

DUVERSITY NEWSLETTER

No. 1 1999

www.duversity.org

The DuVersity newsletter will contain information on current activities run under the auspices of the DuVersity. It will also contain short articles on ideas challenging established thinking. These will be critical, original and inspired. We will also be including poems and images, reviews and letters as they come our way.



Creator of THE QUEST
Creator of the principle idea of
the Plow.

The Ploughman painted by Joseph Rael

THE DUVERSITY IS HERE

The DuVersity supposes that unity is a mode of togetherness of diversity and that diversity is primary reality. It engages in new ways of understanding diverse unity – amongst people, disciplines, and in nature and ideas – that follows John Bennett's dictum of 'integration without rejection'. Diversity is the seed bed of intelligence. The DuVersity was constituted as a non-profit

organisation at the end of 1998. We are now gathering our forces to launch a membership drive and fund-raise for our various projects.

Reconstruction —
it takes a long time
but it is here, now.
Now there is a going forward,
the past is disowned,
becomes crude foundations.
The piles must go deep
searchingly into what is solid.
The construction —
it must not be weak,
liable to collapse
and recrimination.
It must make room enough
for the new people —
they will pass through a generation
when the world will change.

Manifesto, Anthony Blake, Prague, 1968

SEMINAR PROGRAM

The Working Group, Sweet Briar, Virginia, June
Mind Healing, Santa Fe, New Mexico, July 3
Once Again, Continuing Your Quest (with Dr Edith Wallace), Santa Fe, New Mexico, July 30—Aug 4
The Sophiagenic Lives of Jesus and Mary (with John Kirby). Portland, Oregon, Sept 26-30
Mind Healing, Baltimore, Maryland, Sept.
Imagination, Sensation and Movements, Sebastapol, California, Oct 27-31
Meaning and Sensation in Movement (Gurdjieff), Claymont, Charles Town, WV Nov 4-7
Consciousness, Charlottesville, Jan 2000
Humanity, a seminar-dialogue, Baltimore, March 14-17, 2000
A JOURNEY TO EGYPT, October 2000
John Anthony West (see his essay below) has offered to guide a tour of ancient Egypt under the auspices of the DuVersity.

For further information on the tour and the seminars, please contact the **Registrar**, Karen Stefano, 8 Homewood Hills, Charles Town, WV 25414; tel. (304) 725 0061; e-mail KarenStefano@csi.com.

ESSAY – ANTHONY BLAKE

The following piece was drafted at the end of March, this year. I read Blake's *Milton* because I planned to record a reading of it. I was conscious of the deep undercurrents of thought from which Blake's genius sprang through the writings of Denis Saurat, particularly his quite extraordinary book *Gods of the People*. In this book, he makes much use of what he calls a 'XXth century document' received from an obscure man he met in London. This speaks of a spiritual reality close to that of Milton, Blake and Hugo. In one passage the 'Eternals' declare:

"With us, individualities are not so distinct as with you. We are not all in one place – or in one time. One can be in several pieces of one time, or in several kinds of time, or in several places, or in several planes, and yet be one." (p.60)

I was also deeply influenced by the 'identity-transparency' concept of William Pensinger (see below) and had been following through the cognitive-ontological implications of the dialogue process advocated by David Bohm. This was not merely theoretical. I was working in a group that was going through processes that seemed to reflect these radical ideas and I owe my friends in this group considerable thanks.

Some of the ideas tentatively suggested here are being taken up in the book I am writing based on the Twelve Hypotheses of Higher Intelligence that formed the basis for the last seminar-dialogue at Baltimore. This is all part of a programme of work concerned with taking further the suggestions first made by John Bennett many years ago; in particular, that it should now be possible to understand higher intelligence in a new way through information theory.

THE BLAKE-BLAKE THEORY OF COMMUNION

This theory has been largely inspired by William Blake's prophetic poem 'Milton'. In this magnificent work, Milton transforms from a puritan locked into Selfhood into a 'plenary' State, which is the redemption of Albion. As preface to Book Two of the poem, Blake writes:

"How wide the Gulf & Unpassable! Between
Simplicity and Insipidity"

"Contraries are Positives
A Negation is not a Contrary"

Let us bear this in mind. The core of the theory is given in the section 'Propositions' and the rest is amounting to commentary and gloss.

PREAMBLE

We have been concerned with two questions. Firstly, is there a deeper ground on which Bennett's systematics rests? Secondly, what are the implications of Pensinger's concept of multi-value for groups, or assemblies of individuals?

The investigation of the first question led to puzzlement about unity and counting. It seemed to us that how we count and how we understand unity are coupled closely together. We also came to feel that the starting point of systematics in sets was inadequate. There must be many kinds of grouping, other than those distinguished by number. These different kinds were to be distinguished in ways that systematics has not acknowledged.

Pensinger's multi-value or m-logue concept requires of us that we conceive of groups in a new way. If we ascribe multi-value to individuals, then the 'togetherness' of individuals with each other cannot be conceived of in terms of sets or classes.

Our starting point was given by William Blake's concept of 'States' as 'Combinations of Individuals'.

We need, however, to allow for States to inhere in Individuals, if we are to accommodate Pensinger's concepts. In the case of 'Milton', the leading character himself is described as taking on such a State: "And thou, O Milton, art a State about to be Created." We introduce, therefore, the idea of Individuals that, though 'eternal', are able to assume States. Such multi-value thinking was initiated 2,000 years ago in the struggles to understand the nature of Christ, aspects of which are to be found in our theory. Christ as 2-valued and God as 3-valued were incredible steps of thinking. Considerations of God, prophecy and sin fall naturally out of the theory.



Now, this theory concerns itself with Individuals. There is no place for more abstract elements such as forces, sources, limits, etc. – in other words, none of the content of traditional systematics. We believe that systems are merely reflections of the primary reality of States of Individuals. Individuals are not composed, even though they may assume States. In proposing this, we echo the original genius of Duns Scotus (born just a few miles away from where I live in the Borders of Scotland) who taught that we first have knowledge of concrete individuals, each with its *hæcceitas* or 'suchness', and only secondarily with the general 'forms' of existence.

States correspond to experience. What then are Individuals? Our provisional answer is that they are much the same as Bennett's Will, though in its most concrete form. Bennett's treatment of Will (in

volume II of 'The Dramatic Universe') gave a curiously composite form to Individuality and never sat comfortably with the idea of 'particulate' Will. However, in his book 'Hazard', in Appendix Two, we can find a closer model (see Comments at end).

PROPOSITIONS

1. Reality is made of Communions.
2. A Communion of Individuals is such that every Individual is in a State of combination of Individuals of that Communion.
 - 2a. There can be an Individual that is in a State of combination of every Individual of the Communion (including the 'fallen' – see below). This is the Plenary Individual.
 - 2b. There can be a 'symbolic form' (such as ancestral totem pole) in place of the Plenary Individual.
 - 2c. The symbolic form is 'God'. The Plenary Individual is 'prophet'.
3. Individuals who are in a State of combination only of themselves are 'fallen into sin'.
4. Sex consists of all States of combination of two Individuals in the Communion.
5. Individuals of a Communion can be in a State that includes the Plenary Individual. Such States are called 'participation'; but they are only partial.
 - 5a. A symbolic form of a participation is called a 'church'.
- 6a. The States of combination of single Individuals ('in sin') are 'conscious'.
- 6b. The States of combination of two individuals ('in sex') are 'creative'.
- 6c. The States of combination of three or more Individuals, including the Plenary – i.e. in participation – are 'unitive' ("When two or three are gathered together in My Name, then am I with them")

6d. The States of combination of Individuals which belong to different Communions are 'transcendent'.

7. A Communion is defined by its inclusion of a Plenary Individual or symbolic form. Hence such are religions, faiths, tribes, ways of living, etc.
7a. Individuals who are included in two or more Communions are called 'peace-makers'.

8. Reality is without boundaries.

8a. The Individuals of a Reality cannot be counted.

8b. The States of a Reality go beyond experience.

8c. The Communions of a Reality are unknown.

9. States resolve into subjective and objective aspects in that single-valued Individuals are most like objects and Plenary Individuals are most like subjects.

9a. It is likely that this gives much the same results as e.g. Kashmiri Shaivism.

9b. The theory of Communion contains Whitehead's concept of organic prehension (as States) and Leibniz's concept of monads (as Individuals).

10. The theory does not involve communication or any transfer 'between' Individuals. We regard communication as a poor theory of communion. In Communion, there is no need for any exchange because different Individuals are not separated in the States they assume.

11. A divine messenger is transcendent

A prophet is unitive

A saint is creative (lovers = one saint)

A sinner is conscious ("Hell is oneself" T. S.

Eliot, taken from Blake)

12. In a Communion, 'many' is always 'one', and 'one' is always 'many'. When one = many, there is a State. All States are 'images' of the Communion.

COMMENTS

1. Our theory may strike the reader as abstract and elevated and not concerned with the usual human condition. This would be a mistake. What is offered here for contemplation is a seeing of the world of communion in which we already participate. We have experience in states, though these are ordinarily regarded in terms of 'awareness of the world' or 'relationships', which token only external connection. We have to go to the implicate side of our experience, into the interiority of states. We then need to allow this implicate type of perception to 'disclose' communion. The communion cannot be reduced to an experience, not unless we are the plenary individual. By taking the plenary individual on faith, we allow this state to 'in-form' us. It is by this in-forming, we argue, that we are supported in our faith, hope and love.

The theory allows us to conceive of 'sacred individuals' but also of the possibility of our participation in their nature. It seems to us that this gives substance to religious views which must, as we believe is obvious, concern the 'subjective' aspect of communion. At the same time, the realm of human interaction, usually considered in the objective' aspect of communion, can be accommodated.

2. The systems of systematics appear in the theory as reflections of states onto the objective aspect. For this to be acceptable, we have to allow a symbolic replacement of individuals by sub-elements of experience such as objects, forces, sources, limits, etc. In this light, systems may be thought of as, in their essence, 'acts of will'. It is no accident that systems are as they are because they are 'seen that way'. The view of systems as based on external connections becomes valid only at the objective limits of communion.

We draw attention to a critical proposition in Bennett's systematics. This is that the 'terms' of any system are 'homo-ousias', that is, of the same kind. In this guise, they can take the place of individuals: individuals are strictly homo-ousias

and 'equal'. The mere approximations to the ideality of systems we find in empirical circumstances can be understood as deriving from the lack of true equality and individuality of empirical terms.

The variety of a system [N] we find in practice are due to the variety of states of N individuals in combination to be realised in a given communion. This may serve to explain why cultures are significant for the explication of systematics.

3. In the book 'Hazard', Bennett says that Will is "an indivisible whole that always remains the same and yet it is composed of an infinity of particulate wills." (Appendix Two). Though poised on the threshold, so-to-say, he makes no allowance for any significance of combinations of particulate wills. In another place, in the book 'Creation', however, he uses Cantor's concept of transfinite numbers to entertain such an idea. In 'The



Dramatic Universe' (vol. II) he talks extensively of Will as 3-fold, but not even as a state of combination of 3 particulate wills or individuals. Our theory offers a bridge between his various models. Of course, our theory gives an exalted status to 'individuals', much as in the religious sense of individuals as 'sparks of the divine'.

In 'Hazard' he says that the 'atoms of will' only make themselves felt when enclosed in a vessel. How such atoms can be enclosed is a mystery. Our theory allows us to postulate states as intermediary. There are no vessels as such. Particles of will can 'take shape' in combinations.

In many places, he speaks of the 'self-limitation of will' in terms of the formation of the 'determining-conditions' of space, time, number, etc. We would

like to replace the concept of self-limitation by the theory of combinations. Because a combination of individuals is involved, there has to be agreement about 'how to act'. It is this agreement that is the basis of the determining conditions. We can then see that there are a multitude of determining conditions, in the form of agreements. The individuals in a combination have to act together; and they thereby exemplify what Bennett, in yet other writings, called 'coalescence'. It is this property that gives rise to Cosmos out of the apparent Chaos of raw communion.

Implicit in this argument is a strong version of the 'anthropic' principle, but based on individuals and not on human generality. It implies that the far greater part of the universe is yet to be discovered. Agreeing with Bennett, we can conceive of a baseline agreement which is simply to 'exist' at all.

Finally, to revert to Bennett's model of a 'vessel', we can take note that he regarded this as 'being'. We want to point out that the root concept of being is 'inner-togetherness' – which is tantamount to what we mean by combinations of individuals. In this sense, every individual contains' every other who belongs in the same state.

ESSAY – JOHN ANTHONY WEST

John Anthony West was one of our presenters at the last Baltimore seminar-dialogue on 'Ways of Higher Intelligence'. An acerbic and witty speaker, he does not pull his punches in demolishing our favoured ideas of 'progress'. He is best known for his book *Serpent in the Sky* and became widely recognised as a key figure in Egyptology by his discovery that the Sphinx showed evidence of erosion by water, which suggests that it may be as much as twelve thousand years old and date to the time of 'pre-sand Egypt' that Gurdjieff mentions in *Meetings with Remarkable Men*. The following

piece is part one of the Sekhmet series to be found at the web site <http://members.aol.com/jawsphinx>.

SEKHMET SPEAKS

by John Anthony West e-mail
jawsphinx@aol.com Fax: (518) 945-2329

Part One

INTRODUCING SEKHMET

Sekhmet, in ancient Egypt, was portrayed as a female figure with the head of a lioness. In the mythology, it was Sekhmet who meted out Divine vengeance when errant humanity neglected to worship the gods and took matters into its own unknowing hands. Her destructive rampages were designed to restore rightful order, she was the goddess who heals... but by fire. Here in the pages of BRES she is spoken for (in appropriately contemporary terminology) by her amanuensis, John Anthony West, rogue Egyptologist, author of *Serpent in the Sky: the High Wisdom of Ancient Egypt* and other books and student of the 'symbolist' school of Egyptology developed by the Alsatian mathematician and philosopher, R. A. Schwaller de Lubicz, and developer of the controversial but geologically supported theory that the Great Sphinx of Giza was built, not by the dynastic Egyptians, but by an earlier civilization flourishing in Egypt around 12,000 or more years ago.

SEKHMET ON CIVILIZATION

Civilization is like a park. It's not 'natural', it doesn't just happen in the normal course of affairs. Nature, left to her own devices will not produce a park; human beings, interested only in procreation, food, shelter and the acquisition of material goods will not produce a civilization. Both park and civilization are contingent upon human will, intelligence, industry and intervention -- and the understanding that both natural world and human

beings possesses a hidden or occult potential. Both park and civilization may be seen as exaltations of the natural order. Only human beings can bring them forth into manifestation.

A good park (the Japanese are perhaps the most accomplished masters of the art) is not the "conquest" or even the taming of wild nature, but an aesthetic enhancement of its manifold distinct but hidden qualities. And a valid civilization is not the suppression, repression or distortion of our human nature but rather its transformation into something higher; something nature (that is to say "the gods") have not freely bestowed upon us except as potential. In the park of civilization, the mighty oaks and maples represent the great religions; the shrubbery and flower beds the complex of sophisticated amenities that distinguish civilizations from so-called primitive societies. (These are no less satisfactory or spiritually developed on their own terms but they function in tune with nature and are uninterested in or consciously opposed to making nature serve human values. So for the sake of our extended metaphor these primitive or traditional societies are not civilizations in the usual sense of the word.)

Once established, the park/civilization calls for endless co-operation and intelligent attention if it is to flourish. When the parkkeepers, (its priests, scientists, philosophers and artists) are drunk, crazy, greedy and lazy the park quickly degenerates. Once the process of degeneration sets in, there is no direction from above. Without direction from above, the humble but necessary carters and traders who bring in the manure, tools and supplies quickly take advantage of the anarchy. Dissatisfied with their lowly status, they euphemize themselves into "businessmen", "industrialists", "entrepreneurs", "marketing managers", "advertising executives" and "financiers" and preempt positions of power. Their power is then maintained by a hierarchy of mercenaries, henchmen and yes-men similarly euphemized into "politicians". Chaos ensues. And in this particular instance that chaos is called "Progress". A pseudo-

science is then invented to justify the production and distribution of ever-greater heaps of manure. This pseudo-science is called "economics". It has no basis in reality, yet it seems to—once the manure carters have taken over the park. In the absence of a functioning, spiritually based religion, "economics" is then glorified in turn into a pseudo-religion: Theo-economics, which, supported by its accompanying philosophy of Metafinance, becomes the catechism of the Church of Progress. And so we find ourselves today. The oaks and maples are blighted and rot from the core out; the shrubbery grows rampant and out of control, the ponds are stagnant, weeds, brambles and poison ivy take over all open spaces, and everything is covered with manure. There is no room for bear or deer or wolves to live, but bugs and vermin flourish. What had been an exaltation of nature becomes nature degraded—to many a state far less satisfactory than nature left to her own devices which in turn provokes a nostalgia for simpler times.

Left to itself, sooner or later the park will revert back to nature leaving little trace of its former state. But meanwhile, life in the park—except for the bugs, the vermin and the manure carters—is hell. How then to reverse the process? Obviously it can't be stopped. It has to run its course. Nothing can nourish the oaks and maples back to health (in the park of Western Civilization these trees were stunted, diseased and grotesquely deformed to begin with and their conversion into useful firewood will provoke little mourning). Pruning the shrubbery is next to useless. There are only a couple of alternatives.

The simplest of course is set the whole thing on fire, burn everything to the ground, and start from scratch. Ancient legends and texts around the world seem to indicate that this has happened in the past. Sodom and Gomorrah may refer to such an event; Plato's 'Atlantis' to another version of the same; in the prophetic Hermetic book of Aesclepius (ca. 2nd Century AD) Hermes Trismegistus (Thrice Great Hermes) the

Neoplatonic name for Djehuti, or Thoth, the ancient Egyptian embodiment of Divine Wisdom, declares unequivocally that this has been the repeated fate of parks when the parkkeepers go berserk. And of course the potential for a conflagration of this sort is ever-present today--nuclear, environmental, pestilential, or any combination thereof.

If that is what is actually in store, the Armageddonites have the only solution. Head for the hills, prepare bunkers stocked with assault rifles and supplies of pork and beans and hope to ride out the holocaust. But if that is not the preordained and ineluctable denouement, perhaps the park can be revived even as it goes through its necessary process of dissolution: salvaging what is still viable and salvageable, dismantling and recycling what is not, disposing of what is noxious, toxic and inessential, and re-establishing the correct chain of command as a prerequisite to a new order. All of this takes time, vision, a common aim, and a wide variety of complementary skills. Enlightened gardeners must replant trees. (It is a curious fact that, just before they die, trees often produce far more nuts and seeds than they do in healthy maturity.) In this case, the trees will not be genetic clones of the old (the park/civilization analogy is not exact—analogy never are. But they will be viable mutations based upon the same eternal principles—what Schwaller de Lubicz called the doctrine of the return to the "source"; what Graham Hancock calls "the science of immortality").

In ancient Egypt the gardeners were the followers of Osiris, divine creator of civilization, embodiment of the principle of regeneration and renewal, the mortal "god" who dies but who carries the seed of eternal life (Horus) within him. Landscape architects (sons and daughters of Ptah, architect of heaven and earth) must redesign the entire plan to conform to the radically changed conditions of a new precessional age. The parkkeepers have to be sobered up and brought back to sanity—or summarily fired and replaced.

The arrogant manure carters must be deprived of power and put back in their rightful, honorable, but subordinate positions. But before constructive gardening and landscaping activity can take place on a grand scale, before the ponds can be purified and restocked with fish, the ground first has to be thoroughly cleared. The brambles have to be chopped down, the poison ivy pulled out by the roots, the deadwood cleared away and the weeds composted. In Egypt, this was the work of Sekhmet, the lioness, female aspect of the fire principle, she who both destroys and heals ... through fire and purgation. Appropriately equipped with flame-thrower and chainsaw to cope with the stubborn contemporary breed of weed, bramble and poison ivy, it is Sekhmet's twenty-first century job to clear the way for the gardeners and architects; to apply the wrecking ball to the Church of Progress.

Civilization is not a birthright, it is a privilege. We can act upon it, or ignore it -- the latter at our peril.

Nut, the Sky-Goddess

Hers is the path of constructive destruction.

ESSAY – WILLIAM PENSINGER

William Pensinger was one of the presenters at the first Baltimore seminar-dialogue in 1997. Together with his wife, Cong Huyen Ton Nu Nha Trang, a Vietnamese scholar and poet, he authored one of the most remarkable 'novels' of our time: *The Moon of Hoa Binh* (see the web site www.peaknet.org/webpages/autopoy/index.html).

In this novel, he makes an intensive investigation into the reality experienced in earlier 'animistic' cultures, exploring as he goes the recent history of Vietnam, the nature of art in the twentieth century, quantum mechanics on the macroscale, and many radical issues such as 'multi-value' and 'identity-transparency'. Working in military intelligence during the Vietnamese war and later learning the traditional art of Japanese landscape gardening he



became acutely aware of the radically different world view of early Asiatic cultures and its relevance to many conceptual-perceptual breakthroughs in the west at the turn of the century. He is one of the few people to understand and embrace Bennett's concept of three kinds of time and his insight into multi-value is an independent addition to Bennett's systematics.. His characters reflect his insights into identity-transparency, set in vivid reconstructions of life in Vietnam. He includes some detailed observations from his experiments with 'walking meditation' that are some of the most profound reflections on 'self-remembering' to be found anywhere. We urge all our readers to read his book (obtainable through the web site given above). This short essay was written for our newsletter.

OBJECT AND SUBJECT

by William L. Pensinger
e-mail autopoy@brandx.net

DRAFT: Not for quotation or distribution without author's written permission.

In traditional Asian cultures, directions -- left and right -- were referenced from the point of view of the implicitly animistic object, not that of the subject viewing the object. A Westerner receiving directions involving landmarks would generally take a series of wrong turns. Likewise, perhaps, regarding directions relative to realms of the spirit — because the notions of identity diverge so decisively: identity transparency in old East, individual identity in post-Renaissance West. Difficulties in comprehending this difference are compounded because identity transparency is not a particular state of the subject, as the Westerner accustomed to inanimate objects instinctively supposes, but a state of the {object : subject :: subject : object} occasion in undivided gestalt.

“Everything becomes confused and blended into one. The state of everything is essentially precarious. Their aspect is elusive and affords no hold for us to seize. This curious vision of the Universe explains some beliefs which otherwise would be hardly conceivable. Each individuality

being very badly defined, its limits are wavering, extensible. They do not confine within the individual himself, but overlap him and encroach on his surroundings. Under these conditions, it is as difficult to discern the individual from the group to which he belongs as to discern him from everything that touches him or reminds of himself. With these concepts, we may understand that the Universe must appear as an inextricable entanglement of reciprocal influences where persons and things, in a perpetual state of instability, become confused together while borrowing mutually their qualities.”

These words, describing the state of identity transparency characteristic of peasant animism, were written in 1912 by the French anthropologist, Giran, (MAGIE ET RELIGION ANNAMITES, Paris: Challamel) and translated into English during the 1960s by Vietnamese scholar Nguyen Khac Kham. While today, there is much concern about subject being regarded as object—sex object, laborer as commodity fetish, whatever—in the past, object was often regarded as subject. Object as subject has been denigrated by social psychology by anthropology, as “contagion” as “participation mystique”: the primitive mind, via psychological projection, transfers its own subjective contents onto the object—and then perceives those contents in transference as if actual attributes of the object. Indeed, inability to distinguish between the subjective and object is treated as the hallmark of primitive mind and some psychoses. Even Buddhism negatively so regards, as this concatenation of object and subject is considered the root of all suffering: attachment. High culture always demeans animism. We say subject and object, rather than object and subject, for “good” reason. But is object and subject object as subject or object in subject?

The Germans were once an animistic people, and this history is reflected in their language. *Einfuhlung*, empathy, is low-grade contagion low-grade participation mystique: to empathize is to identify with subjective attributes perceived as residing in an object of perception: object as

subject in empathic resonance—the identification is just not allowed to get out of hand. *Umwelt*, own-world, is a different thing a different state altogether—all to gather. Awareness of threat, rather than resonance, is the context within which to map parameters of ones own-world, ones *Umwelt*. Fear of death is dread, dread of losing the attributes of being: being for the self, self-being, being itself. But so often we humans are willing to set aside fear of death at the prospect of denial, denial of what we have eaten, psychologically eaten: the beloved, the fatherland, the cherished belief, the motherland, the cause, the revered shibboleth. Threat to these—even their mere verbal abuse—is received as denial of the actual attributes of being itself, as assault on the being of oneself, as existential denial. Fright. Flight. Fight. We experience a little death, we simultaneously are willing to risk the big death, when what we have identified with the self is subject to denial: object in subject. The own-world is a world of objects introjected, objects brought into the subject, consumed as fetish as theater as totem as building me-opposed-to-them. My own-world as me. Objectification of the subject, rather than subjectification of the object. Instead of theater beneath the skirt (sex object: she stoops to conquer), the stage strutting and fretting within the thespian (existential subject: he eats to fight). Subject and object, object and subject: which is which?

On the outskirts of Bangkok there is an old house, a house made of teak in Thai style with multiple levels, multiple terraces, many roofs, separate structures interconnected by ramps of the inner garden hanging pomelo and papaya and plum and persimmon, durian, mango and milk-breast fruit. Near the door to the highest sleeping pavilion is a large pierced carving—3 by 4 meters—forming the frontal wall. One will walk past this layered cut-out relief dozens of times, momentarily stopping perhaps, registering only a confusion of abstractions, an entanglement of all shapes blended into one, wavering, precarious, a collection of aspects elusive and affording no hold, until

suddenly—object as subject!—the image appears in awareness: A giant cicada superimposed upon a farmer squatting on a rice paddy dike, whose knees and thighs are the shoulders and torsos of two straining water buffalo surging forward at the viewing subject out of a valley of rice rimmed in circling hills stitched of bristling undergrowth. But the figures will not remain resolved! They become confused together borrowing mutually their qualities, appearing as an inextricable entanglement of reciprocal influences, persons and things in a perpetual state of instability confused together borrowing mutually their qualities, confused together, confused until suddenly—object in subject!—reappears the confusion of abstractions, all shapes blended into one, wavering, precarious, a collection of aspects: {object : subject :: subject : object, object : subject :: subject : object . . . n}.

DIALOGUE

The DuVersity encourages and fosters the dialogue process wherever it can. We will be including short articles on dialogue in most issues of the newsletter. These will include abstract theoretical papers as well as more general descriptions, such as the following (written for people in the Edinburgh region of Scotland).

There is a new way of having conversation together in groups that is being explored in a variety of ways throughout the world. No one person or movement is responsible for this. It is happening spontaneously in response to a need which is coming more and more into consciousness. All the various groups and experiments are participating in their own diverse ways in the realisation of this need – what it means and how we can help each other to meet it.

The need is only just coming to light. It seems to us that it entails a new appreciation of human intelligence and a deep admission of diversity and

difference. In an age when information is freely available and we have, at least in principle, access to the wealth of all the cultures of the world, we are coming to see that it is only when people truly 'share in mind' primarily through face to face conversation that we can process the bewildering complexity that impinges upon us. This complexity tends to be avoided by specialisation, ethnic segregation, ideological fixation, business, etc. Enthusiasts for computer technology argue that only yet to be invented advanced machines can handle this complexity for us. We disagree. No 'programme' of any kind can possibly deal with the human situation. Both technology and religion are, in their own ways, dead ends.

Human intelligence is fostered through enabling people to express thought in company with each other. It cannot be bottled up in theories, politics,

A dark rectangular box with white text that reads "Make a gate to hold the moon!". The text is centered and appears to be a quote or a title.

beliefs or systems. Yet, in nearly every walk of life, meetings between people remain locked into fixed patterns which maintain basic assumptions that prevent the release of intelligence. We are human beings first and scientists, Scots, left-wingers, believers, etc. second. What we have been avoiding all along – the energy of differences between us – is the key to our own nature.

We talk about a 'new way of conversation' but use the old word 'dialogue' for it. There are in fact a variety of terms such as 'thresholding', 'median groups', and so on. We prefer the old word because it implies that it has been with us all along. What we do not mean by this word is just some exchange of opinions. We mean an exchange in which the WHOLE intelligence can be expressed. This need not have a name. Maybe it is the unknown!

We cultivate the unknown – which is the active source of new intelligence – by meeting together without agenda, without leadership and without preconceived ideas of how to conduct the

conversation. This takes some getting used to. At every turn, it is subverted into the familiar forms of debate, expressing one's opinion, focussing attention on oneself, putting down other people, confirming social niceties, maintaining cultural norms, and so on. But a little patience goes a long way. Just by sticking to it most people can see for themselves the emergence of the unexpected and an expansion of meaning.

Our own search and explorations was very much helped and influenced by the pioneer work of the physicist David Bohm and the psychotherapist Patrick de Mare (of the Tavistock Institute). But we have made our own experiments with groups in England, the USA and Europe. We have worked with groups as small as four and as large as seventy. We feel this search and research can be shared with many others. So, we are sounding you out in case you might feel an instinctive response, a sense of recognition, to what we are saying here.

It cannot be something that anyone has to be persuaded of. We are not teaching anything. When people gather for dialogue, they do so as independent individuals who spontaneously agree to talk together outside the boundaries of convention. What can then come about is a sense of there being an independent intelligence associated with the group that is not confined to the personal concerns of its members. We do not have to believe in this or agree about what it means. We try to operate in terms of what we think and experience in the present moment.

In some ways, to dialogue is to go back into the formation of our minds. As members of a complex human society, our minds have been brought into operation as an expression of forces within it. Largely unconsciously, we propagate forms of thought that have shaped us. To break free of this is not easy. Most of us believe that our minds are our own. This may not be so!

We can offer no proof of the efficacy of our 'dialogue' process. What it is, is determined by those who participate. This is because it does not have goals outside of itself, or ideals to be aspired to. It concerns itself resolutely with what is at hand. It uses speech, not to deny other means of communication, but to work with the very medium which often exploits our misunderstandings and turns them sometimes into violence. We suffer, not only personally but culturally, as former Yugoslavia horrifyingly attests.

Very gently, without grand expectations, we can come together in dialogue and begin to wean ourselves away from the tyrannies of our culture. Sometimes, people get upset, simply because the direct experience of difference can be very disturbing. But, there is no demand on anyone to 'express honestly what they feel', or expose themselves in any way other than that they choose. Trust takes time to develop and cannot be imposed. The 'body of trust' becomes the container for the fostering of new intelligence

DIALOGUE NEWS

The DuVersity has initiated experiments in dialogue for kids, at present only in the UK. Trials with 10-11 year olds have proved so successful that we are undertaking dialogue with 5 year olds next. It is to be hoped that similar programs can be initiated in the USA.

SEMINAR-DIALOGUES BALTIMORE

In the next issue, we will be giving a short report on the last seminar dialogue 'Ways of Higher Intelligence'. Here is part of our announcement for the next major event at the Baltimore Center for Holistic Health, on **Humanity**.

As our planet reels under the impact of six billion people, the idea of humanity assumes a staggering importance. It can begin to be said that the presence of humanity verges on a challenge to the



Dialogue at Baltimore

planet itself. What do we know of the role of humanity on this planet and in this solar system;



and can we even begin to say whether we are fulfilling this role or failing in it?

We know that all of us have come from the same genetic source. There is even the idea that all of us – at least on the female side – are descended from one woman. Yet, we are in conflict with each other. Inside a marriage, inside a family, inside a nation – division makes us suffer. What has our



science, our religion, our art, or our technology done for our humanity? What role do cultures play in the making or unmaking of our humanity? The

John Anthony West, Anthony Blake and Warren Kenton at Baltimore

globalisation forced on us by information technology has brought us to the point of regarding everyone on this planet as an equal. Still, many cultures deny any humanity to their neighbours and engage in various degrees of genocide. We have

hardly begun to understand how to live with each other as equal to one another. What could such equality mean in the vistas of such apparent diversity? But why should people kill other people because they eat slightly different foods or use a language with slightly different inflections? The boundaries and distinctions formed by tribes, nations and religions are under threat even as they continue to foster hatred. How can we learn to bear our humanity? Will acceptance of each other require we accept other forms of life as also equal to our own? Or, will we require the shock of alien intelligence to realise the preciousness of our existence here?

**Joseph Rael and Edith Wallace who will speak
at the Humanity seminar-dialogue 2000**