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Ziauddin Sardar, Director of Centre for Postnormal Policy and Futures Studies, is a well-known writer, cultural critic, and futurologist. His most recent books include Mecca: The Sacred City, A Person of Pakistani Origins, and, as editor, The Postnormal Times Reader and Emerging Epistemologies: The Changing Fabric of Knowledge in Postnormal Times.

Gabrielle: Imagination is at the heart of your most recent thinking. How are you reframing imagination these days?

Zia: There is no lack of imagination. I’ve watched incredible television programs recently, *Fargo*, for example, or *Game of Thrones*. There is no lack of imagination out there and in fact, imagination is creating the world we find ourselves in. But the world we find ourselves is a mess; so, there is something wrong with the imagination that is producing it. Clearly the world reflects our imagination. Everything we do: science and creativity involves imagination, arts and humanities involve imagination, film, cinema, architecture, everything involves imagination.

There’s no lack of imagination, and indeed, there is no lack of serious reflection on imagination throughout history. I mean, you could go back to Aristotle, Hume, and Kant, they all had something to say about imagination.

Of course, my favorites are the English Romantics (e.g., Blake, Byron, Coleridge, Keats, Wordsworth). The English Romantics were heavily into the imagination. In their poetry and meditations on nature and the world, in their images and perception of images, memory, and learning—in all this, imagination plays an important part for the English Romantics.

In general, the English Romantics divided the imagination into two categories: the primary imagination, which is the imagination of everyday perception, and secondary imagination, which is responsible for conscious creation of imagination. You have two distinctions, one where I sit down and imagine something, but if I’m trying to create something, I think consciously of something, that’s a slightly different variation. We can also talk about *The Sociological Imagination*, the imagination of society, and how society is shaped. C Wright Mills (2000/1959) said, “imagination enables its possessor to understand the larger historical scene in terms of its meaning for the inner life and the external...
career of a variety of individuals” (p. 11). That says a lot. Imagination provides inner meaning as well as shapes the outer world.

Alfonso: If there’s so much imagination out there and so many studies have been done and the field is rich in scholarship, what’s the problem, in your view?

Zia: The problem is very simple—this imagination is the product of a single worldview. It doesn’t matter where you are nowadays, whether you are a Chinese or a Japanese person or a Muslim from the Middle East. Whatever your ethnicity, national outlook, civilization, culture, the imagination that you buy into is the imagination of the dominant Western worldview. The worldview that creates desires. It’s the desire that then activates the imagination, the desire for producing art or progress in science, the basic trigger for imagination is desire. Even those people who want to leave the world and live in the wilderness have a desire to be on their own, not necessarily alone, but just on their own. Therefore, they may have a different kind of idea of what imagination is all about.

The Cambridge Book of Imagination (2020) offers several definitions. It says the potential aims of imagination include but are not limited to knowledge acquisition (p. 102). This is very important: imagination is connected to producing knowledge. All the knowledge we have is part of the imagination that comes out of a single worldview. It’s a very truncated form of imagination that leads to a truncated form of knowledge itself. The problems of knowledge we are facing relate to the fact that imagination itself is essentially a product of a single dominant culture.

To continue with the Cambridge Book of Imagination (2020) definitions, imagination includes “(1) knowledge-acquisition, (2) creativity, and (3) comprehension of others’ creative output” (p. 102).

Now, this is a very interesting definition because it combines knowledge, creativity, and the notion of the other, all of which are, in a sense, product of the imagination that we have today, which I argue and problematize, is essentially the imagination of a dominant culture.

The point I’m trying to make is that most non-western cultures now imbibe this imagination. Whatever their conceptual cultural makeup may be, all non-western cultures now basically imbibed this imagination. Everybody thinks like white Europeans used to think like or like what white American academics think.

The Cambridge Book of the Imagination (2020) also tells us that “imagination is generative. To serve any useful purpose, it must give us more than we already started with, as such imagination cannot be too constrained by our intentions” (p. 102). So, it’s a kind of this free-floating thing. Imagination adds to what we already have. Every time a new idea comes in, for example, you imagine something new, it adds to what was already there.

Imagination often seems unbound and without constraint. This is a very common misconception that imagination is without constraint, but as the definition goes on to say, if this were the case, then imagination would be more likely to generate falsehoods than truths. Imagination must be constrained to provide knowledge. It’s a bit like freedom. We all want freedom, but do you want freedom at the expense of the freedom of others? You don’t even have the freedom to drive the way you want to drive. There are traffic rules. The reason there are traffic rules is because if you don’t drive according to the structure that has been laid out for you, you’re going to kill lots of people. Similarly, imagination has a structure, and unless it has some sort of structure, it’s not going to produce the kind of knowledge that you want.

Now, all this is very useful because it confirms the notion that there is a great deal of imagination out there, that the world is being shaped by all this imagination, but the
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world is in a mess. We are in postnormal times. That means that there may be something wrong with the imagination that we have, the reservoir of the imagination.

Gabrielle: Given all of this, how are you defining imagination in the context of postnormal times?

Zia: I’ve thought about my own definition, and I’ve come up with this—imagination is a human capacity, that transforms experience and thought, generates new knowledge, and all to produce alternative visions of futures. Now my emphasis here is slightly different from the Cambridge Handbook definition because I’m saying that imagination does not simply produce thought and creativity and knowledge, but also produces visions that are alternative to what already exists.

So that’s a very important point. I’m trying to shift the notion of imagination, to move away from the capitalist dominant paradigm.

The context of postnormal times is important here. If we are saying that the world is in a mess because imagination is a mess, then we need to define what kind of mess that the world is in; what is the problem? What is the problem with the world? That’s where we move on to the postnormal times. We’re facing a world that is essentially running faster and faster. Speed is the essence that is globalized. Things become globalized very quickly. The pandemic is an excellent example, it happened very quickly, it was global in scale, every individual has been impacted by it, and it has created a string of simultaneous problems: problems of unemployment, problems of loneliness, problems of travel, economic crisis, and so forth.

This is what drives postnormal times, and essentially, it has three basic features. One is complexity. In an interconnected, globalized world, there’s a lot of reinforcing feedback and huge variables. We live in a very complex world, almost every problem we face has many changing dimensions, so complexities are there. Out of that complexity emerge a lot of contradictions, which in fact, feed and improve or enhance complexity, and often all of that can come with positive feedback and lead to chaos. These are the three Cs of postnormal times.

Alfonso: We know that what you call The Three Tomorrows is a central lens in understanding postnormal times, how does this map with your evolving definition of imagination?

Zia: Yes, understanding how imagination functions within the three tomorrows of postnormal times is helpful in this investigation. The first tomorrow we call the extended present, which is essentially not a future at all, because it simply continues what exists today in terms of technology, development, innovation, and so forth. The second tomorrow is the familiar futures, which is where the future is shaped by the images and metaphors that we have imbibed. The third is the unthought future, where in fact they’re not unthinkable, but they are outside the framework of the dominant paradigm and that’s why we don’t think of them. These three tomorrows can actually interact simultaneously. They’re not discrete entities and they’re not necessarily linear as well, they feed on the feedback loop.

Gabrielle: Can you walk us through each of The Three Tomorrows and how imagination plays a role?

Zia: In the first tomorrow, the extended present, we have what I call the trapped imagination. The imagination is essentially trapped in the dominant paradigms, dogmatic frameworks, standard procedures that we have. Essentially, the extended present is the trends that are deeply embedded and continue. We know, for example, that next year Apple will produce some new variant of its iPhone. The following year, it will produce another variant of its iPhone. We’ll get the new varieties of computers, and AI will become more powerful. We have the dominant technologies and dominant ideas, which
are entrenched, and they will continue in the near future. That’s the extended present, the imagination is trapped by all these things.

This is something that, in fact, Ursula Le Guin pointed out in 1989 in one of her essays. She said, “it seems that the utopian imagination is trapped like capitalism and industrialism, and the human population in a one-way future consisting only of growth” (as cited in Tsing, 2015, p. 17). She discusses how the dominant system of continuous growth, capitalism, has actually trapped our imagination.

Also, the imagination is trapped in all varieties of dogmatism. A good example is the rise of puritanical religion in all shapes and forms—the rise of religious nationalism. In a sense, America is experiencing a rise in religious nationalism, that’s what “Make America Great” is all about. Somebody asked me when was America ever great? That’s a very interesting question to explore. All these mythologies are trapping our imagination. There’s a wonderful book called *Sustainable Knowledge* by Robert Frodeman (2013). He points out that we are trapped in capitalist desires so much that we need “the get out of jail free card that suggests that we might be able to invent our way out of the need to recognize any limit to our desires” (p. 72). The whole point is that there seems to be no limit to the desire that the extended present creates, and imagination feeds on that. Thus, imagination in the extended present, the first tomorrow, is a *trapped imagination*. Essentially the imagination is trapped in the trends and technological determinism of contemporary times. Even the climate change imagination is trapped. How we imagine climate change is progressing and how apocalyptic it could be—more and more carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, more pollution, the rivers dying, acidity in the sea, rising seawater, the shortage of fresh drinking water, and so forth. So, these trends feed our imagination. Even some of the necessary work we need to do is, in fact, part of the trapped imagination. How we rescue ourselves from the climate emergency and the solutions we produce and advocate are part of the trapped imagination.

The second tomorrow is the *familiar future*. Here my argument is that the imagination is colonized. We find ourselves in a colonized imagination. But we need to make a distinction. A trapped imagination is essentially a physical phenomenon, like when you get trapped in a room. A colonized imagination is a mental phenomenon. That means you have internalized certain things and the mind itself has become colonized.

In familiar futures, we are colonized by certain ideas, concepts, notions, metaphors, and images that we take for granted. The idea of progress, the idea of efficiency, the notions of modernity or postmodernism, relativism, difference, otherness, all these concepts, and countless others, all colonize our minds. They all gently orient our imagination in a specific and a particular direction.

Even though theories of history and possible futures are employed and are connected in these categories as our dreams, as individuals and societies, they serve as basic resource material for our imagination, and thus, our imagination is colonized by them.

When I was reading through the literature, I came across Jean-Paul Sartre’s (1936/2012) book on imagination and his idea of *image facts*. These are facts that are irreducible structures of consciousness. Image facts shape our physical reality. Now, if your image facts come from a colonized concept, then it is not surprising that it becomes part of your consciousness, and then you use that to shape the physical reality around you.

Take China, which has a totally different worldview from the West. It has been colonized by dominant notions of capitalism such as growth, efficiency, markets, and perpetual linear progress aimed at nothing more than wealth creation. Even though there’s a big contradiction between a communist state-controlled economy and a capitalist
economy, China has colonized these ideas so much that it is replicating the same reality, the same injustices, climate damage, greed, and political belligerence as the West—despite the fact that it has a totally different history and worldview. Or, look at Japan and how Japan, over the years, basically reconstructed western society within a Japanese milieu: the same desire, the same notions, despite being a totally different worldview. It’s because the image facts, which come from the dominant conceptual notions, have been imbibed, internalized, and then used to shape society.

Notice how all these social, cultural, and intellectual metaphors and concepts have been seen as synonymous with creativity and have been used in the development of AI, which shows that this colonized imagination plays an important part in morals, theorizing, and decision-making.

The morality that is producing AI is shaped by a particular imagination. The decision-making that is involved. You’re basically creating the reality of your imagination. Even though every single person who works on AI is probably highly creative and a very imaginative person—they couldn’t do this work unless they had a really, dynamic, imaginative mind. But what they are doing is reproducing the physical reality of the concept that shapes their imagination.

Now it has also to be said that both trapped and colonized imaginations are a product of the western philosophical intellectual tradition, based not on universal concepts but on culturally constituted traditions of imagination with metaphors in endless conflict. I’m not saying that the western imagination is a monolithic entity. I’m saying traditions of western imagination produce an overall framework that is monolithic. There’s a diversity within the framework, but the framework itself doesn’t allow you to go in any other direction or doesn’t allow you to think of alternatives.

So, there’s a feedback loop in operation here: western cultural resources nourish the imagination of western culture with both culture and imagination enveloped in a framework of concepts and metaphors. This is how both history and future are studied and shaped with political imagination, constructing an image of us against the perceived others, not just in terms of people and constructing identities, but also in terms of other ways of knowing, other traditions of relating to nature, and other visions of alternative futures. Cultural artifacts present very important and potent tools with which imagination can be communicated, shared, and channeled. They can also be used to control people’s imagination and social action. Both of these dimensions we see in action.

Now we move to the third tomorrow, which is the unthought futures tomorrow. Here, we move from the trapped imagination and colonized imagination to the unthought imagination.

Unthought begins with awareness, and awareness has to do with ignorance. Only if you are aware that you do not know something will you try to find what that something is. Sometimes this is known as learner ignorance. It involves awareness of the brutal fact that the extended present has trapped our imagination and familiar futures have colonized our imagination. The first step toward the unthought imagination is the awareness of the previous two categories of imagination that I’m talking about because you cannot proceed to a genuine alternative unless this awareness is there.

This is essentially an admission of one’s own ignorance. Of course, there’s nothing more difficult for a culture to admit than its ignorance. In certain cultures, saving face is essential. Even the most obvious thing you can’t say because of concern somebody is going to lose face. In Chinese culture, and certainly in Southeast Asian culture, face saving is very important. You can’t say the obvious point of ignorance because somebody’s going to lose face.
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What has happened now is that western culture has acquired this losing face mentality. Western culture itself finds it very difficult to admit its own ignorance. We can see this in all of its institutions. Politicians never admit their faults and ignorance. The police misbehave, but they don’t acknowledge the misbehavior. There may be a report or a court case that would reveal a segment of the truth years later. Patterns of neglect in hospitals, mistreatment of migrants and refugees, and gross miscarriages of justice are always suppressed and have to be dragged out by investigative journalism. But institutions just do not want to admit their own ignorance. Yet, if they admitted their own ignorance, they could have done something about it four or five years ago, ten years ago, very quickly and the situation would have been improved, and reforms would have been made. There is something, in our institutions, in our mental makeup, whatever it is, we do not like to accept that we are ignorant.

The dominant system has a very serious problem with ignorance. The first step to the untaught is the acceptance of one’s own ignorance. If you cannot do that, you just cannot move to the untaught. That’s the first thing.

There is a Waorani woman in Ecuador named Nemonte Nenquimo. She’s a co-founder of the Indigenous nonprofit organization called Ceibo Alliance. When I went to Ecuador about six or seven years ago, I heard her, and I just kept her name in the back of my mind. So, the other day, I opened The Guardian, and there, to my surprise, was an article by her in the opinion page. This is what Nenquimo (2020, October 12) says:

You’re probably not used to an Indigenous woman calling you ignorant. But for Indigenous people, it is clear. The less you know about something, the less value it has to you, and it is easier to destroy it. And by easy, I mean guiltlessly, remorselessly, foolishly, even righteously. And this is exactly what you are doing to us as Indigenous peoples, to our rainforest territories, and ultimately to our planet’s climate. You forced your civilization upon us and now look where we are: global pandemic, climate crisis, species extinction and, driving it all, widespread spiritual poverty. In all these years of taking, taking, taking from our lands, you have not had the courage, or the curiosity, or the respect to get to know us. To understand how we see, and think, and feel, and what we know about life on this Earth.

She just summed it up beautifully. In an 800-word opinion piece, she nails it. The less you know of something, the less value it seems to have. This is precisely the point, the more ignorant you are about something, the less value it has for you. If you are totally ignorant of the unthought, then it has no value for you. This is a big ignorance. It is very difficult for us civilized westerners to admit that we know little to nothing about Indigenous cultures.

Now, this is interesting—she’s not speaking from the head, she’s speaking from experience. This is the other dimension of the unthought—the realization of the unthought also comes from experience.

Nicholas Cusanus’ famous book, Of Learned Ignorance (1954), is about developing an appreciation that knowledge is framed by our limited imagination. Learned ignorance acknowledges the fact that knowledge is shaped by ignorance-based limited imagination, “which is itself based on our culture, and that a crucial objective of knowledge should be the discovery of its own ignorance” (pp. 8–9).
I think this is very important. Not just that we are ignorant, but that we are learned ignorant. In the sense that we may think we are learned, but we have not appreciated the fact that learning is part of the limited imagination that we have as a dominant culture. Whatever knowledge we discover, we find, whatever knowledge we create, that ignorance should be part of its own discovery is important to realize.

Alfonso: Can you unpack the notion of learned ignorance a little further for us?

Zia: In post-normal times theory, we describe two varieties of learned ignorance. One is invincible and the other is vincible ignorance. Invincible ignorance is the ignorance that can only be overcome if you move out of the dominant paradigms—this is why it’s invincible. If you are within the dominant paradigms, you will always be ignorant. If the dominant paradigm is that Indigenous people have no value, no worth, if the dominant paradigm is that they’re primitive and they do not feature in the great books of civilization, if that is the notion, then we will be completely ignorant of them. This is invincible ignorance. We can never overcome it.

Then there’s vincible ignorance. That is ignorance, which can be known. Vincible ignorance can be known by further research, by awareness, by acknowledging the fact that you’re ignorant, and then moving forward. This ignorance can be overcome if you acknowledge the fact that your imagination is trapped and your imagination is colonized in both ways. Only by doing that, you can overcome it. But that is not enough. You must then get out of the dominant paradigms to actually move toward the genuine unthought.

Gabrielle: What does moving towards the unthought imagination require?

Zia: We just don’t have appropriate resources to move towards the unthought imagination. There’s nothing out there that points towards the unthought. Everything points us to the extended present, and familiar future. Nothing is saying, “look towards the unthought, it’s a different direction towards the unthought.”

Here, I have a quote from Samuel Scheffler (2018). I don’t know whether you’ve seen his wonderful, small book Why Worry about Future Generations? The opening sums it up. It says,

Most of us who live in contemporary liberal societies lack a rich set of evaluative resources for thinking about the human beings who will come after us. We do not have a highly developed set of ideas about the value of human continuity, or about the values we hope will be realized in the future, or about the values and norms that should inform our own activities insofar as they affect future generations or depend on the expectation that there will be future generations.

(p. 1)

Now, it’s only recently that we started talking about future generations. Throughout the 20th and 19th centuries, there was no notion that we need to leave something for the people who will come after us. There are no resources. For example, you go down to any university and you will find departments of history, sociology, anthropology, and physics, but where would you go to learn and to develop the resources to look after the future generation? There’s no department for that!

What we need then is a kind of imagination that reveals the awareness of our trapped and colonized imagination, shifts our attention toward the unthought imagination, and then generates the values and resources that deepen our engagement with the chaotic, complex, and contradictory and uncertain world of postnormal times.
This cannot be done by a single culture or intellectual tradition. It becomes crucial for us to nourish our imagination from a wide range of cultures, artifacts, modes of knowing and being, non-western, Indigenous, and even otherworldly. We urgently need an imagination that can construct new meanings, give a new sense of direction to individuals and communities, develop holistic outlooks, and ultimately reorient the narrative of greed and despair into narratives of sharing and hope.

Now, these are lovely thoughts, a nice way to move toward unthought imagination and what it could do. However, it’s simply a nice thought. It’s very nice to say we should look toward the non-West. We should look toward other ways of knowing and being. But the question also remains that the non-West too is trapped in the same imagination and colonized by the same dominant conceptual framework. So how do we go forward?

Here, I am now indebted to Gary Lachman (2017). He doesn’t use the term unthought futures, but he argues that the journey toward the unthought imagination actually begins with the discovery of lost knowledge, of what he calls, *The Lost Knowledge of Imagination*. It is imagination that combines physics and metaphysics, intuition and logic, inner experience and objective knowledge, that moves us away from reduction toward synthesis, that reverses the destruction of coherence, and sees things “in stereo,” perceiving their surface and their depth simultaneously. That’s a very tall order, but that’s essentially what we need to do. It is not something that is the privilege or ability of some romanticized culture out there. It is something that we have to do collectively and kind of rediscover—the lost knowledge of imagination.

Now the interesting point that Lachman makes is that we don’t see this type of imagination as a way of knowing but simply as just imagination because we have been taught to do so. Imagination, Lachman is arguing, is also a way of knowing and I’m taking the argument further. I’m saying imagination is not simply a way of knowing, but it’s a way of shaping the world and that the world that exists today has been shaped by a certain kind of imagination.

The question then arises, how do we move toward a new understanding of imagination and how do we bring together physics, metaphysics, intuition, logic, experience, and so forth? Here, I would argue that we look at great thinkers beyond western culture. For example, I’ve been reading Muhammad Iqbal, the early 20th-century poet-philosopher who was an incredibly deep thinker and visionary who inspired the creation of Pakistan. According to Iqbal, it requires a kind of balancing act. He’s arguing for a reason, then he stops. Then he’s arguing for inner experience, then he stops. Why? Because he doesn’t want to take them too far. He doesn’t end up with deep subjectivity, where everything becomes relative, or with instrumental rationalism, which can be. So, there’s a notion of balance. Continuously.

I think Lachman also argues for a balance, but it doesn’t quite come out clearly. Now the notion of balance combining objectivity and rationality with intuition and inner experience is central to many non-western epistemologies. That’s where we need to look. We need to look at non-western epistemologies to get new inspiration and reinvigorate our imagination and move it toward the unthought.

This is expressed in Islamic culture in the concept of *mizan*, which simply means balance, which is emphasizing harmonizing the order of things, the material and spiritual world, objectivity and subjectivity, epistemology and ontology. The celebrated 12th-century philosopher, Ibn Rushd, was deeply rationalist. He belonged to a Rational School of Islamic thought (the Mutazalites) and produced one of the most powerful
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defenses of reason ever written. Yet, he believed in the harmony of reason and revelation. One of his main philosophical treatises is called *On the Harmony of Reason and Revelation*.

You need the right amount of both. You don't want an excess amount of either. The Chinese notion of harmony *He* is a central concept of its worldview. Things only flourish when they complement each other, coexist and nourish each other, and produce more harmony! In the *Spring and Autumn Annuals*, the ancient scholar and politician of Shang dynasty, Yi Yin, suggests that “balance is like making soup. One needs water, fire, vinegar, sauce, salt, and plum to cook fish and meat. One needs to cook them with firewood. The cook has to harmonize the ingredients together in order to balance the taste. He needs to compensate for deficiencies and to reduce excessiveness.” I mean, it’s just beautiful. That’s what balance is all about.

We need to create a new synthesis from different cultures and different epistemologies, but it needs to be done in balance, to be done without dominating. Synthesis requires a notion of equality. To move toward unthought, we need to look at other cultures with some notion of equality. It’s not just a question of giving lip service, “now we love the Indigenous people’ and all that”—it has to be something profound that illustrates the equality. In Hinduism we also have the notion of *sattva*, which also means balance and harmony.

The final point and this goes back to Lachman again, is that the kind of imaginations—from various worldviews and epistemologies—we are looking for will have to be based on living tradition. These imaginations cannot be manufactured. You need to go to a living tradition with a history of thousands of years. Only then do we know that it is a solid tradition. It’s not something that was manufactured, like Father Christmas, 50 or 100 years ago. Only then we will know.

Unthought imagination requires decoupling with the dualistic mind and recoupling with the holistic mind. Where knowledge and values, epistemology and ontology, reason and intuition, are in perfect balance. Unthought imagination can only be invoked beyond the confines of the dominant framework of thought. Only unthought imagination can generate ways of knowing, doing, and being that will successfully help us navigate the contradictory, complex, and chaotic postnormal times.

Now I do see certain signs of hope. First, over the last few years, there has been a genuine emergence of *agnotology*, the study of ignorance. While ignorance was something that we pushed aside, thinking we were all knowledgeable people, now it’s slowly moving from the periphery to the center, which is where we want it. Many disciplines are putting their hands up and are now saying, hang on, not only are we not as learned as we think, but maybe we have not recognized that we are totally ignorant.

In Anna Lowenhaupt Tsing’s (2015) *The Mushroom at the End of the World: On the Possibility of Life in Capitalist Ruins*, the mushroom becomes both the source of knowledge and source of ignorance. She demonstrates how many different cultures, notions, ideas, and peoples are interlinked with mushrooms, which actually grow in a very mucky part of the forest that nobody wants to look at. This is essentially on the edge of capitalist ruins where life manages to survive while capitalism is destroying life everywhere. Here knowledge and ignorance come together.

Another place to explore more is Suzanne Simard’s (2021) book *Finding the Mother Tree*, where she has made the most profound scientific discovery that trees communicate with each other. In an average forest or even where I’m sitting, there’s an underground network through which trees communicate with each other, and they have feelings. She discovered this not through cold objectivity, observation, experiment, repeat, and
conclude method. But from inner experience in her own life. What was happening in her own life—she had cancer and had to balance a complicated life between teaching and motherhood—shaped her discovery. What she shows in the book is that the discovery would not have been possible without the inner experience and how her life is related to it. Of course, her papers were originally rejected. But in the end, her discovery could not be denied; and they had to be accepted and came out in a proper, peer-reviewed scientific journal. Now it is widely accepted that her research is not just solid but accepted as scientific theory.

The point I’m making is that there are certain signs of hope. Things are moving slowly in that direction. When we’ll get there, I have no idea.
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