

Chapter Three

The Creative Process

Give yourself time to learn something new and good, and cease to be whirled around.

—MARCUS AURELIUS

You should never sit in front of a blank piece of paper and have no idea what to write, and how to write it. Your book should write itself.

How is this going to happen? It works through involving your subconscious mind in the creative process. It manifests through a flow of writing coming out from your hand without a 'hard' participation of your thinking process.

Conscious thoughts and subconscious content actually mix in this process, and you need to be in a relaxed state for that to happen. But the most important is that before you are even going to sit down to write the first sentence of your book, you

need to turn inward and direct your subconscious mind to collaborate with your conscious mind. You do this through a positive affirmation that imprints on your inner mind what you are expecting it to do. Here is a sample prayer:

My subconscious mind is always alert and it always participates in my creations. I am creative and ever more creative through the involvement of my subconscious mind in the creative process. This involvement is ongoing and it is at a peak level exactly in the moment I sit in front of a blank paper. I trust the never-ending creative flow of my subconscious mind and I give thanks for the wonderful creation it produces now and ever more again.

Before you sit down to write, it's a good idea to have a glass of wine when recollecting your ideas. It can also be useful to play piano for a moment, so as to harmonize your mind and balance your brain hemispheres.

Some people say that when we are not fully conscious, we are more on the side of illusion or even delusion. Some people even say that creating effortlessly was a form of laziness. They seem to believe that all creation had to be 'hard work.'

Well, I sense it right away when I am reading a book if or not it was created from an inner flow or if it

was puzzled together bit by bit and chunk by chunk from short intervals of conscious and 'hard' thought.

In the first case, the book reads like a novel, even if it's a scientific textbook, while in the second case it rings in your mind as something stale, dry and hard to assimilate.

To write your first sketch in a happy state of mind with a glass of wine at your side doesn't mean you are spilling ideas prematurely. In reality the process works in the following way. You write your text in a semi-conscious flow, which is also called 'flow of consciousness writing style;' in this state of mind, you do not control or censor your content by implying your critical rational mind. You just let it flow.

Then when you feel you have produced enough for the moment, you stop and take a retreat from your project. After a few days when you feel inspired to continue, you do the production part of that piece of writing, or book chapter. Then you do it with a fresh morning mind, and you take up your sketch and give structure to it; this means that you imply your rational mind now and your critical reasoning, and former experience so as to finalize your writing in a professional manner.

In practice you may take out paragraphs, add things on, leave things out, restructure the whole thing and publish the new composition in the form of an essay, article or chapter in your book.

Then that piece of writing has a specific focus, and it looks rather different compared to the original ramble. But note that the

initial jotting down of your sketch is a *deliberate form of relaxation*. If your friends say that creating effortlessly is a form of laziness, let them talk and keep smiling.

(Let them create their 'hard-working' books, they suffer enough doing that!) If people see relaxation or meditation as a form of laziness, then they have a reason for doing so. Then they see it that way because they *want* to see it that way. The main reason why people have such a mindset is that they never found out about the essence of creation, and the role our subconscious mind plays in life, in relationships, and in creation. They may for that matter even go as far as

Before you sit down to write, it's a good idea to have a glass of wine when recollecting your ideas. It can also be useful to play piano for a moment, so as to harmonize your mind and balance your brain hemispheres.

denying the existence of the unconscious thereby ignoring one of the greatest discoveries of humanity, made at the beginning of the 20th century by Dr. Sigmund Freud.

In other words, there are several causative factors behind the magic of spontaneous creation. What happens in these assemblages of ideas that 'hard' thinkers may find delusional is that they rearrange psychic content in ever new creative ways, thereby combining psychic content and new thought content, and also sometimes current events happening on the world stage.

What you then do in the process of creation is to work out an amalgam where the content of your subconscious mind merges with new thought content and with events that are happening all around you, or in the world.

I believe that the creative process is one of reassembling undercurrent ideas and subconscious content in ever more different ways. This is also a form of play because it's mainly your inner child who is behind this semi-conscious process.

That's also why in the final production state it's your inner adult who takes over as the inner child is

not able to produce a final structured piece of literary composition.

After these general terms, let me explain how to use your subconscious mind in daily life.

You may not be a creator but a simple office worker, a nurse, a housewife, a driver, a policeman, an entrepreneur or a banker. How can you make good use of all the riches contained in your subconscious mind for facing your daily challenges? How can you find creative solutions to those challenges? Do you believe that hard work will bring you more success? Sometimes it does, but not always. When does it not? When you are facing an impasse, a creative challenge.

That's a situation where your common way of thinking and acting is not appropriate because it was leading you exactly into the situation you are in now. It was good for a certain time, it has brought you success to a certain extent, but then suddenly you are facing a dead end. It may be that some kind of innovation is needed in your company, that you see that you are facing fierce competition in the market, while some time ago all was apparently working fine.

Or it may be a personal situation that needs a creative change, such as the end of a relationship, or

the beginning of another, or both at the same time. Or you simply got a new idea and you are wondering if that fits in your present structure or if you need to build a new structure for marketing this idea in a creative manner.

You may address your inner advisor by imprinting the following command upon your subconscious mind:

I know that the creative power in me is always active. And it always brings a surplus, in the form of energy, money, promotion or other blessings. This creative power is not afraid of any challenge; in fact it loves challenges for every challenge is an opportunity for growth. I am facing this situation now appropriately because of the inner guidance I am receiving, and by trusting this guidance. My inner guide leads me and I follow, and I know that the destination is wonderful, glorious and blessed, and that it brings riches for all people involved.

It is useful to have a look how creators of genius handle their creativity, and I refer here to a more specialized book of mine if you are interested in this subject:

—Peter Fritz Walter, *Creative Genius: Four-Quadrant Creativity in the Lives and Works of Leonardo da Vinci, Wilhelm Reich, Albert Einstein, Svyatoslav Richter and Keith Jarrett* (2014/2017).

I will here outline only the general observations on the nature of creative genius as I have outlined them in the Introduction of that book.

Creators anticipate their creation through insights from the unified field. They anticipate creation through *intuition*. That is what renders the creator distinct from the craftsman.

The craftsman acts in alignment with the past, based upon conservative values, whereas the creator acts in the present, based upon alternative values. Crafting needs effort, creating is effortless. If effort there is, it sets in *after* the basic creation, the prime creative idea. Then only, during the production phase, consistency is needed to carry the work through to its final achievement.

In the creative phase, however, there is chaos, not consistency, disorder, not order, and the constants of life are *reshuffled, retested, reaffirmed* and if needed, *discarded*.

I got a hint of this as a student when, fascinated about the Russian-German pianist Svyatoslav Richter, I went to our local music store to get what I could of his records. Richter was the only exception to the rule I knew at the time for he was an *artist and craftsman in*

one person; he was aligned with conservative values and alternative values at the same time, thereby breaking the rule. When I listened to Richter, music became for me so plastic and dramatic that I thought there must be a relativity far beyond the one Einstein discovered, a relativity that is something like a law of relationships!

It was the *coherence* in his interpretations that triggered the idea in me. I over and over again wondered how the same music by the same composer could sound so different, plain and genuine with Richter, and fragmented, hollow and outlandish with another pianist?

Richter's craftsmanship, the immense authenticity of his musical diction and pianistic perfection, became for me a metaphor for the power of art. In my younger years, I felt more at home in the art universe than in the science world, so my attraction to Richter felt natural. My attraction to Einstein was of a more academic nature, initially. And yet, I had to admit that Einstein was the greater genius, for he was artist *and* scientist.

All creation sets novelty in place, a pattern of relationships—the invisible threads of potentiality woven into a different arrangement.

The surprise is that the pattern, though novel, looks familiar and one feels ‘at home’ in every new and great work of human genius. This is the very secret of genius; it always feels great and true, revolting—yet simple in its high complexity.

I was speechless most of the time when listening to Richter, especially in my younger years, and I would cry and weep when listening to certain favorite compositions of mine that he played with outstanding brilliance and grandeur—such as Rachmaninov’s 2nd Piano Concerto, Prokofiev’s Second Sonata, or Scriabin’s op. 28 Fantasy.

I believe that quantum physics teaches us that art cannot be conventional, that it cannot, as Krishnamurti would say, belong to the ‘known.’ When novelty is rendered conventional, it is no more novelty. When particles are unobserved, they are in a state of innocence. There are dancing with the universe, and are ‘all over the place’—nonlocal.

Means ... , totally connected. Under the eyes of the observer, they localize and become entangled with the

observer, thereby losing their joy of nonlocality. They become enamored with the one and only one, their observer! Why? *Because of his attention.* When my thoughts can impregnate the memory surface of water, they are creative! And by extension they can be destructive, depending on my intentionality.

Quantum physics thus is the secret behind all creation, behind all novelty, behind all genius. It is the matrix that explains the unlimited genius and creative force of the human mind! That in turn means that the quantum field as the creational matrix is our true belonging. We are not machines, but quantum machines, patterns of complex relationships aligning energy and information. We are vibrating crystals!

What is Creativity?

Human creativeness is a latent potentiality, while creativity is to be understood as the *practical realization* of this potentiality. As long as creativity is not realized, it is potentiality, and outside of space-time. When it is being realized, it makes its way into space-time, and crystallizes in particular talent, particular genius, which is always specific.

We all are potentially creative as humans, but most of us live with a dormant creativeness rather than an awake creativity. Contrary to Edward de Bono's idea of *serious creativity*, the 'deliberate effort of the mind to think different,' I believe that there is no effort in creativity, first of all.

Second, it is not thought that is creative, and can be creative, at all. It is the space in between thoughts which has the potential of creating novelty. It is when thought is not that we are truly creative.

As Krishnamurti has amply explained, this is so because thought is always in the past. It is circular, it cannot create novelty, it can only endlessly repeat and reshuffle its content. In one word, and to repeat it, creativity is a faculty of *intuition*, not of thought.

De Bono clarified from the start that his concept of *serious creativity* does not pertain to the creativity of the artist, but is valid for the corporate world; it could be termed 'business creativity.' That is why it is deliberate and based upon effort. I do not deny its effectiveness, but here I am talking about general creativity, which includes artistic creativity.

We all know that artists are creative. This is some of the things we already learn in school. What we

however did not learn, or most of us, is that *all humans are creative*, in the sense that genuine creativeness simply is a natural add-on to the human nature. You see that with children. All children are creative. Why are not all adults creative?

There are precise factors that make that human creativity, the practical day-to-day application of creativeness, is thwarted. It's like a muscle you never use; it gets weaker and weaker, and then one day, the muscle atrophies and becomes dysfunctional.

Creativity is as it were the muscle of genuine creativeness; or we can say that creativity is the lens through which human creativeness sees its day and becomes visible in daily life. When we are not creative in the practical sense, let's say in finding new ways of doing, drafting new concepts or inventing new things, we are still creative humans, but our lacking creativity makes that our creativeness becomes stagnant.

Let me give some examples of genuinely creative people, who were able to channel their creativeness into serious or not so serious creativity. Let me tell you that this list is only the peak of the iceberg. I would like to mention here Pablo Picasso, Charles

Chaplin, Albert Einstein, Nikola Tesla, Fritjof Capra, Edward de Bono, Dale Carnegie, Svjatoslav Richter, Herbert von Karajan, and Keith Jarrett.

These ten great men, three physicists, two think tanks and corporate coaches, and five artists, have displayed, and display, high creativity. When studying their life stories, their art, their musical performances, their concepts, their patents, we see that creativity is not limited to art or music, but displays its power as well in the corporate world, in business, and in the technical sphere. This insight led me to distinguish four basic realms of creativity:

- ▶ Artistic Creativity
- ▶ Scientific Creativity
- ▶ Conceptual or Business Creativity
- ▶ Technical Creativity

Let me give some examples of each. When I look at *artistic creativity*, I see that Picasso created modern art forms virtually from scratch that were nonexistent before. He ventured into realms of visual art that were so daring that many people, until Picasso was in old age, and world-famous, rejected his art as ‘iconoclast vandalism,’ ‘childish immaturity’ or ‘deliberate ridicule.’ With Charlie Chaplin we see a man who

already well-known as an actor, broke with tradition and his former role image, to create the figure of the street vamp and charming clown, virtually from rags and tatters found in his studio, and dared into the unknown. He was ridiculed at first, but finally became victorious after many trials.

When we look at *scientific creativity*, we see two men standing out, Albert Einstein, today recognized as a universal genius, brilliant physicist, mathematician and

musician (violinist), and Nikola Tesla, controversial inventor, and creator of more than 400 patents on inventions. When we look at *conceptual or business creativity*, we could look at men like Dale Carnegie, Edward de Bono or else Sergio Zyman, who have changed our corporate world with their original and daring concepts.

Dale Carnegie became the first internationally known life coach and corporate trainer and yet when he started out, he was unable to hold a speech in front of a small audience, and learnt it all from the bottom up. He created major concepts for human resource

We all know that artists are creative. This is some of the things we already learn in school.

training that today are no more reflected upon, but taken for granted. This is even more so the case with Edward de Bono, so far in human history the greatest and most versatile life coach and corporate trainer, a think tank who has revolutionized the business world with his brilliant concepts and insights.

He is credited as the proprietor of 'lateral thinking,' the '6 Hats' brainstorming method, 'tactical' success training, conflicts solution, the 'six action shoes', etc. With Sergio Zyman we have a business man and corporate leader who is a bit more controversial in that he stands out not only through his ruthlessness but also his concept-inventiveness when leading the *Coca Cola Company* to worldwide success. While he's a controversial figure, his overall creativity for concept-design cannot be overlooked for it stands out as an example for how to go beyond mere marketing and instead create lasting business success with 'deliberate concept design.' That it works, his successes have proven.

Technical creativity is very important as well, and often visible in our media or fashion magazines. It's not only the creativity and solution thinking of an engineer, but also the daring creations of a couturier,

interior designer, architect, car maker, perfume distiller or shoe maker.

This kind of creativity comes over as so spontaneous and natural that most people never even think about it. Yet it's an integral part of all cultures' aesthetic achievements and craftsmanship.

Genius and Inner Knowledge

We have seen above that *integrated knowledge* is quite something different than the ordinary knowledge traditional science used to consider. Integrated knowledge always existed because it is inner knowledge. We all possess it, but only men and women of genius use it to its fullest, thereby benefitting from universal and perhaps superhuman knowledge sources. Let me exemplify this with the art of learning the piano, and filmmaking.

When Charlie Chaplin started his fabulous career as a film comic, he used the simplest means, and much of it was improvised in the beginning. Chaplin was not interested in the ordinary roles that were offered to him by producers.

Deep down he knew that he owned more power and creativity than all those mediocre film producers

did. Charlie, the figure of the street vamp, clown and charming guy was created from rags and utensils that Chaplin spontaneously fit for costumes. If Charles had not followed his intuition and not played out his cards, Charlie would never have been born. Charlie was the ingenious Pygmalion of Charles.

All through my younger years, I studied biographies and autobiographies. Among the ones that fascinated me most was Charles Chaplin's autobiography.

—Charles Chaplin, *My Autobiography*, New York: Plume, 1992. First published in 1964.

I found he was unique because of his trusting his creative instinct, his own star—although at the decisive point in his life, when he began carrying out his first vision of Charlie, everything and everyone seemed to be against him.

We all have a tendency to look at famous and successful people only from the moment they made it, overlooking the many years of sacrifice and failure they have lived through *before* they were famous.

Edward de Bono, the leading think tank, has written an extraordinary book entitled *Tactics: The Art and Science of Success*.

—Edward de Bono: *Tactics: The Art and Science of Success*,
London: HarperCollins, 1993, first published in 1985.

This book, which is based on the thorough human resource studies of Piers Dudgeon and Valerie Jennings, presents a precious Pandora box full of tactical advice about how to become successful and gain fame. The study is based on fifty interviews with men and women who have been outstandingly successful, among them *David Bailey, Hans Eysenck, Malcolm Forbes, Clive Sinclair, Jackie Stewart and Virginia Wade*. With his usual lucidity Edward de Bono analyzes their different paths to success, revealing some striking truths such as 'Building your strengths brings you more success than compensating for your weaknesses' or 'People care is of huge importance in achieving success.'

The artist where I have seen inner knowledge as if under a magnifier is Pablo Picasso. Among all artists, I do not know one who enjoyed a similar independence and inventiveness. While his contemporaries, like Braque, tried to share with him their ideas about cubism, Picasso in turn did not need to take anything from them. At age fourteen, he could paint like the classical masters, and it's notorious that his father gave up teaching him anything. His life was

not easy once he left his home in Malaga, leaving behind a loving mother and a highly intelligent father, who was a well-known art teacher. Picasso went to leave Spain and settled in Paris, France, only a few years later.

It is also documented that when Braque and Picasso shared an apartment in Paris, when both were very poor, Picasso made a few canvasses in Braque's style, just for the fun of it all. Some experts believe they were better than Braque's originals. Anyway, it led to the break of the friendship because Braque could not live with the idea that his art was for Picasso nothing but child play.

You see in Picasso's art career that his fierce independence even became stronger as he grew older. To look only at *Guernica*, the monumental painting which assumed a unique expressiveness under Picasso's hands.

I do not know any other art work that associates the senseless cruelty of war or civil war in such a sublimated abstract form, unveiling the misery of misguided humanity without itself containing the violence a realistic painting or photography would depict.

You can contemplate *Guernica* and be deeply moved, without being sickened. In this sense, *Guernica* is a cathartic experience, and was so for Picasso himself.

From about the time
Picasso lived in the
Chateau de
Vauvenargues, with
Jacqueline at his side, his
art became so unique
and personal, without
any possible comparison
with existing models,
that even some Picasso
lovers felt estranged.

Picasso was using his
inner knowledge once again to a point to use it as an
exclusive inspiration for his art.

I believe that there is a similarly gigantic
originality with Svjatoslav Richter.

While still some decades ago, many doubted that
musical performance involves real creativity, this
point has been clarified. I remember that back in the
1960s this discussion was still vivid, while today most

The artist where I
have seen inner
knowledge as if
under a magnifier is
Pablo Picasso.
Among all artists, I
do not know one who
enjoyed a similar
independence and
inventiveness.

art critics and even the lay public have accepted the idea that musical performance can be *genuinely creative*. That doesn't imply however that it always is, but it potentially can be.

Back in my childhood, I saw this discussion engaged in Germany regarding Herbert von Karajan, Glenn Gould and Svjatoslav Richter. In the performances of these three artists, a conductor and two pianists, critics and a growing part of the public began to voice things like 'recomposition,' 'recreation,' 'remodeling the original composition,' 'co-creating the original,' and so on. It was Karajan's *Mahler*, Glenn Gould's *Bach* and Richter's *Rachmaninov* that triggered the peak of this discussion about musical aesthetics and right-or-wrong interpretation of a musical composition.

It is curious to see today that these positions have not changed over time. Still now, most critics, and even a new generation of them, say that Karajan was best in Mahler, Gould in Bach and Richter in Rachmaninov. Richter who did not particularly like Karajan, admitted in his Notebooks about Karajan that, 'his Mahler is great.' Richter recreated the Rachmaninov image to a point of no-return; later in

life, he did the same with Schubert. As he relates in *Richter the Enigma* (1998):

Everybody asked me why I wanted to play Schubert? It's Schumann you have to play, not Schubert, they said, but I did not listen. I *knew* I wanted to play Schubert, however differently!

—Bruno Monsaingeon, *Richter The Enigma / L'Insoumis / Der Unbeugsame*, NVC Arts 1998 (DVD).

I think this is a particularly striking example of how a great artist uses his inner knowledge or pure intuition to venture into avenues unknown to millions of people over generations and generations! The service that Richter has rendered Schubert is not to express in words, so precious and unprecedented it is, as he was never understood, overshadowed at his lifetime by Beethoven.

Richter showed the world that Schubert's sonatas stand on equal foot, both in form and in expression, with Beethoven's. This is particularly true for his long B-flat Major Sonata. Glenn Gould speaks in an interview about it, saying he struggled with the 'repetitive structures' of the sonata and became restless and squirmy when he had to sit through it. And that when he saw Richter playing it in Moscow

Conservatory, back in the 1950s, it was like a veil was lifted before his eyes and he suddenly understood that all repetitions were 'organic elements' in the musical piece and that despite the fact that Richter seemed to play the sonata slower than all pianists he had heard playing it before, all seemed to be right in place, and that he had been captivated from the first to the last note.

Gould, talking with so much true reverence about Richter, was a musical genius himself. Gifted just as Richter with a *photographic memory*, he was never once seen to play from a score, while even Richter later in life doubted his fantastic memory when playing in public.

Gould has left us a Bach that sings. When the transition came from playing Bach on a cembalo to playing him on a modern concert grand, most pianists, to this day, have a tendency to play Bach without pedal, using so-called 'finger technique' to render a Bach that strangely reminds of Czerny and Hanon, instead of reminding of Bach.

I still remember that when I heard Bach on the radio in my childhood, I found his music 'hard and violent,' and thought it was bare of emotion and of

tender feelings. Then you listen to the *Well-Tempered Clavier* or the *French Suites* in our days, with Murray Perahia and Andrei Gavrilov, piano, and you realize that the world has changed.

Bach, in fact, contains more tenderness than Telemann and Handel, only that pianists have discovered it rather late. Already the Russian pianist Heinrich Neuhaus, the teacher of Svyatoslav Richter and Emil Gilels, wrote in his book *The Art of Piano Playing* that a pianist can play Bach only if he is able to let 'every single voice' sing.

—Heinrich Neuhaus, *The Art of Piano Playing*, London: Barrie & Jenkins, 1973, first published in 1958.

But as I said earlier, it is well a difference to do something about musical performance because it is recognized by an authority, or to do it because of a strong inner voice that says 'Do it!' So let us explore now how this is possible at all, how we can have sure inner knowledge about things to come or things we should realize, while the whole world sees matters differently, and tells us to do things in the old ways?

I believe that quantum physics and especially the principles of *uncertainty* and *nonlocality* provide the

answers that are not answered since the times of Leonardo da Vinci.

Four-Quadrant Genius

Geniuses, in the past, and today, are geniuses not because they attended schools and universities, but *despite* having done so. What is characteristic about them is that they know better than their teachers and generally suffer from the restrictions and limitations inherent in any school system. In addition, it has not been understood until recently that human intelligence is not uniform in the sense that not every genius is a genius in all four quadrants, nor in just one of them. This model is of course a simplification.

Einstein's genius wasn't just 1st quadrant: deductive-logical-analytical. He said that he arrived at none of his discoveries '*through rational thinking.*' It is that his right-brain intelligence was especially strong, the 2nd quadrant: holistic-intuitive-integrative intelligence.

Generally speaking, my point is that genius is genius not because any quadrant of their IQ is especially highly developed, but because there is an extraordinary *systemic reinforcement* of the general IQ

through the *synergy* between different modes of intelligence. For example, in Einstein's case, and even more so, in Leonardo's case, the 1st and the 2nd quadrant IQ were adding-on to one another with the result of an extraordinary lucidity that is able to check back any little progress in *analysis* with an equal progress in *synthesis*. A wise man once stated that after psychoanalysis must come *psychosynthesis*. I am convinced that if Roberto Assagioli had not invented the latter, another would have done so, simply because it was the lacking half. In fact, if tomorrow you invent another alphabet and you write its first letter, A, you cannot stay there, but you must get through until Z. Only when A to Z is finalized, you can say you have the basis of a coherent something that you call a *language*.

When research on brain hemispheres was developed, the first insight, revolutionary at the time, was that IQ is proportionally higher in case of a *coherence between the brain hemispheres*. This produced the long-overdue insight that genius is not, as formerly believed, an extraordinary development of one of the IQ quadrants, but rather an unusual equilibrium of the left and right brain hemispheres

that leads to what could be called an *integrative* thought process.

This implies that conscious and subconscious mind work in sync, and for this, we have many examples in the lives of highly gifted people. Einstein, for example, used to have little naps throughout the day, short periods when he fell asleep, for no longer than about ten minutes, and sometimes, after waking up, he intuitively felt he had found the solution to one or the other hairy scientific problem he was working on.

In this context, it is helpful to study the various tests that were conducted on Einstein's brain after his death. It was found that his brain did not display abnormalities or hypertrophies of any kind: it was found to be a 'normal brain' in every respect. Some people, who had expected to find 'the key to Einstein's genius' were disappointed in their hope to detect the one single key to human genius, so that it could be cloned.

The answer is that there is no such key, except that geniuses seem to use their brains way more effectively than ordinary people do. I actually researched this matter but found that not even the

legal questions are free of doubt, let alone the various theories about Einstein's brain. In some books it's written he had agreed by testamentary will that his brain was given to research after his death, but in others, it was said that he had expressed his last will only verbally. Fact is that his son, Hans Albert Einstein, had to give an ex-post permission to the autopsy, which is legally a hairy case by itself.

In fact, we know from research that most people use only five to eight percent of their creative resources, but geniuses definitely use more; how much more is still not entirely clarified and subject to further research. I am convinced that all in life is linked through feedback-cycles, a fact now corroborated by systems theory. In high achievers we can observe a *reinforcing cycle* put in place by the very fact of their own belief in being superior!

When research on brain hemispheres was developed, the first insight, revolutionary at the time, was that IQ is proportionally higher in case of a coherence between the brain hemispheres.

The will to achieve higher sets in place an evolutionary upward spiral that positively affects the development of the brain and the building of *preferred pathways*, thereby raising the complexity of neuronal connections.

Salvador Dali is a stunning example as he had taken the decision as a little boy to be a genius; he relates that in his notebooks. It is not surprising, then, that later in life, while not without hassles, he was recognized as an artistic genius. Whatever may be true in this respect, there is no doubt that high self-confidence, and a high level of trust in life is conducive to achieving higher, for outperforming oneself, and for delivering outstanding achievements.

Françoise Dolto (1908-1988) related to me in an interview that at the critical moments in her life when she was developing her famed method for healing psychotic children, she felt she was 'walking on eggs' and did not feel she knew what was going on. It has to be known that at that time, it was believed that psychosis is a fatal disease and cannot be healed, be it manifest in a child or an adult. It was even believed that in every case of psychosis a physical brain damage is the root cause. Today we know that all this

is not true, but these new insights still haven't reached popular science circles.

What happened to Dolto was that she fell asleep in a therapy session with a psychotic child. She didn't understand at first why this was so, but it seemed to be so compelling that she later used to say that

psychotic children '*get their therapist in trance.*' She then found out that the child's psyche actually asked for a *non-biased direct communicative link* with the therapist, which ideally comes about telepathically, when the therapist's reasoning mind is put at rest for a moment. And to her great astonishment, she found that every time after a session she had fallen asleep with a psychotic child, that child had done a major leap forward in healing the disturbance.

With Françoise Dolto, I had found a particularly striking example for the fact that genius also requires a very high level of trust in inner guidance.

Salvador Dali is a stunning example as he had taken the decision as a little boy to be a genius; he relates that in his notebooks.

When Einstein published his *Annus Mirabilis Papers* in 1905, his work on the essence of radiation in 1909, and his ground-breaking study on the theory of relativity in 1915, the scientific world ignored them at first. Nobody saw what a revolution had happened in science with the emergence of these papers, simply because there was nobody who was able to evaluate them. It was only from 1919, because astronomers had confirmed Einstein's prediction of gravitational reflection of starlight by the Sun during a solar eclipse in Brazil that Einstein got the merits he deserved for his discoveries. But Einstein himself, like Dolto, never had doubted that what he discovered had prime value; he most probably did not a moment worry about fame or recognition but simply continued his work. He also could not be sure, at that time, just like Dolto, that what he found was really going to be fully verified as a theory.

We know that in the short intervals before falling asleep and right after waking up, we are in the so-called *alpha* state, which is when brain waves are somewhat longer than in the 'thinking' state of full awareness, and it is in this state that the brain hemispheres are particularly in sync. This means that the *corpus callosum*, the structure that connects the

brain hemispheres in the mammalian brain, is especially active.

In fact, all of the inter-hemispheric communication in the brain is conducted across the *corpus callosum*. This is why, as Einstein used to say, a problem cannot be solved on the same level of thought that created it. In other words, solving problems is not possible through logical deductive thinking, which is left-brain related, but must involve in addition inductive and associative thinking, which is right-brain related. Interestingly so, Einstein himself did not talk about his genius in the usual terms. He was way more specific. He used to say that contrary to most other scientists he was extremely stubborn (*starrköpfig*), and, facing a problem, he would react to it with ‘dogged endurance.’

Another great genius, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, said that genius is diligence (*Genie ist Fleiß*). Einstein also said that ‘the gift of fantasy’ has meant more to him than effort done for absorbing ‘positive knowledge.’

In Einstein’s case, we clearly see that it was these qualities of the right brain, including imagination, fantasy, the capacity to see hidden connections

between obvious appearances, and musical talent that made for his astounding discoveries in atomic physics.

Q & A Session

Q. Have you ever suffered from writer's block? If you are not a writer yourself, what could you imagine writers do for not experiencing such a blockage of their creative expression? If you are a writer, what do you personally do for enhancing your creative flow?

A. Please give yourself the answer.

Q. Is it a good idea to have some kind of preparation before you start writing?

A. It is always smart to involve your subconscious mind in anything you are about to do. You do this by taking a moment after you sit down for writing and keep silent for a minute, focusing inside. Then, affirm sincerely that you wish your innate creativity to manifest here and now for realizing an effective and convincing piece of writing. If you, like me, compose music spontaneously, do the same when you sit down at the piano and before you touch the keys.

Q. What are the two phases of the creative process? In the first part, which brain hemisphere is

most engaged? In the second phase, which other brain hemisphere is most engaged?

A. It's the creation state and the production or post-production state. In the first part, the right hemisphere is predominantly engaged, in the second part, the left hemisphere.

Q. Do you think that creating effortlessly is a form of laziness? If you do, what do you think is the prime advantage of this kind of laziness?

A. This kind of laziness is about the best you can ever experience in your life. If you do some biographical research on high achievers, you will realize that all geniuses were and are *joyfully* lazy in that particular manner. They know, either because of their innate self-knowledge or because they found out later in life, that creativity is not related to conscious thinking but more to intuition, and *passive reception* of ideas from the ether, the vibrational field in which we are all embedded.

Q. What do 'hard thinkers' find delusional in the way creators use their genius? How does play facilitate this process?

A. 'Hard thinkers,' also called left-brain thinkers, believe that only hard work can guarantee for high and valid achievement; they would try to master any task with their reasoning process, and if it doesn't bring a result, they would turn down the task as

‘impossible.’ Children are all born geniuses in the sense that their innate knowledge tells them the truth that *play is the key to creativity*. It is thus not childish to play as an adult, but a good strategy for engaging the creative process. Geniuses are constantly at play, not with toys of course, like children, but with concepts, with ideas, with assumptions, with rules and regulations; they question everything. Edward de Bono, the well-known think tank, found that creativity is always destructive in the sense that we need to *invalidate* established ideas in order to find new ideas. He called this deliberately destructive thinking ‘Serious Creativity,’ title of one of his books. For example, when a large corporation for dental supply asked him for an innovative new toothpaste, he came up with the concept of creating a ‘stinking toothpaste.’ Through this funny-sounding idea, he destroyed the previous concept of a minty toothpaste and started the brainstorming process in that manner. The result was the strawberry toothpaste.

Q. What is the inner entity that is most engaged in this first phase of the creative process? Which inner entity is most engaged during the second phase of the creative process: the so-called production phase?

A. It is our inner child that is most engaged during the first phase, and it’s our inner adult that is most engaged in the second phase of the creative process.

Q. In which way would you agree that every creation always is also destruction?

A. As pointed out already, every new creative idea is based upon the destruction of the previous idea in the evolutionary development of that particular course of ideas.

Q. What is the main characteristic of creative genius? Is it analysis and intellectual reasoning, or is it intuition? Or is it rather that intellect and intuition are working in sync?

A. It is the harmonious collaboration between intuitive mind and reasoning mind or of right brain hemisphere and left brain hemisphere, and in still other terms, of associative thinking and analytic thinking.

Q. What is the basic difference between the creator and the craftsman? Which famous musicians and painters were embodying the *exception* to that rule in that they were both creators and craftsmen?

A. I mention only two here for the sake of convenience for we need to stay with a few examples here, while there would be many more of course to mention. They are the pianist Svjatoslav Richter and the painter Pablo Picasso. Coincidentally, both have been considered as being the *primus inter pares* in their particular field for the 20th century. While it may not be

obvious to non-musicians why Richter, as a performing artist, was also a creator, it is known to many that Picasso was not only a very original painter but that he also was actively engaging in the craft of pottery, creating many highly unique vases, bowls, dinner plates, jugs, and statues that, because of their artisanal nature, are not exhibited in musea but in special exhibitions for the artisanal arts.

Q. Why can we say that quantum physics is the secret behind all creation, behind all novelty, and behind all genius? In which way the quantum field or unified field comes in here to explain that connection?

A. What we call God or the creator force is nothing but the universal energy which is basically *vibration* and which quantum physics has discovered (or rather-rediscovered for all ancient cultures knew about it) as the essential blueprint for all life, and for the universe. This force is energy and spirit, and it is an essential information field. It is today called the *unified field*. This field connects all that is and it is all that is, and it is the dynamic force that makes that all life is change and transformation, and that there is nothing stagnant in the universe.

Q. What is the difference between human creativeness and creativity?

A. Human creativeness is the potential, while creativity is to apply this potential to actually create.

Q. What was Edward de Bono's concept of 'serious creativity' all about?

A. This concept was *not* created for artistic creativity but for bringing about innovation in the corporate setting. It is a method that enables RD concept teams to find new solutions and create new products.

Q. All children are creative. Why are not all adults creative?

A. This is because of the conditioning influence of our very uncreative school systems around the world, which belittle the human potential and are created in the belief that the human being is basically faulty and needs to be reformed by a moralistic education. This kind of education, however, disturbs the creative potential in children more than it helps the child to ever handle it. In fact, it transforms creative children into dull uncreative citizens.

Q. What are the four basic realms of creative genius? Give one example of creative genius for each realm of creativity?

A. They are artistic creativity, scientific creativity, conceptual or business creativity, and technical creativity. An exponent of the first kind of creativity is, for example,

Pablo Picasso, an exponent of the second kind of creativity is for example Albert Einstein, an exponent of the third category would be Edward de Bono and an exponent of the last category would be Alexander Graham Bell.

Q. How would you point out more in detail the truth that genius is basically inner knowledge?

A. Please give yourself the answer.

Q. Why has Picasso been called the greatest visual artist of the 20th century?

A. My personal answer is that he was able to duplicate even the most sophisticated artistic styles such as Braque's cubism, but on top of that he created styles that were absolutely new and unheard of.

Q. Give one example of Svjatoslav Richter's creative genius as a pianist.

A. The way he interpreted the German composer Franz Schubert. His Schubert is legendary and has completely transformed and rejuvenated the image of this almost forgotten composer who was during all his life standing in the shadow of his contemporary, Ludwig van Beethoven.

Q. What does the expression 'four-quadrant genius' mean? Do you think that this classification is

flawless in that every genius falls exactly into one of these four categories?

A. As we have seen this is not or very rarely the case. In the typical scenario with recognized geniuses, they fall in several categories at the same time.

Q. Would you agree with the assumption that geniuses think with their full brain, which means that in their case, their conscious and subconscious minds work in sync?

A. Please provide the answer yourself.

Q. Why so much fuss was made about 'Einstein's brain,' and what was the end result of that investigation?

A. The simple result was that nothing extraordinary could be found about his brain. The whole thing was a typically American media bluff.

Q. How did Germany's great poet, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, define human genius?

A. He said that it's an industrious spirit. ('Genie ist Fleiß.')

Q. Einstein did not talk about genius in the usual terms. He was way more specific. In which way?

A. He said that all his great achievements were due to two qualities: his imagination and his 'doggedness.'
