

Quantum Reality, Consciousness and Social Cohesion in a Multi-Cultural Nation-State

Yimini Shadrack George
Philosophy Unit, Directorate of General Studies
University of Africa, Toru-Orua, Bayelsa State, Nigeria
E-mail: yim_zik@yahoo.com
Cell: +234706 429 4842

Abstract

The social reality in Africa, Nigeria in particular, is one fraught with “multiple contradictions”. Within this discourse of “multiple contradictions” are the grave issues: ‘social relation’ and ‘social cohesion’. Its appalling effect especially, is as conspicuous in such characteristic submission to dismissive, intolerant and rigid attitude – not just between and among individuals but across ethnic and regional delineation. This paper examines why and how this is the case. The paper locates the cause in the influence of postmodernist thought. It explores quantum philosophy – ‘quantum reality’ – a new model for a new thinking as a way out. The work argues that there are quantum potentials latent in us and that this supposed common quantum structure can be found in the ‘factor of consciousness’. The essay projects consciousness as the imagined basis of interconnectedness, social correlation, and social cohesion. The paper concludes that, if we could find an underlying reality that binds us all, we could find a unity in our differences. And thus align ourselves with only that which can aid social transformation.

Keywords: Quantum reality, Consciousness, Postmodernism, Social cohesion, Social transformation

Introduction

How our world is – what it looks like is largely our making. More than we would actually acknowledge, our worldview – our beliefs, theories and such other interpretive assumptions we hold about reality define and shape our outer world – the way we relate to each other and to the natural world. As shall be shown in this essay, what we have happening around in our social reality is a reflection of our emersion in postmodernist influence. That much, as the paper will clearly points to, have had serious consequences: one, not only do we question but desperately sought to get beyond. The troubling question, however, is how to get beyond it. This is the question for which this paper aims to answer. Whatever that answer is, it would require that we declare the postmodernist vision destructive and lacking in the unification theme is such a manner that “we find some radically different grounding for truth and value and for our access to them” (Zohar and

Marshall, 1994, p. 149). This latter I find in quantum reality and our common possession of the factor of consciousness as it will be espoused. It presents, so to say, a model for new thinking – a new grasp of our complex interdependence and route for interconnectedness.

Postmodernism and Social Reality: Nigeria as Context

A closer look at the Nigeria social system uncovers “multiple contradictions” ranging from social, economic to political. Of note, within this discourse of “multiple contradictions” are the grave issues: ‘social relation’ and ‘social cohesion’. Such contradictions that are evident in our polity whether at the social, economic or political sphere, are hardly divorceable from obvious concerns of the said issues. In my opinion, such unfortunate social, economic or political manifestations are products of certain conceptions – ideas and beliefs we live by – that inform our decisions and actions. That the nature of

‘social relation’ and ‘social cohesion’ are as determined and defined by it is not too hard, I think, for anyone to try and figure-out the link. What factor, then, our social space is characterized of echoes much of how as individuals we conceive and interpret reality.

Nigeria today suffers taints of wide complex happenings: of self-seeking tendencies; down-play of cultural values and history. There is conflict of varying magnitude. What is prevalent is that such conceptions aforementioned that inform our interpretation of reality stands side by side in opposition at the individual, tribal, or ethnic level. Each is always projecting, and concern only about its wellbeing. The ruthlessness with which this is seen play-out sometimes (referring so to the Boko Haram quagmire such as we have ongoing, and of course, some such rigid ideologies and fixed expectations one would agree with me inhere the mindset of the Southwest, the Southsouth and the other regions) leaves cause for reflection as to whether there is anything – a ‘commonality’, at all, that as human beings we share as a uniting factor for our social cohesion.

The rigid differences erupting in the different strata (at the individual, groups, tribes and ethnic divides) in recent times confronts us more of a forewarning of the end of humanity. There is a social disconnect that is widening, occasioned by an increased attempt on the part of the individual to fully, actively and continuously articulate their respective form of life. Almost everything that interest man – from fashion to music and any such other things one can think of - has one way or another undergone a shift in perspective. We now live in an era that evokes many levels of meanings and combination of focus: “one which marks the destructive as productive, packages the crooked as the ideal, glosses the debilitating as the creative, and the abnormal (deviant), in many aspect of

existence, as the normal” (Bewaji, 2012, p. 3).

In an important sense, the continued survival of a community depends on the individuals that constitute it. When these individuals, in a bid to live out certain ideologies, place their individual interests always above that of the ‘other’ and the wellbeing of the community, social relation is bound to be sabotaged. A direct resultant effect will be the distancing of one from the other. This appalling state of social relation ruins the needed social cohesion for social transformation. Nonetheless, it will produce different kinds of social pathologies which do not support the ingredients of social progress (Oyeshile, 2005, p. 17). In Nigeria, no doubts, there are such common evident colorations of our polity, all occasioned by such surge of the “My way”; hence the characteristic high polarization where everyone is out only for himself not pausing to consider the “common good”. Daily life, on this strength, has become less agreeable and less productive (Oladipo, 2009, p. 42). The consequence of this problem of social coordination has, of course, being a “deep developmental crisis”. Such structures and norms that regulate social life that ought to have provided support for such “developmental strategies” we need have been rendered weak. Indeed, it is not out of place to say that we have lost the real – all depth and authenticity have disappeared.

These changes, sweeping and encompassing as they are though, the need to know how exactly we got here and what all of these around us mean, has for the most part, refused to be suppressed. This accounts for such serious efforts been channeled toward unearthing the causes. Amidst such literatures adducing reasons of cultural factors, a historical forced amalgamation, and colonization. There is, however, one thing I think is left out in the whirl of consideration: a close scrutiny of such happenings I have mentioned points

to features typical only of the power of the spell exerted by postmodernist thought. Such characteristic ‘indeterminacy’ and ‘immanence’ now typical of our polity and other such evident descriptions which are critical themes of postmodern outlook are:

... heterodoxy, pluralism, randomness, revolt, [and] deformation. The latter alone subsumes a dozen current terms of unmaking: decreation, disintegration, deconstruction, decenterment, displacement, difference, discontinuity, disjunction, disappearance, decomposition, definition, demystification, detotalization, [and]delegitimation (Bertens, 1995, p. 42).

Clearly, happenings around us on a daily basis that fits a number of such descriptions above are quite replete. In many ways, it points in the direction that postmodernism – its influence has “gone beyond the confines of academic and institutional discourse. Of note, it has left the exclusively literary field and manifests itself in contemporary society” (1995, p. 42). This is not happening only here, it is the case in America and the rest of the world. Through globalization, Africa – Nigeria in particular, has gotten its share. The trends such as aforementioned that tend toward anti-representation, anti-togetherness and anarchy have as well flown into our sphere too.

To this turn of events in contemporary society, some of the leading postmodernists (here I mean, in particular, Rorty) have had cause to reason somewhat differently. To such reckon, perhaps that:

Society is never an entity separable from the individuals who compose it. No individual can arrive at the threshold of his potentialities without a culture in which he

participate. Conversely, no civilization has in it an element which in the last analysis is not the contribution of an individual (Benedict, 1946, p. 234).

Rorty, if Ruth Benedict’s interpretable is acceptable, sought ‘difference and representation’. Rorty, in his study, tries to explore the possibilities of doing justice to both the desire for universalism and the self-reflexivity typical of the “new sensitivity” on the part of the postmodern. To this end, he postulates what he describes as “consensus and a sense of social solidarity” (Rorty, 1989, p. 21), what, in his views, means “let’s talk this one thing through”. That though we differ, we have to rally on each other on the justificatory outcome of a local conversation with each other. This form of recommendation that envisages the criteria of success to be entirely pragmatic is not all that bad, but from experience, it is but one form of life amongst several. In my view, it does not work in a situation where most of the people who come for dialogue have non-negotiable and justified certainties. This is a signification that there has to be something more and deeper – something that is rooted rather in our very being, first of all. Until that one thing is located, Rorty’s confirms: “constructive dialogue” appears but a disguised plea for pluralist tolerance (Butler, 2002, p. 19).

What this implies, to use Frederic Jameson’s words, is the “contrived depthlessness”. And not to mention the load of skepticism (of not just metanarratives but as well the ‘other’) the thought of Derrida and Lyotard has helped to enshrine in our world today, a pointer that we do not need to pay a visit to a ghost to know that postmodernist beliefs tend toward a multiculturalist pluralism and relativism (2002, p. 19). This, to an extent, is an impossible condition that should be resisted, and not allowed to

justify a kind of “ironic indifferentism”. It purports to make our world one of superimposition of different worlds – “world’s, between which an uncommunicative ‘otherness’ prevails in a space of coexistence”. This is what Habermas sees and believes that it is dangerous to abandon the ideal of communicative or indeed consensual rationality. For him, the new value placed on the transitory, the illusive and ephemeral, the very celebration of dynamism, discloses a longing for an undefiled, immaculate and stable present (Harvey, 1989, p. 120). Some kind of “hidden interdependence”, a sort of web to which we are drawn to and through which an unspoken mutuality of a sense of acquiescence can spring-up amongst us, despite our differences and the issue at stake. In itself this inclination supposes a ‘reasoned feeling’ with the capacity to douse the sense of threat of the ‘other’. This, in my opinion is what postmodernism in its baggage lacks.

What this translates to is that, as far as real-life ongoing is concern, there will always be “conflicting versions of reality ... within a remarkably torrent and pluralist society” (Butler, 2002, p. 54). This shows that postmodernism has no convincing claim to a unique insight into the truth of our condition, or to an accurate and complete description of society. It may have done

... a great deal to point out and to defend the differences of identity involve here. But they still as a matter of fact often lead to bitter conflicts, which need to be resolved by something better than the postmodernist principle (2002, p. 60).

This “something” so referred, which is better than the postmodernist principle that can constitute and as well serve as a ‘unifying factor’, what I think resides in

quantum philosophy – ‘quantum reality’ – ‘an unbroken web of overlapping or correlated relationships’. And the factor of consciousness – especially such *connexion* between, as it relates to the idea in pursuit is what we will now turn.

Quantum Reality and Consciousness: Connecting the Later to the Former and Justifying the Latter as Rallying-Point for Social Cohesion

Quantum discourses pertain to the nature of reality and the correlation thereto. As a concept – quantum reality, takes it root in quantum physics. And it depicts the nature of a quantum system, in particular, how quantum ‘bits’ “get inside each other, or relate internally” (Bohm and Peat, 1987, p. 97). From grand quantum understanding, quantum reality, to put it quite simply, is a huge complex network of connections. Something more like a spider’s web with a sort of “undivided wholeness” to use Bohm’s words, within which the different ranges overlap. The various lines crisscrossing each other which make up the complex web agree in a way that they can all be said to be part of one quantum formation – unified quite compatibly – such that all the forces of nature, the particles that fill those forces and framework of space and time in which it all plays out (Hawking & Mlodinow, 2010, p. 58) are all intertwined in and to every possible version of existence. Each of the supposed strands explains and describes certain properties but only according to the direction and dictate of the whole quite simultaneously in what in quantum parlance is known as quantum superposition.

In this setting, as physicist has it, there is no distance between objects, or indeed no solid objects in the sense that we mean them, and that the whole notion of “separate” has no basis in reality (Zohar & Marshall, 1994, p. 41). The reality of each is taken up and woven into the other. Its interconnectedness is such that whatever happens in any spot is relayed, transmitted,

and affects every other aspect. Any such happening is but one visible aspect of that situations deeper and very real, underlying possibility. Of note, quantum reality consist of patterns of shifting – it shifts its nature according to its surrounding (1994, p. 46). This, in quantum philosophy is known as “contextualism”. Beneath this somewhat manifestation, its internal order is intact. In effect, what it means is that quantum reality is about the whole situation. We can never, as we could in postmodern setting, for example, isolate bits of a situation and analyze it independently. Perfectly wired into this complex of quantum reality are essential features: both/and kind of thinking, indeterminacy, and the potential of quantum system to be both particle and wave – their capacity to relate on both terms – what is called wave/particle duality. These are inherent features of reality. Whereas the “both/and kind of thinking” and “indeterminacy” seem somewhat self-explanatory, I feel the need to expand on the other – “wave/particle duality”, as what I intend to establish in this section seem to circulate within and around it.

The collocation, wave/particle duality embodies the idea that two very different theories can actually describe the same phenomenon – that an object could be described as either a particle or wave. “A particle is something that is contained in one place. A wave is something that is spread out”(Zukav, 1979, p. 79). This is actually consistent with and as well central in this discourse. To elaborate further, this wave/particle duality as it entails is captured thus:

When two quantum systems meet, their particle aspects tend to stay somewhat separate and maintain shades of their original identities, while their wave aspects merges, giving rise to an entirely new system

that unfolds the originals. The two systems relate internally, they get inside each other and evolve together. The new system to which their overlapping give rise to now has its own particle and wave aspect, and its own new corporate identity. It is not reducible to the sum of its parts. We can't say that ... the new system is composed of *a* and *b* plus the interactions between them. It is a new thing, an “emergent reality”. In the physical world, such emergence is unique to quantum reality (Zohar & Marshall, p. 54).

Although the description above pertains majorly about quantum systems, the fact of its ‘overlapping’ and ‘internal relationship’ wherein nothing may be truly considered, so to say, separate from the other such as we find of quantum reality, leaves one thinking mostly about our social reality: how separated we have become from each other.

That quantum reality as closely x-rayed so far offers us a model of a new kind of thinking and thus, perhaps for some new social vision, is not a doubt. What, however, is mind-boggling is whether as human beings we can do this kind of thinking. In other words, can we evoke this knowledge of quantum reality – its qualities – in human nature, our social relations, and the community at large? Is there a quantum structure in the human brain that can grant us access to such insights of the quantum realm, and if it is the case, can we build it into a sort of interconnectedness and social unity? And what can we project as the imagined basis of such interconnectedness and social cohesion? In what will follow, I will try to provide the answers to these questions; for we believe this sort of dynamic principle of quantum reality can as well be applied

at the larger social level in the ‘community of beings’.

Considering a thought system such as this stems from above failings as demonstrated by the tenets of postmodernism, its basic skeptical attitude and self-seeking tendencies that favor separation and fragmentation. If we seek to get beyond or displace the current order – what we need is another “basic categories of thought” – one that model a society with commonness of pursuits. One in which the knowledge of our interconnectedness will enable an ‘opening up’ of a final state of unification where not just individuals but many cultural tradition may live together and may combine different human endeavors into a new kind of balance between thought and deed, between activity and meditation (Heisenberg, 1989, pp.193-194). Such is what I think the knowledge of quantum reality can offer Africa – Nigeria if we can locate its basic element, and as much allow it guide our thoughts and actions.

How this will work and such air of possibility it commands find strength in the justification of the *connexion* between and of the self which is central in this approach and the ‘factor of consciousness’ – a key component of the human person – a brain activity thought as quantum connected. The self – its role, in the sense described, is very crucial on two interdependent and related fronts: one is our make-up – as mentioned, that we are an embodiment of quantum – that we are composed of its smaller quantities (DeWitt, 2010, p. 236). The other is the fact that as human beings, within physical reality, we are at the center, ontologically part and parcel of everything around us (Zohar and Marshall, 1994, p. 240). Each, if considered on its merit grants evidentiality of a supposed common nature.

As implied, the commonality of human nature as such is what – where the ‘factor of consciousness’ comes in play. In this relationship, human consciousness is

what serves, for the most part, as the assembling point to the other two, in that, the domains of the two other realms constitute the phenomenon that are illuminated. As a pervasive feature of the mental live of not only humans but as well other creatures, it function, basically, to give meaning to things. A given conscious state, then, is a “relation of consciousness to the physical and social environment of conscious and non-conscious beings alike and as well the relation of unity and difference among conscious states themselves” (Stoljar, 2006, p. 160). All these conscious activities human beings are said to be entangled with stems from, to reiterate, somewhere in the brain. This is the point of this essay. To a large extent, such that consciousness arises from processes in brain tissue and all human beings are predisposed to consciousness arising from these processes in brain tissue, it can serve as the basis for interconnectedness and a point of social cohesion among us. This point, perhaps, needs a little more fleshing-out, especially, concerning the fact of the connection between consciousness and the quantum – in such sense, such as that we are all quantum connected.

On grounds of scientific findings, there are but “two basic particles that make up the whole universe”(Zohar and Marshall, 1994, p. 232). The particles are bosons and fermions. The basic constituent atom, that is, electron, proton, neutron, and all matter in the universe – human beings inclusive and all such other things we see every day around us are made up of fermions. Within our brain neural processes is a peculiarly quantum characteristics of a structure called a “Bose-Einstein condensate” (so called because its properties were first suggested by albert Einstein and another physicist Satyendranath Bose). It is a “warm and sticky phenomenon” (that belongs in the community of such other particles called Boson) in the brain. It does the job of “coordinat[ing] fragmented information

from thousands of excited neurons into a coherent meaningful whole” (1994, p. 233). What for most people would be a surprise is the “grounded speculation” that our conscious mind arise from this stuff. Different kinds of experiment pursued by different physicists and biophysicists alike from different places at different time all seem to support that there is indeed the presence of warm quantum structures in biological tissues found around such area of the human brain responsible for consciousness.

The boson family which the Bose-Einstein condensate is a worthy member is of special important here for its sterling features. Unlike fermions, they are essentially “social” – with the tendency to cluster, overlap and get inside each other’s boundaries. The Bose-Einstein condensate, in particular, is thought to possess the “most unified structure in nature”. Our resolve to push consciousness for such a platform is inform by what as I have mentioned, inhere it. I believe that the sort of unity Bose-Einstein condensate provides consciousness – its stream, can be extended such that it will not be only the elements in my ‘conscious field’ to use John Searle’s words, so to say, but each and every one of us and our different conscious fields all thrown into a larger conscious field by way of our been able to get into one another’s conscious field, to understand each other. From this, we can see that within the human mind, the self is a possibility – it carries within itself what kind of society it wants. We can extend the continuity of that from our interior world to the outside – we only need a new worldview – a new attitude and interpretation of social reality – one that is quantum oriented. It is what we need to transform and develop our society.

Quantum Attitude and Social Transformation

The Nigeria social reality with typical happenings such as defining one’s own group in opposition to the other and

casting the other in the role of necessary enemies is appalling. The result, of course, we are much acquainted with having formed much of the content of the paper so far. Such common manifestations of ‘my group’, ‘my interest’, ‘my meanings’, and ‘my way’ is what must be fought for on the political stage. My advantage must be pursued against the other or despite the other weakens any bond, if there were any, that ties us all together. As it is we do not have a shared value, a shared assumption, a shared practice, and definitely, not a common purpose. This is not a surprise. When the citizens that make up a nation are either alienated or caught up, so to say, in the narrow business of fighting one’s own corner, no national social cohesion can arise. The reduction of all meanings to the private and/ or the exclusive denies any emergence of larger meaning that can be shared. All of this accounts for why even at our present stage of evolution we are unable to find a ‘political bond’. Is there a reason, one should not be as disillusioned as such pull out into some quiet and lone existence?

As much as this question mirror what is ongoing and as well envisage what possibly is a necessary choice; we cannot entirely exempt ourselves of all blame. Like I have mentioned prior – how our society is – what it looks like is largely our making. The indicting posture of this statement, notwithstanding, it equally and more evolve a sense of concern (Okunade, 2008, p. 11). It impresses on us a sense of responsibility – that as a people we all have a social role to perform. One would wonder how anything can be done even considering the current situation of politics of conflict and confrontation. The thing is that, to deal with this common problem of our social reality, in itself, require that we come to see the full expression of difference as a part – “a very important part of the *raison d’ etre* of society itself” (Zohar and Marshall, 1994, p. 274). In a deeper sense, I think acknowledging our pluralism is a good starting-point for the

attainment of a new social transformation we seek. As Zohar and Marshall (1994, p. 201) posited, to find real and lasting solutions to conflicts between different interest groups we need general principles that at once reflect the local meanings of small groups and at the same time provides an overarching meaning acceptable to all. These meanings I find in the quantum vision I have outlined.

The quantum attitude I mentioned earlier is very imperative here being that “it recognizes that we are both private and public persons and that there is no hard and fast boundary between the one and the other” (1994, p. 201). What one need do, then, is to engage in what David Bohm and David Peat (1987, p.240) in their joint work *Science, Order and Creativity*, described as a “free form of dialogue”. In this dialogue, the individual with the quantum attitude engages in what is referred to as “reflective consciousness”. He or she pays attention consciously noting that he or she has to do something about it. It involves careful and attentive listening. Within this period, on the surface, it may not occur to one what is really happening but a lot more than the good listener imagines do indeed happens. For instance, the getting into each other involves “a form of free exchange of ideas and information”, in which case, the “deconstruction of old unfriendly ideas”, the “loosening of rigid tacit infrastructures” and the “resyntheses of new ideas” take place. As David Bohm and David Peat (1987, p. 240) puts it, such ideas and information is of fundamental relevance for transforming culture and freeing it of destructive misinformation, so that creativity can be liberated.

This is something I would imagine cannot happen if everyone is just on his or her own: having fixed expectations, tying and adhering ourselves to some ideological themes and rules. In this sense, we will be living out of determinacy. It restricts us to the level of here and now. It fixes us and our relationships in place, within which we

risk growing stale. Such opportunity we would have had “to explore ourselves and to become as such creative members of an emergent group, family or community” (Zohar and Marshall, 1994, p. 327) is denied. It should now be clear, then, why diversity and our differences should not constitute a threat to genuine social cohesion. Our differences – whatever it is that distinguishes each of us as individuals or groups is the very stuff on which a deeper and more meaningful togetherness can be built.

What this translates to is that the task of achieving a new social transformation depends, for the most part, on the individual – the self – its ability to unfold its inherent quantum nature. The truth, “as human beings each of us is responsible for the age” (Jung, 1964, p. 315). How we are to do this is captured quite eloquently by Zohar and Marshall (1994, p. 216) thus:

As I embed my values in thought, feeling, and action, my inner transformation can resonate (get into non-local correlation) with similar transformations in others. More potent still, my own thoughts, feelings, and actions can evoke those transformations in others. As I create myself in dialogue with others, so I help to create the world I share with them.

Naturally, then, a change in the society comes down to a change in me. The outside larger world is the ‘small inside’ of our collection writ large. What we want the outside world to be like involves my going inside myself to transform my personal attitude, and see to the possibility of going into dialogue of a similar nature with other person. It is how our society can be transformed. The self is the source of all transformation.

Conclusion

As has been established, thus far, not only that quantum philosophy suggest it, it does follow as well logically that one can only hope to effect a positive change in the outside world only if the change in question springs from within oneself. In this, then, change is continuity in flow and the starting point is the inside world. This is the trend – the order, one undeniable. Thought as such, then, when society starts to experience changes we find contrary to what we expect – who do we ascribe blame? Ordinarily, we frown at the thought of acknowledging it; we get usually more comfortable pushing the blame to the ‘other’ mostly. As I have pointed out somewhere in this paper, that is most unlikely. We are all responsible for it somehow as much as the other. Such ascription as we can deduce from the paper is always the product of some held and adhered beliefs. This, when taken to the extreme as we portrayed of postmodernism is, at best, not healthy. As I have it in my argument, the deterioration in its manifold facet such as we have in Africa – in particular, Nigeria – the root cause of our being apart can be traced to it. It is what “engenders the tension between groups in society” (Owolabi, 2003, p. 12).

We belong here. We are not only the passive witnesses of our age and its sufferers, but also its makers. We make the epoch we want. We, each and every one of us have a duty, then, to engage ourselves actively and directly in resistance to the social and political ills we see around us. It is our duty to redefine our communities and transform our wider politics. The fruition of this task hinges largely on our coming together. No one person knows it all and no one person can do it alone either. The social cohesion we need to usher in a new social transformation requires a sort of maturity on our part. One, which can stand in face of ambiguity and that, can tolerate the vision of others, a maturity that will allow each and every one of us to live in a complex pluralistic

society without losing our individual bearings (Zohar and Marshall, 1994, p. 156). Such a maturity which will as well involve the realization of the partial validity of one’s convictions but still remain open to other such opinions is what to Isaiah Berlin (1969, p. 172), distinguishes a civilized man from a barbarian. This as I have discussed quite extensively already in the paper can be done so effectively by tapping into the quantum nature latent within each of us.

Our consciousness which we now know is traceable to that same quantum nature will to that extent, in this sense, serve as the avenue with which we can reach each other – indeed, get inside one another through our “wave aspect” for a creative emergent correlation and social cohesion. The philosopher Thomas Nagel (Nagel, 1991, p. 116) in his work *Equality and Partiality* captured as well this double-edged understanding of the human person. To him, the individual contain within himself two standpoints: the personal and impersonal. The “impersonal standpoint” is other directed, yearns for a relationship, it empathizes with and even identifies himself with the needs and desires of others. I would suppose Nagel’s “impersonal standpoint” follow from or is made possible by the “wave aspect”. If we really want to transcend our social reality issues, what we must do as a people is to cultivate the “wave aspect” and the “impersonal standpoint” of us. What it means is that each of us, to some extent, would have to

... let go of our fixed perceptions, our habits, our obsessions, our rigid ideologies, our single minded pursuits of personal gain, and our parochial devotion to our own corner. It requires, instead, that we stand poised and alert, poised to let our inner freedom (our indeterminacy) give rise to

the unfolding common reality of self and community (Zohar and Marshall, 1994, p. 135).

If we get this right, our social institutions, politics and the rest of the other things that make a good society will fall in place and we will be better-off.

References

- Bertens, H. 1991. *The Idea of the Postmodern*. USA: Routledge.
- Benedict, R. 1946. *Patterns of Culture*. New York: Mentors Book.
- Berlin, I. 1969. *Four Essays on Liberty*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bewaji, J. A. 2012. *The Narratives of Struggles – The Philosophy and Politics of Development*. Durham: Carolina Academic Press.
- Bohm, D. and Peat, D. 1987. *Science, Order and Creativity*. London: Bentam.
- Butler, C. 2002. *Postmodernism – A Very Short Introduction*. USA: Oxford University Press.
- De Witt, R. 2010. *Worldviews*. 2nd ed. UK: Willy-Blackwell.
- Harvey, D. 1989. *The Condition of Postmodernity – An Enquiry into the Origin of Cultural Change*. USA: Blackwell.
- Hawking, S. and Mlodinow, L. 2010. *The Grand Design – New Answers to the Ultimate Questions of the Universe*. Britain: Bantam Press.
- Heisenberg, W. 1989. *Physics and Philosophy*. New York and London: Penguin.
- Jung, C. G. 1964. *The Meaning of Psychology for Modern Man. Civilization in Transition*. Vol. The Collected Works. London: Routledge&Kegan Paul. Para. 135.
- Nagel, T. 1991. *Equality and Partiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Okunade, B. 2008. *Leadership: The Big Challenge – An Inaugural Lecture*. Ibadan: UI Press.
- Oladipo, O. 2009. *Philosophy and Social Reconstruction in Africa*. Ibadan: Hope Publications.
- Owolabi, K. 2003. *Fictional Tribes and Tribal Fictions: Ethnicity, Ethnocentrism and Problems of the ‘Other’ in Africa*. Ibadan: Hope Publications.
- Oyeshile, O. A. 2005. *Reconciling the Self with the Other – An Existentialist Perspective on the Management of Ethnic Conflicts in Africa*. Ibadan: Hope Publications.
- Rorty, R. 1989. *Contingency, Irony, and Solidarity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Stoljar, D. 2006. *Philosophy of Science – An Encyclopedia*. Ed. Sarker, S. & Pfeifei. New York: Routledge.
- Zohar, D. and Marshall, I. 1994. *The Quantum Society – Mind, Physics, and New Social Vision*. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc.
- Zukav, G. 1979. *The Dancing Wuli Masters – An Overview of the New Physics*. London: Rider and Company/Hutchinson & Co.