

Chapter 2

The Consciousness Century

My previous thumbnail sketches of ground-breaking scientific discoveries are certainly not adequate to endorse or support my thesis of the Third Appearance. At best, they are linear or third-dimensional explanations. In order to bring us to an other than intellectual assumption, we have to enter fourth-dimensional cluster thinking where, like a juggler, we keep a number of concepts in the air at once. The glue that holds all my conclusions together requires that we have a mutual understanding of, and a personal experience of, the word “consciousness.”

We live, move, and exist in a sea of consciousness, an infinite ocean of levels of awareness manifesting as our individual lives. Without the realization that consciousness is operating behind all the situations and appearances that are taking place in our lives, it is impossible to close the gap between the visible and invisible and experience the spiritual condensate.

Einstein spent the later years of his life trying to find a way to dispute the universe that the quantum physicists were suggesting to him. His relativity approach dealt with the infinite “all,” while quantum mechanics centered on the infinitesimally “small.” Though his condensate theory actually proved the mathematical logic that pointed to the universe being non-local, which means both “here” and “there” at the same time, he couldn’t agree. What he contested was the theory that a non-local universe meant that it is possible for a seemingly unrelated action in one place to affect other situations at other locations and that there are hidden variables embedded in reality that control the outcome of the

physical world. Action at a distance means that there really is a connection among all parts of the universe similar to Greg Braden's DNA tests that showed simultaneous DNA responses at a distance. That connecting link is consciousness.

A non-local universe means that everything each of us does affects everyone else, not just spiritually, but also materially. Though quantum physics is fundamentally a seemingly objective approach that deals with material outcomes, I believe that at a profound level the most spiritual books being written today are those coming from our quantum physicists. They both show and affirm how invisible spirit, or consciousness, visibly affects our lives.

In every culture there is a concept of the existence of a creator or source of creation. In the West we call the creator God. In India they call it Brahma. Our quantum physicists have come up with a new name for it – consciousness. They have concluded that consciousness is the creator, and are substantiating their claim by proving that everything that exists is invisible consciousness appearing visibly in or as form. In other words, form is a projection of consciousness.

Quantum physics states that an object cannot manifest itself in ordinary space-time reality until we observe it as an object, which means that for something to exist it has to be in consciousness. Though consciousness always has a location, a quantum object can be at more than one place at a time. When consciousness is no longer present, whatever form it symbolized ceases to exist. Once we perceive ourselves as being the presence of consciousness, we will understand that we have within us the same power or source of creativity that we have attributed to God.

Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, a priest and a scientist, was one of the first to close the gap between consciousness and form and recognize its spiritual implication. As a paleontologist and one of the discoverers of Peking Man, he proposed that all of creation has consciousness – that even a rock represents a dense and low-grade state of consciousness. Whenever consciousness is removed from a thing, it ceases to exist.

The only thing that can possibly be omnipresent is consciousness or spirit. Obviously, finite form can't be everywhere. Since all intelligence is an expression of consciousness, omniscience is consciousness. Everything that exists is first

created through, as, and out of consciousness; therefore, consciousness is the only power or creator there is.

Recently, I received a letter asking me to define the word consciousness in a simple enough way that an eight-year-old could understand. In attempting to do so I turned to *Webster's New Twentieth Century Dictionary*. It wasn't any help, because it still offered a definition that was carried over from the nineteenth century. It left out the experiential nature of consciousness and labeled it a noun meaning "Awareness, knowledge of what is happening." Webster's did try to define the recently invented phrase, "consciousness-raising." However, it continued by saying that consciousness-raising is a noun, meaning "The process of seeking to increase awareness of one's role in connection with problems of modern life."

My answer to the eight-year-old was that "your consciousness is an invisible picture of who you are. It is made up of all that you think, feel, care about, all that you like or dislike. It includes all the things you remember, those you have forgotten, and those of which you have yet to become aware. Your consciousness is what causes you to make the decisions you make."

The word "consciousness" has become so much a part of our daily lives that it is hard for us to believe that just a hundred years ago the word was seldom used. When it was used, it was interpreted simply to mean mental or conscious awareness, rather than what we now think of as our total awareness – our unconscious, our subconscious, and our infinite super or latent divine consciousness. Unless we are referring to a particular aspect of consciousness, the word summarizes all the multi-dimensional aspects of our being rolled up into one.

If someone were to ask me to select a single word that would sum up the most important subject that our evolution brought us to in the twentieth century, it would have to be "consciousness." That is the century when we became aware of the reality and importance of consciousness. By the latter part of that century, phrases such as "becoming conscious beings," "conscious evolution," or that there is a "collective consciousness," were common usage in futurist, metaphysical, psychological, and scientific jargon.

What takes place in and as our consciousness has not only become the focal point of our psychology and our mental sciences, but it has also become the

cornerstone of quantum physics, which is in the process of proving that consciousness is the ultimate cause and reality of all that exists.

Our acceptance of consciousness as an invisible reality represents a significant shift in how we evaluate life. There are two basic approaches to the way we function as human beings; both are necessary and both are equally valuable. We either judge life objectively by relating to visible material appearances, or subjectively, in terms of invisible values and purposes. Together they represent our consciousness. We can arrive objectively, step-by-step, to an awareness of the subjective truths symbolized by what we see, or we can become aware of how the subjective nature of a thing or situation is arrived at and has created its objectified presence. In other words, we can go from effect to cause or from cause to effect. We can see a situation and from there backtrack and know what caused it to appear, or we can discern the presence of a state of consciousness and know what will result from it.

Whether what appears to us as material reality actually exists or whether it is similar to the image projected onto a movie screen is another matter. Until now the objective way of evaluating life has predominantly assumed top priority, while the subjective, symbolic, or spiritual importance of what we see has been of secondary importance. Once we accept or perceive the creative nature of consciousness, our priorities begin to shift. Making war, dropping bombs on innocent people, using economic pressure to get results, or promoting acts of terrorism are examples of groups and nations giving precedence to an objective approach. When the subjective approach becomes primary the conditions that lead to terrorism, such as poverty, a lack of education, or limited opportunity will be eliminated and there will be no more wars.

A hundred years ago if I had said what I am going to say now, I would have been sent to an asylum. In today's more tolerant world I can openly announce the truth; I don't see any people. Rather, I see states and stages of consciousness manifesting itself in forms. Of course, I see bodies, but the invisible subjective character, vibration, or consciousness I experience in or as a person is more relevant to me than the objective form I see with my eyes. I see bodies as metaphors of the consciousness they symbolize. Viewed from that perspective, there was *no* Jesus, Buddha, Shakespeare, Einstein, or any of the scientists I have previously referred to. There has always been *One* evolving universal

consciousness, and when each additional aspect of consciousness came into human awareness it was labeled by or identified with the personality through which it manifested itself.

How often have you said to yourself, “I should have followed my first impression; it’s almost always right”? At those times you first sensed the presence of the state of consciousness that was present, but then you let your mind, which was loaded with previous judgments, take over. You may have talked yourself out of your gift of intuitive truth.

Though we are not always aware of it, everything we do is an expression of our consciousness. You wouldn’t be reading this book if it were not in your consciousness to be doing it. It was in my consciousness to write it, but it was your own consciousness that drew the concepts included in this book into your awareness. If there weren’t a reason for what is being said to enter the catalogue of your conscious awareness, it wouldn’t be happening.

Our crisis of perception, and the effect that thought has on matter, is a classical example of how science is proving the existence of consciousness, or spirit. In doing so, they have shown us that the mystics have been right when they have said that we are not living a life of time or space, but as spirit, which knows no time, no distance, and no boundaries. The way in which our own consciousness unfolds dictates the quality of our physical and human experience. When our scientists discover the nature of consciousness, they will realize that they have found what most people think God to be.

In 1954 the author Joel Goldsmith, whose mystical message was ahead of its time, not only prophetically voiced what scientists are now proving, but also clearly gave us the spiritual principle that is now being scientifically revealed. He said, “Consciousness always has a form. If consciousness did not have form, it would be non-existent. The moment consciousness has existence, it exists as something, and that something must be a form of reality. The reality of being, whether of mind, body, or purse, is consciousness unfolding and disclosing itself individually, on the level of our respective here and now.” In other words, we are not just states of consciousness; we are consciousness itself.

In his original, unedited lectures entitled *Consciousness Unfolding*, Goldsmith went on to say that by expressing states of consciousness we affect our physical lives. He wrote, “Health is not a condition of body, but a condition of

consciousness. Wealth is not a condition of purse, but of consciousness. And when you learn to close your eyes and think in terms of I AM consciousness, then as consciousness, I am what I am conscious of experiencing. Do not separate 'mind' and 'body.' Do not separate consciousness and body. Do not separate yourself in any way. Do not separate any part of your experience from consciousness. Learn to close the eyes and begin to realize your life as consciousness." The premise is that when you know your life as consciousness appearing in the form of your body, your body will then be what it was intended to be – a tool or instrument for you to use in the pursuit of your life's purpose. As such, your perceptions dictate the conditions of your body.

The mystical principle that the science of perception proves to us is that through a transformation of our own consciousness and how we perceive life, we no longer need to be victims of circumstance. When we are faced with what appear to be possibly dire circumstances, if we can *perceive* a positive outcome we create conditions that separate us from apparent probability. By subjectively becoming aware of the consciousness of a situation before taking action at the objective level, we can be masters of our own destinies.

I am not denigrating the importance of our physical bodies, but when we begin to be consciously aware of ourselves as being primarily consciousness with bodies rather than the other way around, we begin to have dominion over the way our bodies react. And once we begin to interpret personal, national, and international issues in terms of the consciousness they represent, we will know better how to take effective actions to help change the consciousness when necessary.

In 1914, Max Plank, the father of quantum mechanics, claimed not only that consciousness or mind was the source of all creation, but that matter, as such, does not exist. That was exactly what the founder of Christian Science, Mary Baker Eddy, announced well over a hundred years ago in her Scientific Statement of Being – "There is no life, truth, intelligence, nor substance in matter. All is infinite Mind (consciousness) and its infinite manifestation..." That principle became the underlying foundation of the whole metaphysical (mind over matter) movement, a movement based primarily on a subjective experience of life that, in turn, would manifest objectively as a more healthy and harmonious way of living.

This shift in awareness from an objective way of looking at life toward a subjective approach may sound speculative, but in order to understand the evolution of our spiritual consciousness and to discover how this non-material viewpoint can affect our day-to-day existence, we have to become aware of a whole new way of perceiving ourselves. That is why we are facing a personal crisis of perception.

Becoming aware of ourselves as consciousness rather than bodies may sound far-fetched and of little consequence; however, I will share a personal example that proved it to me.

In the early nineteen nineties, on my ranch in the Texas Hill Country, winter was just ending and horseback riding season was imminent. Our horses hadn't been ridden for some time, but nevertheless, about ten of us decided to ride out and go down a narrow path into a nearby canyon. Halfway down the narrow rocky path, a lady's horse balked and refused to go further. My friend became anxious; so I helped her off her horse and put her on mine. By this time all the horses were getting restless; therefore, I immediately jumped up on her horse without taking the time to calm him down. The horse reared up, lost his footing, and fell over backward on top of me. After he rolled off me I couldn't move, so we all knew that it was serious. An ambulance was called and I was taken to a hospital in San Antonio where they X-rayed me and found that several ribs had been broken and both sides of my pelvic bone had been severely fractured.

Throughout this part of the experience I felt as though I was observing what was happening to me, rather than participating in it. My only thought was, "What am I going to learn out of this?" Once I was in my hospital room that feeling continued, and I went through the whole experience without taking any painkillers, drugs, or sleeping pills. How? I didn't need any painkillers or drugs because I literally hovered over my body and didn't feel any pain. I found that if I didn't move I didn't hurt. It was as though I was watching me rather than being me. When I sought an understanding of what was taking place my memory flashed back to something that began many years ago.

Back in the late 1940s I had read about remarkable physical feats that Hindu yogis could perform, how they could stop their hearts from beating, be buried alive and come back, and even tele-transport themselves. I started studying everything I could get my hands on about astral travel, out-of-body

experiences, and other such phenomenon – some phony, some real. Eventually, I had a couple of remarkable experiences where I seemed to be in two places at once, or witnessed things happen without being physically present. At that point my inner guidance said, “Now don’t play around with that any more. You have learned the principle involved, and further experiments will be both a waste of time and an ego trip – a phenomenal rather than a spiritual experience.” So I dropped that pursuit and never thought of it again until 30 years later. Lying in that hospital bed without consciously thinking of what I had learned in the past, it took over.

I can explain in a sentence how an out-of-body experience such as mine can take place, though I can’t always actually repeat it myself just by wanting to. In direct ratio that you are aware of yourself as consciousness with a body rather than a body with consciousness, you are not limited to a body. Consciousness knows no time or space and is free to travel, whereas material sense is bound by both time and space. Once we begin to experience ourselves as consciousness we are on our way and will eventually be able to take that awareness to extraordinary lengths. In the second half of this book I will discuss how to condition consciousness in order to attain that level of awareness.

Where We Live

Before going on, I want to pause a minute and offer you a simple test to

help you understand to what degree you perceive yourself as consciousness. Ask yourself, “Where do I live?” If the first thing that pops into your mind is that you live in a particular city, a house, or a geographical location, that thought indicates that you are still primarily viewing who you are and where you live objectively.

To the degree that you identify yourself with a location, you still think you are an object rather than being consciousness. You still believe that you are what you see in the mirror, rather than the life force or consciousness that is seeing through your eyes, digesting your food, or breathing your breath. It would be all right for you to continue to see yourself and where you live objectively, except that your survival may one day depend on your ability to experience yourself as

informed consciousness rather than as a physical object. Remember that consciousness is not limited to time or space. Therefore, as consciousness you are not limited to material restrictions and you will enter a whole new way of life. It is when your material circumstances seem most chaotic that you are facing your crisis of perception.

Once we stop thinking of ourselves as only physical bodies, we will automatically see appearances subjectively as symbolizing the consciousness that created them. We will know that if we want to change the form, we must change our consciousness through how we perceive things. We must change our perceptions. When we are asked where we live our answer will be that we do not live in man-made cities or buildings, but rather that we live in cities of ideas and beliefs.

The cities of ideas that we exist in won't have physical boundaries. Our consciousness-cities will be composed of and populated by those who have the same values, the same ideas and the same consciousness that we individually inhabit. Certainly we will still have material lodgings with E-mail and street addresses, but the boundaries of our cities – our city limits – will be defined by the consciousness we live in.

Those who lived in the cities of the past were brought together by objective goals, by mutual material desires and for protection. The idea cities of tomorrow will be constructed from the consciousness of those who are drawn together for the survival of their souls, not of their bodies or material possessions.

In similar fashion, our families won't be made up of those with whom we share a physical heritage. Our families will be those among us who share the same consciousness and values that we do. No matter where we are physically, when something takes place that is detrimental to our shared belief system, we will consciously feel it.

An article that appeared in the *Austin American-Statesman* in 2002 by Bill Bishop and Mark Lisher, equated the building of our present-day "idea" cities with the game of Monopoly. They said, "Cities expanded because their land was cheap, their workers skilled or plentiful, and because they were on river or trade routes. They grew with Reading Railroads and Boardwalks, and by adding houses and hotels, but the game is changing. The board's been jostled, the pieces scattered." Their conclusion was that in the future people will believe that the

ideas and creativity that inhabits the houses and hotels will define the new social order. Most importantly, people will move away from the cultural norms and traditions that have defined our country for the past two hundred years.

Bishop and Lisheron also point out that Americans are leaving traditional organizations in droves. The Rotarians, Kiwanis, PTA, and the Red Cross are all losing members – their numbers are down by half since 1965. This dwindling social capital is accompanied by a decrease in financial capital those institutions have traditionally depended on for their survival.

Robert Cushing, a retired University of Texas social scientist professor, made a study of fifty states and a hundred major cities, and came up with a startling observation: American cities generally high in traditional measures of social capital were lower in technology development, lower in income, and lower in population growth. He claimed that where many people attended church or were active in religious organizations, economic growth was the slowest. Those cities strong in faith-based institutions were also weaker in the development of technology and new patents.

High-technology cities, such as Austin, Seattle, and San Francisco, were the exact opposite. They had a lower percentage of people going to church regularly, fewer joiners, fewer volunteers, and fewer people involved in traditional politics. Those cities where technologic and scientific ideas were abundantly produced were fast growing and prosperous. They were populated with people of diverse backgrounds, interests, races, and spiritual interests who joined boycotts and protests, signed petitions, and participated in reform movements. More importantly, they put their money where their ideas were.

Another professor, Richard Florida, who authored *The Rise of the Creative Class*, says that these new idea people don't move to traditional cities with civic clubs and bowling leagues, but, rather, they head in the other direction. He writes, "Communities that once attracted people now repel them. People want diversity, low entry barriers, and the ability to be themselves." The people in these cities tend to be more optimistic and self-confident than residents in more traditional American communities. What's more, these cities are the best at promoting economic growth. "Diversity and its running mate, tolerance, appear to be the source of economic power in the cities of ideas. The economy isn't building itself

on the institutions and culture of 50 to 80 years ago. Joiners aren't driving the economy in these cities of ideas with close ties to particular organizations. Interactions among people who do not look alike or think alike are the driving force to economic success now."

What does that tell us about the effect of consciousness? It says that churches prospered in the past because they were places of revolutionary ideas, and for them to be successful now, they must come up with completely new ideas, or at least a new packaging of old ideas. It tells us that people are listening, that people now know who they are and are ready to stand on their own. The institutions and relationships that were responsible for building the materialistic concept we call the American dream are fading out. Social structures and organizations that were dominant until the last couple of decades now fail to manifest prosperity. In their place we will reverse the previous order where material accomplishment was primary, and in doing so our organizations of ideas will prosper.

Unless there is a corollary between our ideas and the quality of spirit or consciousness inherent in them, our cities of ideas will also self-destruct in time. Today the script is being written by every professional and intellectual pursuit, telling us that we are in a critical stage of our consciousness evolution, if not revolution. The values we individually perceive will decide the outcome.

20th Century Evolution

My attempts to define and describe consciousness will remain abstract exercises unless I can substantiate them by offering several objective examples. There are a number of outstanding events that took place in the twentieth century that can help us understand how consciousness evolved during that time. Having lived through four-fifths of that century, and having been personally affected by many of the changes as they took place makes it possible for me to see how our understanding of consciousness developed. I am going to point out three significant examples that illustrate the evolution of consciousness during the twentieth century. These, among many others, represent one seamless process that is still taking place today.

1. The Death of God

*A*t the beginning of the twentieth century, there were three men in particular who voiced a heretical concept with such profound spiritual implications that the Orthodox Church adamantly rejected them all. Nietzsche, Dostoevsky, and Freud introduced the beginnings of a revolutionary shift in consciousness and were universally reviled for it. Because revelation is never easy, those who initiate progress often pay a heavy personal price – Nietzsche and Dostoevsky went insane at the end of their lives, and Freud became a drug addict. Like the man, Jesus, they confronted the established order with a new concept of God. Those who were at that time founding the metaphysical movement, both in America and elsewhere, were simultaneously reinterpreting the traditional meaning of God. But by putting it in a religious context, although controversial, it was less disturbing to the reigning establishment.

Nietzsche, Dostoevsky, and Freud, each in his own way, announced that God was dead. This concept was widely publicized and discussed a half-century later in the 1950s when a book with that title was published. Their work resulted in two important things. They laid the groundwork so that the divinity of individual man could be consciously realized, and through the “death of God” they created a new religion for many – the deification of science. Before the twentieth century, religion denied the omnipotence of science, and until scientists like Einstein and Plank came along, science denied the power of spiritual perception. While agreeing that there is an order or design for life, Nietzsche, Dostoevsky, and Freud were simply saying that the objective or basically materialistic concept of God as a super-being sitting on a cloud judging and punishing humankind does not exist.

Nietzsche was the most maligned of those who were exposing the narrowness of a father/God concept. His saying that God is dead led most people, in particular theologians, to think that he believed that nothing of a divine or spiritual nature existed; whereas he was actually centering divinity in humankind itself. When he spoke of the superman, he didn't mean a genetically superior race in the same way the Nazis interpreted it, but rather that humankind would now

evolve into super God-like beings – all of us, not just a chosen few. Instead of this existential approach denying God, it makes a god of our existence itself.

Dostoevsky, by putting words into the mouths of his characters in *Crime and Punishment* and other writings also announced his belief that the God he was brought up to believe in was dead, and that in his place was one's own conscience or consciousness. In doing so, he implied our need for a subjective rather than objective approach to life, as well as that our lives are the product of our own consciousness. In making consciousness the progenitor, he laid the groundwork for Freud.

Freud denied the existence of an outside God by making God out of consciousness itself. By demonstrating the power inherent in our conscious, unconscious, and subconscious minds, he gave birth to psychotherapy and laid the foundation for the mental sciences. Freud laid the groundwork for us to realize that we are consciousness with physical bodies rather than bodies with consciousness, and to ultimately recognize that that consciousness is God.

In saying that “God is dead,” these three men introduced something that was far more important than a new definition of divinity. By exalting the power inherent in consciousness rather than our continuing to conceive of God as a super, all-powerful, punishing, and rewarding demigod, they were saying that a subjective approach to life accomplishes what we have previously attributed to divinity. They were hinting that a change was evolving that would make invisibles more powerful than visibles. It took a while for their viewpoint to affect theology, but by mid-century God-consciousness, defined by theologian Paul Tillich as “the ground of being,” was widely accepted, and the possibility of accepting the belief of personal divinity became more than fantasy.

2. The Atom-Splitting Implication

The most important, consciousness-affecting occurrence of the twentieth century happened when we split the atom. When the full implications of what took place almost sixty years ago are understood, we will see how it seeded our current world conflicts. When the spiritual significance of the shift in consciousness introduced by this scientific event is recognized, we will

understand why it deserves such a prominent place in our spiritual evolution. The splitting of the atom signaled the end of the dominance of materiality or the objective approach. It announced the primacy of consciousness – subjective motivation. The splitting of the atom means that nothing of a material nature is guaranteed survival.

Ever since the beginning of civilization, every culture has believed that there is some kind of spiritual basis for life. Along with that belief came rules of conduct that were supposed to make spirituality applicable to daily life. However, in actuality, the first law of human nature, material survival, usually took precedence over subjective idealism. Putting bread on the table superseded altruistic goals as the *modus operandi* of existence. What could be seen, touched, tasted, or smelled came first, but when we split the atom, which is the substance of everything that exists at the material level, we ended the dominance of the material or objective approach to life. We didn't split the atom by finding a greater material power but by the subjective power of consciousness.

Actually, the priority of putting spiritual principle or consciousness first was in the teachings of mystics such as Jesus and Gautama the Buddha. However, in mass acceptance that belief didn't begin to move from speculation to empirical fact until the atom was split. The most important result of splitting the atom is not the creation of a super power base or the discovery that the energy stored in a single atom can transform our daily lives. Its primary importance is that it pinpoints our need for a major shift in priorities.

Man has always recognized the need for both a spiritual and material approach to life, but until the splitting of the atom took his top priority had been to achieve material goals, and any spiritual or altruistic solution for the fulfillment of his needs was secondary. But when the atom was split by the spirit or consciousness within human beings, the realization that consciousness is more important to us than effects moved from speculation to logic. Despite the fact that mystics taught that “in the beginning was the Word... and the Word was made flesh,” until now objective concerns have taken precedence over spiritual principle. Cause precedes effects. “In the beginning” is an idea that comes from subjective thinking, after which that idea manifests in form. If I want to bake a cake, I first get the idea, the recipe or word, and then I acquire flour, eggs, sugar,

etc., and a couple of hours later I have a cake. The cake, in turn, reflects the quality of the word, or precept, I have chosen.

The problem that current societies now face is that most of our institutions, including governments, are based primarily on the old priority of perpetuating material conditions. Materialistic goals continue to take precedence over spiritual or altruistic values. In America we claim that “In God we trust,” but in actuality, if we do not get what we want expediently through diplomacy, we send in the military and allow materialistic objectives to take precedence over subjective idealism.

It seems obvious that if we were to spend as much money on subjective values like education, consensus management, and the feeding, clothing, and housing of the world’s poor, as we do on weapons of mass destruction, we wouldn’t have any need to protect ourselves against terrorists because there wouldn’t be any. Most of the world’s chaos, whether in our personal lives, our national priorities, our religious institutions, or our industries happens because putting objective results as our top priority no longer works, and the new subjective or spiritual approach has not yet been incorporated. When the spiritual effect of the splitting the atom is completely understood, we will solve our crisis of perception, and subjective values will become primary.

3. The Importance of One

¶ Uncle Gilbert had lived to the end of the twentieth century, he would have seen his advice to keep it simple express itself in a most extraordinary way – a shift in consciousness to an awareness of the importance of One. Nothing is simpler than One; complications begin when we try to encompass the many. A change in priority is emerging that seems to go against collective socialization. If properly instituted, the growing awareness of the importance of each individual actually shows us how we can successfully live together.

Making One preeminent represents a complete reversal of the direction society has taken for thousands of years. Even in our earliest civilizations, the direction has always been toward more, bigger, and more powerful. Families became clans, clans became states, and states became nations. As civilizations

progressed, larger nations dominated weaker nations, always more, bigger, and stronger, until now the United States has emerged as the preeminent world power; however, now there is a tendency heading toward the importance of and even the dominance of the small – of *One*.

When one young man on a tiny island in the Philippines can get on his computer, shut down whole nations, and cost the world's businesses billions of dollars by putting the words "I love you" on the Internet, that signifies the power inherent in one seemingly insignificant person. When one terrorist can put a single bomb on a plane and cause us to spend a billion dollars every day examining luggage at all the world's airports, that is telling us that individual terrorists are more effective than whole armies.

Today, our supposedly all-powerful, developed countries no longer have major problems with each other, but face a dilemma and threat to their financial and ecological survival over what to do about the small third-world countries. As of now, industry downsizing is in style and giant companies, such as A.T.&T., find it better to break up into smaller companies. That shows that valuing small over bigger is in our financial consciousness as well. On top of that, globalization is running rampant and affecting each one of us politically, economically, and socially, without any powerful nation or group directing or controlling it.

Finally, when the world's most powerful country has an election that hung on single votes, that tells us something – that each individual who votes is important. If nothing more, it showed that we can no longer say, "My one vote won't make a difference." In fact, it revealed that the very essence of democracy rests on the importance of each individual.

The only way to experience who we really are is for us to stop being in awe of the big and start seeing the wonder of the small. Under the guise of being offered spiritual enlightenment, we have been taught to transcend the finite rather than to love it. Institutions that denigrate individualism by encouraging conformity subordinate the single for the whole and deny the sacredness of the small.

Everything starts and ends with One. When socialization caused the well-being of the individual to be inferior to the aims of organizations, churches, and nations, wars became inevitable. I believe that when concern for the individual takes precedence over national interests, war itself will cease to exist. Surprisingly, a couple of years ago, our United States military establishment came

out with a new slogan, "The Army of One." I wonder if they understood the New Age meaning of what they were proclaiming.

I have just touched on three examples of the birth and maturing of consciousness that has taken place during the twentieth century: the death of an objective concept of God, the spiritual implication of splitting the atom, and the importance of One. Each of these examples was meant to illustrate how consciousness is taking us to new levels of awareness in preparation for our individually experiencing the spiritual condensate.