

J Krishnamurti : Silence, Music and the Arts



J Krishnamurti : Silence, Music and the Arts

The cover picture is taken from the book *All the Marvellous Earth* – a book that looks at the earth in all its beauty and grandeur, and our connection with other creatures. Through his deep appreciation of beauty and questioning of our relationship with nature, Krishnamurti goes beyond the environmentalists' external appeal for sustainable development to argue that the interaction between humankind and nature has a deeper, inward, and life-enhancing dimension.

About the concert - Programme

Aditi Mangaldas

– Seeking the Beloved: Extract from “Uncharted Seas”/ Classical Kathak

Nigel North

– J S Bach: Suite for lute in G minor, BWV 995

Prelude
Allemande
Courante
Sarabande
Gavottes 1 & 2
Gigue

Interval

The interval is designed to be especially long - one hour – so that people can enjoy the art on display at their leisure without feeling pressured or rushed

Aditi Mangaldas

– Zero Moment: Extract Timeless. Contemporary work based on Kathak

Maria João Pires

– Beethoven Sonata in C minor 32, opus 111

The idea of a concert at a well-known hall in central London came about as a result of an informal discussion regarding the philosopher J Krishnamurti's work reaching a wider public, particularly amongst those interested in music and the arts.

Krishnamurti's sensitivity towards the arts and the relationship of the arts to beauty and truth are well-known. He often spoke about arts as a way of creating sensitivity and of its importance in education and in life. In relation to music he said the beauty of music lay in the “silence between the notes”.

More recently, several notable musicians have spoken about the quality of silence that can accompany a musical performance. Claudio Abbado, the conductor, repeatedly referred to the relationship of silence to music. Abbado was well-known for his very great attention to listening in music and facilitating this amongst the players in his orchestras – a quality of listening he transferred from chamber music to orchestral music.

During his lifetime many eminent classical musicians both Western and Indian were associated with Krishnamurti and he is known to have given his time and attention to musicians like Pablo Casals, Arturo Benedetti Michelangeli, Andres Segovia and Igor Stravinsky. M S Subbalakshmi, the great Indian classical singer performed for him year after year in India, and Indian musicians of international repute like Ravi Shankar, Pandit Jasraj, Lakshmi Shankar performed for him after his series of talks at Brockwood Park in Hampshire, for the benefit of the audience too.

London is an important centre for the arts worldwide, with a large community of musicians and artists. So we are conducting an experiment to see if Krishnamurti's art might find a place in mainstream life. In the same way that Mendelssohn brought the work of J S Bach into the public sphere. Perhaps the concert might lead some members of the audience to explore in complete freedom Krishnamurti's work and take it further in their lives if they so wish. So a link, we hope, will be established with the world of the arts and an awareness of Krishnamurti's work in general. Any money that is raised by the concert will go to the Krishnamurti Foundation for the purpose of making Krishnamurti's work available more widely to the public.



Krishnamurti with Stravinsky.

From left to right: J Krishnamurti, Igor Stravinsky, Vera Stravinsky
Photograph made available by Krishnamurti Foundation Trust.

Maria João Pires is one of the very finest classical pianists in the world today. What makes her an outstanding pianist is not only her exquisite artistry but how she views music. She has said in an interview that "learning about music is learning about life" and that "breathing the space and the quietness of the space" is all important to her. A reviewer, Bryce Morrison, has said of her playing "I have no hesitation in declaring Maria João Pires without trace of narcissism - among the most eloquent master - musicians of our time." Maria João Pires, when contacted, said that she has been reading Krishnamurti over many years and that she would consider it an honour to play at such an event.



Photo Felix Broede, Deutsche Grammophon



Photo Dinesh Khanna

Aditi Mangaldas is a leader in the field of classical Indian Dance. She performs regularly at the South Bank and at venues all over the world. She grew up with Krishnamurti's philosophy as her grandmother, Nandini Mehta and her great aunt, Pupul Jayakar, were associated with Krishnamurti for over forty years. Aditi is not only proficient in the classical Kathak dance form but she also incorporates in a very powerful, innovative and imaginative way Krishnamurti's philosophy in dance dramas, thus taking this exquisite dance form beyond the aesthetic aspects to make the audience think about important contemporary but universal human issues. A recent reviewer said of her "Aditi makes the item a sheer delight. Her innovative talent was in full cry... her dance had painterly vision, like quick brush strokes on the canvas creating fleeting images in space".

Nigel North is considered one of the best lutenists in the world today. He is also familiar with Krishnamurti's work and will be playing a Bach suite. Julian Bream in a talk given to the Lute Society at the Wigmore Hall in London in September 2002, said, "I remember going to a remarkable recital, one which I wish I had the ability to give: it was one of Nigel North's Bach recitals, and I was bowled over by how masterful and how musical it was. A real musical experience, something you don't always get from guitar and lute players and which, in general, is pretty rare."



Photo Nigel North



Photo Ian Skelly

Ian Skelly has been a presenter with Radio 3 for nearly 20 years. He introduces live concerts from around the country, presents *Breakfast* and anchors the evenings on Radio 3. He has also made documentaries for the station, for Radio 4 and the World Service, and has been a travel writer for the Observer newspaper. He is also a film maker. He was the writer on a recent film made in Hollywood, shown across America and also, at the express wish of Robert Redford, at the first London Sundance Festival. Ian is a full time writer and has worked closely for a decade with HRH The Prince of Wales, helping him to articulate the detail of his initiatives. They have written a book together, *Harmony*, which was published internationally in 2010. Ian is also the Chairman of the Temenos Academy which is concerned with philosophy and the arts and whose patron is HRH The Prince of Wales.

Art on Display

Nikolaus Harnoncourt, the conductor, said in an interview that art changes the listener.

Krishnamurti's art relates to a fundamental change in human consciousness.

Antoine Bourdelle

31 October 1861 – 1 October 1929

Bourdelle was born at Montauban, Tarn-et-Garonne. He left school at the age of 13 to work as a woodcarver in his father's cabinet-making shop. He learned drawing with the founder of the Ingres Museum in Montauban, then sculpture at the art school in Toulouse. At the age of 24 he won a scholarship to the École des Beaux-Arts in Paris, worked briefly in the atelier of Alexandre Falguière, and frequented the studio of Jules Dalou, who was his neighbour.

In 1888 Bourdelle did his first sculptures of Beethoven, producing authoritative work with an emphasis on order, the spirit of geometry, construction and invention. He became one of the pioneers of 20th century monumental sculpture. Auguste Rodin became a great admirer of his work, and by September 1893 Bourdelle joined Rodin as his assistant where he soon became a popular teacher, both there and at his own studio where many future prominent artists attended his classes, so that his influence on sculpture was considerable.

During his last years, Bourdelle received several commissions for monuments and war memorials. He was a participant in the 1913 Armory Show in New York, a founder and vice-president of the Parisian Salon des Tuileries. In 1909 he was named Knight of the Legion of Honor, in 1919 Officier of the Legion of Honor, and in 1924 became a Commander of the Legion of Honor. Bourdelle's son, Pierre Bourdelle (1903–1966), became an artist most active in the United States, notable for his work at Cincinnati Union Terminal in 1933.

Bourdelle died at Le Vésinet, near Paris, on 1 October 1929 and was interred in the Cimetière du Montparnasse, Paris.

Krishnamurti and Bourdelle

Krishnamurti speaking in Bangalore in 1927, made reference to his friendship with Bourdelle in the following manner: "I have talked to great artists and they understand the simplicity of the truth. They are interested not in jargon nor in phraseology, but in life. I do not wish to appear conceited in any way, but the sculptor Bourdelle, who is considered as great if not greater than the famous Rodin, told me, 'I wish I had met you twenty years ago. I would have been a much greater sculptor.' I tell you this to make you understand that if you go to the source of all things, everything you do will bear the stamp of greatness and of beauty."

Siegward Sprotte

20 April 1913 – 7 September 2004

Siegward Sprotte encountered Krishnamurti for the first time in Hamburg in 1956 and then throughout his life regarded Krishnamurti as the most profound person that he had met. Krishnamurti was undoubtedly a significant influence on Sprotte's life and art.

To quote Sir Hebert Read: "The images that Siegward Sprotte offers us are simple rather than complex; sometimes the object in nature is reduced to a linear sign, an ideograph. But, as in Chinese calligraphy, the sign is always vital, derived from organic patterns of growth.

The justification for such simplicity is its power of visual penetration. Needlessly to elaborate an image is to reduce its effectiveness. All natural growth seeks an economy of means, or as Newton said in the preface to his Principia: *Natura enim simplex est, et rerum causis superfluis non luxuriat* – 'Nature is pleased with simplicity, and affects not the pomp of superfluous cause.' Art too is pleased with simplicity, and I know of no better demonstration of this universal truth than the works of Siegward Sprotte."

Mark Edwards

Photographer, on meeting Krishnamurti

"I was introduced to Krishnamurti by a friend, rather a strange person. I'm pretty sure it was in 1967. I was 20 and studying photography at Guildford School of Art and this guy made me read part of a talk K had given in the 1930s. There was a lot of fuss about Indian gurus at the time. I felt they were fakers, riding a celebrity bandwagon and I wouldn't have enquired into K's teachings if I hadn't been forced, so I'm grateful for the push. I was hooked at the first paragraph.

I was living in a village near Farnham at the time and read everything I could find by and about K - I became a proper Krishnamurti bore. It turned out my parents knew two people who had met K and who both lived in the village – bizarrely the midwife at the nursing home where I was born lived in retirement opposite and had been a Theosophy member; the other friend lived just down the road. Through them I found out about Mary Cadogan who ran the Krishnamurti office. I wrote to her asking if I could photograph Mr Krishnamurti (I pondered the "Mr" for a long time). I really wanted to see if Krishnamurti was genuine – I was still suspicious of the guru image I had, but now it just seems so arrogant on my part. Years later K came up to me and said, "I wish they'd called me Christian Murphy – people wouldn't think I was a guru, a joke he made to a lot of people but it struck a chord in me. Anyway, Mary was working on the first edition of the Bulletin (a small brochure circulated regularly by the Krishnamurti Foundation) and needed an up to date photograph, so it was good timing. We arranged to meet and became friends immediately – a friendship that has enriched my life beyond measure. She liked the sample photos I took along (of the Yehudi Menuhin School I photographed for a college project) and arranged for me to meet K in London, at the White House Hotel alongside Regent's Park.

I drove up from Farnham and was met by K in the lobby. He took me to the lift, the doors closed and he looked at me. I realized he could see me completely – everything about me. I knew that I had a choice in this: I could bring down the curtains and hide or remain open to this very perceptive man. It was a conscious decision on my part to keep the curtains open. All this occurred in that silence that was so much a part of K. We only went to the second floor so it all happened in the space of a few moments. I've spoken to other people who met K and they have had a similar experience, so this was not something special to me."



Tree by Mark Edwards



Krishnamurti by Antoine Bourdelle

SILENT AUCTION

Armin Sprotte of Falkenstein Fine Art, Alte Dorfstrasse 1, 25999 Kampen/Sylt, Germany, Telephone:+49 4651 42413, www.FalkensteinFineArt.com and who is the son of the artist Siegwald Sprotte, has very kindly donated four of Siegwald Sprotte's paintings for Silent Auction. All of the proceeds from the Silent Auction will go to the charity, The Krishnamurti Foundation Trust, to help in making aware of J Krishnamurti's work to the public.

The way the Silent Auction works is that if anyone would like to make a bid for any of the paintings, they can fill in a slip of paper and write their bid on the paper, then put the piece of paper into the box next to the relevant Siegwald Sprotte painting.

Alternatively you can email your bid with your contact details to :

artbid@j-krishnamurti.co.uk

The Silent Auction is open until midnight on 14 October 2016 when the auction will be closed.

We are also very lucky to be able to say that the artist Ben Henderson of New York, USA has donated one of his paintings for the Silent Auction. Like Siegwald Sprotte did, Ben Henderson greatly appreciates the work of Krishnamurti and we are also very grateful for his generosity in contributing one of his works to the Silent Auction.

The reserve prices for the paintings are as follows:



Siegward Sprotte, Coloured Wave, 1977.
Gouache on paper, 51 x 73 cm
We will start with bidding offers at £2,800
Valuation: £7,000



Siegward Sprotte, Coloured Wave II, 1977.
Gouache on paper, 50.7 x 72.9 cm
We will start with bidding offers at £2,800
Valuation: £7,000



Siegward Sprotte, Poppies, 1988.
Gouache on Japan paper, 61 x 40.5 cm
We will start with bidding offers at £1,900
Valuation: £5,600



Siegward Sprotte, In my Garden, 1990.
Gouache on Chinese paper, 61 x 41.5 cm
We will start with bidding offers at £1,900
Valuation: £5,600



Ben Henderson, Flying Dots, 11x 14 “
Open bidding

Siegward Sprotte



Siegward Sprotte, Coloured Wave, 1977, gouache on paper, 51 x 73 cm
Copyright: Falkenstern Fine Art



Siegward Sprotte, Coloured Wave II, 1977, gouache on paper, 50.7 x 72.9 cm
Copyright: Falkenstern Fine Art



Siegward Sprötte, Poppies, 1988, gouache on Japan paper, 61 x 40.5 cm
Copyright: Falkenstein Fine Art



Siegward Sprotte, *In my Garden*, 1990, gouache on Chinese paper, 61 x 41.5 cm
Copyright: Falkenstein Fine Art

Krishnamurti, Music and Silence

Krishnamurti said and wrote a great deal about listening and also about music. In July 1983, he gave a public talk in Saanen, Switzerland called Meditation and the Miracle in Listening – in that talk he explains that listening is an art. The talk is available on YouTube.

It is as if Krishnamurti is pointing out something in life and in music that other artists in the field of music have also come across. It is interesting to see the similarity in some of these quotations:

"The silence between the notes makes for harmonious music"
J Krishnamurti

"The pauses between the notes, ah, that is where the art resides"
Artur Schnabel

"My grandfather used to take me for walks in the mountains and he didn't say very much. I learned from him to listen to silence. And for me, listening is the most important thing: to listen to each other, to listen to what people say, to listen to music"
Claudio Abbado

"After all, music is the silence between two notes. If there were a continuous sound there would be no music. It is the silence between two notes that gives emphasis, beauty to the notes – similarly it is the silence between words, between thoughts, that gives significance meaning to the thought"
J Krishnamurti

Many artists have referred to music being a metaphor for life. Maria João Pires said in a recent interview that the capacity to listen comes from silence and that silence in this context is another word for space.

The connection between listening and meditation is made very clear by Krishnamurti and he said that "meditation is the action of silence" and "when the song is real, there is neither you nor I, but only the silence of the eternal. The song is not the sound but the silence"

"Silence and spaciousness go together. The immensity of silence is the immensity of the mind in which a centre does not exist"

"In total silence, mind comes across the eternal"

The following excerpts from Krishnamurti's work relate directly to listening, meditation, silence and space.

Meditation and Silence

Meditation is not a withdrawal from life. Meditation is a process of understanding oneself. When one begins to understand oneself, not only the conscious but all the hidden parts of oneself as well, there comes tranquillity. A mind that is made still, through meditation, through compulsion, through conformity, is not still. It is a stagnant mind. It is not a mind that is alert, passive, capable of creative receptivity. Meditation demands constant watchfulness, constant awareness of every word, every thought and feeling, which reveals the state of our own being, the hidden as well as the superficial; and as that is arduous, we escape into every kind of comforting, deceptive thing, and call it meditation.

If one can see that self-knowledge is the beginning of meditation, then the problem becomes extraordinarily interesting and vital. After all, if there is no self-knowledge, you may practise what you call meditation and still be attached to your principles, to your family, to your property; or giving up your property, you may be attached to an idea and be so concentrated on it that you create more and more of that idea. That is not meditation. So, self-knowledge is the beginning of meditation; without self-knowledge there is no meditation. As one goes deeper into the question of self-knowledge, not only does the upper mind become tranquil, quiet, but the different layers of the hidden are revealed. When the superficial mind is quiet, the unconscious, the hidden layers of consciousness project themselves; they reveal their content, they give their intimations; so that the whole process of one's being is completely understood.

So, the mind becomes extremely quiet—is quiet. It is not made quiet, it is not compelled to be quiet by a reward, by fear. Then there is a silence in which reality comes into being. But that silence is not Christian silence or Hindu silence or Buddhist silence. That silence is silence, not named. If you follow the path of Christian silence or Hindu or Buddhist, you will never be silent. A man who would find reality must abandon his condition completely—whether Christian, Hindu, Buddhist or of any other group. Merely to strengthen the background through meditation, through conformity brings about stagnation of the mind, dullness of the mind; and I'm not at all sure that's not what most of us want, because it's so much easier to create a pattern and follow it. But to be free of the background demands constant watchfulness in relationship.

When once that silence is, there is an extraordinary creative state—not that you must write poems, paint pictures: you may or you may not. That silence is not to be pursued, copied, imitated—then it ceases to be silence. You cannot come to it through any path. It comes into being only when the ways of the self are understood, and the self with all its activities and mischief comes to an end. That is, when the mind ceases to create, then there is creation. Therefore the mind must become simple, must become quiet, must be quiet—the “must” is wrong: to say the mind must be quiet, implies compulsion. The mind is quiet only when the whole process of the self has come to an end. When all the ways of the self are understood, and therefore the activities of the self have come to an end, then only is there silence. That silence is true meditation; and in that silence the eternal comes into being.

Thought, intelligence, and the immeasurable

I do not know if you have ever thought about space. Where there is space there is silence. Not the space created by thought, but a space that has no frontiers at all, a space that is not measurable, that cannot be connived at by thought, a space that is really quite unimaginable. When man has space, real space, width and depth and an immeasurable sense of extension, not of his consciousness—which is merely another form of thought extending itself with its measurement from a centre—but that sense of space which is not conceived by thought, when there is that kind of space there is absolute silence.

With the overcrowding of cities, the noise, the exploding population, outwardly there is more and more restriction, there is less and less space. New buildings are going up, there are more people, more and more cars polluting the air. In India thousands of people are sleeping and living on the pavement. In London, New York, or where you will, there is hardly any space; the houses are small, people are living enclosed, trapped, and where there is no space there is violence. We have no space either ecologically, socially, or in our own mind. This is partly responsible for the violence.

In our own minds the space we create is isolation, a world built around ourselves. Please do observe this in yourselves. Our space is a space of isolation and withdrawal. We don't want to be hurt any more. We have been hurt and the marks of hurt remain, so we withdraw, we resist, we build a wall around ourselves and around those whom we think we like or love, and that gives a very limited space. It is like looking over the wall into another person's garden, or into another person's mind, but the wall is still there and in that world there is very little space. From that narrow, small, rather shoddy space we act, we think, we love, we function, and from that centre we try to reform the world, joining this or that party. Or from that narrow hold, we try to find a new guru who will teach us the latest way to enlightenment. And in our chattering minds, crowded with knowledge, rumours and opinions, there is hardly any space at all.

I do not know if you have noticed it, but if one has been observant, aware of the things around one and in oneself, has not just lived to earn money and have a bank account, this and that, one must have seen how little space one has, how crowded it is in ourselves. Please watch it in yourself. Being isolated in that little space, with enormous thick walls of resistance, of ideas and of aggression, how is one to have space that is really immeasurable? Thought is measurable, thought is measure. Any form of self-improvement is measurable; self-improvement is the most callous form of isolation. One sees that thought cannot bring about the vast space in which there is complete and utter silence. Thought cannot bring it. Thought can only progress, evolve, in ratio to the end it projects, which is measurable. That space which thought creates, imaginatively or of necessity, can never enter a dimension in which there is space which is not of thought. Through centuries thought has built a space that is very limited, narrow, isolated, and because of this very isolation, it creates division. Where there is division there is conflict, nationally, religiously, politically, in relationship, in every way. Conflict is measurable: less conflict or more conflict, and so on.

Now the question is: how can thought enter into the other? Or can thought never enter it? I am the result of thought. All my activities, logical, illogical and neurotic, or highly educated and scientific are based on thought. "I" am the result of all that, and it has space within the walls of resistance. How is the mind to change that and discover something which is of a totally different dimension? Have you understood my question? Can the two come together?—the freedom in which there is complete silence and therefore vast space, and the walls of resistance which thought has created with its narrow little space. Can the two come together, flow together? This has been the problem of man religiously when he inquires at great depth. Can I hold on to my little ego, to my little space, to the things that I have collected, to my knowledge, experiences, hopes and pleasures, and move into a different dimension where the two can operate? I want to sit on the right hand of God and yet I want to be free of God! I want to live a life of great delight, pleasure and beauty, and also I want to have joy which is not measurable, which cannot be caught by thought. I want pleasure and joy. I know the movement, the demand, the pursuit of pleasure with all its fears, travails, sorrow, agony and anxiety. I also know that joy which is totally uninvited, which thought can never capture; if it does capture it, it again becomes pleasure and then the old routine begins. So I want to have both—the things of this world and the other world.

I think this is the problem for most of us, isn't it? To have a wonderful time in this world—why not?—and avoid all pain, all sorrow, because I also know other moments when there is great joy which cannot be touched, which is not corrupt. I want both, and that is what we are seeking: to carry all our burden and yet to seek freedom. Can I do this through will? Will has nothing whatsoever to do with the actual, with *what is*. Will is the expression of desire as "me". We think somehow through will we shall come upon the other, so we say to ourselves, 'I must control thought, I must discipline thought.' When the "I" says, 'I must control and discipline thought,' it is thought which has separated itself as the "I" and controls thought as something separate. It is still thought: the "I" and the "not I". And one realises—thought being measurable, noisy, chattering, running all over the place—that thought has created the space of a little rat, a monkey that chases its own tail. So one says: how is thought to become quiet? Thought has created the technological world of chaos, of war, of national divisions, religious separations; thought has brought about misery, confusion and sorrow. Thought is time, so time is sorrow. You see all this if you have gone deeply, not at the instruction of another, but merely by observing this in the world and in yourself.

Then the question arises: can thought be completely silent and only function when necessary—when one has to use technical knowledge, in the office, when one is talking and so on—and the rest of the time be absolutely quiet? The more there is space and silence, the more it can function logically, sanely, healthily with knowledge. Otherwise knowledge becomes an end in itself and brings about chaos. Do not agree with me, see it for yourself. Thought, which is the response of memory, of knowledge, 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.

There must be vast space and silence, because when there is that space and silence, beauty comes, there is love. Not the beauty put together by man, architecture, tapestries, porcelain, paintings or poems, but that sense of beauty, of vast space and silence. And yet thought must act, must function. There is no living there, and then coming down. So that is our problem—I am making it a problem so that we can investigate together, so that both you and I discover something in this which is totally new. Each time one investigates without knowing, one discovers something. But if you investigate with knowing, then you will never discover anything. So that is what we are doing. Can thought become silent? Can that thought, which must function in the field of knowledge totally, completely, objectively and sanely, can that thought end itself? That is, can thought which is the past, which is memory, which is a thousand yesterdays, can all that past, all that conditioning come totally to an end, so that there is silence, there is space, there is a sense of extraordinary dimension?

I am asking myself and you are asking it with me: how is thought to end and not in the very ending of it get perverted, go off into some imaginative state and become rather lopsided, neurotic and vague? How is that thought, which must function with great energy and vitality, to be at the same time completely motionless? Have you understood my question? This has been the problem of every serious religious man—not the man who belongs to some sect based on organized belief and propaganda and therefore not religious at all. Can the two operate together, can they move together—not coalesce, not join together, but move together? They can only move together if thought does not separate itself as the observer and the observed.

Life is a movement in relationship, constantly moving and changing. That movement can sustain itself, move freely, when there is no division between the thinker and the thought. That is, when thought does not divide itself as the “me” and the “not me”, as the observer and the observed, the experiencer and the experienced; because in that there is division and therefore conflict. When thought sees the truth of that, then it is not seeking experience, then it is moving in experiencing. Aren't you doing this now?

Just now I said thought with all its knowledge, which is always accumulating, is something living; it is not a dead thing, therefore the vast space can move together with thought. When thought separates itself as the thinker, as the experiencer causing division and conflict, then that experiencer, observer, thinker, becomes the past which is stationary and therefore cannot move. The mind sees in this examination that where there is division in thought, movement is not possible. Where there is division the past comes in and the past becomes stationary, the immovable centre. The immovable centre can be modified and added to, but it is an immovable state and therefore it has no free movement.

So my next question to myself and so to you is: does thought see this, or is perception something entirely different from thought? One sees division in the world, national, religious, economic, social and all the rest of it; in this division there is conflict. That is clear. And when there is division and fragmentation in myself, there must be conflict. Then I am divided in myself as the observer and the observed, the thinker and the thought, the experiencer and the experience. That very division is created by thought, which is the result of the past. I see the truth of this. Now my question is: does thought see this, or does some other factor see it? Or is the new factor intelligence and not thought?

What is the relationship between thought and intelligence? Do you understand my question? I am terribly interested in this personally, you can come with me or not. It is extraordinary to go into this.

Thought has created this division: the past, the present, the future. Thought is time. And thought says to itself: I see this division outwardly and inwardly, I see this division is the factor of conflict. It is not capable of going beyond it, therefore it says: I am where I began, I am still with my conflicts, I see the truth of division and conflict. Now, does thought see that, or does a new factor of intelligence see it? If it is intelligence that sees it, what is the relationship between thought and intelligence? Is intelligence personal? Is intelligence the result of book knowledge, logic, experience? Or is intelligence the freedom from the division of thought, the division which thought has created? Seeing that logically and not being able to go beyond it, it remains with it; it does not try to struggle with it or to overcome it. Out of that comes intelligence.

We are asking: what is intelligence? Can intelligence be cultivated? Is intelligence innate? Does thought see the truth of conflict, of division and all the rest of it, or is it the quality of mind that sees the fact and is completely quiet with the fact?—completely silent, not trying to go beyond it, to overcome it, to change it, but is completely still with the fact. It is that stillness that is intelligence. Intelligence is not thought. Intelligence is this silence and is therefore totally impersonal. It does not belong to any group, to any person, to any race, to any culture.

So my mind has found that there is a silence, not something put together by thought, discipline, practice and all that horror, but a seeing thought cannot possibly go beyond itself; because thought is the result of the past and where the past is functioning it must create division and therefore conflicts. Can one see that and remain still with it? You know, it is like being completely still with sorrow. When somebody dies for whom you care, whom you have looked after, cherished, loved and been concerned with, there is the shock of loneliness, of despair, a sense of isolation, everything falls around you; can one remain with that sorrow not seeking explanations and the cause, thinking, 'Why should he go and not I?' 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.

So the question arises: how is the mind, your mind, which is endlessly chattering, endlessly bourgeois—caught in a trap, struggling, seeking, following a guru and using discipline—how is that mind to be completely still?

Harmony is stillness. There is harmony between the body, the heart and the mind, complete harmony, not discord. That means the body must not be imposed upon, not disciplined by the mind. When it likes a certain kind of food, or tobacco or drugs and the excitement of all that, to be controlled by the mind is an imposition. Whereas the body has its own intelligence when it is sensitive, alive and not spoiled; it has its own intelligence. One must have such a body, which is alive, active, not drugged. Also one must have a heart—not excitement, not sentiment, not emotion, not enthusiasm, but that sense of fullness, of depth, quality, vigour, that can only be when there is love. And one must have a mind that has immense space. Then there is harmony.

How is the mind to come upon this? I am sure you are all asking this, perhaps not now but when you go home, when you walk, you will ask: how can one have this sense of complete integrity, of unity of body, heart and mind without any sense of distortion, division or fragmentation? How do you think you can have it? You see the fact of this, don't you? You see the truth of it, that you must have complete harmony in yourself, in the mind, the heart and the body. It is like having a clear window, without any scratch, unsullied; then as you look out through the window you can see things without any distortion. How can you have that?

Now, who sees this truth? Who sees the truth that there must be this complete harmony? As we said, when there is harmony there is silence. When the mind, the heart and the organism are completely in harmony there is silence; but when one of the three becomes distorted, there is noise. Who sees this fact? Do you see it as an idea, as a theory, as something you "should have"? If you do, then it is all the function of thought. Then you will say: tell me what kind of system I must practise to get this, I will renounce, I will discipline. All that is the activity of thought. But when you see the truth of this—the truth, not what "should be"—when you see that is the fact, then it is intelligence that sees it. Therefore it is intelligence that will function and bring about this state.

Thought is of time, intelligence is not of time. Intelligence is immeasurable—not the scientific intelligence, not the intelligence of a technician, or of a housewife, or of a man who knows a great deal. Those are all within the field of thought and knowledge. It is only when the mind is completely still—and it can be still, you don't have to practise or control, it can be completely still—then there is harmony, there is vast space and silence. Only then the immeasurable is.

Extract from J Krishnamurti, *The Awakening of Intelligence*, Chapter 7 (HarperOne pub.)

Krishnamurti and Modern Science

This is an extract from an article written by eminent quantum physicist David Bohm in 1982.

©Krishnamurti Foundation of America.

"My first acquaintance with Krishnamurti's work was in 1959 when I read his book *The First and Last Freedom*. What particularly aroused my interest was his deep insight into the question of the observer and the observed. This question had long been close to the centre of my own work as a theoretical physicist who was primarily interested in the meaning of the quantum theory. In this theory, for the first time in the development of physics, the notion that these two cannot be separated has been put forth as necessary for the understanding of the fundamental laws of matter in general. Because of this as well as because the book contained many other deep insights, I felt that it was urgent for me to talk with Krishnamurti directly and personally as soon as possible. And when I first met him on one of his visits to London, I was struck by the great ease of communication with him, which was made possible by the intense energy with which he listened and by the freedom from self-protective reservations and barriers with which he responded to what I had to say. As a person who works in science, I felt completely at home with this sort of response, because it was in essence of the same quality as that which I had made in contacts with those other scientists with whom there had been a very close meeting of minds. And here, I think especially of Einstein who showed a similar intensity and absence of barriers in a number of discussions that took place between him and me. After this I began to meet Krishnamurti regularly and to discuss with him whenever he came to London.

Krishnamurti's work is permeated by what may be called the essence of the scientific approach, when this is considered in its very highest and purest form. Thus, he begins from a fact like the nature of our thought processes. This fact is established through close attention, involving careful listening to the process of consciousness, and observing it assiduously. In this, one is constantly learning, and out of this learning comes insight into the overall or general nature of the process of thought. This insight is then tested. First, one sees whether it holds together in a rational order. And then one sees whether it leads to order and coherence in what flows out of it in life as a whole. Krishnamurti constantly emphasizes that he is in no sense an authority. He has made certain discoveries, and he is simply doing his best to make these discoveries accessible to all those who are able to listen. His work does not contain a body of doctrine, nor does he offer techniques or methods for obtaining a silent mind. He is not aiming to set up any new system of religious belief. Rather, it is up to each human being to see if he can discover for himself that to which Krishnamurti is calling attention, and to go on from there to make new discoveries on his own."

Krishnamurti's approach to finding out about what is true in life could be described as the *via negativa* approach – the approach to deny all that can be denied in life until you come across that which is undeniable, and that which cannot be denied is truth. An alternative way of expressing this enquiry into life is to call it the scientific method – the way of experimentation.

In that, what is purported is tested out in actuality, by experimentation, to see if it stands up. If it does not, it is discarded.

The eminent Quantum physicist David Bohm, and associate of Albert Einstein, came across through his science what Krishnamurti was expressing in philosophy:

"He is not aiming to set up any new system of religious belief. Rather, it is up to each human being to see if he can discover for himself that to which Krishnamurti is calling attention, and to go on from there to make new discoveries on his own."

David Bohm

Krishnamurti said this about the self, which is totally relevant to the 'observer and the observed' conundrum, and which interested David Bohm deeply.

"So what are you? You are a name, a form, the result of a society, a culture which has emphasized throughout the ages that you are separate, something indefinitely identifiable. Right? You have your character, your particular tendency, either aggressive or yielding. Is that not put together by the culture, which has been brought about by thought? It is very difficult for people to accept a very simple, logical examination, because they would like to think that the self is something most extraordinary. We are

pointing out that the self is nothing but words and memories."

Taken from *On Mind and Thought*, J Krishnamurti

He said the following about the observer and the observed:

"In all our experiences, there is always the experiencer, the observer, who is gathering to himself more and more or denying himself. Is that not a wrong process and is that not a pursuit which does not bring about the creative state? If it is a wrong process, can we wipe it out completely and put it aside? That can come about only when I experience, not as a thinker experiences, but when I am aware of the false process and see that there is only a state in which the thinker is the thought."

Taken from *The First and Last Freedom*, J Krishnamurti

Krishnamurti pointed out that normal perception through thought and time can never be complete. It is always partial, fragmented, incomplete, broken up, and perception through thought inherently means conflict. Both inwardly in the mind and also in society, which is just a collection of minds – a society which one could say at the moment is the result of minds in conflict, in themselves and often with others.

In one recorded dialogue between Krishnamurti and David Bohm in 1975 there is a passage where David Bohm talks from his scientific viewpoint how thought works in the mind and in the cells of brain.

Bohm says that thought makes an abstraction of reality. Makes an image of it (like a digital camera image – if you like, in today's parlance) which is put into memory contained in the brain cells.

But the image is not the thing. The image is not life in the sense of truth. As David Bohm repeats in the dialogue, the thought image is always an abstraction from life, partial and can never be complete.

The nature of this movement, of this movement of images which is memory of the past, moving and taking itself in and through the present moment and then on, albeit slightly modified, projecting itself into the future, all of this is the entirely closed loop movement of the self operating in time. Krishnamurti often said that thought occurs in matter and Bohm referred to it as a material process in this particular dialogue.

It is very interesting to see what the current brain specialists in the world of cutting edge medicine say. The current neuroscientists refer to the plasticity of the brain and recently an eminent professor of neuroscience asked "if the sense of self and its sense of reality is an illusion created by the brain"

That is science speaking, not Krishnamurti speaking – though you would be hard pressed to tell the difference in that phrase.

But what in essence is Krishnamurti pointing out? Isn't it all about a radical change in consciousness? A different perception of life – a timeless perception which is the result of a transformation of human consciousness. A transformation which, to use Aldous Huxley's words, is through a different set of doors of perception. Not a perception through the observer which is thought, or thought-time, but an entirely different perception.

There is another connection with modern brain science also to be found in Krishnamurti's work where as part of transformation of consciousness he refers to a mutation in the brain cells. Also that listening and awareness are important in this transformation of consciousness.

And what do the the modern brain scientists say about this aspect? When looking at the brain structure some neuroscientists have discovered there is an ability to be aware of habits – but they are not sure of its purpose.

There is a very interesting short collection of letters written by Krishnamurti to a young friend. In those letters he sets out the important part silence plays in the enquiry into life: that meditation in his use of the word is not a conscious act and that the seeing is the doing. That seeing is its own action – the action of awareness. And he writes of awareness chasing thought.

In those letters collected together in the book *Letters to a young friend* he wrote: "Let awareness chase thought through the corridors of the mind, uncovering, never choosing, ever pursuing!"

In relation to the change of consciousness, Krishnamurti wrote:

"What is important is a radical change in the unconscious. Any conscious action of the will cannot touch the unconscious. As the conscious will cannot touch the unconscious pursuits, wants, urges, the conscious mind must subside, be still, and not try to force the unconscious according to any particular pattern of action. The unconscious has its own pattern of action, its own frame within which it functions. This frame cannot be broken by any outward action, and will is an outward act. If this is really seen and understood, the outward mind is still because there is no resistance, set up by will, one will find that the so – called unconscious begins to free itself from its own limitations. Then only is there a radical transformation in the total being of man"

The following interesting quotations relate to modern brain studies and how the scientific method is discovering and coming accross what J Krishnamurti was pointing out in philosophy:

"Identity is often understood to be a product of memory as we try to build a narrative from the many experiences of our lives."

New Scientist

"We are pointing out that the self is nothing but words and memories" *On Mind and Thought*, J Krishnamurti

"In simple terms, what you perceive as real is actually a neurological reconstruction or simulation of the actual real thing. It's not as simple as saying, we see as it is. Actually we do not ever see as it is."

Abhijit Naskar, *Homo: A Brief History of Consciousness*

"The mind is the product of the past, it is the result of yesterday, and can such a mind be open to the unknown? It can only project an image, but that projection is not real."

J Krishnamurti, *The Book of Life*

"This intuitive sense of self is an effortless and fundamental human experience. But it is nothing more than an elaborate illusion. Under scrutiny, many common-sense beliefs about selfhood begin to unravel. Some thinkers even go as far as claiming that there is no such thing as the self."

New Scientist

"Meditation is the ending of this space, the ending of the *me*... for in that space, which is not made by thought, the other does not exist, for you do not exist."

J Krishnamurti, *Meditations 1969*

Joy Hirsch, PhD, a professor of psychiatry, comparative medicine, and of neuroscience at Yale University, has been conducting experiments in what she called the "social synapse", or what occurs in the brain as people communicate. Her lab uses near – infrared spectroscopy, a technique that places laser emitting optodes and electrodes around the skull to free subjects from the scanner to monitor the brain while people interact. They found that two brains in communication work in sync, alternating between word

reception, or speech and production. Hirsch believes these two different approaches shows a new way to look at the self, as part of a larger collective consciousness, overlapping with the selves of others.

"Our consciousness is common, it is shared by all human beings."

J Krishnamurti, July 1983

"We are essentially the common humankind – psychologically; you may be tall, short, dark I am not talking about that. Psychologically we are like the rest of humanity, so we are humanity."

J Krishnamurti, Questions and Answers July 1980, Saanen

"This is the common ground on which all humanity stands. And whatever happens in this field of consciousness we are responsible. That is, if I am that consciousness which is common to all of us, if I am not violent, I am not adding to it, I am bringing a totally new factor to that consciousness. So I am profoundly responsible either to contribute to that violence, to that confusion, to that terrible division; or as I recognise deeply in my heart, in my blood, in the depths of my being, that I am the rest of the world, I am mankind, I am the world, the world is not separate from me, then I become totally responsible."

J Krishnamurti, *Social Responsibility*

Is the via negativa of philosophy, the scientific method and Art reflecting one indivisible truth ?

It is interesting the congruence between modern scientific approaches to the brain and Krishnamurti's philosophy, as if science and philosophy are reflecting the same truths.

Furthermore is there specific relationship between Science, Art and Beauty ? The language of science is mathematics and Bertrand Russell, who met Krishnamurti said:

"Mathematics, rightly viewed, possesses not only truth, but supreme beauty – a beauty cold and austere, like that of sculpture, without appeal to any part of our weaker nature, without the gorgeous trappings of painting or music, yet sublimely pure, and capable of a stern perfection such as only the greatest art can show."

Bertrand Russell (1872-1970), *The Study of Mathematics*

Krishnamurti pointed out that it is not necessary to rush away to a monastery to find out truth - or to live in a special segregated community – rather the understanding of truth can occur exactly where we find ourselves in daily living: "What you do now is far more essential than what you do at some future date. Life is what is happening this instant, not an imagined instant, not what thought has conceived. So it is the first step you take now that is important. If that step is in the right direction, then the whole of life is open to you. The right direction is not towards an ideal, a predetermined end, It is inseparable from what is taking place now. This is not a philosophy, a series of theories. It is exactly what the word philosophy means – love of truth and love of life. It is not something you go to university to the learn. We are learning about the art of living in our daily life"

Krishnamurti and Artists and Musicians

Many artists, writers and musicians had contact directly with Krishnamurti during his lifetime, including:

Aldous Huxley
Igor Stravinsky
Arturo Benedetti Michelangeli
Christopher Isherwood
Pablo Casals
Andres Segovia
Peter Brook

Other artists, writers and musicians although they might never have met him were influenced by, or touched by, Krishnamurti's philosophy such as:

Van Morrison
Henry Miller
Pepe Romero

Some interesting quotes:

"Although I came across and read his books in the early 1970s, I only heard him speak once, at the Masonic Hall San Francisco.

As far back as I can remember I have been influenced by religions and philosophic works and I had a big change in my state of mind just prior to discovering Krishnamurti's books. His philosophy corresponded to what I myself was going through on an inward level. I felt the meaning of Krishnamurti for our time is that one has to think for oneself and not be swayed by any outside religions or spiritual authorities"

Van Morrison

"There is no man I would consider it a greater privilege to meet". "I know of no living man whose thought is more inspiring." "There is a name . . . which stands out in contrast to all that is secret, suspect, confusing, bookish and enslaving: Krishnamurti. Here is one man of our time who may be said to be a master of reality. He stands alone..." "[His] language is naked, revelatory and inspiring. . . Instead of an obstacle race or a rat trap, it makes of daily life a joyous pursuit. There is something about Krishnamurti's utterances which makes the reading of books seem utterly superfluous."

Henry Miller

After attending one of Krishnamurti's talks, confided in a letter, . . . "the most impressive thing I have listened to. It was like listening to a discourse of the Buddha - such power, such intrinsic authority. . . The reader will find a clear contemporary statement of the fundamental human problem, together with an invitation to solve it in the only way in which it can be solved - by and for himself."

Aldous Huxley

Krishnamurti "a religious figure of the greatest distinction" and added, "He is the most beautiful human being I have ever seen."

George Bernard Shaw

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank all who contributed to J Krishnamurti: Silence, Music and the Arts including:

Maria João Pires

Nigel North

Aditi Mangaldas

Ian Skelly

Armin Sprotte

Ben Henderson

Melanie Moulton and Askonas Holt Ltd

Steinway Hall

Bob and Elizabeth Boas

David and Louise Kaye

Invictanet Ltd

Artofdata.com Ltd

World Arts

Aileen Hennell

Humphrey Burton

Sam Jackson and Classic FM

Diana Mavroleon and Resonance FM

Lancewich Ltd

Krishnamurti Concert

**Beethoven Sonata No: 32 Opus 111
Bach Lute Suite, BWV 995
Indian Classical Dance**

A unique concert to celebrate philosophy and the arts

**3rd September 2016 - 7.30pm
London, Cadogan Hall**

Maria João Pires



**PhotoFelix Broede, Deutsche
Grammophon**

Nigel North



Aditi Mangaldas



Photo Dinesh Khanna

***All proceeds will go to making J Krishnamurti's work available to the public
Picture: Siegwald Sprotte, Unobstructed Horizons I, 1986, Sprotte Foundation ST - 1131
copyright: falckenstern fine art**

S. Sprotte 86