

THAT WILL NEVER HAPPEN

“That will never happen,” is a statement made that comes straight out of the mouth of the collective ego, which believes it is God. The collective ego is a false god made out of the shared unconscious and conscious beliefs we have collectively agreed upon. The collective ego is not God, because it does not beat your heart, it does not grow your fingernails, it does not support your life-force energy with the unconditional love of God; in fact, you support it with God’s dime.

A long time ago, there was a group of people from Africa who had been kidnapped and forced into slavery in America. They were treated brutally and regularly sexually assaulted, and viewed by many Southerners as lesser life forms. The weird thing about the collective ego is that if one person performs the crimes of kidnap and assault, and promotes the assertion that some people are not actually human beings—which is clearly psychotic behavior, we all agree that person is a psychopath who needs to go to jail. But, if a large enough group of people perform the same crimes, they are not viewed as crazy, simply because they all agree with each other and validate what they are doing is normal. The people who kidnapped the group of Africans and brought them over to America to be forced into slavery were all psychopaths, all completely crazy as Ted Bundy. They did not have psychiatric medicine back then, they did not have a diagnosis and medication for mental illnesses such as schizophrenia, a condition in which one enters into a delusional fantasy reality, which these kidnapper/rapists may have demonstrated when they failed to recognize members of their own species and instead perceived them as “less than” human.

Racism is not a mental illness, because believing a race of people to be superior is simply a belief; psychiatry is not a system of dogma, it is a system of medicine. There are many people who sincerely believe that one race of people is superior to another, but they refuse to participate in genocide or slavery, and wouldn’t be caught dead kidnapping, raping, or murdering people of the races they looked down upon. Perhaps their failure to hold perpetrators of their own race accountable for these crimes is based on fear of standing up to bullies, and they submitted to avoid negative attention being drawn to themselves. “Better them than me,” is most likely their byline. There have been female humans throughout the course of human history who have demonstrated mental illness with their appetite for damage and destruction towards other adults for nothing more than their emotional satisfaction to see violence take place at any opportunity.

Ted Bundy was executed for his crimes, yet the people who perpetrated slavery in the South were mostly excused, based on the reasoning that if crimes are committed for money then the person who committed them is definitely not criminally insane. The Holocaust was a genocide that was committed largely for economic reasons, as the Jews were robbed before they were mass murdered. Yet despite the economic motivations, this genocide was entirely based on the appetite for destruction, to rob, rape, and murder, and this is not a pattern of behavior that has supported the health and well-being of the human species, as the majority of females don’t like it. The female desire was designed by Mother Nature to complement the male desire and to weed out traits through natural selection.

Is greed truly what we think it is? When in the course of human history has it ever been necessary for the survival of the human race for one tribe to raid, pillage, maraud, rape, kidnap, and murder members of another tribe, when they could have simply joined forces and pooled resources? If survival of the fittest meant a competition over which humans are the best at killing their neighbor and stealing his wife and children, where does the female desire come into play?

In the absence of the bias of a male-dominated society, wouldn't the scientific viewpoint towards survival of the fittest be based on earning the approval of the female human? Have we as women throughout the course of human history been bloodthirsty savages that cheered men on as they raided and marauded neighboring villages for their second wives? Did we say, honey, have fun killing the neighbors, go get me some cheap labor, I'm tired of doing all these chores by myself after my children died of malaria? If it was only labor that was needed, why did the men have to be killed during the raid, why couldn't two tribes have joined forces and shared the workload?

What if the underlying cause of all war was the drive to rape women and men? Would sociologists continue to support the idea that war is natural because it is based on survival of the fittest? What if thousands of years ago a genetic mutation took place that threw off the levels of testosterone or changed how aggression was expressed in male and female humans and these traits were never weeded out because of female humans who lost the option to choose their partners?

Circa 1860, the human race was so backwards in the absence of modern psychology and psychiatric medicine, *and* there was such a polarization between belief systems that if a Southerner married a Northerner, she was likely to be disowned by her family. If you imagine the conversation between some Southerners about how justice for this group of kidnapped people seemed impossible, and when a Southerner visionary dreamed of their freedom, the jaded response was, "That will never happen," you may see a reflection of current bad attitudes towards progress. As it so happened, we had a president uncompromising in his integrity named Abraham Lincoln, who incidentally enough was a Republican, and he made a stand against the Southern property-owners with un-diagnosed mental illness that drove them to perpetrate slavery and ongoing violence. The Abolitionists, who included great thinkers like Henry David Thoreau, refused to agree with the sentiment, "That will never happen," and instead chose to make it happen.

Concepts and language are used to rationalize behaviors that go against the grain of common sense. Freedom to practice religion, cultural traditions, art, customs, heritage, these are all valuable treasures within the human race to be preserved, kept alive, and cherished. Yet the very same patterns within specific cultural traditions such as male and female genital mutilation, a behavior based on pedophilia (appetite for defiling purity, making your mark, and sabotaging future enjoyment of sex) is the same exact driving force within the extinguishing of many indigenous cultural traditions lost to colonialism.

Colonialism and pedophilia are both patterns based on the emotional appetite to conquer, appropriate, and consume the private property of individuals. What is specific to pedophilia is the appetite for maximum destruction to life itself; people sick with pedophilia find permanent damage to health to be highly erotic. What is specific to colonialism is the intolerance of the unknown, the drive to destroy the

mystery, and the energy of dissection of individual human beings as an act of domination, appropriation, and consumption. Mass surveillance is a classic example of colonialism.

Colonialism has never been necessary for the survival of any tribe of humans; it is based on people who have no willingness to engage in diplomacy, negotiation, and cooperation with others because they choose to murder instead. Colonialism is not driven by greed; it is purely an appetite to conquer. You could take a vacation to a foreign land and visit as a guest, or, you could bring an army and kill the current residents and take over. Bad manners, or mental illness? Survival of the fittest between males competing for dominance, or women surviving rape? Where within the survival of the fittest theory did women's desires for non-violence be dismissed as non-existent, and the female human choosing her partner to weed out undesirable traits become unnecessary?

Many of us inherited a legacy that was not of our making, we didn't choose that, we were grumpy about the system we were born into, but we accepted it. We continue to be responsible for the things we accept, even if it wasn't what we wanted. I'm not referring to oppressed people who are victims of kidnapping, I'm referring to the free people who are confused about what their responsibility level is. It can be confusing to know whether or not you are supposed to live your own life and do the best you can, or whether you need to drop everything and treat a crisis of human rights in the U.S. (human trafficking) like it is a 5 alarm emergency. The reason for this confusion is that our direct line of guidance from our spirits to our conscious minds gets interfered with by the collective ego. At the very least, you can voice your highest truth to anyone who will listen, especially your state and federal legislators. If you think your email or phone call to your legislator or city council member won't make a difference, you are wrong!

What if the people in Germany witnessing the Holocaust take place simply shrugged their shoulders and said to themselves, "It's always been this way, it's the state of the human race," instead of opening their homes to save the lives of Jewish people being taken away to concentration camps?

What if the citizens of the U.S. agreed to the brainwash of the collective ego that human trafficking of U.S. citizens in this country was a random crime spree and not systemized domestic terrorism used to control the masses through vicarious trauma?

At what point will people stop clinging to the comforting falsehood that all human trafficking in the U.S. is based on illegal immigrants who come here as refugees to have better lives, and what they survive here while being trafficked isn't any worse than what they were surviving in the country they immigrated from, so it isn't that big deal where the same crimes would be taking place?

If you interviewed both Northerners and Southerners in 1865 and asked any of them if they believed that the descendants of the African-Americans who survived slavery would in the future be attending colleges and universities, sitting next to white folks and drinking out the same water fountains without even thinking twice, some of them might have said, "That will never happen," in a jaded, heartbroken, grumpy, defeated, stubborn tone. But it did happen, because the healing of God's body is inevitable.

The end of patriarchy is nigh. The Empire of Human Trafficking will fall. Commercialized child abuse in the United States has an end date. All citizens have a responsibility to protect those who cannot protect themselves.

What if in the future we lived in a country in which not one infant or child experienced any genital mutilation? What if male genital mutilation (circumcision) was outlawed before the age of consent? What if all cosmetic surgery to children was outlawed before the age of consent?

Public sentiment is everything, and we each have the power to influence the direction of the collective consciousness by voicing our innermost truths about what we will accept and what we will reject. One good example is accepting the practice of perpetrating slavery (human trafficking) as anything other than psychotic behavior. When we as a majority of free people think to ourselves, "Slavery has been around for many thousands of years, it has always been that way, it's just something crappy the human race has to put up with," we are refusing to uphold the standard of humanity. It's like saying, *rabid dogs have always run around terrorizing people, gee I wish there was a better life out there, but it's just one of those lame things you have to put up with*. No, actually, this is the year 2017 and we do not tolerate that kind of barbaric behavior anymore, we stopped marrying cousins waaay back a long time ago, we have evolved, our genes have improved, we don't do stuff like that anymore.

Our tax dollars are allotted to fight crime, and when we have a group of U.S. citizens who have been kidnapped and subjected to multiple sexual assaults (human trafficking in the U.S.), it isn't any less of an emergency than if it was one privileged child who went missing. Because this is happening to a large group of people, it is accurately named as domestic terrorism in the U.S.

It is quite possible that hatred is a chemical being carried around in the human brain, and we attach a story to it that justifies its presence. What I mean is, maybe the hatred is unconditional and people who suffer from this chemical imbalance would find something to hate on no matter what their circumstance or who the people around them were. If people who absolutely hated African-Americans simply for existing were taken away to a desert island and lived thousands of miles away from them, do you really think their hatred would stop, or would they find someone or something else different from them to hate, such as others in their group? Maybe they would hate on children instead, or a species of plant on the desert island that just annoyed the living daylights out of them because they didn't like how the fronds on the fern were shaped.

What if hatred towards a particular race of people had everything to do with a chemical imbalance in the brain that prevented them from being able to be comfortable co-existing with people who visually appeared different than them? What if racism was based entirely on the relationship to empathy and visual recognition? What if people who were racist were suffering from a disability in which they lacked the ability to empathize with others who visually appeared different from them?

If I was going to conduct a scientific research project on racism, it would go like this: gather a bunch of self-proclaimed racists of several different ethnicities, add non-racists to the control group, and perform brain scans on all them to measure their brain patterns as they view photographs of people of many different races. Afterwards, conduct an interview in which the subjects volunteer their feelings about

the people in the photographs based on race. After this stage is completed, gain the DNA ancestry information of the subjects, and discover if there is any correlation between prejudice, discrimination, or racism towards certain races of people and the invading tribes of people that may have conquered their ancestors thousands of years ago or ran them off their land. What if when a person looked upon another person of a specific race and perceived them as racially inferior, it was actually based on a genetic discrimination from the memories of their ancestors of that race of people conquering them and taking their land? It is not uncommon to have a superiority complex towards people who have stolen from you.