

Messages for Humanity

Hoots first message for Humanity - I Had A Dream

Yo! I have spent many years studying and meditating on the idea of nonviolence. I do consider myself to be a practitioner. I have been doing research in the form of interviews and dialogue about nonviolence with people. I have been trying to find people who resonate with the idea or the ideal of nonviolence. One night while sleeping I had a dream. In my dream I was at a party and I was trying to find people who might resonate with the idea of nonviolence. I noticed a woman who was already speaking with a group of people about nonviolence. These people were

laughing at her and saying do you mean you're just going to let somebody kill you, and you're not

going to defend yourself? The woman was trying to respond that just because she didn't want to kill in self-defense did not mean that she would not defend herself but just not in that way. The people were laughing too hard to hear what she was saying. As I approached the group I made eye contact with the woman and I nodded my head as I said that's what I'm saying. Then the people that were laughing at her all started laughing at me and said we got another one. I said oh so you think that's funny you want something to laugh at? I'll give you something to laugh at. I'm going to tell you the ultimate joke. It is the joke to end all jokes. I used to tell this joke that least I thought it was a joke back then when I told it. people laughed When it is told as a joke the contradiction seems glaringly obvious. Then I realized one day that it is not a joke, and it is not funny at all yet when told in all seriousness it is hiding in plain sight, and unseen, and unrecognized. Okay so you ready to hear the joke? Here's the joke -I figured out how to end all wars and have peace on Earth.

All we have to do is kill all the violent people. That is the joke. I thought that my joke was a way of highlighting a contradiction. Obviously if all the violent people were gone only the non-violent people would be left. I assumed that the non-violent people would be those who would not kill under any circumstances. Hence the contradiction. However it turns out that many of those who claimed the word nonviolent for themselves do not preclude killing as an option. I estimate that 80 percent of all of the people who use the word nonviolent do not preclude killing in a worst case scenario. This is not consistent with the dictionary definitions of nonviolence. Non violence - the use of peaceful means not force - the practice of refusing to respond to anything with violence - not using or including violence. It has been suggested to me that the correct term for what I am trying to say is pacifism. I do not prefer this term because it seems to imply passivity- as if to indicate that the only alternative to responding to violence with more violence or counter-violence is passivity. It is surprising to me how often people assume that When I say nonviolent that I really mean passive which to them implies victim- as if to say that the only way to not be a victim is to be an aggressor. This was the point in my research when I first began to be aware of the gap-the dead zone- the blind-spot- the black hole in human consciousness. The vast ocean of unconsciousness that lies in between the continents of either and or. The entropy of dualistic thinking. The transformation of consciousness- the quantum shift if there even is such a thing has to be about going Beyond dualistic thinking. The Human Condition of today is so enmeshed in dualistic perspectives that it is virtually everywhere around

us and affecting every aspect all of our reality. It may seem profoundly difficult to make this transition yet it is really fundamentally simple. With respect to nonviolence it is simply a matter of replacing contention with empathy. The solution to conflict is a matter of trying to understand the point of view of an adversary. When the emphasis shifts from trying to prove ones own point to that of trying to understand another's point we are enabled to find peaceful Solutions to conflicts. Otherwise when each party is more interested in proving their own point of view than in understanding the others point-we are disabled from finding peaceful Solutions This may seem glaringly obvious but it is appalling to see the extent to which humans become trapped in dualistic and either-or perspectives. In order to thrive as a species we must make this transition. For myself it is a matter off projecting my consciousness in such a way so as to imagine that I am the other person and that they are me. We often confuse between understanding and agreement. It is not necessary to agree with someone in order to understand them. Short of understanding we end up misunderstanding and by default-misunderstandings lead to conflicts that could have been avoided. In order to truly understand someone we must start by respecting them. If you disrespect someone you will never be able to understand them,

Respect involves the realization that everyone no matter what is struggling in their own way. In summary- empathy, compassion, respect, and understanding are key to finding peaceful Solutions to conflicts. These principles are applicable in any and all situations. After telling my joke many times; one day I suddenly realized that this is precisely the rationale behind all wars. Those people are the violent people and we are the peaceful people so in order for there to be peace we need to get rid of those violent people and then we will have peace. The net result of this is we end up killing In The Name Of Peace and that is called War underlying this rationale lies the idea that we have the right to kill in self-defense. As we march to war this idea is the prime mover for every Soldier on a Battlefield. This is an idea that has had it's heyday. Killing In The Name Of Peace as a strategy may have worked temporarily for rulers such as Alexander the Great and King David to mention a few. It did not work out so well for others. Yet if we continue from this point to carry the banner of the right to kill in self-defense onward and further down the yellow brick road of History it may lead to our mutual destruction. I am not challenging the idea of the right to kill in self-defense in such a way so as to as to claim that we or you do not have this right- I am however claiming that it is not a right- it is a choice. This may seem to be a semantic distinction, but it is important in the sense that rights are things which we assume to be facts. Things which we take for granted often without questioning. Choices on the other hand are things that imply a need to think before acting. It is important that we make a distinction that the right to kill in self-defense is an idea- not a fact. Choices on the other hand have consequences either way. The idea that it is a choice not a right shifts the responsibility back to the individual! It becomes a matter of c conscience. Conversely an idea of a right that is taken to be a fact may be considered as more then just a right it becomes a responsibility and then an obligation and the responsibility for actions end up being removed from the individual. The individual Acts as if it were just following orders and following orders because of the right to kill in self-defense which is considered to be a fact. We do have free will and that is the freedom to choose to kill or to choose to not kill. Let us as individuals think long and hard about the choices that we make. When a government sends its armies to war it

is virtually always described as a necessary Act of self-defense. When soldiers go to war it is virtually always predicated on an idea that it is a matter of self-defense. Think of it- throughout history every Banner, cause, sword ever drawn- both offensive and defensive labored under the cause of self-defense. It has become difficult to determine whether a threat is real or imagined. How do we determine what action is appropriate if we don't even know whether a threat it's real or not. We have acquired the ability to destroy ourselves in the name of self defense. The idea of the right to kill in self-defense has brought us to the brink of self-destruction as a species. Perhaps we need to rethink what is self, and what are we defending. What is consciousness and what are rights? The idea of a government of the people, by the people, and for the people is predicated upon the idea of certain unalienable rights that are given to us by God. Namely the right to life liberty and the pursuit of happiness. The right to life implies air to breathe, water to drink, food to eat, and shelter. These things are necessary to sustain life. Does my right to life give me the right to tear down the forest, generate plastic with each meal and destroy habitats of endangered species etcetera? Without realizing that we have done so we assume that the fact of our existence automatically comes with a set of entitlements we call rights. It seems self-evident that because I have a body I also have the right to breathe air, drink water, eat food, and have shelter. In short because I exist I obviously have the right to exist. It stands to reason then that if I have the right to exist- as in to breathe, drink, eat, and have shelter that I also have the right to bear children, the right to bear arms, the right to kill in self-defense. These are all subsets of the right to exist and the right to exist is a subset of the fact of existence. It is also held to be self-evident that all men are created equal. Yet in our world today there are millions that do not have adequate air, food, water, or shelter. We consider our rights to be a matter of fact which is self evident and automatic. This is taken for granted to be an established fact. As we go about our daily activities we turn a blind eye to the realization that it is virtually impossible to exercise our so-called rights without infringing on the rights of other humans, plants, animals etc. This contradiction has become irreconcilable. The very idea of Rights per se

is no longer tenable. When our rights are exercised in such a way that others who are our equals are infringed upon or deprived of the selfsame rights we have a fundamental contradiction. We understand now that the laws of Newtonian physics fail at the quantum level. In the same sense has the phenomenon of our ideas which we have assumed to be facts are breaking down under the pressure of accelerating time, technology, and population growth. We have considered our quote-unquote facts to be immutable laws. This they are not. If the gift of life does not come with a set of entitlements a sort of built in automatic eminent domain then what does it come with and what is it? What the gift of life is and what it comes with is consciousness- awareness. With this consciousness comes free will. Free will is the freedom to choose. The freedom to choose is not an ordained right; it is an aspect of consciousness. The idea of freedom has been over interpreted to imply that there are an infinite number of choices. This is a misconception. There is really only one choice- consciousness. We can choose to be aware or we can abstain from choosing and remain unaware. When we act out of awareness we create Harmony! When we act out of a lack of awareness we create disharmony and chaos. Awareness leads to compassion and compassion is the solution. What we often consider to be good and evil are simply awareness and ignorance. Ignorance being the lack of awareness. When someone Acts out of hatred or malice it is not because they are evil but they are ignorant-

they simply lack awareness or compassion. As humans we are neither fully conscious nor are we fully unconscious. Consciousness however is an evolutionary process in the sense that no matter how many times we fail to choose awareness we always still have the freedom to choose. The direction of the evolutionary process is moving from unawareness towards awareness. When we lived in caves and it was winter we did not have the right to take the skin of the bear. It was a matter of necessity not a matter of Rights. In order to survive we evolved a culture of dominance as in nature. As survival of the fittest- aggression became a necessary survival trait. In times of scarcity we as individuals had to compete against each other for food and water etcetera. Then we learned to cooperate with each other in order to compete as groups against other groups. This type of competition we call War. Through this war we have been naturally selecting for aggression. This aggression has enabled us to be "successful", to the extent that we have become the dominant species on Earth. In effect we have been too successful for our own good. Inherent in our success lie the seeds of our potential failure as a species. In terms of geologic time we have but a virtual instant to change from a spirit of competition to that of Cooperation. Not the cooperation within a group as against another group- but cooperation as a species, as a whole, no longer divided within itself. We are like the baby that first learned to communicate; to survive by crying to get its way. All of a sudden virtually overnight this skill no longer serves. If we continue crying to get our way no one wants to hear it. Our asset has become a liability. In order to survive the baby needs to unlearn the behavior that enabled it up until that point. This is not a discussion about right and wrong. In the caves without aggression we were at an evolutionary dead end. Aggression was the skill set required to enable us to survive back then. Today however the skill set of aggression has become our greatest liability. If we fail to transcend-to transform-to transmute this aggression into a spirit of cooperation and communication and understanding we are again at an evolutionary dead end. You may wish to argue at this point that survival of the fittest and competition is a force of nature and that we are but an extension of that Force. This idea it's no doubt true to an extent. However if we continue as if we were dogs fighting over bones our future is dubious at best. Beneath the Veil of a civilized world and a civilized society we still live in a dog-eat-dog world in many ways. No other species on Earth is capable of the type of wanton destruction that humans inflict upon each other and their environment. Dog eat dog is the default setting for The Human Condition. It is only through conscious awareness and reasoning that we have the potential ability to evolve a new skill set that may be appropriate for our "modern era"!