

Chapter 14

The Age of Light

All we need to do in order to imagine, discover, and attain superlife is to think and move ever further ahead in the directions where the past lines of evolution take on their maximum coherence.

Pierre Teilhard de Chardin

The human being can have no hope of an evolutionary future except in association with all the rest.

Pierre Teilhard de Chardin

*The telos of philosophy is a constructive reorganization of all human knowledge in a synthesis, or correlation of parts. The telos of human life is the practical and continuous amelioration of the material, social, and moral conditions of the human organism—
the unity of the brotherhood of Man on this planet.*

Frederic Harrison

We now come to the fourth and final phase in Pierre Teilhard de Chardin's four-stage model of evolution, which he called Superlife, and the third major epoch in human evolution: that of universal spirit (the us-epoch), transcending and embracing the earlier three phases, including the most recent: the mental-egoic, patriarchal period (me-epoch). Teilhard foresaw that this eschatological epoch of super-consciousness and superintelligence would come about at the Omega point of evolution through a megasynthesis of all thinking elements of the Earth in a gigantic psychobiological operation.¹ As he said, "Evolution is a rise towards consciousness ... [and] must culminate ahead in some kind of supreme consciousness,"² a process he called the law of complexity-consciousness, the greater the complexity, the greater the consciousness.

The Unified Relationships Theory is the megasynthesis of all knowledge that Teilhard prophesied would one day emerge. As a consequence, the author of this book has been consciously living at the Omega point of evolution since the spring of 1982. Sadly, however, this wondrous experience is unprecedented in the entire history of evolution. So anyone who has not yet reached the Omega point cannot really understand what this means. Teilhard, himself, had an intuitive feeling for Omega, inseparable from Alpha, for as he said, "To be supremely attractive, Omega must be already supremely present."³ No one can return Home to Wholeness, for no one has ever left Home. We all live in Wholeness at every instant of our lives, whether we are conscious of this fact or not.

The greatest stumbling block here is that we can only reach the Omega point of evolution by starting afresh at the very beginning, at the Alpha point, as described in Chapter 1 of this book. But no society or community in the world today is organized along these lines. As children, we learn what our parents and teachers want us to learn, a process that has been going on for thousands of years, as Chapter 11 'The Evolution of the Mind' describes. Even the healing initiatives described in Chapter 12 'The Crisis of the Mind' are not sufficient to carry the populace as a whole to the Omega point of evolution. So most are still living with fragmented, schizoid, and deluded minds, caused by religious demarcations, academic specialization, and the division of labour in the workplace.

As described in the Prologue to Part III, reaching Omega is a three-part process of revolution, evolution, and involution. First, we need to pass through an apocalyptic death and rebirth process, revealing something hidden

from the great bulk of humanity: the Principle of Unity, *Wholeness is the union of all opposites*. By then living in harmony with this universal truth, the fundamental design principle of the Universe, we can build a coherent body of knowledge that corresponds to all our experiences, from the mundane to the mystical, in a natural evolutionary manner, as described in Part I of this book. But this is not enough to realize the union of Omega and Alpha.

Evolution is essentially the outward process of the development of relativistic forms, structures, and relationships from Absolute Formlessness. So to unify Omega and Alpha, it is necessary to reverse this process, moving from form to Formlessness, most simply called involution. This is essentially a dying process, the opposite of growth. But it is not like the death of our bodies. Rather involution is a psychological death, which enables us to be fully awake while still in the body called *jivan-mukta* in the East. And then, the three steps of revolution, evolution, and involution merge in Wholeness. There is no longer a past and future, nothing whatsoever to worry about or hope for, because the sense of a separate self has disappeared.

As we saw in Chapter 1, mathematicians, computer programmers, and information systems architects treat time in exactly the same way as all other concepts in their equations, functions, and models. There is nothing special about time. Like every other being in the relativistic world of form, time is simply an abstraction from or appearance in Consciousness, not real in an Absolute sense. So time is just as much an illusion, called *maya* in the East, as our minds and bodies.

Nevertheless, as individuals and as a species, time appears quite real to us. We awake from sleep each morning, go about our daily business, and go to sleep at night for about one third of our lives. On a broader scale, we are conceived in Paradise, are born, grow, and develop, and eventually die after the Psalmist's three score years and ten, more or less. Expanding from ontogeny to phylogeny, *Homo sapiens* was conceived in Paradise, in the transition period between biological and mental evolution, then passed through the 5,000-year epoch of noogenesis, leading us to where we are today. Eventually, *Homo sapiens* will die, just like every other structure in the world of form. And if we do not accept the principle of impermanence (*anitja*), we shall suffer (*dubkha*), as Shakyamuni Buddha taught over 2,500 years ago.

Over the centuries, the mystics have discovered that the way to be free of suffering is to return Home to Paradise, where we are conceived as both individuals and as a species. However, until now, people have primarily discovered their True Nature before reaching the Omega point of evolution. They have taken a short cut to Paradise, depicted in the smaller bell-shape curve in the diagram on the next page. The opposite to this mystical way of life is depicted in the line marked 'Western civilization', which is rushing away from Reality faster and faster with every day that passes. Such an insane way of living is clearly unsustainable. The only sustainable society is one where there is no longer a schism between reason and mysticism, where the mind and technology are our servants, not our masters. This Middle Way is depicted in the large bell-shaped curve, which we look at in more detail in the rest of this chapter.

To put this vision into perspective, we first need to give it a name. In 1516, Thomas More, influenced by Plato's *Republic*, described what he considered to be a perfect society Utopia in his book with this name. He tells us that Utopia was located on an island in the New World, named after its conqueror Utopos,⁴ from the Greek *ou-* 'not' and *topos* 'place'. However, More was well aware of a play of words here. Utopia could equally be derived from the homophone *eutopia* from *eu-* 'good, well, true', as in *eulogy* and *euphemism*, both literally meaning 'good-speaking'. In *evangelist* the *u* has become consonantized, from *angelos* 'messenger'. So let us call our imaginary society Eutopia, as a number of writers did in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.⁵ Eutopia is what I have been calling the Paragonian Society since 1984, a civilization living in love and peace, beyond conflict and suffering.

Interestingly, Plato's Atlantis was also located on an island, "larger than Libya and Asia combined", opposite the strait called the Pillars of Hercules, which we know as Gibraltar,⁶ in the Atlantic Ocean. In Plato's dialogue, Critias tells us that when the gods distributed the whole earth between them, the island called Atlantis was given to Posiedon, who had five pairs of male twins with his wife Cleito. The eldest son was called Atlas, giving his name to the whole island,⁷ perhaps named after the god Atlas, the Titan who supported the heavens. The his-

torian Herodotus named the Atlantic Ocean and the mountains in north-west Africa opposite the Strait of Gibraltar after Atlas in the fifth century BCE.⁸

In order to give his story of Atlantis a measure of historical verisimilitude, Plato's Critias gives an elaborate story how it has existed some 9,000 years earlier, and how he had heard the story from his grandfather, who was told it by Solon, who had received it from the Egyptians, who originally wrote down the story. Plato most probably placed Atlantis in history because, as Thomas Johansen says, "If we believe that something has happened, we are clearly more likely to believe that it could happen [again]."⁹ But then to stop people searching for his fiction, Plato had to destroy the island in "earthquakes and floods of extraordinary violence", leading to the island of Atlantis being swallowed up by the sea and vanishing.¹⁰

The possibility of such a catastrophic event was given some credibility because of a volcanic eruption on the island of Thera about 1500 BCE. This eruption, one of the most stupendous of historical times, was accompanied by a series of earthquakes and tsunamis that shattered civilization on Crete. But despite Plato's obvious ruse, "medieval European writers who received the tale from Arab geographers believed it to be true, and later writers tried to identify it with an actual country."¹¹ Even today people speculate about a possible location for the legendary Atlantis, in the Mediterranean, the Atlantic, and even further afield.¹²

Be that as it may, there are a number of truths we can glean from Plato's vision, clearing up much confusion on the way. First, as we have seen in this book, there are a multitude of stories about an ideal society existing in prehistory, before the egoic, analytical mind came to dominate human affairs. But as Ken Wilber points out with his famous pre/trans fallacy,¹³ we should not conflate the subconscious and prepersonal with the superconscious and transpersonal,¹⁴ despite their similarities. As a species, we are not moving backwards but forwards into an eschatological epoch quite unlike any other in human history.

One similarity with Atlantis is that in Eutopia, the notion that there are separate beings who can own property will disappear. The Atlantins "had no private property but regarded their possessions as common to all".¹⁵ There was a similar arrangement in Utopia. "As everything is divided equally among the entire population, there obviously can't be any poor people or beggars."¹⁶ But both Atlantis and Utopia regarded women as second-class citizens, reflecting the dominant ethos of the patriarchal epoch, quite unlike the preceding matrifocal epoch or the androgynous epoch we are evolving into.

What this means is that despite the immense literature on utopian thought in the Western world, which Frank E. and Fritzie P. Manuel reviewed in a 900-page tome with this name, we really need to start afresh at the very beginning by looking deeply inside ourselves to learn what Eutopia might feel and look like. The central issue here is whether Eutopia will ever be a global society, or whether it will be restricted to comparatively local communities. It is significant that both Atlantis and Utopia were located on islands, isolated from the rest of the world, trading with this world, sometimes at war with it. Indeed, before the ocean swallowed up Atlantis, Critias tells us that Athens defeated Atlantis in a great war, at the time Athens being a carbon copy of Socrates' ideal city.¹⁷

There is nothing in Teilhard's vision of the ultimate Earth to suggest that he saw anything other than this being global in extent. Indeed, as he said, "It is in the mutual reinforcement of these two still antagonistic forces [science and religion], in the conjunction of reason and mysticism, that the human spirit is destined, by the very nature of its development, to find its ultimate penetration, with maximum intensity of dynamic force."¹⁸ Now for this to happen on a global scale, each of us, as individuals, has to take responsibility for the entire evolution of the whole human race, as Andrew Cohen points out. As he says, "To succeed, we must be prepared to do battle with the powerful conditioning, conscious and unconscious, of the whole race. That means we have to come out from the shadows and be seen. Like Atlas, we have to be willing to hold up the whole world on our shoulders. It's an awesome task."¹⁹

This means that Teilhard was mistaken when he thought that humanity could collectively reach the Omega point of evolution without passing through an apocalyptic transformation of consciousness.²⁰ In the words of the Irishman on being asked by a stranger in his town how to get to the station, "Oh! You can't get there from here." The reason is that for the past several thousand years, the evolution of the mind has been more focused

on its divergent tendencies than on its convergent ones. As a consequence, minds have become severely fragmented and split, leading the world of learning to be utterly confused and deluded. To sort out this frightful mess, we have no choice but to start afresh at the very beginning.

So humanity is very far from being *Homo sapiens sapiens*, ‘wise, wise human’, as we have arrogantly called ourselves. The English word *stupid* derives from the Latin *stupidus* ‘senseless’ from *stupere* ‘to be stunned’. The Latin word for *stupid* was *stolidus*, with a PIE base **stel-* ‘to put, stand’, *stolidus* thus literally meaning ‘firm-standing’, from which we derive *stolid* ‘dull and impassive’ and *stultify* ‘to render useless or ineffectual, cripple’. So we should really call ourselves *Homo stolidus*, for it is really stupid to hold on to the status quo just as evolution is passing through the most momentous turning point in its fourteen billion-year history.

Yet if that is happening, that is what is meant to happen, for we are all the products of all these aeons of evolution. None of us would be where we are today without this vast history. Nevertheless, there is still a chance that if we can face our fear of Love and Freedom, evolution could become fully conscious itself. Through a process of revolution, evolution, and involution, what we could also call *Homo divisionis* could become *Homo divinus universalis* ‘divine, cosmic human’. It is not the purpose of this chapter to investigate how this miracle might happen. Let us assume that it has already happened within at least a significant proportion of human beings. So what might Eutopia look like? For if we don’t know this deep in our hearts, we cannot possibly know where we are heading as a species.

Governance

The *Oxford English Dictionary* contains over a hundred words with the suffix *-ocracy*, from the Greek *kratia* ‘power, rule’, from *kratos* ‘strength, power’, from PIE base **kar-* ‘hard’, and nearly as many ending in *-archy*, from Greek *archein* ‘to rule, govern’, often being used as the prefix *arch-* in English from *archos* ‘chief, leader’. While some of these words are nonce words, *-ocracy* sometimes designating mockery or ridicule, the very fact that so many such words exist indicates the struggle that we human beings have had over the years of finding a healthy and fulfilling way of organizing society.

The Greeks themselves used a number of *-ocracy* words, such as *aristocratia*, ‘rule by the best’ from *aristos* ‘best’, *democratia*, ‘rule by the general populace’ from *demos* ‘people’, *ochlacrata*, ‘mob-rule’ from *ochlos* ‘crowd, mob’, *plutocratia* ‘rule by the wealthy’, from *ploutos* ‘wealth, riches’, and *theocratia* ‘rule by a deity through a priestly order’ from *theos* ‘God’.

Plato and Aristotle also studied *timocracy* in their political philosophies, but used the word in somewhat different ways, because *timē* could mean both ‘honour, esteem’ (Plato’s use) and ‘value, price’ (Aristotle’s use). Here are Webster’s two definitions of *timocracy*: “government in which love of honour is the ruling principle” and “government in which a certain amount of property is necessary for office”.²¹ In Plato’s case, a timocracy was one of four imperfect societies to be compared to his idea of a perfect state, the others being oligarchy, democracy, and tyranny.²² Aristotle compares three types of political constitution, monarchy (which can degrade into tyranny), aristocracy, and timocracy, a corruption of aristocracy when ministers pay most regard to wealth, keeping most or all of the benefits to themselves. However, for Aristotle, timocracy could also change into democracy, based on the principle that all who own property would have equal rights.²³

The Greeks also had the word *autokrates* ‘sovereign, independent’, from *auto* ‘self’, which has led to autocracy, a despotic form of government in which political power is held by a single, self-appointed ruler. But an ego-centred democracy can be just as tyrannous as an autocracy as Alexis de Tocqueville pointed out in the middle of the nineteenth century with his famous notion of the tyranny of the majority or masses,²⁴ which John Stuart Mill further explored in *On Liberty*.²⁵ As he said:

In general, opinions contrary to those commonly received can only obtain a hearing by studied moderation of language and the most cautious avoidance of unnecessary offence, from which they can hardly ever deviate even in a slight degree without losing ground, while unmeasured vituperation employed on the side of the prevailing opinion really does deter people from professing contrary opinions and from listening to those who profess them.²⁶

In a similar fashion, Barry Long says in *Only Fear Dies*, no one is responsible for what happens in society in a democracy. People have given away their freedom to representative politicians, but neither the people nor the

leaders can take responsibility for the whole. “Freedom without responsibility is the popular notion arising from the instinct of the human herd.” As he said, “As democratic societies became progressively unhappy, so faceless law enforcers and upholders were needed in increasing numbers (‘forces’) to protect democratic society from itself.”²⁷

The central problem here is not so much with democracy as such as with the fact that “government of the people, by the people, for the people”, in Abraham’s ‘immortal’ words spoken at Gettysburg on 19th November 1863,²⁸ is unsustainable and unworkable with today’s extremely low level of consciousness. As Ronald Reagan said in his first inaugural address on 20th January 1981,

In this present crisis, government is not the solution to our problem; government is the problem. From time to time we’ve been tempted to believe that society has become too complex to be managed by self-rule, that government by an elite group is superior to government for, by, and of the people. Well, if no one among us is capable of governing himself, then who among us has the capacity to govern someone else? All of us together, in and out of government, must bear the burden. The solutions we seek must be equitable, with no one group singled out to pay a higher price.²⁹

Of the many other ocracies, we can note just a few. Meritocracy is “Government by persons selected on the basis of merit in a competitive educational system; a society so governed; a ruling or influential class of educated people,”³⁰ from Latin *meritum* neuter past participle of *merere* ‘to deserve, earn’, perhaps cognate with Greek *meiromai* ‘to receive as one’s share’, from *meros* ‘share, part’, from PIE base **(s)mer-* ‘to get a share of something’. Technocracy is “the control of society or industry by technical experts; a ruling body of such experts,”³¹ from Greek *tekhne* ‘art, craft, skill’ from PIE base **teks-* ‘to weave, fabricate’, also root of *text*, *tissue*, *subtle*, and *architect*, but not *tantra*, which comes from Sanskrit *tantrum* ‘loom’, with another PIE base **ten-*. And bureaucracy, not actually an ocracy, is government by officialism, from French ‘cloth cover for desks, desk, office’, from Old French *burel* ‘woollen cloth’, probably from Vulgar Latin **būra*, from Late Latin *burra* ‘shaggy garment’. *Office* itself derives from Latin *officium* ‘dutiful or respectful action’, from *ob* ‘in the direction of, towards, against, in the way of, in front of, in view of, on account of’ and *facere* ‘to make, do’, from PIE base **dhē* ‘to set, put’, the root of a multitudinous number of English words, too many to list.

We now come to the archies. The first group are numerically derived. For instance, *anarchy* ‘rule by no one’, literally ‘no leader’, from Greek *aneu* ‘without’; *monarchy* ‘rule by one’, from *monos* ‘alone’; and *oligarchy*, ‘rule by a few’, from *oligos* ‘few’. Then there are *matriarchy* ‘rule by women’ from Latin *mater* ‘mother’ from PIE base **māter* also root of *matter* and *matrix*, and *patriarchy* ‘rule by men’ from Latin *pater* ‘father’.

Then there is *hierarchy* ‘priestly rule’ from Greek *ieros* ‘holy’ and *ierous* ‘priest’. Hierarchies have got a bad name in recent years, not only because of the authoritarian structure of the churches, but also because similar dominant structures exist in the military, in universities, and in business. But as Integral Relational Logic well demonstrates, such hierarchical structures are essential for organizing our knowledge into a coherent whole. So we cannot eschew hierarchies, as much as the New Age movement would like to do so, supported by the systems theorists’ notion of the web of life.

Because of people’s aversion to hierarchies, a number of people prefer the term *heterarchy*, from Greek *eteros* ‘other of two’, as in *heterosexual* ‘sexual interest in members of the opposite sex’, the opposite of *homosexual*, from Greek *omos* ‘same’. Warren McCulloch, one of the first cyberneticists, apparently coined *heterarchy* as the opposite of *hierarchy*,³² although the OED gives an obsolete definition: ‘rule of an alien’. As Ken Wilber points out, “Nowhere in the literature of modern social theory is there more acrimony expressed than over the topic of hierarchy/heterarchy,”³³ a colossal semantic confusion which he partially resolves using Arthur Koestler’s notion of holon.

In *The Ghost in the Machine*, Koestler made an extensive study of hierarchical structures in the biological and social sciences, which he compared to the branching structures of trees. He was particularly concerned with what are called aggregation structures in Integral Relational Logic and the Unified Modeling Language (UML). In such structures, each element can be considered both as a whole, containing subordinate elements, and as a dependent part of a larger whole. The members of a hierarchy, like the Roman god Janus, all have two faces looking in opposite directions, a clear example of the Principle of Unity at work. To encapsulate this unifying effect

of these Janus-faced entities, Koestler coined the word *holon* from the Greek *holos* ‘whole’, with the suffix *on* suggesting a particle or part, as in *proton* and *neutron*.³⁴

Koestler applied the Principle of Unity in another way. He noticed that complex societies are structured by several types of interlocking or interlacing hierarchies. “Hierarchies can be regarded as ‘vertically’ arborizing structures whose branches interlock with those of other hierarchies at a multiplicity of levels and form ‘horizontal’ networks: arborization [from Latin *arbor* ‘tree’] and reticulation [from Latin *reticulum* diminutive of *rete* ‘net’] are complementary principles in the architecture of organisms and societies.”³⁵ Although he was primarily focused on aggregation and association structures, Koestler was thus coming close to visualizing the underlying structure of the Universe as an infinitely dimensional network of hierarchical relationships at the ontological level of IRL.

Regarding just ramification structures (from Latin *ramus* ‘branch, bough, twig’), Koestler noticed other polarities in holons. They have both a self-assertive tendency, as the dynamic expression of their wholeness, and an integrative or participatory tendency, the dynamic expression of their partness. When these contrasting tendencies get out of balance, the effect is pathological, as we often see in hierarchical social structures today. As *hierarchy* is rather unattractive, often provoking a strong emotional resistance, in *Janus: A Summing Up*, encouraged by the friendly reception *holon*, Koestler introduced the word *holarchy* as a replacement for *hierarchy*,³⁶ which Ken Wilber adopted in his writings.³⁷

He then went on to make another key distinction in holoarchies. Drawing on the work of Riane Esler, herself a rather staunch champion of heterarchy, Wilber distinguished domination and actualization hierarchies as pathological and healthy, respectively. He also pointed out that both hierarchies and heterarchies can manifest in these contrasting ways. But even a healthy holarchy is not sufficiently holistic to embrace all aspects of social structures. A holoarchy is still the opposite of heterarchy and this word does not embrace generalization hierarchies, which are key to bringing universal order to all our thoughts, as we saw in Part I.

To overcome these limitations, let us turn to Plato’s famous statement on the governance of what he saw as an ideal society:

The society we have described can never grow into a reality or see the light of day, and there will be no end to the troubles of states, or indeed, dear Glaucon, of humanity itself, till philosophers become kings in this world, or till those we call kings and rulers really and truly become philosophers, and political power and philosophy thus come into the same hands, while the many natures now content to follow either to the exclusion of the other are forcibly debarred from doing so.³⁸

Now as we saw in Chapter 11, a philosopher to Plato was quite different from philosophers in academia today. A philosopher is a generalist, not a specialist, a person who is ready to taste every branch of learning, whose passion is for wisdom of every kind without distinction in the search for Truth.³⁹ Philosophers are also not grasping for money, not worrying about things that make men so eager to get and spend money,⁴⁰ for such activities are pathological, not healthy. As generalists, philosophers are like pure mathematicians, more focused on abstractions than on calculation. Furthermore, it is vitally important for philosophers to have a cosmological perspective, which to Plato meant the physical universe of the heavens.

In today’s society, the closest occupation to Plato’s notion of a philosopher is not a university philosopher or an astronomer but an information systems architect in business. IS architects are the master builders in society today, able to see the big picture, from Greek *arkhitekton* from *arkhos* ‘chief’, cognate with *arkhein* ‘to begin, take the lead’ and *arkhe* ‘beginning, origin’, and *tekton* ‘builder’. As with so many notions in the relativistic world of form, IS architects can work at different levels. At the lowest level, they are rather like what used to be called ‘chief programmers’ implicitly and intuitively developing class libraries for other programmers to use, both generally applicable, like Java class libraries, and some more application specific. In contrast, some IS architects are more concerned with making information systems as explicit as possible with model-driven architecture (MDA), using such tools as UML.

In order for evolution to become fully conscious of itself in us human beings, IRL takes this explicit, model-building approach as far as it is possible to go, being guided by the Principle of Unity, the fundamental design principle of the Universe: *Wholeness is the union of all opposites*. Therein lies the fundamental power in society, as well as the Universe, viewed as Consciousness. An ideal society is thus one in which all individuals are live in

harmony with the Principle of Unity. Constantly violating this fundamental principle, which we are taught to do today, is the root cause of what Erich Fromm aptly called our sick society.

As the word *holarchy* has too narrow a definition to denote a society governed by the Principle of Unity, perhaps we can better use *holocracy*, although a Google search for this word returns over two thousand hits. This means that all educated people will need to become panosophers ‘all-wise’ in a healthy democracy, in contrast to Plato’s notion of philosopher, an aristocrat having dominator control over society, much criticized by Karl Popper in *The Open Society and Its Enemies*.

Education

Both Plato and Thomas More placed central importance on education in their ideal states and it would seem that we should do likewise in Eutopia. But whatever educational institutions that we shall need to set up will be so different from the schools, colleges, academies, and universities that have existed for the last two or three millennia that they will be virtually unrecognizable. To see why this is so, let us first visualize a society in which the entire adult population is consciously living at the Omega point of evolution, at the end of time.

Looking backwards in time to see how this miracle could have happened, guided by the Principle of Unity, all adults will be both generalists and specialists, having learnt Integral Relational Logic as children, just as we learnt our multiplication tables. For IRL is based on the concept of set in the new maths, taught to children in the 1960s, for the concept of set is more fundamental than that of number.⁴¹ So when children are brought up to consistently and egalitarianly form concepts by looking carefully at the similarities and differences in the data patterns of their experience, free of any distorting religious, scientific, or economic filters, the clarity that will result will mean that they will never need to leave their innate innocence. They will not need to return Home to Paradise in later life, because they will remain there throughout their lives.

In other words, the seven pillars of unwisdom, which underpin the West’s education system today, will have been consigned to the history books. All encyclopædias and textbooks will have been rewritten on the seven pillars of wisdom, knowing that Consciousness is the Cosmic Context for all our learning and that Love is the Divine Essence that unifies us all. All knowledge taught in educational establishments will thus form a coherent whole, called the Unified Relationships Theory in this book. We shall thus all recognize that we are all one, not separate from the Divine, Nature, or each other for a single instant in our lives.

So what will education mean in this stimulating environment? Well, as people often point out *educate* derives from the Latin *ēducāre* ‘to bring up, educate’ and *ēducēre* ‘to draw out, lead out’ from *ē(x)* ‘from, out of’ and *dūcēre* ‘to draw’. So as educators are often at pains to point out, education is not about putting in, but drawing out what is already there. But if what is drawn out is based on the seven pillars of unwisdom, what value does it have? Furthermore, who do parents and teachers think they are as educators of children? Life is the Ultimate Source of energy for all our creative and learning activities, arising directly from the Divine, not any authorities in our lives. So it is our self-reflective Intelligence, sometimes called the Witness in spiritual circles, but often stultified by today’s education system, that is the true power that determines how and what we learn.

To reflect this, J. Krishnamurti aid, “Intelligence is the capacity to perceive the essential, the *what is*, and to awaken this capacity, in oneself and in others, is education.” As he said in *Education and the Significance of Life*, which should be required reading for everyone, “Without an integrated understanding of life, our individual and collective problems will only deepen and extend.”⁴² And such an understanding comes through self-inquiry, through knowing ourselves, unconditioned by what parents, politicians, presidents, and professors want us to learn today.

Therein lies the rub. Most people are so heavily conditioned by the culture or subculture that they belong to that it is virtually impossible for Divine Intelligence to function with full power in the brilliant light of Cosmic Consciousness. If musicians want to become concert pianists or virtuoso violinists, they need to begin learning their instruments at a very early age, typically around five. Similarly, if today’s younger generations are to carry humanity into Eutopia, they need to begin rebelling very early in life, perhaps even before they are born. If they wait until they are adolescents to question the entrenched belief systems of their parents, it is already too late.

Moved indigo to ch 13.

As a community of souls living at the Omega point of evolution will be superintelligent, we can leave it up to them and their children how people should be educated, given the ecological circumstances that will prevail at that time. But the question arises how will such a community living in Wholeness relate to those around them still living with fragmented, confused minds? For we cannot assume that the entire population on Earth will miraculously jump into Wholeness all at once. How then might these Indigo children become panosophers, those who make no distinction between science, philosophy, and religion as mystics living without organized religion? What educational institutions do we need today to help them make such a radical transformation of consciousness, compared with that of their ancestors?

Well, there is no simple answer to this question given the ubiquitous ignorance of even the possibility of healing the fragmented, deluded mind in Wholeness at the Omega point of evolution. All we can do is trust that it will happen. For any alternative is unthinkable. If we continue teaching our children the seven pillars of un wisdom, we shall simply be driven to extinction before we have reached our fullest potential as a species. To understand the dilemma facing humanity today, we need to remind ourselves of the three things that need to happen for evolution to become fully conscious of itself in us human beings, described in Chapter 1. If our children are to reach their fullest potential as divine, cosmic beings, they need to (a) start afresh at the very beginning, at the Alpha point of evolution, the Divine Origin of the Universe, (b) know themselves by including our mapmaking processes in the territory being mapped, and (c) take the process of conceptual abstraction to its utmost level of generality.

These three conditions explain why studying the root cause of the accelerating pace of change in society today is not considered a valid scientific project, why we are managing our business affairs in ignorance of the origin of the creative evolutionary energies that cause us to behave as we do. Fairly obviously, scientists only pose questions that can be answered within their prevailing paradigm or worldview, with generally accepted scientific methods, which deny the validity of self-inquiry. Specifically, physicists only recognize the existence of four physical forces—electromagnetic and gravitational and the strong and weak nucleic forces—ignoring mental, psychic, subtle, and spiritual energies, and biologists do not recognize the existence of Life arising from our Divine Source, at best using self-organizing systems as a poor substitute. So to develop a scientific theory of the causes of social and psychospiritual change it is necessary to start afresh at the very beginning, so that David Bohm's theory of the implicate order, which reconciled the incompatibilities between quantum and relativity theories, can be accommodated.

If we are to awaken to what is happening to our species today, it is thus absolutely essential that we create a safe, nurturing space in which today's children can be free of the misconceptions about God and the Universe that have been unwittingly passed from generation to generation for hundreds and thousands of years. For as Jesus said in the gnostic *Gospel of Thomas*, "Whoever does not hate father and mother as I do cannot be my disciple, and whoever does not love father and mother as I do cannot be my disciple. For my mother gave me falsehood, but my true mother gave me life."⁴³

The key point here is that for a new species of humanity to emerge on a global scale, as some are visualizing today, cultural ontogeny can no longer recapitulate cultural phylogeny. Most importantly, Western civilization has to die so that humanity might live. And as we looked at earlier in this book in various chapters, this can only happen when the phylogeny of the species recapitulates the ontogeny of those pioneering individuals taking evolution in a quite new direction, returning Home to Paradise, whence we are all conceived. In technical evolutionary terms, this is a process of paedomorphosis 'the shaping of the young', which leads to the rejuvenation of the species, not gerontomorphosis 'the shaping of the old, which can only lead to an evolutionary cul-de-sac.

Expanding further on these three vital points, first, if we are to fully understand what is happening to humanity at the present time, we have no alternative but to start afresh at the very beginning, to conduct an experiment in learning that is based on the Truth—the Alpha and Omega point of evolution—free of the beliefs,

assumptions, and worldviews that have unwittingly been passed from generation to generation for hundreds and thousands of years by our less than fully conscious forebears.

Secondly, if evolution is to become fully conscious of itself, we need to use our self-reflective Intelligence—the great gift that distinguishes us from the other animals and machines, like computers—to watch the way that our thoughts arise from their Divine Source, knowing that there is no separation between the observer and the observed, that the territory being mapped includes the mapmaker. There is no other way that we can truly know ourselves than to invoke what is called the Witness in spiritual circles.

Specifically, while information systems modelling methods are more comprehensive than financial modelling methods, they do not, as they stand today, represent the dynamics of business as a whole, or indeed of any one business. What are missing in such process models are satisfactory representations of personal computing, program development, and especially the process of creating a business model itself. If these processes are not included, we run our business affairs having little understanding of what we are doing. But in so doing, we can develop a comprehensive model of the psychodynamics of society as a whole, as an integral part of an all-inclusive theory of evolution.

Thirdly, if we are to heal our fragmented minds by integrating all knowledge in all cultures and disciplines at all times into a coherent whole, we need to take the conceptual abstractions used by pure mathematicians, computer programmers, information systems business modellers, and the classical Greek philosophers to the utmost level of generality, forming all concepts in exactly the same way: by carefully observing the similarities and differences in the data patterns of our experience.

By thus forming all concepts in an equalitarian manner, not giving any concepts a special position, such as space, time, matter, Universe, God, or ego, we can see the Totality of Existence in terms of the more abstract concepts of form, structure, relationships, and meaning. By following the principles of simplicity, clarity, integrity, and consistency in concept formation, we can heal the mind in Wholeness. In this way, we can establish that Consciousness is all there is as a scientific truth, not just a mystical one. Extending Bohm's concept of the holomovement, which he likened to the river of life, an undivided flowing movement, Consciousness is like a vast ocean, a great ball of water. Everything in the relativistic world of form is just an appearance in or abstraction from Consciousness, like waves, ripples, and currents on and in the ocean. The still centre of the ocean is our Divine Source, out of which the entire Universe becomes manifest.

We can thereby become free of the false belief that goes back at least to the Babylonians that the physical universe is the Universe, leading scientists to spend many billions of dollars in searching for a fundamental particle of matter in the LHC particle accelerator and for Life, Intelligence, and the origin of the Universe in outer space with the Hubble telescope and other devices. If we want to answer the question, "Where have we come from?" we can only do so by looking inwards, as the mystics have been doing for thousands of years. And such self-inquiries do not cost a cent or a penny.

The work ethic

As well as the education system, the work ethic in Eutopia will be utterly different from what it is today. During the past few thousand years, there has been a clear distinction between those engaged in the world—as farmers, weavers, bakers, and so on—and contemplatives looking inwards seeking union with the Divine. The former have been the ones who have driven the economy, while meditative mystics have often been mendicants, although some monasteries are famous for their products, such as *bénédictine* and *chartreuse*!

The global economic crisis the world faces today shows quite clearly that such a split between inner and outer work is no longer sustainable. We urgently need to change the work ethic, breaking free of the producer-consumer cycle that is causing severe psychological distress and ecological damage, which can only lead to extinction before we have had the chance to reach our fullest potential as a species. Yet on a visit to Stockholm in October 2008, I saw a large advertisement in the underground for new social-security rules introduced by the right-of-centre government making this statement: *Den nya sjukförsäkringen tvingar sjuk att jobba* 'The new social security policy forces the sick to work.'

This is utter madness, a clear symptom of a grievously sick society. Many are unable to work in the conventional manner because they have been made sick by working in such a pathogenic workplace. Some, at least, are thus using their 'spare' time to look inwards, because it is not easy living in a culture that is unwittingly causing so much grief. Those we call 'unemployed' today can be the forerunners of

Further to my e-mail on Tuesday, if we enter the imminent terminal recession of capitalism with as much ignorance of the evolutionary energies that are causing this to happen as we have today, the result will be widespread panic and the deaths of many hundreds of thousands of people. For evolution is poised to go in a radically new direction, carrying humanity into an exquisitely beautiful eschatological epoch. And for the new to be born, the old has to die. In Hindu terms, Shiva the destroyer has to act before Brahma the creator can bring about the transformation of consciousness that is urgently needed.

While many might feel that rising unemployment is catastrophic, it will actually be a blessing in disguise. For it will give people the opportunity, if they are willing to take it, to look inwards, studying the 99% of the Universe that is beneath the material surface of things in the Cosmic Psyche. Such a radical change in work ethic is key to the revolution in culture and consciousness taking place today, more Eastern than Western.

For as *Wholeness* shows with utmost clarity, human beings are not machines and nothing but machines. Because we live constantly in union with the Divine, it is not possible for computers to replace all jobs currently being performed by humans, as mechanical labour becomes cheaper and cheaper compared to human labour. While there is no limit to human consciousness, there is a limit to technological development, which therefore cannot drive economic growth indefinitely. The only way forward for humanity is to focus our primary attention on discovering what it truly means to be a human being, free of our mechanistic conditioning.

In the East, spiritual seekers have long been held in great respect, with kings traditionally seeking their advice. Not so in the West, which believes that the primary purpose of work is to provide cannon fodder for the economic machine, which is leading many into deep psychological distress. In turn, this leads to rampant consumerism, which is causing severe ecological damage. For if people do not buy the products available in the marketplace, then share prices will not increase, which is the primary purpose of joint-stock companies, the most insane of human inventions.

Our health, well-being, and survival as a species is thus dependent on the abolition of stock markets and joint-stock banks and companies. We shall still need some form of organization to produce the products that we need for our daily lives. But the purpose of such companies will be meaningful, expressly stating that they have been formed to bake bread, build houses, or whatever. Two hundred years ago, companies' articles of association included such statements. But, even if such goals are mentioned today, they are largely ignored.

The primary purpose is to make money in whatever way possible, whether it be to produce food to feed us or guns to kill us. Driven by fear, values have been reduced to a quantitative common denominator—the obsession for money—which is driving humanity to the brink of extinction. *Homo sapiens* is as much an endangered species as any of the other great apes. In management accounting spreadsheets, salaries, wages, and consultancy fees are just a few rows, along with the cost of machines, travel expenses, and so on. Human beings are not valued as such, in any different way from anything else.

Today, financial models used by economists and management accountants act like a thick cloud preventing us from intelligently managing our business affairs with full consciousness of what we are doing. In the Sharing Economy, on the other hand, human beings will be valued as divine, cosmic creatures, with immense unfulfilled potential. Recognizing that the concept of set is more fundamental than that of number in mathematics, our minds can become translucent, enabling us to use semantic information systems modelling methods to cocreate the meaningful infrastructure for such a life-enhancing way of conducting our business affairs.

Some people have been made so sick by today's meaningless environment that they are unable to work, living on social benefits. Governments regard such people as a burden on society. But actually many are the vanguard of the New Humanity, using the opportunity to engage in spiritual practices, to awaken to their life's purpose,

leading the way for others to follow. Some more fortunate people are able to use their savings from their conventional jobs for a similar purpose or even to find their life's purpose in paid employment. In *A New Earth*, Eckhart Tolle calls social outcasts 'frequency-holders', whose "function is to anchor the frequency of the new consciousness on this planet."

For myself, when Life set me free of the constraints and delusions of Western civilization and the global economy in 1980, this event was catastrophic, leading me to lose my family, job, business career, and home, the end of what is called the 'American dream'. But it was also apocalyptic in the literal sense of the word. For *apocalypse* derives from the Greek *apokaluptein* 'to uncover' or 'to reveal' from the Greek prefix *apo*, 'from, away' and *kaluptra*, 'veil'. So *apocalypse* literally means 'draw the veil away from', indicating the disclosure of something hidden from the mass of humanity: our True Nature.

Since then, I have worked in paid employment for just eleven years, living on a pension and savings for most of the other seventeen, on an inheritance from my mother in the early 1990s, on generous gifts from my former mother-in-law in the late 1980s, and on social benefits in the middle of the 1980s, when the tumultuous creative energies that were pouring inexorably through me made me unemployable in a conventional sense. So while I do not expect everyone to go through a similar process, I know, in my own direct experience, something of what has to happen to many millions of others in the years to come, as we become free of the personal, cultural, and collective conditioning that has been accumulating for decades, centuries, and millennia.

But none of this will happen in the year or two we have available to us if cannot generate sufficient synergy by working harmoniously together with a common vision. For as the Unified Relationships Theory shows with the most rigorous scientific reasoning, all beings in the Universe are related to all other beings, including themselves, in a multitude of different ways, some of which can be categorized as scientific fields, including morphic resonance, and some of which lie beyond classification, which must remain a mystery.

In developmental terms, this means that evolution is 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 new relationships that are formed, magically out of nothing. And as I know from my own direct experience, such evolutionary processes can proceed at superhyperexponential rates of growth when all inhibitions are enthusiastically cast to the wind, for *enthusiasm* has a Late *enthūsiasmus* Latin root, from Greek *entheos* 'inspired by the Divine', literally 'possessed by a god'.

One last point, for the moment anyway. If we want a particular outcome from our endeavours, we cannot possibly realize *moksha* 'liberation'. As Ramana Maharshi wrote when his mother tried to persuade him to return home from Arunachala in 1898, "What is not meant to happen will not happen, however much you wish it. What is meant to happen will happen, no matter what you do to prevent it. This is certain." As we are all the products of some fourteen billion years of evolution, there is no doership, no separate being who has the freedom to be in control of our lives, including the Divine. Under these circumstances, all any of us can do is to humbly follow our bliss, in Joseph Campbell's words. For me, that is True Freedom.

Health

Placeholder

Placeholder

The Sharing Economy

Placeholder

Placeholder