

# 7. The Challenge of Publishing *Wholeness*

Paul Hague

February 2011

**W***holeness: The Union of All Opposites*, the book that I have been researching and writing since the spring of 1980, is the solution to the problem that Albert Einstein spent the last thirty years of his life trying to solve. Namely, *Wholeness*, alternatively titled *Semantic Principles of Natural Philosophy*, expresses a fully integrated body of knowledge capable of describing all the forces in the Universe—both psychospiritual and physical—within a single, all-encompassing, coherent framework.

I must admit to feeling not a little scared at the magnitude of the task that Life has given me to complete. For publication of this book would change the lives of every child, woman, and man on Earth. Specifically, *Wholeness* describes in the most thorough scientific terms how all the Holy wars—wars about the Whole—that have bedevilled human affairs for many thousands of years could come to end. Furthermore, by unifying Eastern mysticism and Western reason, *Wholeness* shows how we could end not only the long-running war between science and religion, but also all the other conflicts between groups and individuals, not the least those between the sexes and banks and other financial institutions, such as joint-stock companies, more focused on making money than on fulfilling our basic needs for food, clothing, warmth, and shelter, with calamitous psychological and ecological consequences.

So publishing *Wholeness* would be a most unusual event in the history of ideas, one that can only really be understood in relationship to the publication of other epoch-making treatises. For instance, Nicolaus Copernicus completed his book *On the Revolutions of the Heavenly Spheres* around 1530, when he was 57. However, it was not until he was on his deathbed 13 years later that the ‘young firebrand’, Joachim Rheticus, persuaded him to publish. In a similar fashion, while Johannes Kepler published the *New Astronomy* in 1609, when he was 38, it was not until ten years later that he completed his greatest masterpiece *The Harmony of the World*. And Isaac Newton only published *Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy* in 1687 when he was 44 after Edmund Halley agreed to act as midwife, financing publication himself. For as a student at Cambridge University commented on seeing Newton pass him in the street, “There goes the man that writt a book that neither he nor any body else understands.”

More recently, Charles Darwin was only motivated to publish *On the Origin of Species by Natural Selection* in 1859 aged 50 upon receiving a letter from Alfred Russel Wallace describing a very similar theory of evolution. Darwin had hesitated for some 20 years because he knew that publishing would offend both his wife and some of his closest friends. It was left to Thomas Huxley, Darwin’s ‘bulldog’, to present this flawed, Life-denying theory in public. Einstein, himself, was able to publish his special theory of relativity in 1905, when he was just 26, because the change that he made to Newton’s worldview was minimal. However, it took another 11 years to complete the general theory of relativity, which Arthur Eddington confirmed experimentally in 1919. But even then, this was not easy to understand. A journalist interviewing Eddington is reputed to have said, “I hear that you are one of only three people who understand the theory of relativity,” to which Eddington replied, “Oh! Who is the third one?”

Then when David Bohm, a colleague and friend of Einstein, was 63 in 1980, he published *Wholeness and the Implicate Order*, the product of a lifetime seeking to heal his fragmented mind, thereby reconciling the incompatibilities between quantum and relativity theories. When I first met him in November that year, when I was 38, I asked him how many people understood his book. He sadly just shrugged his shoulders without further reply. Similarly, he asked me how many of my former colleagues in IBM understood the synthesis of mental and physical energies that was just then emerging in consciousness. I replied, “None.”

It is perhaps not surprising that Bohm suffered deep depression in old age, despite having been a friend and colleague of J. Krishnamurti for 20 years. As F. David Peat frankly tells us in *Infinite Potential: The Life and Times of David Bohm*, Bohm received electro-convulsive therapy to try to shake him out of his melancholy. Such episodes are not unusual in the history of ideas. Another vivid example was Ignaz Semmelweiss, a Hungarian doctor working in Vienna in the mid-1800s. He discovered that if doctors, nurses, and students washed their hands in chlorinated lime water before entering the maternity ward, then the number of women dying from puerperal fever dropped considerably. Indeed, within two years, the number of deaths in Semmelweiss' ward dropped from 12% to 1%. Semmelweiss' reward for this discovery was to be hounded out of Vienna by doctors who resented the suggestion that they carried death on their hands. Semmelweiss returned to Budapest, but was treated in a similar manner after denouncing his opponents as murderers. Semmelweiss eventually went raving mad and died in a mental hospital.

Conversely, as Anthony Storr shows in his study of the pathology of genius in *The Dynamics of Creation*, great creativity often arises to overcome some early mental disorder or trauma. As well as Newton and Einstein, Storr cites people as diverse as Ian Fleming and Robert Schumann as examples. I don't need to dwell on the pre-natal trauma and mid-life apocalyptic death and rebirth process that have led me to where I am today. I understand them well enough, even if almost no one else does. In 2008, when I went to the Altai Mountains in Russia with Nukunu, he called me 'Swami', meaning 'someone who knows himself'. Although I am invisible to most of those around me, a few have made similar comments.

But this has not yet moved anyone to give me the practical support I need to help our children and grandchildren to understand the momentous times we live in. The basic problem here is that the framework for the Unified Relationships Theory (URT) has evolved from my career as an information systems architect with IBM. Specifically, the central concept in Integral Relational Logic (IRL) is the superclass **Being**, a generalization of the superclass **Object** in object-oriented modelling methods, which underlie not only the Internet, but also the entire Universe, viewed as Consciousness. As a consequence, my own individual consciousness has deepened and broadened to such an extent that it is now coterminous with Consciousness itself, an all-inclusive worldview that embraces all the cosmologies, theories, opinions, and beliefs of every individual who has ever lived or will do so in the world.

But saying this is utterly unacceptable to fragmented minds, egoically seeking to hold on to unique perspectives, afraid to explore what we all share in common, which is essential if we are ever to live in love, peace, and harmony with each other and our environment. In particular, because **Being** is all-inclusive, people sometimes think that Paul is trying to present himself as some sort of messianic, saviour figure like Maitreya, Kalki, or Mahdi, prophesied by all the religions to appear at the end of time. Of course, this is utter nonsense, for Paul's True Nature, like everyone else's, is Wholeness—Ineffable, Immortal, Nondual Wholeness—which Ken Wilber says in *A Theory of Everything* can never be realized by human beings.

So it is quite possible that *Wholeness* is never meant to be published, that *Homo sapiens sapiens* 'wise, wise human' will become extinct in the next few generations in ignorance of the fundamental design principle of Universe, the both-and Principle of Unity: *Wholeness is the union of all opposites*. On the other hand, every time I feel some resistance within me, introjecting the hostility I have long felt in my social environment, Life helps me to get in touch again with Love, the Divine Essence we all share, and self-reflective Intelligence, the quality that distinguishes human beings from the other animals and machines, like computers.

It is this irrepressible energy that has led me to write this short essay on 14th February, celebrating love and affection between intimate companions. But as even some of my closest friends and associates are vehemently opposed to the publication of *Wholeness*, whether any of them could ever change their attitude looks most unlikely. However, as Ramesh S. Balsekar said, "Who cares?!" in a book with this title. "Life is happening," as Vijai Shankar often said in his satsangs, our daily lives being nothing but a dream.