The Millennium of Consciousness: Reflections on the One Mind*

But if there is only One Mind, how can anything really be outside of anything? . . . Could there be a science big enough to hold prayers, and paper airplanes, and all of our explorations? The thing and the understanding of the thing, all together? What sort of science would it be?1

— Ann Jauregui, PhD, psychotherapist

Every whole is a unity and every unity that is divisible is a whole . . . . for something to be a whole, it has to have an additional object, say, a soul or a mind . . . consciousness is connected with one unity.2

— Kurt Gödel
Mathematician, logician, originator of Gödel’s theorem

The years 1990–1999 were declared the Decade of the Brain by President George H. W. Bush, “to enhance public awareness of the benefits to be derived from brain research.”3 Many scholars predicted that this research would prove conclusively that consciousness is a product of the physical brain. As neuroscientist Antonio Damasio, of the University of Southern California, confidently stated in 1999 as the brain’s decade drew to a close, “In an effort that continued to gain momentum, virtually all the functions studied in traditional psychology—perception, learning, and memory—are being understood in terms of their brain underpinning. The mystery behind many of these functions are being solved, one by one, and it is now apparent that even consciousness, the towering problem in the field, is likely to be elucidated before too long.”4 Or as psychiatrist and sleep researcher Allan Hobson pithily put it a decade later, “Consciousness, like sleep, is of the Brain, by the Brain, and for the Brain. A new day is dawning.”5

It is ironic, however, that as we learn more about the brain, we discover that the local brain cannot account for the nonlocal ways in which consciousness manifests. When we muster the courage to acknowledge these findings, perhaps we shall declare our era not the Decade of the Brain but the Century of Consciousness or even the Millennium of Consciousness. This would help fulfill the nonlocal visions of humanity such as Shakespeare’s in Hamlet: “What a piece of work is a man! How noble in reason! how infinite in faculty! in form, in moving, how express and admirable! in action how like an angel! in apprehension how like a god!”6 As we shall see, Shakespeare’s succinct phrase “infinite in faculty” is one of the best definitions of nonlocal mind ever written. Why isn’t a brain-based approach to consciousness sufficient? Where is consciousness research taking us? How does nonlocal consciousness manifest? What justifies our devoting a century or millennium to consciousness instead of to the brain? Let’s take a look.

OUR EXPANDING CONCEPTS OF MIND

Often in this column, I have discussed the abundant evidence suggesting that human consciousness is fundamentally nonlocal—not localized or confined to specific points in space, such as brains and bodies, nor to specific points in time, such as the present. A mind that is genuinely nonlocal is unbounded in space and time, and, if unbounded, it cannot be separate from other minds, but must be, in some sense, united and one with all other minds. Unbounded, unlimited minds would therefore form what I’ve called the One Mind,7 which in times past has been called the Universal Mind and similar terms. I capitalize the One Mind to distinguish it from the apparently single, one mind that is possessed by each individual.

This proposal is not as fanciful as it might seem. Our concept of mind has been expanding and deepening for some time. In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, we were introduced to several subdivisions of mind, such as the conscious, the preconscious, the subconscious, the unconscious, the collective conscious, and the collective unconscious. The One Mind is an additional perspective on our mental landscape. The difference is that the One Mind is not a subdivision. It is the overarching, inclusive dimension to which all the mental components of all individual minds belong.

Many outstanding scientists have endorsed a unitary, collective side of consciousness. Among them is Erwin Schrödinger, who was awarded the Nobel Prize in Physics in 1933. Schrödinger wrote, “To divide or multiply consciousness is something meaningless. In all the world, there is no kind of framework within which we can find consciousness in
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the plural; this is simply something we construct because of the spatio-temporal plurality of individuals, but it is a false construction . . . The category of number, of whole and of parts are then simply not applicable to it . . . "8 In adopting a unitary view of human consciousness, Schrödinger recognized what he called the “anthropic paradox” — that although there are billions of apparently separate minds, the view that humans have of the world is largely coherent. There is only one adequate explanation for this, he wrote, “namely the unification of minds or consciousness. Their multiplicity is only apparent, in truth there is only one mind."9 Mind is by its very nature a singu-lar-tantum. I should say: the overall number of minds is just one."10 The distinguished physicist David Bohm agreed, saying, “Deep down the consciousness of mankind is one. This is a virtual certainty . . . and if we don’t see this it’s because we are blinding ourselves to it.”11

NONLOCAL MIND
A key to a unitary, collective One Mind is the concept of nonlocal mind. Nonlocal mind, a term I coined in 1989,12 is associated with nonlocal mental experiences. In general, these are events in which information is either mentally inserted into the environment or mentally extracted from it, without the constraints of space or time and without mediation by the physical senses. Individuals may know things remotely, even at global distances. The odds against chance in the hundreds of experiments that test this possibility are staggering billions against one.13 People may communicate with individuals from whom they are spatially separated. In studies testing this premise, the against-chance odds are millions to one.14 Individuals may mentally influence physical systems such as random number generators, again with astronomical odds against chance of a trillion to one.15 They may know future events, either consciously16 or unconsciously.17 They may successfully direct healing intentions to distant individuals who are in need,18,19 they may mentally influence the healing rates of wounds in animals,20 or they may use compassionate intentions to promote the healing of cancers in animals.21,22 Individuals may acquire detailed information about scenes and situations at global distances,23 and so on. All these possibilities have been affirmed in hundreds of controlled experiments during the past few decades. For a sweeping analysis of these findings, I recommend researcher and Explore co-editor-in-chief Dean Radin’s books The Conscious Universe24 and Entangled Minds,25 as well as the book Irru-cidible Mind: Toward a Psychology for the 21st Century by consciousness researcher Edward F. Kelly of the University of Virginia and his colleagues.26 On balance, we confront the necessity of either acknowledging a nonlocal aspect of consciousness or repudiating science.

Although these phenomena are infinitely varied, they all reveal an aspect of consciousness that transcends physical confinement or localization to individual brains, bodies, and the present. These events show that consciousness can do things brains cannot do: it can act remotely in space and time in an unbounded way. And if unconfined and unbounded, consciousness must unite in some dimension, as intuited by Schrödinger, Bohm, and countless other visionaries throughout human history. As Schrödinger emphasized: “Subject and object are only one. The barrier between them cannot be said to have broken down as a result of recent experience in the physical sciences, for this barrier does not exist.”27

DO WE LOSE OUR IDENTITY?
But then the opposite problem comes up: becoming too strongly linked to the commonality — losing touch with your own individuality. Part of our loyalty to life is being loyal to our own lives, you see, not sacrificing your self, but letting oneself play in relation to the other in a prudent and positive way . . . Striking a balance.28

— Joseph Campbell

Unitary mind presents a logical problem, however. If all individual minds are part of a greater mind, do we then lose our identity? What keeps all mental activity from melting into a homogenous mass?33 . . . Our intuition of an underlying wholeness shouldn’t imply melting into a homogenous mass.34 Because our minds don’t dissolve into sameness, specific and individualized one-Mind events are preserved. The One Mind is picky. A worried mother can connect with her child, not all children. Minds can affect specific electronic gadgets, not all electronic systems. Remote viewers can connect with specific scenes, not the entire planetary landscape.

Whether we call the One Mind the Source, the All, the Whole, the Absolute, Universe, Pure Being, God, Allah, the frequency domain, the collective unconscious, the holographic realm, the Akashic...
or all cell types. They are on call. When are pluripotent, meaning they can transform into any type of specialized cell in the body. However, stem cells don’t go off on their own, randomly turning into just any or all cell types. They are on call. When prompted, these uncommitted, undifferentiated cells transform into a specific type of cell — cardiac, skin, intestinal, blood, etc. — depending on the body’s need.

Like stem cells, the One Mind, the Source, awaits instructions and prompting. This is why information arising from it can be highly individualized, not random. Pattern, specificity, and individuality, therefore, typify the way the One Mind manifests in our lives. It responds to the needs, wishes, desires, and intentions of individuals and situations. The One Mind can spin out the thoughts and knowledge of a savant, a Leonardo, or an Einstein. It can grant the discovery of fire or the invention of the wheel. Its generative possibilities are unlimited. But it needs a nudge.

The One Mind also has a warning and therefore a survival function. It can reveal itself as a precognitive dream of a natural disaster or an impending illness. These need-based revelations are quite common. Why need? In these situations, one needs to know about the upcoming event in order to take measures to avoid such, because the approaching event may be a matter of life or death. The warnings may be symbolic, or they may arrive in realistic, camera-like detail. Forebodings arrive as if from a larger frame of knowing, from a source of intelligence that often operates outside of conscious awareness.

Author David Grann reports an example in his captivating book *The Lost City of Z*, which details the adventures of the legendary British explorer Percy Fawcett in the Amazon jungles in the early 1900s. There are many ways of perishing in this environment — lethal infections, a variety of predators, starvation, accidents, madness, murder by hostile tribes — yet Fawcett had an uncanny capacity to avoid nearly all of them. His ability to avoid predators was astonishing. On one occasion, after leaping over a pit viper, he wrote in his journal, “What amazed me more than anything was the warning of my subconscious mind, and instant muscular response . . . I had not seen it till it flashed between my legs, but the ‘inner man’ — if I can call it that — not only saw it in time, but judged its striking height and distance exactly, and issued commands to the body accordingly!”

This sort of knowing is often labeled as a “sixth sense” or “second sight,” but to label something is not to explain it. Nonlocal mind or boundless, nonlocal awareness, which leads to the premise of the One Mind, is another point of view. Nonlocal awareness is called “first sight” by psychologist and consciousness researcher James Carpenter, who believes its contribution to our survival is so fundamental that it supersedes the importance of vision.

It is foolish to try to separate stem cells from the body. Their behavior and fate are so intimately integrated with the body that they are the body. Just so, it is unwise to separate human consciousness from the information source that is the One Mind. There is no separate source. We are it and it is we. But, again, this unity does not do away with specificity and individuality. The One Mind is not amorphous goo.

Stem cells are physical entities that occupy specific locations in the body. They can be seen under the microscope. They are things. The One Mind, however, is not a physical thing. It is not visible. It is not localized or confined to specific points in space or time. It occupies a timeless, spaceless domain.

**RELEVANCE TO HEALING**

The borders of our minds are ever shifting, and . . . many minds can flow into one another . . . and create or reveal a single mind, a single energy . . . [T]he borders of our memories are . . . shifting, and . . . our memories are a part of one great memory . . .

— William Butler Yeats

William Bengston, PhD, is a professor of sociology at St Joseph's College in New York City. He has been conducting research in the area of anomalous healing for several decades, and he has proven the effectiveness of his technique in 10 controlled animal experiments conducted in five university biological and medical laboratories. His healing research has produced the first successful full cures of transplanted mammary cancer and methylicholanthrene-induced sarcomas in experimental mice by mental techniques he helped develop. Normally, 100% of laboratory mice injected with mammary cancer cells die within 28 days. But when treated with Bengston’s methods, around 90% of the mice survive and are cured. After the disappearance of the mammary cancer, they are immune to the cancer and cannot be successfully reinjected with cancer tissue.

The healing method Bengston uses in the mice experiments is largely mental, and is described in detail in his book *The Energy Cure*. The cage containing the mice is held by the healer, but the mice themselves are not touched. This contrasts with Bengston’s healing efforts in humans, who are often touched, thus the term “hands-on healing.”

In the course of his experiments, Bengston found that many control mice with transplanted cancer that were not treated with the healing technique were getting well nonetheless. It was as if the treated and control mice had formed a unit so that the healing effect spilled over into the control group. Bengston also found that a similar bonding process appeared to occur among the healers, who were university students he had trained in his technique. “Once the healers had bonded,” he writes, “the healing work of any one could not be separated from the healing work of any other.” Bengston called this phenomenon “resonant bonding,” a unity that enveloped both healers and their subjects.

Bengston’s “resonant bonding” resembles the need-based explanation we examined previously. The mice injected with mammary cancer cells were doomed to die within 28 days. All the mice, including those in both the treatment and control groups, needed healing, and this collective need perhaps created a bond between them. The healers also needed their intimations to be effective. This was obvious to Bengston, who noted that a felt, emotional connection often developed between the healers and the mice. Need
therefore suffused the entire experimental set-up: the need of the mice for healing, and the need of the healers to be of help to the doomed mice. As Bengston says, “Perhaps resonant bonding among the healers, among the mice, and between the healers and their mice, all merged to create a dynamic field of energy and intent”[^43] – a One-Mind, unitary event lubricated by need, intention, and compassion.

Thus seen, the idea of “sending” healing is limited and misleading. One could as easily say that healing, from the perspective of the mice, was “drawn” toward them because of their need. The idea of a passive, downstream recipient in healing transactions is erroneous. But, in fact, both “upstream” and “downstream” images are flawed. For in nonlocal correlations between distant entities, as between a healer and healee, nothing is sent, because spatial separation is not fundamental in nonlocal transactions. In nonlocal, distant, consciousness-mediated healing, the healing potential does not travel. It is already there. Nonlocal talk such as this invariably causes furrowed brows, the only cure for which is to learn to think nonlocally, as we shall see.

I suspect conventional medical researchers often stumble onto nonlocal forms of healing without realizing it because these forms of healing have no place in their worldview and therefore remain invisible. As an example, consider a striking result in an experiment conducted at Ohio State University. Researchers were studying the effects of a diet high in fat and cholesterol in rabbits. At the end of the study the rabbits were sacrificed (I am not endorsing this methodology) and specific arteries were examined for atherosclerosis. The rabbits were riddled with atherosclerotic changes, except for one group that was 60% less affected than the overall group. To make sure they were not dealing with two meaningless coincidences, the Ohio State researchers ran the experiment a third time, with the same results. They were now convinced that touching, petting, handling, and gentle talking were a crucial determinant in arterial atherosclerosis in the rabbits. Their findings were published in *Science*, one of the most prestigious science journals in the world[^44].

These experiments can be interpreted in different ways. In their report, the researchers attributed the atherosclerosis-sparing effect to “social environment” and the mechanical effects of handling. Terms such as consciousness, compassion, tenderness, or healing intent did not appear in their write-up (otherwise their paper probably would not have been published). Perhaps the researchers were correct in excluding any direct effects of conscious healing intent, love, and caring, and perhaps the individual giving special care to the rabbits would disavow any healing abilities. But in view of Bengston’s dramatically successful healing interventions in mice, similar healing effects may have been going on with the Ohio State rabbits as well, effects related to nonlocal healing intentions and “resonant bonding.” Natural healers may be more numerous than we realize. They may crop up anywhere, including in conventional research settings. When they do, they may skew research outcomes. Resonant bonding between experimenters and their subjects may underlie the variable results seen in medical research, and may be a major factor in the much-maligned placebo effect.

**ENTER MODERN PHYSICS**

[If] nonlocality holds for the material world, what about the world of the human mind? If both mind and matter are nonlocal, we are on our way to regaining what was lost in Newton’s time – a complete, whole world in which we can live complete, whole lives, in the awareness that we are far more interrelated than we had thought.

— Huston Smith[^45]

In the One Mind, all possibilities, all configurations of information, appear to exist in potentia, all superimposed on one another, awaiting some prompt in order to transform into an actuality in our world of experience. This is an image that physicists would immediately recognize, because it is one that is often employed in quantum physics. Most physicists believe that, before a measurement is made at the quantum level, a particle exists in all its theoretically possible states. There are no real entities at this stage, only an ensemble of potentials that coexist in an all-at-once “superposition.” When a measurement or observation occurs, these potentials undergo a “collapse of the wave function,” which is a mathematical description, and manifest as only one of many possible configurations. Measurement or observation makes the ghostly potentials real.

There are many other interpretations within physics. As a single example, some physicists believe that, after an observation at the quantum level, *all* possibilities are realized, and that we are aware of only one of them. This is the so-called many-worlds or parallel-universe interpretation of quantum theory. For a cursory look at 16 additional interpretations, see the Wikipedia entry “Interpretations of quantum mechanics.”[^46] In the One Mind, however, it is not *measurement* that produces a transformation of the potential into the actual, but *need* and *intention*.

**ENTANGLEMENT**

[M]inds are entangled with the universe, so in principle minds can nonlocally influence anything, including a collection of other minds or physical systems . . . [I] ndividual minds may combine into networks of entangled minds, giving rise to more complex ‘mind circuits,’ forms of awareness, and collective psi effects beyond our conception.

— Dean Radin[^47]

Another promising image that might explain our intimate, One-Mind connections is entanglement, a concept also drawn from the world of quantum physics[^48]. An object is said to be entangled if it cannot be fully described without considering one or more additional objects. It is as if the separate, distant entities comprise a single system. Entanglement has been experimentally verified many times over the past three decades, and is accepted by
the majority of physicists as a fundamental feature of nature.49

Entanglement is considered to be the mechanism for nonlocality. What is nonlocality? According to physicist Nick Herbert, “A non-local connection links up one location with another without crossing space, without decay, and without delay.” These connections have three identifying characteristics, says Herbert. They are unmediated (no connecting signal is involved), unmitigated (the strength of the correlations does not fade with increasing distance), and immediate (they are instantaneous).50

The implications of entanglement and nonlocality are stunning — so stunning that some physicists have had great difficulty believing them. This includes Einstein, who ridiculed nonlocal connections as “spooky action at a distance.”51 Einstein was wrong in his objections, however, and the unbelievable has come to pass. As physicist Menas Kafatos and science historian Robert Nadeau, both of George Mason University, say in their book *The Conscious Universe: Parts and Wholes in Physical Reality,* “[T]he universe on a very basic level could be a vast web of particles that remain in contact with one another over any distance in no time in the absence of the transfer of energy or information.”52

In order for distant particles to demonstrate nonlocal connections and entanglement, they must have once been in contact. According to the Big Bang theory, all the matter in the universe was originally in contact, concentrated in a “very hot dot” of matter-energy that exploded approximately 14.5 billion years ago, resulting in the universe we see.53 So, if the Big Bang theory is valid, a requirement for nonlocal connections — original contact — was met early on.

Only recently, scientists believed entanglement was limited to the microworld of atoms and subatomic particles. Recently, however, entanglement has been proved to be a feature of the biology of living creatures, apparently including ourselves.54-57

Can entanglement account for the connectedness we see in the One Mind? Consciousness researcher Dean Radin believes it might. In his illuminating book *Entangled Minds,* already mentioned, he shows how entanglement may apply at the mental level, possibly accounting for the various beyond-the-brain, One Mind-type events we routinely experience.

**MORPHIC FIELDS**

A related hypothesis that may underlie the connectedness of individual minds is that of morphic fields, proposed by British biologist Rupert Sheldrake.55 Morphic fields, Sheldrake proposes, are nonmaterial domains of influence unlimited by space and time, which influence the form, behavior, emotions, and thought of sentient organisms, and the manifestations of inorganic, inanimate things as well. Because morphic fields are species specific, they would lend uniqueness to ways in which the One Mind manifests in life. Unlike many consciousness theorists, Sheldrake has courageously subjected his ideas to experimental testing, usually with positive outcomes.50

**HOLOGRAMS**

The hologram is another metaphor that helps illustrate the relationship between single, individual minds and the One Mind. In the 1980s the eminent physicist David Bohm, Professor of Theoretical Physics at Birkbeck College, University of London, said in his classic book *Wholeness and the Implicate Order,* “[R]elativity and quantum theory imply undivided wholeness, in which analysis into distinct and well-defined parts is no longer relevant.”52 Bohm proposed the “implicate order” as an explanation for universal wholeness. The essential feature of the implicate order is that the whole universe is in some way enfolded in each part, and that each part is enfolded in the whole. Bohm proposed the hologram as an “instrument that can help give a certain immediate perceptual insight into what can be meant by undivided wholeness . . . .”53 Hologram is derived from Greek words meaning “to write the whole.” Each part of a hologram contains sufficient information to reconstitute the entire hologram — in effect, “writing the whole.”

The hologram is strikingly similar to the metaphor of Indra’s net, developed in the third century by the Mahayana school of Buddhism. When Indra fashioned the world, he made it as a net or web, in which there is a glistening jewel at every knot. The net is infinite, therefore the jewels are infinite in number. In the glittering surface of every jewel is reflected the image of all the other jewels in the net — an infinite mirroring process, symbolizing the interpenetration, interconnectedness, and simultaneous mutual identity of all phenomena in the universe.54

**ENFOLDMENT**

Each person enfolds something of the spirit of the other in his consciousness.55 . . . If we don’t establish these absolute boundaries between minds, then it’s possible they could . . . unite as one mind.56

— David Bohm

In addition to the hologram, Bohm uses a simpler example to illustrate the enfolding of parts and wholes. Consider a transparent container full of a very viscous fluid that is sitting on a mechanical rotator that can “stir” the fluid very slowly. If a droplet of insoluble black ink is added to the fluid and the stirring device is activated, the ink is slowly transformed into a thread that extends through the whole fluid, eventually appearing as if it is distributed randomly throughout the fluid as a shade of gray. But if the mechanical stirrer is reversed, turning in the opposite direction, the droplet of black ink gradually reappears, reconstituted. The ink droplet has retained its individuality, even though it appeared to be randomly dispersed.67 In the same way, individual minds retain their individuality, even though they are enfolded into the One Mind.

David Bohm was one of the most distinguished physicists of the twentieth century. He was known for fearlessly challenging scientific orthodoxy, and his interests spilled into many areas such as philosophy, psychology, religion, biology, and the nature of consciousness. He was a proponent of a single, collective, One Mind. He arrived at his ideas of unitary consciousness through the rigorous path of modern physics, as well as his personal experiences. His dialogues with the spiritual teacher Jiddu Krishnamurti inspired thousands and are still available.68 (Professor Bohm and I got to know each other a bit, through exchange among the roles of meaning and the mind in healing. Once, in a hallway conversation at a small, intimate gathering, I asked him his opinion of the future of humankind. I said, “Do you think we’ll make it?” He
In our modern market of ideas, there are many models to choose from in describing the operations of consciousness. Everyone seems to be hawking his or her favorite candidate. At some point, however, all talk of mechanism—whether nonlocality, entanglement, holograms, implicit orders, or any other process—becomes irrelevant. These concepts are watered-down versions of the Real Thing, sanitized and diluted so as to be graspable by human brains. But the sages who represent the esoteric side of the great wisdom traditions unanimously maintain that, as understanding grows, all descriptions of the Absolute are eventually transcended. Name and form, which are the keynotes of the Absolute, the Source. At this stage, language is simply outgrown and is subsumed by this single task. Our willing preference for mechanistic, causal, linear modes of thought, and our slavish dedication to a subject/object and self/other mode of being in the world. This means creating a place where a higher form of knowing can enter. The mystics consider this passage into silence a prerequisite for Divine Union—complete absorption into the One Mind, the All, the Absolute, the Source. At this stage, language is simply outgrown and is superseded by being.

It is rather like kything, a wordless, mind-to-mind communication that author Madeleine L’Engle introduced in the books in her Time Quartet series.72 “Kythe” is from an old Scottish word meaning “to make visible,” which L’Engle reportedly discovered in an old Scottish dictionary belonging to her grandfather. In kything, communication is so immediate and intimate that one person essentially becomes another, as if perceiving the world through the other’s senses. In this state, words do not facilitate communication, but they inhibit it.

Thousands of near-death survivors have described this state of transverbal communication. When neurosurgeon Eben Alexander entered his near-death experience due to near-lethal meningitis, described in his bestseller Proof of Heaven, he found that the wonders he experienced and the wisdom he was granted were conveyed wordlessly. Ordinary language was simply unnecessary.73,74 Or as Meister Eckhart put it, “It is God’s nature to be without a nature.”75 No description possible. No description needed.

**LEARNING TO THINK NONLOCALLY**

There is always a strong inclination for a body of professionals to oppose an unorthodox view. Such a group has a considerable investment in orthodoxy: they have learned to interpret a large body of data in terms of the old view, and they have prepared lectures and perhaps written books with the old background. To think the whole subject through again when one is no longer young is not easy and involves admitting a partially misspent youth . . . . Clearly it is more prudent to keep quiet, to be a moderate defender of orthodoxy, or to maintain that all is doubtful, sit on the fence, and wait in statesmanlike ambiguity for more data . . . .

—Sir Edward Bullard, geoscientist76

“The Emergence of Plate Tectonics: A Personal View” Cambridge University, 1975

There are formidable obstacles to our recognition of the nonlocal nature of consciousness. The greatest is our innate avoidance of nonlocal thinking, our obstinate preference for mechanistic, causal, linear modes of thought, and our cavalier dedication to a subject/object and self/other mode of being in the world. This granular, atomistic way of conceiving our existence separates us from one another and distances us from the world and its creatures. These ingrained habits of thought have seduced entire generations of scientists to turn away from the overwhelming evidence for a nonlocal side of consciousness. These spectacular displays of willful blindness are camouflaged as healthy skepticism, but they are neither healthy nor truly skeptical, because skepticism requires open-mindedness to data wherever it leads, which has been lacking in much of the debate over these issues.

Learning to think nonlocally is our most important challenge. Our response to all the problems we face as humans are subsumed by this single task. Our willingness to think and function as nonlocal creatures who are “infinite in faculty,” as Shakespeare said in Hamlet, linked inseparably to one another and all else, permits us to tap into the reservoir of wisdom that is the One Mind, unleashing a cascade of potent responses to the difficulties that confront us.

The choice is ours.

Larry Dossey, MD
Executive Editor
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