

DAVID BOHM

Oct 29, 1967

Dear Marcus

I have just finished reading your book "Intuition and Science". The criticism of intuitionism is excellent. Perhaps intuitionism is a modern form of our old friend Plato's notions. Plato had the eternal ideas and perfect forms, to be grasped as seen by the philosopher. Now, the intuitionist "constructs" his world at will by manipulating ~~with~~ the contents of his mind, so that he can do without the eternal reality. He has something "better" - his own ability to "construct" reality by his playing with the mathematical forms of ideas. At least Plato had the modesty to ascribe these forms to some God. But the intuitionist has even taken over the role of the latter.

Although the intuitionist is so very confused, he is trying to express a mixed up glimpse of something that we all "sense" in some way or other - that logic and routine modes of perception ^{and discernment} are not the whole story. You did go into creativity in your third chapter. However, I think that it may be important to go deeper into this question, as it is rather an important one.

To clarify the problem, let me call attention to a distinction between recognition and realization. As I walk home, I

(2)

recognizing the way (i.e., I "know it again") But if I make a mistake, I suddenly realize that I have gone wrong. I submit that there is a big difference in what happens in these two cases (e.g., to recognize that I have made a mistake would be very different, and ~~not to recognize~~ since I would then merely be "knowing again" that which I suddenly realized)

I suggest that realization is the essence of creature perception. I would place the perception of what is true and false as the most fundamental creature realization. Without the capacity to do this, a man's life and work would be worthless and meaningless. Only in nature does one ever "recognize" truth or falsity. What is generally referred to as realization.

Now, I further suggest that all perception is creature. Thus, an insane, drunken, or drugged man can "create" every manner of illusory "real" that is not actually there. It takes a clear mind to perceive what is illusory and what is not. So the an essential function of intelligence is to throw out false "creations". For We all know that even normal, sane, people can easily see as real that which is not there, but which they just expect. Here, creature is reduced to re-creation of what one expects from memory. An alert mind is one that does not re-create its perceptions, but creates them afresh, and then checks them relentlessly by every

means available (logical, experimental, etc) to see what
in his perceptions is true and what is false

In creative perception of novelty, the past plays a
big part. But it is important also to see the past ^{in its} false,
inadequate aspects. In doing this, you get a hint as to what is true
(As in seeing the non-existence of "the man behind the mirror",
you learn that the mirror provides a reflection of yourself)

So a man is always "creating" and "re-creating"
his perceptions, in response to experiencing. A very broad
perception that integrates a whole field, I shall call
an understanding. No interchange the words "I see"
and "I understand". The reason is that the eye perceives
the whole picture. ~~So~~ Similarly, the "inner eye" can
realize a fresh understanding. In this connection, there is
the story of the man who was blind from birth, and then was
operated on to give him vision. After a while, he saw a little.
When asked whether a given figure was a triangle, he counted
the corners. But in real vision, you see the triangle as a
whole first, and then, you come to its corners. Similarly,
in an understanding, you grasp a broad field as a whole,
and then come down to the partial aspects. Of course, you
can understand wrongly. This is where perception of what is true

and what is folk comes into play.

(4)

The word "intuition" is a confused, vague, and inadequate word, to deal with a whole complex of as yet poorly understood processes. I myself think that invention is quite a different ability from understanding. Understanding is like the artistic perception that suddenly "sees" the picture. The fundamental creativity in the artist is in the act of seeing. He needs techniques, instruments, inventions, etc. to "express" what he sees on paint and stone. Similarly, in science, the basic ~~act~~ creativity is in the act of understanding. Invention comes into play in finding new technical methods for expressing or ~~or~~ developing an understanding. Of course, invention is also creative. But it seems to be a lower order of creativity than the basic act of understanding - of grasping the whole, and then coming to all the aspects, ruthlessly to test in the aspects the truth of the vision of the whole.

About ~~your~~ the possibility of your coming to England, I missed seeing Pepper before he was off to America again. In any case, your chance of survival may be better in Argentina. Best regards from me and from my wife, to you and to your family.

Yours sincerely

Dave