "Thought, which is the response of memory, of knowledge, of experience and time, is the content of consciousness; thought must function with knowledge, but it can only function with the highest intelligence when there is space and silence-when it functions from there" (1976, p. 347). This raises a paradox because

thought is asking itself whether it can be quiet. ... Can it do anything to be silent? ... Can thought say to itself: I must be quiet? That is not being quiet! Then what is silence which is not the product of thought? Which means, can thought come to an end by itself, without asking to come to an end? Isn't that what is implied when you listen to something, when you see clearly? ... Then in that attention the observer as thought does not exist (1976, p. ...)

In this psychological state there is the possibility of a genuinely intelligent functioning awakening. During a conversation with Krishnamurti the physicist David Bohm asked whether it is the case that, when this intelligence understands the activity of thought, then thought becomes different in its operation? Krishnamurti replied: "Yes, obviously. That is, if thought has created nationalism as a means of security and then one sees the fallacy of it, the seeing of the fallacy of it is intelligence.
Thought then creates a different kind of world in which nationalism doesn't exist" (1976, p. 491). Earlier in the same volume he clarifies these points when he says:

We must use thought to survive. But to survive, thought has divided the world as my country, your country, my government, your government, my God, your God. . . . Though it wants to plan to survive, thought has divided the world which destroys itself, of which I am a part. So I have to understand the nature of thought, where it is necessary, and where it is diabolical, where it is destructive and where it creates fear—that is my problem (1976, p.400).

In sum the questions raised by Krishnamurti are: "Can thought see its own limitations and bring about a different kind of intelligence? If thought sees its own limitation, is there a different kind of intelligence in operation? Then is there not an awakening of intelligence which is above and beyond thought?" (1976, p. 432).

IMAGINATION

Like thought, images cast their shadow over what we perceive. Since we look at the world through images (opinions, preconceived ideas, judgment and evaluation), the world we see is distorted. The question raised by Krishnamurti is whether we can look at the world without this distortion. Can we be in the physical and human world without images? A frequent illustration he gives is that if you were angry with me yesterday I will create an image of you as no longer being a friend, an image that you no longer like me, an image of your angry face. "If I look at you with that image next time I meet you, that image will distort my perception" (1976, p. 305). This is not to suggest that all images are undesirable or unnecessary. Some images have a valuable protective function, such as the image that certain animals may be harmful. However, we carry with us many unnecessary images from the past which distort what we perceive in the present and, therefore, these images destroy our relationship with others or the world. The friend in the illustration above may no longer be angry, may be approaching me in a welcoming manner. Is it possible for me to respond to what I perceive or is what I see only the image of yesterday? "If I have a relationship with another ... throughout the days, weeks or years of the relationship I have built an image and I act according to that image, and the other acts according to the image which he has. . . . Our relationship is based on images, and how can there be a relationship with another, if it is merely the relationship of these images?" (1976, p. 314). Krishnamurti
therefore asks whether it is "possible for me, in daily life, to observe my wife, my child, everything around me, without a shadow of an image?" (1976, p. 439).

It is important to appreciate why we create images. There are two main reasons. Firstly, we are taught or learn to compare and measure ourselves against others. For example, your mother exhorts you to be as bright as an elder brother, and the process of building images about yourself and others begins. Yet, in projecting images of yourself and in holding images of others, energy is wasted in trying to become your image and in the conflict which images create. Secondly, thought has created images for a number of psychological, sociological, economic and cultural reasons. Essentially, however, images are the reaction of thought seeking security. This reaction of thought frequently includes images of ourselves. However, an image of ourself as, for example, "intelligent" gives false security because someone may call me a fool and I will be hurt. Without this image, I would not be hurt. Thus, we only become invulnerable when we have no images of ourselves.

As with thought, the ending of images comes through observation and awareness, not analysis (Which is itself thought and imagery), and seeing the mechanisms by which images are created.

How can one be free of the images that one has? First of all I must find out how these images come into being, what is the mechanism that creates them. You can see that in the moment of actual relationship, that is when you are talking, when there are arguments, when there are insults and brutality, if you are not completely attentive at that moment, then the mechanism of building an image starts. That is, when the mind is not completely attentive at the moment of action, then the mechanism of building images is set in motion. When you say something to me which I do not like—or which I like—if at that moment I am not completely attentive, then the mechanism starts. If I am attentive, aware, then there is no building of images (1976, p. 316).

CONDITIONING, KNOWLEDGE AND LEARNING

Conditioning: In many of his talks, Krishnamurti emphasizes that he is concerned with how the mind can be unconditioned. "So the question then is: Is it possible to be so intensely aware of conditioning that you see the truth of it?" (1973, p. 59) The truth of seeing this conditioning is the realization that as human beings we are the product of the past; we are as it were, second hand, and we constantly view the present through past conditioning. "Our conscious and unconscious responses to all
the challenges our environment-intellectual, emotional, outward and inward—all these are the action of conditioning. Language “is conditioning; all thought is the action, the response of conditioning” (1977, p. 277). The only possible way of breaking through this conditioning is through awareness. The "me" is the product of conditioning. Being determined by conditioning, how is one to be free? It is only when we look without the movement of thought that it is possible to transcend our conditioning. Seeing our conditioning we see that we are not free. And seeing our conditioning means that we also see that we perceive our conditioning in a way that is also conditioned.

How does one free oneself from this conditioning . . . First, I must be aware that I am conditioned—not somebody telling me that I am conditioned ... if somebody tells me I am hungry, that's something different from actually being hungry. So I must be aware of my conditioning, which means, I must be aware of it not only superficially, but at the deeper levels, That is, I must be aware totally. To be so aware, means that I am not trying to go beyond the conditioning, not trying to be free of the conditioning. I must see it as it actually is, not bring in another element, such as: wanting to be free of it, because that is an escape from actuality, I must be aware, What does that mean? To be aware of my conditioning totally, not partially, means my mind must be highly sensitive, mustn't it? Otherwise I can't be aware. To be sensitive means to observe everything very, very closely—the colours, the quality of people, all the things around me, I must be aware of what actually is without any choice. Can you do that—not trying to interpret it, not trying to change it, not trying to go beyond it or trying to be free of it—just to be totally aware of it (1976, p. 70-71).

In another talk published in the same volume he says:

When I look at myself, I am looking with the eyes of the past; so I condemn, judge, evaluate, "This is right," "This is wrong," good or bad according to my particular culture and tradition, according to the knowledge and experience which I have gathered, Therefore, it prevents observation of the living thing, which is the "me." And that "me" may not be "me" at all, because I only know the "me" as the past, When the Muslim says that he is a Muslim, he is the past conditioned by the culture in which he has been brought up; it is the same with the Catholic or the Communist (1976, p.304).

Knowledge: Krishnamurti states that knowledge grows from experience and this experience creates thoughts and images. Because it has accumulated from the past, any choice based on knowledge is of the past and may cause confusion or disorder in the present or future, Furthermore, since thought is always old,
it cannot bring anything new into being. The brain or mind "can discover something new only when it sees the truth that the old cannot find anything new and therefore the old becomes quiet" (1976, p. 378). Elsewhere he comments that it "is strange that one can never say, 'I don't know'... But to admit to not knowing is to stop the mechanical process of knowing" (1978, p. 207). This is important because "each time one investigates without knowing, one discovers something. But if you investigate with knowing, then you will never discover anything" (1976, p. 347). Discoveries are made—whether by scientists or others—when this is the case, when the person looks without conclusions or assumptions, when the "old brain" is quiet or not interfering. It is important therefore to recognize the value of knowledge while seeing its limitations and going beyond it. "This doesn't mean to wipe out the known but to enter a different dimension altogether from which the known is observed" (1977, p. 205). This brings us to learning.

Learning: Krishnamurti distinguishes between knowledge and learning in the following way:

I have learned from past experience that fire burns. That is knowledge. I have learned it; therefore I don't go near fire. I have ceased to learn. And most of us, having learned, act from there. Having gathered information about ourselves (or about another) this becomes knowledge; then that knowledge becomes almost static and from that we act. Therefore, action is always old. So learning is something entirely different (1973, p. 55).

It is freedom from the known. The word "learning" is an active present, and living, learning and acting are indivisible, not three separate things. "Learning implies a constant action. There is learning all the time. And the very act of learning is doing. The doing is not separate from the learning. Whereas for most of us the doing is separate from the knowledge" (1973, p. 55).

The above is relevant to any problem-solving activity. To look at a problem we have to be free of assumptions or conclusions in order to see what actually is. In particular, it is relevant to self-understanding and personal change.

If you look at yourself with an image about yourself, you cannot learn. For instance, I discover in myself a deep-rooted hatred and I say, "How terrible, how ugly." When I say that, I prevent myself from looking. The verbal statement, the word, the symbol, prevents observation. To learn about myself there must be no word, no knowledge, no symbol, no image; then I am actively learning (1973, p. 23).
Krishnamurti asks what is involved in attachment and dependence and why we depend? He states that, if we watch closely, we discover that attachment and dependence is rooted in fear. Although this fear has value, since as infants we have to depend entirely on others, and as adults we continue to depend on food, clothing and shelter, etc. in order to survive, this dependence carries over into other areas of life—for example, being dependent on a husband or wife, a role, status, material objects, ideologies and concepts. Being attached to these things psychologically, since they give security and pleasure, we fear their loss. "The brain...has found security in nationalism, in a belief in the family; in having possessions, which are all various forms of neurosis. The brain must be secure to function and it may chose to find security in something false, unreal, illusory, neurotic" (1976, p. 449).

Krishnamurti asks whether pleasure is separate from fear or whether they are two sides of the same coin. For example, yesterday we had an experience which was pleasurable. Because that experience leaves a mark on the mind as a memory, thought says that it must have the same thing again. This also gives rise to fear since the pleasure may be lost or not repeatable. "So when thought demands a continuity to pleasure, it is constantly inviting fear" (1969,p. 217). Similarly, the memory of psychological or physical pain caused through such things as rejection or failure, ill health, or disease, is projected into the future by thought producing the fear that the same experience may occur again.

Krishnamurti states that trying to understand and analyze individual fears and dividing them into conscious and unconscious fears does not necessarily bring an end to fear. Desire and fear are a single interrelated process (two sides of a coin) which expresses itself in different ways, either seeking or avoiding individual objects or situations. It is the awareness of this fact that brings about individual change. There can be no end to analyzing individual desires and fears. But seeing the root cause of the processes offers the possibility of liberation from its control over our life. The difficulty in this is being able "to look at fear which is indivisible and therefore not fragmentary, without the fragmentation which the mind has cultivated" (1969, p. 63). Fear can only be understood when there is no interference from thoughts, when there is no division between the observer and the observed, when there is attention or awareness without choice. "To observe fear you have to live with it, you must know and understand all its content, its nature, its structure and its movement" (1969, p. 71).
CONFLICT

There is this fact of disorder. There is no doubt about it: it is an actual fact. The traditional approach to this fact is to analyse it, to try to discover the cause of it and overcome the cause, or else to invent its opposite and battle toward that. This is the traditional approach with its disciplines, drills, controls, suppressions, sublimations. Man has done this for thousands upon thousands of years; it has led nowhere (1977, p. 199).

Krishnamurti states that conflict and violence result from the divisive nature of thought. Thought divides the wholeness of relationship—it divides individuals into Muslim and Christian, it divides the world into countries and nations. The same division occurs inwardly or psychologically.

When you resist anger or hatred, what has actually taken place? You build a wall against hatred, but it is still there; the wall merely hides it from you. Or you determine not to be angry, but this determination is part of anger, and the very resistance strengthens the anger. You can see it in your self if you observe this fact. When you resist, control, suppress, or try to transcend ... you have thickened the wall of resistance, and so you become more and more enslaved, narrow, petty. And it is from this pettiness, this narrowness, that you want to be free, and that very want is the reaction which is going to create another barrier, more pettiness. So we move from one resistance, one barrier, to another. (1977, p. 62).

Our problem is that we continue to look at the world and/ or ourselves in a way that interferes because we try to understand from the basis of knowledge and images (see earlier section) or because we are using thought which analyzes and divides and which, consequently, produces further division, conflict and violence. Thus knowledge, images and thought not only prevent learning (see earlier section) but actually compound the problem of conflict and violence. Krishnamurti points out that life is a whole; you cannot, for example, divide life into technological life and non-technological life. "So we are asking, 'Is it possible to live so completely that the part is included in the whole?' . . . So you have divided life and therefore there is conflict in your life between the two. And we are asking a quite different thing, to live so that there is no division at all" (1976, p. 265).

Can individuals be, from this moment, completely free of nationality, tradition, culture and the past? If they cannot, they "live in fragmentation and therefore everlastingly life becomes a battlefield" (1976, p. 272). This fragmentation can only come to an end through choiceless awareness or attention:
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When you give your attention completely... you will find there is no centre at all, there is no observer and therefore there is no division between the observed and the observer, and you eradicate conflict totally, this conflict brought about by separation, by division. It only seems difficult because you are not used to this way of looking at life. It is really quite simple if you know how to look (1976, p. 195-6).

RELATIONSHIP

Every aspect of Krishnamurti's comments on psychology and living mentioned earlier can only be fully appreciated through understanding the meaning and importance he gives to relationship. He emphasizes that living is a movement in relationship. "To understand that relationship and to end the conflict in that relationship is our entire problem" (1973, p. 47).

Relationship is defined as follows: "Relationship means not only physical contact but also a state in which there is no division psychologically" (1973, p. 86). The division created by thought destroys relationship.

Thought always cuts up what it observes into fragments within space— as you and me, yours and mine, me and my thoughts and so on. This space, which thought has created between what it observes, has become real; and it is this space that divides. Then thought tries to build a bridge over this division, thus playing a trick upon itself all the time, deceiving itself and hoping for unity (1973, p. 195).

Also, for example, when we act, is this action based on past experience and acting according to that memory or knowledge? "If it is, then action is always in the past, never the present" (1976, p. 313). Therefore, as mentioned earlier, if a "relationship is based on images, how can there be a relationship, if it is the relationship of images?" (1976, p. 314).

Most importantly, Krishnamurti stresses that self-understanding can only occur in, or through, relationship. "I can only know myself in relationship; the observation of myself takes place only when there is a response and reaction in relationship..." (1976, p. 444). Thus learning occurs through observation or awareness in relationship. "One can only observe oneself in relationship... And in that relationship, through observing one's reactions, thoughts and motives, one can see, non-verbally, what we are" (1973, p. 110).
For Krishnamurti the term "intelligence" is not synonymous with the ability to use memory, thought and knowledge. Intelligence only exists when there is freedom from the tyranny of memory, thought and knowledge. When our awareness is dominated by knowledge, we are not, in fact, intelligent. "Intelligence has nothing to do with knowledge or information. Knowledge is always the past; it can be called upon to act in the present but it limits the present. Intelligence is always in the present, and of no time" (1977, p. 119). Later in the same volume, Krishnamurti states:

Intelligence is not discernment and judgement or critical evaluation. Intelligence is the seeing of what is. The what is is constantly changing, and when the seeing is anchored in the past, the intelligence of seeing ceases. Then the dead weight of memory dictates the action and not the intelligence of perception. . . . And to see, there must be silence, and from this silence there is action which is entirely different from the activities of thought (p. 141).

One of the best brief descriptions given by Krishnamurti of what he means by intelligence is as follows:

The only thing you can do is to see; you cannot cultivate intelligence. Seeing is more important than intelligence.

There is only seeing or not seeing. . . .

To see means to understand how thought creates the opposites. What thought creates is not real. To see means to understand the nature of thought, memory, conflict, ideas; to see all this as a total process is to understand. This is intelligence; seeing totally is intelligence; seeing fragmentarily is the lack of intelligence (1917, p.287).

Seeing can only occur in a state of mental and physical harmony in which there is no division between the observer and the observed and where the mind is still.

It is that stillness that is intelligence. Intelligence is not thought. . . . Can one see that and remain still with it? . . . To remain completely still with it is intelligence. That intelligence can then operate in thought, using knowledge, and that knowledge and thought will not create division (1976, p. 349).

The above can be summed up as follows: Intelligence exists when there is a "stillness" of mind which brings freedom from
the division of thought and a state of harmony. Out of that stillness and harmony, out of awareness and seeing what is, there is intelligence which can use thought and/or knowledge intelligently or without division, conflict and violence. For example, as cited earlier, thought creates nationalism as a means of security, but seeing the fallacy of this—which is intelligence—it is possible for thought to create a different world in which nationalism does not exist.

CONCLUSION

The preceding paper has summarized some of Krishnamurti’s statements on awareness, thoughts, images, conditioning, knowledge, learning, attachment, dependence, pleasure, fear, memory, conflict, relationship and intelligence. It now remains to place these comments within the context of modern day psychology.

Since the demise of “armchair psychology” and the dominance of behaviorism and logical positivism for most of this century, psychologists are now taking greater interest in phenomenology and the way that thoughts, images, beliefs or concepts influence behavior (e.g. Lazarus, 1966; Alden & Safran, 1978; Meichenbaum, 1977; Beck, 1976; Kelly, 1955). There is a related interest in what has been termed “metacognition” or the human ability to be aware of our own cognitive or phenomenological processes. Many psychologists now consider that increasing individual self-awareness can be a powerful agent of change (e.g. Johnson & White, 1971; Watson & Tharp, 1981; Hodgson & Miller, 1982). Furthermore, most psychologists would agree with Krishnamurti that human beings, their thoughts, feelings, images, beliefs, etc., are highly conditioned, and most would agree with his comments on the way that pleasure, fear and memory shape behavior. His statements that attachment and dependence are survival orientated and rooted in fear have also been supported by empirical studies associated with attachment theory and separation anxiety (e.g., Harlow & Zimmerman, 1959; Bowlby, 1971, 1973; Rutter, 1972).

Where Krishnamurti differs radically from mainstream psychology is in highlighting a heuristic approach to understanding through an awareness in which there is no division between the observer and the observed; his emphasis on the divisive or distorting nature of thoughts and images and the limits of knowledge; the importance he places on the necessity of staying with and getting to the root of fear in order for change to take place, his stress on achieving freedom from conditioning.
through awareness; his understanding of relationship and conflict, and the way he defines learning and intelligence.

Although this brief introduction has not covered all the psychological/phenomenological issues on which he has commented (such as, for example, the difference between sentiment, affection and love), the reader can see that Krishnamurti describes an essential and comprehensive phenomenology. As such its importance and relevance to general and clinical psychology should not be overlooked. In particular, the author suggests that the reader consider the therapeutic relevance of this phenomenology, not as a set of techniques like psychoanalysis or behavior therapy, but as a genuinely heuristically oriented form of learning through awareness.

As a final word it should be said that in writing this paper it was not intended to draw further conclusions than these. Conclusions preempt learnings. Readers should make their own observations in living and thereby discover whether Krishnamurti’s statements are fact or fiction.

NOTE

“The term heuristic is used throughout this paper in the sense defined by Chambers Twentieth Century Dictionary’s “serving or leading to find out” or "the method in education by which the pupil is set to find out things for himself” and not "depending on assumptions based on past experience” (Chambers Twentieth Century Dictionary, New Edition, Edinburgh, Chambers, 1972, p. 612).
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