

# Questioning and Completing the Legacy of David Bohm

## Reflections on SMN Conference, November 2009

### Paul Hague

This essay contains a few reflections on the conference organized by the Scientific and Medical Network (SMN) on the legacy of David Bohm on 21st November 2009 in London called 'Infinite Potential'. As such, it completes the set of essays and flyers I wrote in preparation for the conference, which were not distributed because the milieu was not conducive and there were no facilities for doing so.

So what is a legacy and what was DB's true legacy? Well, using DB's archaeology of language, not mentioned at the conference, *legacy* was originally the office of a deputy, the district of a legate, which derives from Latin *legatus*, past participle of *legare* 'to send as a deputy, bequeath', from the Proto-Indo-European root *\*leg-* 'to collect, to speak', also the base of *lecture*, *lesson*, *legend*, *intelligent*, *legal*, *loyal*, *logic*, *Logos* and many other related words. So a legate maintaining the legacy of David Bohm is someone who speaks on his behalf, like an official representative of the pope. But such an approach does not do justice to DB's life and work. For instance, he said in 1986 in an interview on Krishnamurti's liberating approach to education that if we do not question our beliefs and assumptions, then humanity is not a viable species. In a similar fashion, Leonardo da Vinci said, "He is a poor disciple who does not excel his master."

Of course, following in the footsteps of an authority is the traditional academic way, endeavouring to maintain the status quo. But as Vimala Thakar said in *Spirituality and Social Action*, "In a time when the survival of the human race is in question, continuing with the status quo is to cooperate with insanity, to contribute to chaos," hardly consonant with DB's endeavours to bring a new sense of order to science in particular and life in general. The traditional way of maintaining a legacy also does not help with the SMN's New Renaissance project or with the Institute of Noetic Science's promotion of "the next scientific revolution, one every bit as profound as those created by Copernicus, Darwin, and Einstein".

The conventional approach to learning is also not consistent with DB's method of working. As Basil Hiley told us in his talk, DB would start with informal intuitive ideas and then construct technical arguments. This is very similar to Einstein's approach, described in a famous letter published in Jaques Hadamard's *The Psychology of Invention in the Mathematical Field* in 1945. Einstein said that words or language did not play any role in his mechanism (sic) of thought. Rather he began by combining psychical images as elements of thought. He then said, "Conventional words or other signs have to be sought for laboriously only in a secondary stage, when the mentioned associative play is established and can be reproduced at will."

Being conscious of the way we think was, of course, central to DB's work, which he extended into the social arena with his concept of Dialogue, as Donald Factor told us in his talk. However, I was surprised that DF did not fully mention what for me are two key elements of Dialogue, although I have never actually participated in a Bohmian Dialogue myself. As the initiating proposal for Dialogue that DB and DF wrote with Peter Garrett states, "In Dialogue, a group of people can explore the individual and collective presuppositions, ideas, beliefs, and feelings that subtly control their interactions." (As far as I remember, DF did not mention the need to question our

*Questioning and Completing the Legacy of David Bohm*

presuppositions.) Secondly, if the group is to be conscious of the process of dialogue, it is sometimes necessary to break into a meta-dialogue, mentioned in the proposal but not in DF's talk.

So what is DB's true legacy and how can we broaden it and bring it to its natural culmination? Well, we can clearly see that DB's intuitive starting point was Wholeness, the True Nature of us all, whatever our beliefs to the contrary might be. But how can we consciously return Home to Wholeness, the Alpha and Omega for all our lives? Well, DB wrote in the first paragraph of the first chapter of *Wholeness and the Implicate Order*, called 'Fragmentation and Wholeness':

It is especially important to consider this question today, for fragmentation is now very widespread, not only throughout society, but also in each individual; and this is leading to a kind of general confusion of the mind, which creates an endless series of problems and interferes with our clarity of perception so seriously as to prevent us from being able to solve most of them. Thus art, science, technology, and human work, in general, are divided up into specialities, each considered to be separate from the others.

DB then went on to say that because "each human being has been fragmented into a large number of separate and conflicting compartments ... it is generally accepted that some degree of neurosis is inevitable, while many individuals going beyond the 'normal' limits of fragmentation are classified as paranoid, schizoid, psychotic, etc."

Yet, it hasn't always been this way, as DB points out. From time immemorial, people have "projected myths of a yet earlier 'golden age', before the split between man and nature and between man and man had yet taken place. Indeed, man has always been seeking wholeness—mental, physical, social, individual."

Then, pointing out that the words *health*, *whole*, and *holy* have a common Germanic root, "roughly equivalent to the Hebrew *shalom* ['peace']", DB said, "All of this indicates that man has sensed always that wholeness or integrity is an absolute necessity to make life worth living. Yet, over the ages, he has generally lived in fragmentation. *Surely, the question of why all this has come about requires careful attention and serious consideration* (my emphasis)."

It is thus utterly amazing that a conference convened to honour David Bohm's legacy barely mentioned this, the most critical issue of our times. While *Wholeness* was mentioned occasionally, I heard no speaker or questioner using the word *fragmentation*. So the subject of how the fragmented mind might be healed in Wholeness did not come up. DB understood many of the key issues here, some mentioned in passing by several speakers at the conference, and outlined in my essay 'In Gratitude to David Bohm and J. Krishnamurti', a summary of an extended essay 'Healing the Fragmented, Split Mind in Wholeness'. However, DB, himself, was unable to take all the necessary steps, and neither, it seems, have his successors at the conference.

To some extent, this is because of DB's own behaviour patterns. F. David Peat tells us in his candid biography of DB called *Infinite Potential* that while DB complained about fragmentation both in science and in life, "with respect to friends and colleagues, [he] compartmentalized his areas of interest, discussing physics with one, Krishnamurti with someone else, and with yet another, language and perception." So all of the speakers at the conference represented just one aspect of DB's life and work, with none representing the whole man. The conceptual confusion that arose from this fragmentation was, for me, the most noticeable feature of the conference. For fragmentation leads to delusion, a mental disorder that is as widespread as the split mind, which Osho and Eckhart Tolle have called schizophrenia, out of touch with Reality, from the Greek *skhizein* 'to split' and *phren* 'mind'.

One step that DB could have taken in his own search for Wholeness would have been to have abandoned physics and work with Krishnamurti full time, for you cannot find Wholeness from within any one specialist discipline or culture. But while DB considered this possibility, as FDP told us, he did not take this step. FDP also talked about an incident when his wife described the powerful effect of a holotropic breathwork session that she had had with Stanislav Grof, at which DB had said how much he would have liked to do such an exercise.

*Reflections on SMN Conference, November 2009*

This is particularly sad because in April 1992, DB spoke at a conference organized by the International Transpersonal Association in Prague called ‘Science, Spirituality, and the Global Crisis’, where I last met DB and met Saral Bohm for the first and only time. And as a pre-conference activity, Christina and Stan Grof arranged a holotropic breathwork session for some 300 participants, a most wonderful liberating experience and a vitally important step in my own psychospiritual awakening.

But maybe such an opportunity was too late for DB himself. When I met DB in 1985 (our fourth meeting after a break of a couple of years), he apologized for not being able to meet me earlier because he was recovering from long periods of depression the previous year, as Mary Cadogan told us in her short talk on DB’s relationship to Krishnamurti. For myself, I was in the process of recovering from what Christina and Stan Grof call a ‘spiritual emergency’, when Spirit emerges faster than the organism can handle.

Andrew Gibb, a Ph.D. student with Basil Hiley in DB’s department at Birkbeck College, who I had met at the Teilhard Centre in 1984, told me that such a crisis is symptomatic of what Abraham Maslow called the ‘Jonah Syndrome’, a pandemic today, as I describe in my writings. Andrew, who was one of the few people ever to appreciate my questioning approach to human learning, but who tragically died at thirty of a genetic disorder, was the spark that set my own psychospiritual healing process in motion. He invited me to participate in a two-weekend therapy training with some Americans called ‘LifeTraining’, which several academics at Cambridge University had taken, including a Nobel Laureate, who also attended the SMN conference this month.

At the conference, both MC and FDP honestly spoke about DB’s difficulties in this respect, not usually done at scientific conferences. As MC told us, DB had a deep longing for approval and acknowledgement, but as this was not forthcoming in the way that DB, a man living many years ahead of his time, desired, he suffered deep depressions at various times in his life. Despite working with K for some twenty years, DB never resolved his psychospiritual problems, leading to estrangement, as FDP tells us in his biography. This is very sad because if we are unwilling to look into the depths of the soul for whatever reason, then humanity is not a viable species, quite unable to realize its Infinite Potential, as I outline in my flyer ‘Opening up the Soul’.

So how can we fulfil DB’s legacy, completing both his life’s work and that of Isaac Newton and Albert Einstein? Well, to do so, we need to take an evolutionary perspective, which tells us why people’s minds are so fragmented and split today. We can simply define evolution as an accumulative process of divergence and convergence, proceeding in an accelerating, exponential fashion by synergistically creating wholes that are greater than the sum of the preceding wholes through the relationships that are formed, apparently out of nothing. (This ability of structures to increase in complexity through the power of Life from nothing could be related to what DB called the quantum potential, a term in the partial differential equations that BH used in his presentation.)

However, while evolution is both divergent and convergent, during the 25,000 years of human learning in the noosphere, it has been more divergent than convergent, which we can clearly see in religious demarcations, academic specialization, and the division of labour in the workplace. Indeed, it is this divergence that enables us to see the wonderful diversity of the species, but unable to see the underlying Reality that all forms of life share in common. It is interesting to note in this respect that biodiversity—the variation of life forms—is often used as a measure of the health of biological systems.

So no one is to blame for our fragmented minds and what Erich Fromm called our sick society, whose superficial diversity is as much a source of conflict and suffering as a source of necessity and fascination. We are all the products of some fourteen billion years of evolution since the most recent big bang. None of us would be where we are today without all these aeons of development. And as a corollary, where we might evolve in the future is not in our hands, or minds, as we might

### *Questioning and Completing the Legacy of David Bohm*

more appropriately say. Nevertheless, we can see the general trends once we are conscious of the way we think, learn, and organize our ideas, for then evolution becomes fully conscious of itself.

Most importantly, if divergent evolution continues to predominate, with no one able to understand what is happening to us all at these critical times we live in, then it is probable that we shall be driven to extinction in ignorance before we have been able to realize our Infinite Potential as Divine, Cosmic beings.

The only practical way forward for humanity is therefore for all the divergent streams of evolution to converge in a megasynthesis of everything, as Pierre Teilhard de Chardin prophesied in *The Human Phenomenon*. However, he saw this megasynthesis more in the collective than in the individual, healing our sick society more than our fragmented minds, as this passage indicates:

The way out for the world, the gates of the future, the entry into the superhuman, will not open ahead to some privileged few, or to a single people, elect among all peoples. They will yield only to the thrust of *all together* in the direction where all can rejoin and complete one another in a spiritual renewal of the Earth.

What Teilhard called Superhuman is obviously related to Aurobindo Ghose's Supermind, in which there is no paralysing division, because knowledge is not self-divided. As Aurobindo said in *The Life Divine*, "The Supermind is the Vast; it starts from unity, not division, it is primarily comprehensive, differentiation is only its secondary act."

But it is important not to confuse the underlying concepts with the words that are used to represent concepts. What Aurobindo meant by *Supermind* seems to be much closer to what I would call *Consciousness* or *Wholeness*. We can see this from his confusion about the concepts of evolution and involution in relationship to time, as I describe in two other flyers prepared for the David Bohm conference, held three days before the 150th anniversary of the publication of Darwin's *On the Origin of Species*: 'Evolution, Involution, and Revolution' and 'The Two Dimensions of Time'. We can see from these flyers that while Aurobindo started from unity, he did not manage to use David Bohm's notion of order, learnt from his artist friend Charles Biederman, to develop and maintain a fully integrated mind, which is what we can best call Supermind.

But is humanity destined to evolve into a society of individuals with healed, translucent minds living in love, peace, and harmony with each other and our environment? Well, while I have lived in hope for the past sixty years that such a Utopian society would one day emerge, my visit to London this month has finally convinced me that it won't. For even DB thought that Teilhard's prophecy would never be fulfilled. As FDP reminded us, DB could not see how there could be a grand unified theory (as a form of insight) that encompasses the Totality of Existence. In DB's words, mentioned by FDP, "there can no more be an ultimate form of such thought than there could be an ultimate poem (that would make all further poems unnecessary)". And in an obituary on DB published in the *Noetic Sciences Review* in 1994, William Keepin said, "imagine a Grand Unified Symphony that encompassed all possible symphonies—past, present, and future—thereby rendering all further musical composition redundant and unnecessary. The idea is preposterous."

One reason why DB limited his potential was that he never inverted his worldview, putting Consciousness first, matter second. This is a little strange because when we met in 1985, after I had discovered the paradigm shift taking place in science through such people as Fritjof Capra, Rupert Sheldrake, Peter Russell, Willis Harman, and David Bohm himself, we talked about the possibility of completing today's scientific revolution. I was very keen on this prospect, for what was to become Integral Relational Logic (IRL), the gnostic foundation and metaphysical framework for the Unified Relationships Theory (URT), was just beginning to emerge in consciousness. But DB pointed out that if such a scientific revolution were a possibility, it would not be a paradigm shift or change. For Wholeness is not a paradigm in the sense of pattern; ultimately Consciousness is a seamless, borderless continuum, with no divisions anywhere. In a similar fashion, Krishnamurti called Truth the 'Pathless Land'. Nevertheless DB could not see that the infinite potential of self-reflective, integral, abstract thought would lead to an all-inclusive cosmology of cosmologies.

*Reflections on SMN Conference, November 2009*

DB and I began to go in different directions after this 1985 meeting. I began to focus on my psychospiritual awakening, an adventure that DB wanted to go on but apparently didn't dare. Two years later, my Norwegian wife and I told DB about Barry Long, who was claiming to be K's successor, which led DB to meet BL a couple of times, I believe, not mentioned in FDP's biography. But at our sixth and final meeting in Prague in 1992, it was clear from DB's comments about BL that DB was searching for spiritual enlightenment while still being attached to his identity as a physicist. Nevertheless, even to his dying days, DB was longing to realize what K taught, as MC told us in her talk.

All the physicists at the conference were similarly still holding on to the traditional Western worldview. When a questioner asked how DB was led to study the way that consciousness emerges from matter, none of the panellists said that the question contains an invalid assumption. One problem here is a lack of understanding of what a physicist studies. The word *physics* derives from Greek *phusis* 'birth, origin, nature, inborn quality'. So the true physicist turns inwards searching for the origin of the Universe. She or he does not spend billions of dollars searching for our origins through telescopes pointing into outer space or in particle accelerators. When Bernard Carr, the chairman of the conference and SMN vice-chair, asked how many people at the conference were physicists, I was tempted to put my hand up. But I don't think anyone would have understood my meaning in doing so.

It was particularly revealing that BC should rejoice when he told the meeting that the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) had been switched on again that very day after a one-year hiatus. For DB said that the philosophy of atomism, which we have inherited from Leucippus and Democritus, is inconsistent with the undivided and unbroken flowing movement that is most evident to experience and observation. Furthermore, while BH told us that DB thought that quantum physics should really be called *quantum non-mechanics* rather than *quantum mechanics*, BH used the latter term throughout his talk.

When we are sloppy with language in this way, this is a clear indication that we don't really understand the key difference between human beings and machines, like computers. When I first met DB in November 1980, six months after I had resigned from my marketing job with International Business Machines (IBM), he gave me a synopsis for a science fiction fable, of which there were apparently several versions, as MC told us at the conference. The plot that I was given addressed the key issue of the relationship between 'silicon-based intelligence' (SBI) and 'carbon-based intelligence' (CBI), focusing attention on how any tensions between SBI and CBI might be resolved in the future. For myself, after some forty-five years investigating this vitally important issue, I have now resolved this dilemma, as I describe in my magnum opus, *Wholeness: The Union of All Opposites*. But it turns out that scientific fact is much stranger than science fiction, given our materialistic, mechanistic, and monetary conditioning.

In BH's case, he honestly told us that he is still at a primitive stage of development in the understanding of the relationship of mind and matter. Fair enough, for all European languages reflect this confusion. Even though language is secondary in the creation of a coherent set of ideas, as DB and Einstein were aware, DB introduced the rheomode of language to denote his process view of reality, making the verb primary, overcoming the subject-verb-object structure of the English language.

Leroy Little Bear told us in a most interesting talk on the Blackfoot language of Native Americans that this language similarly puts the verb first. Indeed LLB told us that he can talk all day without using a noun. This is an aspect of ancient wisdom that I had not been aware of before. Not only is the semantics of original languages closer to Nature and the Truth, it seems that the syntax of such indigenous languages is also, a subject that I still have to investigate further through a DVD called *The Language of Spirituality* starring both Leroy Little Bear and F. David Peat.

### *Questioning and Completing the Legacy of David Bohm*

For myself, I coined a rheomode word in November 1983, when writing a paper for DB called ‘The Thoughtful Society: The Problems and Ethics of Communicating my Universal System of Coherent Thought’. DB coined the verb *vidate*, from the Latin *videre* ‘to see’, which is used in English in *video*, to mean “to call the attention to a spontaneous and unrestricted act of perception of any sort whatsoever, including perception of whether what is seen fits or does not fit into a broader context or not, as well as perception even of the very attention-calling function of the word itself”. He also coined *redivate*, *dividate*, *redividate*, and *irredividate* with corresponding nouns based on *vidation*.

But none of these words satisfactorily describe how I came to create and see a holographic image of the Totality of Existence. So I naturally coined the words *convidate* and *convidation* to denote the universal system of coherent thought that was then emerging within me. Today I call this commonsensical science of reason Integral Relational Logic because it has evolved from Ted Codd’s relational model of data, which Larry Ellison took as the foundation for Oracle, today a Fortune-500 company. Although I had not yet learnt to meditate in the conventional way, I regarded *convidation* as a form of meditation, where the focus of attention is not on a process, like breathing, but on the emergence of ideas as they arise directly from our Divine Source.

However, James Robertson—cofounder of The Other Economic Summit, where I met my Norwegian wife in 1985, and the New Economics Foundation—wrote to me that year saying that *convidate* and *convidation* should really be *convide* and *convision*. I didn’t much like this and as the rheomode clearly wasn’t working, around 1989, I changed these words to *colluminate* and *collumination*, based on *illuminate* and *illumination*, respectively. *Collumination* has two meanings: (1) The coherent light of Consciousness, enabling us to view the Totality of Existence holographically, rather like the coherent light of a laser, in contrast to the diffuse light of the sun or a light bulb, (2) The action of colluminating, the skill of combining thinking or cogitation with a meditation technique such as vipassana or insight meditation, enabling the coherent light of Consciousness to shine radiantly through the healed, translucent mind.

But collumination is not really a process in the horizontal dimension of time, where machines, like computers, function. Collumination acts more in the vertical dimension of time, where the mystics live: in the Eternal Now. Using another well-known metaphor for Consciousness as an ocean, the Ocean of Consciousness is a multidimensional development of DB’s notion of the holomovement, as I describe in ‘Healing the Fragmented, Split Mind in Wholeness’. However, I don’t often use the word *collumination* because, even though I have been consciously colluminating for over a quarter of a century, I have yet to discover anyone else on Earth who is even beginning to learn to colluminate.

Nevertheless, it is through collumination, as a creative, evolutionary process, and its reverse, dying process, which I call involution, that I have been able to end the long-running war between science and religion, which deeply disturbed me as an eight-year-old in 1950. Sadly, no one else seems to have unified Western reason and Eastern mysticism in this way, for if they had, there would no longer be any need for the SMN to hold Mystics and Scientists conferences each year, or even for the SMN to exist.

This ongoing split was quite obvious at the David Bohm conference. For instance, another symptom of the deep schism between science and spirituality was revealed when BC said in his opening remarks that DB had become something of a cult figure in the New Age movement, at which BH ejaculated, ‘unfortunately’. But even those on the other side of the fence, so to speak, did not always view DB favourably. For instance, at Barry Long’s first master class in Australia in October 1993, BL despisingly referred to DB as the ‘archpriest’ of the scientists. There clearly was not a meeting of the minds when they met, a situation that I similarly experienced in my meetings with Barry, as a man. It was only as a mystic that he mirrored my Divine Essence, which we all share.

So where does humanity go from here? With scientists and medical practitioners unable to put first things first, realizing in their depth and breadth of being that Consciousness is the Cosmic Context for all our lives and that Love is the Divine Essence that we all share, we must regard the more advanced spiritual seekers who have gone beyond the much-ridiculed New Age movement to be the harbingers of whatever awakened society might arise from the ashes of the global economy, which will inevitably self-destruct in the next couple of years. But these exemplars of *Homo divinus* are generally more focused on Oneness than Wholeness, more interested in killing the mind in No-Mind than in healing the fragmented mind so that it becomes translucent, as free as possible of our religious, scientific, and economic mechanistic conditioning.

So Andrew Stone's enthusiastic talk on 'Space to Contemplate' may be the way to go, even though this falls far short of building on DB's legacy, on his lifelong endeavours to heal the fragmented, split mind in Wholeness. Such an initiative is more related to the great Spiritual Renaissance currently spreading around the world than to today's Scientific Revolution, both of which are necessary if we are to cocreate the Sharing Economy, recognizing that we are all one.

For myself, it is now crystal clear that my magnum opus, alternatively called *Semantic Principles of Natural Philosophy*, will never be published in hardcopy form. This alternative title indicates that this seminal book is intended to complete today's scientific revolution, just as Newton's *Principia* completed the Copernican revolution. Most of this book has been on the Internet for the past two years in close to its final form and on the Web for over ten years in an evolving form. But not a single person on Earth has discovered that the solution to the ultimate problem of human learning has been available to anyone who might be searching for it. Even when I give people a printed copy, they do not read it because it is too overwhelming. It is not sufficient just to be interested in ending the long-running war between science and religion. It is also necessary to dedicate one's entire life to Wholeness, sacrificing everything that might get in the way, such as attachment to family, home, job, career, and money. For without a radical change of work ethic, focused on the Awakening of Intelligence, humanity has no future.

How I should live the rest of my life on Earth is however far from clear. What is certain is that never again will I leave my natural habitat, which is Wholeness, and attempt to communicate to those who are not able to receive what I have to offer. For doing so is a violation of Wholeness and thus extremely painful, which shows that I am not yet fully free of my personal conditioning in a social environment, although I am in solitude, when on silent meditation retreat, or when making divine love with my beloved. I am thus more of a Bodhisattva than a Buddha, an issue that DB explored in his first book, as BH described, and which I have not yet read, but have ordered from the Swedish university library system, along with some other books mentioned at the conference.

For beginning with Wholeness and undivided flowing movement, BH told us that DB was led to question the relationship between Wholeness and the individual, which I explore in depth in 'Healing the Fragmented, Split Mind in Wholeness', and between movement and the invariant, just a couple of pairs of opposites, all of which are unified by the Principle of Unity, the fundamental design principle of the Universe: *Wholeness is the union of all opposites*. But as I said in my flyer 'The Principle of Unity', this universal, self-verifying truth is at once the simplest and most difficult notion to assimilate in consciousness. For by doing so, the fragmented mind becomes fully healed and individual consciousness expands to such an extent that it becomes coterminous with Consciousness itself, quite mind-shattering and -opening.

As there is a primary-secondary relationship between mysticism and science, I could just rest in the bliss of Wholeness, doing nothing for the rest of my life, like hermits living in their caves. For having reached the Omega point of evolution at the end of time, there really is nothing more for me to do in life. However, falling into the traditional mystical trap, drunk with the Divine, doesn't feel right given the limitless creative energies that are constantly pouring through me.

### *Questioning and Completing the Legacy of David Bohm*

So I might well complete my magnum opus, continuing to clarify particular subjects that I have studied over the years, but not yet fully written down in an ordered fashion, such as the history of modern philosophy and banking. BH told us that DB wrote his first book on quantum physics with such a purpose. For myself, I find writing most therapeutic, a healing process that is damaged by wanting people to understand what I am saying. But, without attempting to communicate to others, for in Wholeness that is no other, there is still some further work I could do. For instance, there is clearly a link between what DB called DROPS (Distinction, Relationship, Order, Pattern, and Structure) and my view of the Universe as meaningful, structure-forming relationships, an all-inclusive view that has arisen from my work with information systems architects in business.

It is thus surprising that apparently there is nothing that I can say that my contemporaries could understand with fragmented, conditioned minds. To resolve this problem, four years ago, I drafted a 13-part television series called 'Our Evolutionary Story' intended to bring the central issue of our times to the general public, as I outlined in another flyer prepared for the David Bohm conference.

So on the Monday evening following the conference, I tossed this idea to Barrie Whatley, a friend of friend, who I first met when they were both Ph.D. students in the 1960s. Barrie was a science TV producer for the Open University and cofounder of PAWS (Public Awareness of Science and Engineering), an organization encouraging TV producers throughout Europe to present science through their programmes and other media. However, Barrie could not see any purpose in my proposal, and maybe he is right. What is happening to humanity at the present time could be both incredibly exiting and terrifying. It is not possible to separate these opposites, although the New Age movement tends to focus attention on the former and others on the latter. So maybe it is best that people should remain in ignorance and I should not speak. For as Thomas Gray said in a poem reflecting on his schooldays at Eton, "Where ignorance is bliss, 'tis folly to be wise."

I met Barrie at the annual award ceremony for 'Environment in TV and New Media', focusing on climate change along the theme 'Last Stop before Copenhagen: Visions of the Future'. One topic that came up in the discussion panel at the end was how can science could generate energy technologies that could reduce carbon emissions by 80% in the UK, considered conservative by the moderator, but much less than the USA and China are intending to propose in Denmark.

But what no one seems to realize is that the energy crisis facing humanity today is not about physical energy, but about the immense psychospiritual energies that lie trapped in the human psyche. That is the source of our Infinite Potential. But how can we release all this energy when even organizations like the SMN are constrained by the prevailing culture? We are all limited by decades, centuries, and millennia of personal, cultural, and collective conditioning, which if not released soon will drive humanity to an early grave. As Osho said forty-one times in his discourses, for humanity to realize its Infinite Potential, "We have to create a discontinuity with the past."

In this respect, Osho was an even greater revolutionary than Krishnamurti, who was against all organizations and so was not a threat to the Roman Catholic Church, as Osho pointed out in *Sermon in Stones*. For it is only when we work harmoniously together with a common vision that we can create miracles. As Osho said, "Be realistic, plan for a miracle."

Four days before the David Bohm conference, I formulated a project with this purpose in mind called 'Project Heraclitus: Revealing the Hidden Harmony'. At lunch on the Saturday, I tried to bounce this idea with Iain McGilgrist, the author of *The Master and the Emissary: The Divided Brain and the Making of the Western World*. But we did not get very far because Iain sees Heraclitus as a process philosopher, not as a both-and mystic, like Lao Tzu and Osho. Furthermore, he looks at the global crisis facing humanity today in terms of brain function, not as a crisis of the mind, the title of the penultimate chapter in my magnum opus, yet to be completed. For if we do not demolish the seven pillars of unwisdom that underlie Western civilization and rebuild society on the seven pillars of wisdom, humanity has no future. Doing this collectively is where David Bohm's true legacy lies.