

SECTION 10

The Species Guild



COLUMBA KREBS— "The Angelic Kingdom" (1956)

[Click here to read the Introductory to this section.](#)

08.08.02 [The Topic of the Human Species Guild Revisited Six Years Later](#)

[Ingo Database](#) | [Real Story](#) | [Contributed Papers](#) | [Contributed RV Papers](#) |
[Superpowers/ET Intel](#) | [RV Honor Roll](#) | [Superpowers Art](#)
[Miscellaneous](#) | [Reviews](#) | [Species Guild](#) | [Welcome](#) | [Home](#)



The Species Guild

Ingo Swann (04Jun97)

Introductory

Although you may fall over laughing at the idea of it, Section Ten of this database has but one purpose.

This single purpose is to ATTEMPT to consider and discuss how astonishing, amazing, wonderful, creative, energetic, visionary and etc. our incredible species actually is, and to focus on these qualities and attributes ONLY in some positive sense.

*

Naturally, this ATTEMPT will require some kind of "letting go" of the utter fascination our species negative attributes hold over us.

And so this effort might result in some kind of cultural shock and thence be held as some kind of adventure into eternal realm of impossibility.

*

This attempt, however, should not be thought of as a retreat into sweetness and light -- that undulating, glittering, picture-perfect -- but foggy -- realm where fundamentals of our species can be forgotten or ignored.

*

The way to conduct this attempt is not at all clear -- except to think that a first step is to rise above all the mierda del toro found everywhere among our species, even if this rising be only

momentarily or temporary.

This first step, hesitatingly taken, might itself be difficult. After all, if mierda del toro is presented as sparkling diamonds, it tends to assume the quality of being thought of as meaningful.

*

This attempt (probably a rather silly one, all things considered) means that the various negative and deplorable factors of our species will NOT be the endless, ongoing central focus of this section.

There are at least four reasons for this diminishment and possible exclusion altogether.

*

FIRST, how awful and deplorable our species is or can be is given considerable examination elsewhere in sources that are considered meaningful in mighty ways. These sources actually range from misinformation to expert opinion. Most of them are presented with robust vigor -- often approaching a condition of overwrought, drooling enthusiasm.

The availability of such sources is endemic and constant in a Big Time way, and so widespread, that it is completely unnecessary in this section to reinvent that wheel or jump on it and ride along with pride.

*

SECOND, it would seem that after 2000 years of actively considering our species negative-making factors, hardly anything has been archived regarding ways or methods to ameliorate them along with the vividly awful situations those factors inspire.

The study and examination of our negative factors has consumed enormous amounts of good will, energy, FUNDING, research, and psychological and sociological experimenting all aimed at finding ways to "cure" them.

Today our species still has no idea of how to deal with a small time

issing contest, much less cope with negative factors grown to such large panoramas that they are largely out of anyone's or everyone's understanding and control.

It would be clear that the study and examination of our negative factors should continue, but perhaps not at the price of becoming so overwhelmingly paramount as to occlude and submerge our species positive factors.

*

The THIRD reason has two parts:

1. It is quite well known that if you repeat, adumbrate, and constantly draw attention to something, then whatever that something is will take on a bigger and bigger reinforced reality. This is technically referred to as "learning" via repeated exposure, until our wonderful brains erect mental pathways for that specific kind of data and information. Eventually, meaning and importance will become attached to whatever is being repeated and emphasized, and which this bigger and bigger reality might not deserve -- or perhaps was nonexistent in the first place. It can be admitted, with some evidence to support it, that our species does have elements of gross and refined stupidity. But are those elements MORE important than other elements that tend to get lost in the confusions the stupid ones bring into existence?
2. It is also fair to observe and admit that our species negative aspects ARE so widely fascinating that ways and means have been found to milk their economic potentials for all that can be gotten out of them. So this widespread fascination has become a meaningful COMMODITY replete with producers and consumers. It appears that little can be done about this, except to observe that our positive factors are not altogether competitive with our negative ones.

That this is so is, I think, understandable. After all, those attributes get the adrenaline, emotions and sentiments pumping whether in real, fictional, gossipy, imaginary, or illusory form.

And so we drool over them, while some opine that those very aspects are emulated so that one might get one's share of the economic pie, or shall I say *drool pie*.

I, however, and for better delineation, would want to rename *drool pie* as *playground pismire with a lobotomy* -- even though I, too, get off on some examples that emanate out of it. Even I like to watch examples of the good guys winning over the bad guys or ET space monsters.

But for this kind of thing to be possible, the real or imagined presence of the bad guys (or *things*) has to be engineered and masturbated into climaxial existing.

Of course, there is the question involving whether the good guys exist only to tackle, surmount and waste the bad guys. If so, then we absolutely NEED the bad guys so that the good ones can manifest their only purpose in being born out of the genetic pool.

*

FOURTH, our negative aspects have proven to be so charismatic that when they and our positive ones are discussed together in sort of dichotomous contexts, the negative ones attract all of the attention. Or at least various amounts of attention wander away from out positive aspects and over to the lascivious excitements promised by the negative aspects.

*

I'm NOT AT ALL suggesting that serious attention case being paid to our species disgusting, abysmal, degrading, soporific, hypnoid garbage heaps -- and all of which are thrill-making.

I'm not at all suggesting that if you "accentuate the positive, eliminate the negative" our species will be on the road to and achieve the carrot on the end of so many philosophical and ideological sticks.

*

In fact, I'm not even suggesting that the positive be accentuated -- but merely be DISCUSSED.

Regarding this, I've learned via some very serious demonstrations that specimens of our species try doing what they want, and do the trying at all times and all of the time -- to the length and degree of whatever they can get away with doing.

*

Thus, since nothing will be gained or even lost by a forum exclusively to discuss our species amazing and wonderful factors, well, why not set one up?

Few will be interested in reading what appears in such a forum, and which forum anyway can't possibly a threat to any vested interests desirous of pumping our species negative factors for all they are worth.

*

For those few who MIGHT take some passing interest, it may turn out an interesting challenge to discover how to examine and discuss our species wonderful qualities WITHOUT first beating up on our deplorable ones or trying to smash them along the way.

After all, some 6,000 years of our species history on this planet, now discovered to be fragile, has shown that trying to smash our negative aspects has yielded little in the way of self-perpetuating results.

*

In any event, observations and papers from those who want to try achieving this eternally useless endeavor might be presented in this section of this database -- for this particular topic BELONGS herein more than anything else. Guidelines for doing so will be presented shortly.

Our Species

But here at the startup, some preliminary about OUR SPECIES is needed.

Along these needed lines, it is to be understood that although our sciences and philosophies have traditional definitions of what is meant by OUR SPECIES, these might radically shift about in the near future because of advances in genetic detection. Nevertheless, it is worthwhile reviewing in brief form the traditional versions.

*

The term *species* is taken directly from the Latin, and originally meant "of a kind" or "of one kind."

The term still means that, technically speaking. But it also transliterates neatly into "of OUR KIND" or "of THEIR KIND" -- ending up in various stereotyping "of DIFFERENT KINDS." In this sense, social forces manage to engineer programming methods effectively causing our wonderful brains to erect cognitive synapse formations so that we become enabled to recognize the differences between our kind and all other kinds. The same programming also encodes how those that are now different are to be treated.

*

In terms of science-speak, in pre-scientific times SPECIES was seized upon (about 1608) to denote "a group or class of animals or plants having certain common and permanent characteristics which distinguish it from other groups.

Much before 1608, the idea of OUR SPECIES apparently DID NOT exist. It is therefore interesting to discover how, or if, earlier peoples thought of themselves as members of a corporate species. I've not been able to uncover much along these lines, but it would appear that our ancestors thought of themselves only in the contexts of clans or nations.

*

In any event, SPECIES was thereafter seized upon (about 1711) to denote "the human race."

One of the earliest scientific criteria utilized to identify a species had to do with sexual transmission or intercourse. Only those of the SAME species could enact that activity AND produce progeny. Thus, if stalwart specimens of our species would be sexually mated to extraterrestrials AND produce progeny, then the ETs would be of our species or we of theirs -- regardless of what the progeny might look like.

*

A SPECIES is commonly thought of as a sub-set of a GENUS. GENUS refers to plants and animals that look alike or similar in some apparent way, but which, when mated, do not produce progeny, or if progeny do result the progeny cannot produce progeny.

*

It is also worth noting an obsolete usage of SPECIES, in that it once was used to refer to similarity ideas, theologies, ideologies and social classes of specimens of our species. This was convenient, once, for it enabled the higher, more powerful classes to consider their corporate selves as a different species.

This, I tend to think, still goes on -- in that at least intellectuals of the modern period have taken it for granted that they are of a different species from those deemed not intellectuals.

*

At some point between about 1790 and 1890 (I've not been able to determine just when or why), the idea of OUR SPECIES took on an egalitarian or democratic frame of reference. Somehow, it was determined that all specimens of OUR SPECIES were equivalents of each other in some philosophical sense of the idea, on no other grounds than that they were of the same species because they could produce progeny.

This concept, with slightly earlier ramifications, brought about great revolutions in many areas.

*

Our species belongs to the genus HOMO, and our species subset of the genus is referred to as Sapiens Sapiens.

In its traditional format, HOMO referred to MAN, inclusive of the two sexes needed to copulate AND produce progeny.

MAN was apparently derived from the Sanskrit MANU or MANA, referring to a combined life-energy-higher-mind principle. MAN entered English via Scandinavian and Nordic pathways, seemingly indicating that the Sanskrit-speaking peoples normally associated with India migrated to the north of Europe.

*

Since about 1890, the term HOMO has fallen onto bad times, then being adapted as a reference to males of our species who mate or fool around in some way but do not produce progeny -- this nonetheless a possibility science is in process of examining.

*

As it is, OUR SPECIES is referred to as Homo Sapiens Sapiens, the "Sapiens" part being derived from the Old French SAPIENT, and which denoted "wise man (or wise Homo in the combined sense of male/female) with further reference to being sentiently sensible.

*

The transliteration of Homo Sapiens Sapiens into plain English is fraught with difficulties. On the surface, it apparently meant HE/SHE Man who is doubly wise.

Literally, perhaps, it means MAN who thinks and knows it, and is therefore able to discriminate and accumulate knowledge by reflecting and cogitating upon the thinking. Various problems arise from this concept.

*

Even if there are transliterating difficulties here, the general gist of them makes OUR SPECIES feel quite good about its corporate self.

*

The general essence of Homo Sapiens Sapiens is true enough, at least in part. But on equally available evidence, our species might also style itself as Homo screwupiensis; Homo estupidogiganticofabuloso (this brings in a dramatic Spanish play); or, perhaps Homo thinkingmachinemagnificus (but susceptible to thinking viruses). We might also think of our species as Homo computererectus, albeit with wiring and hard drive problems.

There is a neo-possibility to restyle OUR SPECIES as Homo

scientificusprogressicus. But doing so which might detach a large number of our species from our species and result in increases of socio-problems -- and which, based on some visible evidence, has already happened.

*

Aside from the wisdom and wise elements originally built into the concept of Homo Sapiens Sapiens, our species is nonetheless determined to be a species only on biological evidence that it is one.

This is convenient in several ways, essentially because our species hasn't really been able to live up to its Sapiens Sapiens connotations. Those connotations, implied to exist, are an embarrassment to those specimens who are sap saps, and so the idea that we are a biological species only comes as relief and refreshment.

*

Thus, as the modern, scientific age progressed, the term OUR SPECIES was exclusively seen in its biological contexts -- IF those contexts also result in the production of progeny.

So today, when we think of OUR SPECIES, we are thinking of our biology -- only, with our Sapiens Sapiens part retired into cultural backgrounds or undergrounds. This is precisely to say that our formerly respected (if idealized) Sapiens Sapiens parts have been relegated to the Fringes of alienated, sapient inquiry.

*

It is quite probable that only about 50 percent of the total combined specimens of our species today has ever heard of the term OUR SPECIES.

Many of those who HAVE heard of our species probably think that it refers only to our biological meat bodies.

It is quite possible that many others who have heard of our species haven't the least idea of what it means -- until they are informed via a horror flick that SPECIES refers to creatures that suck blood and energy from HUMAN BEINGS, sometimes ripping, shredding and

devouring the later in the process.

It may be, however, that many equate OUR SPECIES to HUMAN BEINGS -- but only IF the subhuman elements of the latter are not too gross, visible -- or provable in a court of law, and which has almost nothing to do with conscience.

*

The foregoing has been a very brief, and probably quite inadequate Introductory. More will follow, but I'll temporarily end here with two questions:

1. What IS our species?
2. Is it possible to consider our species not as a genetically random collection of sexually produced biobodies, but as a great and wonderful collective of brains that, hypothetically speaking, form a kind of human neural network -- and which, altogether IS more sapient than any one of the produced progeny? I emphasize my use of "hypothetically."

The possibly foolhardy task of The Species Guild is hypothetically to attempt to extract and discuss indications of our species excellence.

[Ingo Database](#) | [Real Story](#) | [Contributed Papers](#) |
[Contributed RV Papers](#) |
[Superpowers/ET Intel](#) | [RV Honor Roll](#) | [Superpowers](#)
[Art](#)
[Miscellaneous](#) | [Reviews](#) | [Species Guild](#) | [Welcome](#)
| [Home](#)

Copyright © 2003, Ingo Swann. All rights reserved.

THE TOPIC OF THE HUMAN SPECIES GUILD REVISITED SIX YEARS LATER

Ingo Swann (08Aug02)

“No one gossips about other
people’s secret virtues.”
— Bertrand Russell

An essay entitled THE SPECIES GUILD was introduced into this website in June of 1997.

It was designated as an “ATTEMPT to consider and discuss how astonishing, amazing, wonderful, creative, energetic, and visionary species actually is, and to focus on these qualities and attributes ONLY in some positive sense.”

Considering some of the awful content of the past six years, it seems time to take another look at the topic, and to enlarge consideration of it.

Unfortunately, one does not have to go far to encounter the overwhelming accumulation of information, literature, and entertainments that focus on the most dreadful going’s on within our species as a whole.

In stark contrast, references to the amazing nature and superlative virtues of our species have become almost non-existent, most specifically within the conventional mainstreams.

For example, the term WISDOM has almost dropped out of usage altogether, even though IF our species has intelligence it OUGHT to have engineered deliverable and perpetuating wisdom, too.

Reference to wisdom in this website is not out of place, since it constitutes one of the most superlative superpowers of our species, alongside the several others that support and nurture it. Indeed, if

intelligence is not somehow effectively infused with wisdom, one could think that intelligence might not be all that intelligent.

In a superficial sense, WISDOM is ambiguously defined as knowledge accumulated via philosophic or scientific learning. More profoundly, it is defined as “ability to discern inner qualities and relationships” in order “to achieve insight, good sense, good judgment, and wise attitudes and courses of action.”

The foregoing is not so much a complaint as it is a reminder that all individuals of our species are born with innate, hard-wired equipment to have insight, etc.

But it can be stipulated, as many authors have done, that a wide variety of social conditioning software programs can cause insight to remain latent and therefore not too actualizing and functional – the same conditioning programs that largely result in “the unbearable pity for the suffering of mankind.”

To this writer at least, it seems that when there is constant focus and emphasis on the negative aspects of our species, coupled with NO nurturing of our superlative virtues, one can begin to wonder what the long-term outcome of things will be.

Our history bears ample testaments to this. There are many deplorable examples of affairs within which wisdom, etc., was apparently considered as nothing more than an inconvenient nuisance.

REMARKABLE VISITOR FROM EUROPE

A few years ago, an individual of rather remarkable status in Europe came to see me. The purpose of the visit was to discuss certain issues, one of which was why it was so difficult to research and develop those human attributes referred to in this website as superpowers.

We quickly agreed that the world’s conventional power structures and affairs are largely governed not only by control of power, but also via secrecy of various kinds, and that those affairs need elements of secrecy in order to function as they do.

A list of human activities that depend on secrecy is actually quite long. But even a short list shows the magnitude of the role that secrecy plays - for example, in political, governmental, and diplomatic activities, in intelligence and espionage organizations, in

major economic activities, in military and warfare strategies and tactics, and in nefarious activities many of which can outwit discovery of them.

Secrecy can be seen as meaningful - as long as conventional human existence is conceptualized only in the contexts of the short list above.

Indeed, it is quite clear that those contexts are not all rowing the same lifeboat of developing and nurturing human excellence.

Various secrecy activities are, of course, enemies, or at least opponents, to each other. But they all have one concern, or fear, in common: discovery and exposure not only of their activities, but also their goals and motives.

Most formats of secrecy are pursued with at least a relative certainty that they can be set up and remain secure, specifically within conventional contexts.

In this sense, there is a relative trust in knowing what conventional contexts consist of, so that the understood dimensions of these can be factored into designs of conventional secrecy efforts.

Their thrust is to keep things hidden from the perceptions of others - specifically from the conventionally known and thus ordinary perceptions which are understood to be narrow, and therefore easily identified and predicted.

All secrecy efforts have vested interests in keeping modalities of secrecy within the contexts of ordinary perceptions. And so all of them find themselves united when it comes to ANY prospect of non-conventional forms of perception.

If non-conventional forms of perception would become efficient enough, they would be seen as invasive to conventional formats of secrecy. So the solution to this would be to prevent knowledge and development of them altogether.

THREE SCENARIOS THAT MIGHT DEMAND EMERGENCE OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT OF HUMAN SUPERPOWERS

My visitor and I then began discussions of what would have to happen in order to transcend whatever prevents development of human superpowers - including intuition, clairvoyance, and telepathy, each of which is considered as non-conventional, hence invasive of

secrecy and all THAT implies.

We then spent an invigorating morning sorting out three potential scenarios that would not only support research and development of human superpowers, but also demand it.

THE FIRST SCENARIO

The first scenario would consist of discovering that a nation or some other powerful human group has taken a secret, but serious initiative in this kind of research and development.

If something like this did happen, then other nations or powerful human groups would have to respond to it, at least in order to find out the specifics of what was going on and what progress was being made.

An example of the first scenario actually happened during the Cold War era when, much to their utter surprise, American intelligence analysts learned, during the late 1960s, that the Soviet Union had been involved in this kind of research and development since the 1920s.

The intelligence agencies were thus obliged to fund significant research of their own, even though the idea of emergent human superpowers had long been consigned to “giggle factor” status.

This first scenario could not gain permanency, because individual national and power-group activities come and go. Their initiatives would, in time, be covered over within the power machinations of conventional contexts.

THE SECOND SCENARIO

But such would not be the case if the second scenario came about. Let's say our human species encountered another species at least equivalent or greater in intelligence, but which was also equipped with certain developed superpowers – especially that of telepathy. In that nothing like this other species exists on our planet, that species would necessarily have to be ET in origin.

This means that such species would not be confined to the contexts of Earth environments and limits as those are presently understood so far in conventional terms – and that THEY might even have

greater flexibility outside them.

If the second scenario would come about (and there are indications that it has), then some kind of serious human species effort would ultimately have to be mounted, even if only to attempt to obtain a defensive posture to the possibly invasive threat from Out There. A developmental effort of this kind reason would surely disrupt the secrecy elements of our own species conventional power structures on Earth.

A THIRD SCENARIO

A third scenario could come about if, in advancing times, it might be perceived that wheeling and dealing only in conventional power-structure contexts alone are not all that workable with regard to saving, for example, Earth's ecology, or to save the integrity or, in some possible end, even the survival of our species.

There is good evidence that conventional elements and their traditional contexts put their own survival in front of, and often in opposition to, numerous larger whole-Earth issues that ultimately affect everything on Earth.

While a spectrum of those larger issues had little meaning 100 years ago, they are now slowly manifesting in undeniable negative ways. Without some kind of big scale responsiveness, they will have dire consequences – even for conventional elements.

Thus, in recent times efforts have arisen outside of conventional elements to save things such as forests, threatened species, the air, water, and natural resources, etc., and to do so before they are depleted and perhaps irrecoverable.

One context shared by all such efforts is that they represent formative guilds. GUILD is principally defined as “an association of those with kindred pursuits or common interests or aims,” formed especially to save, protect, and preserve, sometimes by any ways and means possible.

A guild for saving, protecting, and preserving that has not yet come into existence is a human species guild. One essential aim of such a guild would be to reassert the higher-order superlative virtues and

superpowers of our species.

Or, if one prefers, to rescue and re-emphasize them from among the massive morass of lower-order activities that focus on our species negative going's on - a focus which is ending up in the depletion of just about everything including human wisdom-making.

There are, of course, confusions about just what human superpowers consist of.

Many human factors that are simply taken for granted are not thought of as superpowers – such as insightful thinking and deduction, intuition that foresees outcomes, problem identification and solving, and that type of clairvoyance (sometimes called “hunches” or “gut-feelings”) that can assess whatever is invisible to the physical senses.

This author even includes thinking itself as a superpower, if only because it can be discriminated from thoughtlessness, especially from big-time thoughtlessness.

And a superlative superpower, almost always ignored as such, is Caring - and which can achieve great positive outcomes and influence. After all, the absence of caring achieves nothing while its presence can often move mountains.

Regarding research and development of human superpowers, a potential human species guild would have to establish at least some kind of focus as to what might save the human species from its lower-order, often abysmal proclivities within which evidence of FUNCTIONAL human superpowers is nil.

A MAJOR UNBEARABLE PITY

In any event, as indicated in the quotation at the head of this essay, human “virtues” (secret or otherwise) are almost so alienated from social awareness that their existences does not even enter into the realm of gossip about them.

This essay was actually triggered by a recent quotation offered up in the syndicated gossip column of Liz Smith, and featured in The New York Post.

"No one gossips about other people's secret virtues." (Bertrand Russell)

Bertrand Russell (1872-1970) was the once-famous British philosopher and social reformer, and whom, in my own experience, had tremendous influence and impact during the 1950's – that post-war decade during which were blueprinted the outlines of many socio-economic scenarios that are still functioning today.

On its surface, the quotation seems simple enough, even somewhat amusing. But it has several significant layers of meaning – one of which is that the blind spot regarding human virtues is so insidious that other people's secret virtues do not even enter the otherwise powerful realms of gossip.

If other people's secret virtues also reflect virtues inherent in our species, then Russell's observation can be seen as deep and trenchant. In other words, the quotation takes on far, far more meaning than the mere eight words used to say it.

In addition to there being no gossip about other people's virtues, no encyclopedias exist that itemize positive and superlative human qualities, just as there are no encyclopedias itemizing human powers. And so no one has any organized source to consult about the real existence of their own superlative qualities and powers.

The absence of such encyclopedias may not at first seem all that meaningful and significant.

But the absence reflects the on-going existence of some kind of subtle and mysterious sociological situation which, itself, is left unexamined in ways that almost everything else otherwise comes under scrutiny.

Indeed, no one gossips about the existence of that mysterious situation, either.

While Bertrand Russell (a once important philosopher and social reformer) has faded into the past (like so many others of now-defunct significance), he indicated in his autobiography (published in three volumes between 1967-69) that: "Three passions, simple but overwhelmingly strong, have governed my life: the longing for love, the search for knowledge, and the unbearable pity for the suffering of mankind."

Well, leaving aside the "longing" (because it is all too familiar, right?), any search for knowledge that does not include attempts to increase

knowledge of the superlative qualities of our species is a somewhat suspect search – for if we do not achieve such knowledge, then what does the search otherwise consist of.

WHAT IS INTELLIGENCE IF IT IS NOT INFUSED WITH KNOWLEDGE OF OUR SPECIES SUPERLATIVE VIRTUES?

In any event, in the absence of the search for knowledge of our species superlative qualities, then the unbearable pity for the suffering of mankind DOES tend to come into view – at least to those who bother to notice it.

It then can be wondered why the unbearable suffering exists in the SAME species that otherwise prides itself on having what is grandly referred to as intelligence.

So we have a prideful intelligent species within which pity ALSO exists for the unbearable suffering of mankind.

A sense of that pity can activate, here and there, what is often defined as “social consciousness,” which is generally thought of as discovering ways and means to alleviate and combat the existence of the unbearable suffering of mankind.

Without any doubt, such social consciousness activities are obviously laudable and important.

But it can be assumed that the unbearable suffering merely consists of symptoms downloading out of much deeper going's on that are not too much attuned to the suffering itself – and in some cases are notably aloof from it.

One reason behind this assumption is that the unbearable suffering of mankind has a very long and still on-going track record.

Another reason could be that human intelligence, as so far defined and perceived, still has something to find out about itself in order to become more fully functional.

Perhaps the desirable terms here might be something along the lines of “superfunctional” or metafunctional, which incorporate the superlative qualities and powers of our species itself.

If that might be the case, then it is appropriate to wonder about what IS incorporated into human intelligence, or, rather, into the uses of human intelligence that are not really consistent with all that much intelligence.

Here one could enter into the well-known litany and dirge of uses of

intelligence that do not really reflect too much of it, but which are made quite visible everywhere, so much so that one doesn't really need an encyclopedia to grasp them.

This litany and dirge apparently consists of almost anything that does not reflect, or even suggest, the existence of the vast reservoir of superlative human qualities that endure throughout our on-going species, even though not much real use is made of them.

THE TRACK RECORD OF THE SUFFERING OF MANKIND

Since ancient times, historians have principally focused on the great changes and shifts that have occurred within the outlines of various social orders. In more modern times, the on-going historical effort has included emphasis on "progress" that has been made within such orders.

In the same modern times, and in keeping with the emergence of various formats of social consciousness, some historians have attempted to document the tremendous suffering that has occurred within and because of the great changes and shifts that seem noteworthy enough to be considered of historical importance.

Except for some statistical downloading, these few efforts have not attracted any large degree of interest.

One probable reason for this is that most of those who have suffered are not among the movers and shakers of those orders – and so they have little historical importance or interest. But even so, many movers and shakers have been brought to their knees, beheaded or hanged, sometimes exterminated, and so they are not automatically excused from the suffering.

Well, conventional power orders are indeed composed of movers and shakers, but their numbers involve certainly not more than 10 percent, and probably less than 5 percent of any given societal population.

Thus, conventional human history is not much more than the history of this smaller fraction of our species, and as such is NOTHING resembling the real history of mankind – because that real history needs to incorporate the magnitudes of the unbearable suffering of the majority born into life.

If we think of our species as having intelligence, the actual historical track record of the suffering of mankind is appalling in the extreme.

In one way or another, it certainly involves more than 50 percent of all those born into human life, many of which have been direct and indirect victims of 5 percent of human history, this including the many who have simply been wasted within the contexts of collateral damage.

THE GOOD – THE BAD – THE UGLY

In respect of all this, it seems to be the case that our species has its ugly underbelly, some parts of which seem to be devoid of intelligence - with the exception of whatever kinds of intelligence or cleverness are needed to propagate them.

And those parts of the underbelly ARE propagated, if for nothing else, via the overwhelming focus on them.

Now, it needs to be pointed up that dealing with the ugly underbelly is considered a high virtue, and so, for example, the fictional superheros Superman, Batman, Spiderman, Wonder Woman, etc., including 007, having possession of some kind of superpowers, inherit this task.

The implications of all this are that the essential and only purpose of the superheros is to deal with elements of the ugly underbelly, and specifically within the terms recognized by those elements.

When this is well done, either in fact or in fiction, it is a joy to behold. But a subtle element of all this is that the superheros seem to have no other function.

And this gives the impression that the ugly elements are always on-going and that one needs to be a superhero to begin with in order to deal with them.

If one reflects on the reasons for the tremendous popularity of the fictional superheros, it could be thought that their successes trigger some kind of latent awareness that reminds of superhero factors in our species.

In any event, the contexts of the superhero fictions do deal with potential human superpowers, and do so in ways that are hardly to be found elsewhere. The fictions can therefore be appreciated for this, since any contextualizing of human superpowers is better than none at all.

There are, of course, numerous jumps that have to be made to get

from fictional contexts to non-fictional ones, i.e., to get into what is usually referred to as “real-life” issues regarding activities within the ugly underbelly.

Characteristics of the ugly activities usually become plain to see in the end. But by the time the activities are seen it is usually too late to do anything about them.

The ugly activities are interesting and fascinating in themselves. But they do come and go, perhaps largely because they come crashing down as ultimate effects of their own internal discord.

The ugly activities therefore do not persist as such, but the human motives behind them seem to be on-going and continuous – and so chapters in the saga of the unbearable pity for the suffering of mankind also continue.

The suffering begins again in each generation, making the platitude that our human species should learn from the history of its past mistakes seem badly out of tune.

And speaking of ABSENT encyclopedias, there are none that list and itemize identifiable human motives, very many of which are repeated time and again, and are therefore identifiable.

One possible reason for the absence of THIS particular kind of encyclopedia is that once motives are identified then too many games are automatically down the tubes – unless they are maintained by social conditioning or by abject force.

So, in that sense, it is better not to have encyclopedias that list the wide spectrum of motives along with their subtle characteristics. Indeed, there are many human motives that cannot fulfill themselves, that cannot really work too well, if they become too visible – visible, say, to their potential and ultimately realized victims.

For reasons not too clear, in conventional terms human motives, and their resulting activities and proclivities, are commonly divided into the good, the bad, and the ugly.

In the sense of this division, our species thus reflects one part positive and two parts negative motives and activities.

The implication of this little calculation is that the one part good can easily be outmaneuvered by the two parts negative.

There is copious evidence easily at hand that something like this is

the on-going case. It is well understood that the two parts negative can, in time and with dedication, disassemble the one part positive, and do so within the contexts of clandestine machiavellian strategies and tactics.

Thus, as it is commonly said, things can change but things remain the same.

THE SUPERLATIVE – THE GOOD - THE BAD – THE UGLY

In any event, it IS quite well understood that our species/mankind is in possession of superlative virtues, i.e., superpowers, against which, if they manifest, do give problems to the two negative parts.

For example, when linked with each other, the two basic superpowers of insightful deduction and caring can easily give pause and concern to the two parts negative.

Indeed, the mix of these two basic superpowers often results in serious commitments that are difficult for the two parts negative to cope with.

It is thus to be wondered why the super-positive superlative part is lopped off from positive-negative line-up of our species.

Which is to say, lopped off, for example, within modernist sociological and psychological contexts and which disciplines otherwise exclusively tend to focus only on what is negative within mankind.

One possible explanation for this is that those two once-powerful disciplines were being responsive only to social orders whose workings cannot permit too much manifesting of superlative human powers, and all that they imply in superpower ways.

LOWER-ORDER AND HIGHER-ORDER MOTIVES AMONG OUR SPECIES

For lack of a better way to express it, one can think in the rather tired and tattered terms of higher- and lower-order motives, but with the proviso that distinguishing between them is often difficult and arcane. For example, many lower-order motives announce themselves as higher-order ones, and all too often continue generally to be perceived as such.

It is tempting to begin a list, as so many have, of lower-order motives. But each reader should attempt this on their own steam, lest it be thought that this author is trying to lead readers into his own reality box.

In any event, it is far more challenging to try to identify at least ten higher-order ones.

This kind of task somewhat depends on what one is using as a reality box, whether one has self-constructed it, or whether it is a socially conditioned one. So guidelines are a little hard to establish.

Generally speaking, however, lower-order motives ultimately lead in the direction of victimization of one kind or another – and/or, when large-scale enough, into the direction of the unbearable pity for the suffering of mankind.

A difficulty that can be encountered in attempting these lists is that one might have to depend on one's intuitive, clairvoyant, and telepathic factors – because utilizing reason and logic alone might not reveal too much with regard to motives that are deliberately hidden.

Other essays in this website have discussed the background of these particular difficulties. But briefly here, hidden motives, especially of the lower-order kind, need to thwart too much emergence of those particular human superpowers, and the reasons for doing so are quite obvious.

If certain human superpowers are perceived as an invasive threat to hidden lower-order motives, higher-order motives are but an occasional nuisance to them.

While there are numerous reasons for this, higher-order motives are, on the one hand, often based in a sense of potential harmony throughout the species that COULD be nurtured as such.

But, on the other hand, many higher-order motives tend to try to unfold within their own reality-box contexts, and thereby make themselves aloof from the prevailing real-time, lower-order activities and the rather sorry intellectualizing of the motives that invigorate them.

Indeed, THIS author has been told by many higher-order activists

that giving attention at all to lower-order motives serves no other purpose than to give energy to them.

Well, lower-order motives have more than enough energy of their own – which is why they do prevail so easily and have evolved many Machiavellian devices whereby they reproduce themselves so easily.

MACHIAVELLIANISM is, of course, “the view that politics [of any lesser or greater kind] is amoral and that any means however unscrupulous can justifiably be used in achieving political power.” As has been pointed up by many investigators and authors, Machiavellian perceptions translate quite easily into all walks of lower-motivational orders in which unscrupulousness is depended upon to play many significant roles.

It is understandable that many higher-order enthusiasts do not themselves wish to evince symptoms of unscrupulousness - which, nevertheless, is explicitly acknowledged as one of the principle sources of the unbearable pity for the suffering of mankind. And so those enthusiasts have not evolved Machiavellian strategies and tactics of their own – which is somewhat to say that they have not become lean, mean, fighting machines with regard to their own goals and visions on behalf of our entire species.

Advocates of lower-order motives of course realize this, for some of them are not entirely bereft of modicums of intelligence.

So the best thinkers among them realize that higher-order enthusiasts will not, in general, become lean, mean, fighting machines.

Rather, as one anti-utopian functionary once told this author via a nice turn of phrasing, they “will strangle themselves with their own platitudes of social consciousness.”

Well, many, or even most, lower-order motives do not have too much social consciousness to begin with. Indeed,, the history of the twentieth century alone has provided some stunning examples of this kind of vacuum.

Another aspect of higher-order motives consists of the pseudo-legendary assumption that human superpowers of the species (such as intuition, clairvoyance, and telepathy) should not be developed because they could be used to support negative goals and ends.

Well, maybe, but maybe not.

One possible reason for the “maybe not” is that modicums of clairvoyance and telepathy put one in closer touch with sensing and feeling the unbearable pity for the suffering of mankind. Many famous psychics this author has fortunately known often complained about this, and begin wondering how to “help.”

Indeed, lower-order enthusiasts seem not to come into too much contact with these kinds of sensing and feeling, and so although the suffering may be “out there” it doesn’t have all that much to do with them.

As Samuel Johnson (1709-84), the English author and leading literary scholar and critic of his time, once observed: “Those who do not feel pain [and suffering] seldom think that it is felt [by others].” One of Johnson’s more famous works was his book entitled LIFE OF SAVAGE (1744). This was a bitter portrait of corruption in London and the many miseries endured because of it.

Sounds somewhat familiar, doesn’t it?

WHAT WE BECOME

In the past, this author read somewhere of the concept that each of us becomes what we do, but only in the light of what we can sense and feel – what we cannot sense or feel does not really exist for us. This is somewhat like saying that if we cannot sense-feel “ripples in the Force,” then we are at distinct disadvantages as to what is impending in it. The “ripples” of course refer to, say, lower-order disharmony injected into the higher-harmonies of the Force.

But one of the meanings of this is that while those who do not feel pain and suffering might not think that others do feel and experience them, the awakening, for example, of the superpowers of vibsensing, empathy, and telepathy, etc., tends to put one more in touch with the unbearable pity for the suffering of mankind.

Indeed, those particular superpowers are among the many that, in a more complete sense, connect us with the larger vista of mankind, our species entire, and perhaps with all species and life forms.

There is in little developed evidence of this in our species so far. And

so it is not too surprising that ET fly-bys fly right on and do not touch down to engage in interchanges. THE HUMAN SPECIES GUILD

[To Be Continued]

[Ingo Database](#) | [Real Story](#) | [Contributed Papers](#) | [Contributed RV Papers](#) |
[Superpowers/ET Intel](#) | [RV Honor Roll](#) | [Superpowers Art](#)
[Miscellaneous](#) | [Reviews](#) | [Species Guild](#) | [Welcome](#) | [Home](#)

Copyright © 2003, Ingo Swann. All rights reserved.

Site by [Tom](#)