

Ideology Resonance 20170406

It's April 6th, 2017, about 10:30 in the morning. I'm making this recording based on a conversation that I had recently, and during the conversation, the individual that I was speaking with was expressing concerns of fear about a threat, a perceived threat, and during the conversation I made a statement. I don't remember the exact words, but it was something along the lines of, any time that people are, any time that people act in fear, I think more so it was along the lines of, any time, it seems to me in my observation, that any time people are herded by fear, the outcomes are always a detriment. In other words, when people are herded by fear, there's always horrific results, and it was just a passing comment during the conversation, but later I returned to it, and I started thinking about it in terms of, and this is going to be kind of bumpy, because I haven't really quite figured out how to approach it, or even how to model, you know, how to structure a model of it, but I just want to grab some basic notes so the concept doesn't escape me, but I guess I kind of started thinking about it kind of like a resonant cavity. It's like when someone hears something and it resonates with them. In other words, I think that is related to the phrase, the ring of truth. In other words, upon hearing the statement, I could say the incantation, upon the casting of the spell, it resonates with them and they're moved to, what's the word I'm looking for? That it's credible. That there's a ring of truth in it. So anyway, what, and again, that resonant cavity, I'm not, I can't quite, you know, I'm not quite to the point where I can easily envision how that resonant cavity, you know, the existence of it, the presence of it. So, but what I'm leading to is, so if we have two, if we have two collectives and each of the two collectives fear the other, of course, for me that is sort of a, it's sort of a form of what I think I would term intolerance. You know, I find that people tend to fear what they don't understand. So through whatever, for whatever reason or rationale, someone doesn't, or let's say someone or a group of individuals or a collective, if they're intolerant of another individual or group or collective, there's this, to me it's like a resonant cavity of fear, meaning resonance, resonance, the intensity of resonance increases with slight amounts of excitation to the cavity. So if we allow the resonant cavity to be fear, then every time someone in one collective or another feels fear, it adds to the collective resonance and therefore intensity of the resonant cavity. So basically fear grows and intensifies. And of course at some point, I think that comes down to the human response mechanism of fight or flight. In other words, what I'm saying is, if that fear intensifies

enough, there's either going to be a flight, meaning they will withdraw and put more distance between themselves and what they fear, or they will fight, they will engage to do harm, to destroy what they fear. So I was sort of playing this through my mind, because in the conversation that I had with this individual, I realized that there are the puppet masters is one way I say it. There are herders and there are herds. So the herd, the thundering herd, sometimes the masses, I refer to, it's the Perdido Law, I can't remember the name of the law now, but it's the 80-20 rule. And it's something that was observed in nature and in society, which of course it could be argued that that's actually part of nature also. But in my case, the way I was looking at it, I think one of the first observations made by the person who first observed it and quantified it, meaning they recorded it, was that 80% of the land, I believe it was in France, but I'm not sure of the country, but 80% of the land was owned by 20% of the population of the citizens of that country. I started to think that 80% of the course of thought and therefore the course of events, is determined or influenced, I guess I should say guided by, 20% of the participants. That's kind of how I started thinking about it. So whether you take a small group or the whole of humanity, 80% of the participants are primarily, in my view of this, would be considered primarily passive. In other words, with the whole human instinct of safety in numbers, they don't want to stand out. So where the herd turns in their course of thought and therefore their contribution to the course of events, those who are inclusive in the herd mindset, or the hive mind is another way I've sort of thought of it, they turn with the herd. But then, lying outside the herd, there's those who are guiding the course of the herd, and that's what I termed the herders. And the way I kind of came to view that in my own model was there's the avatar nature and the troll nature. These are the basis of human conflict, different visions and different values. So if it is 20% that are the herders or puppet masters of the herd, and therefore the course of thought and the course of events, it's not necessarily the case, because these are all approximations, I guess is the way that I would term it specifically. But I've even kind of, in a slang way, kind of referred to it as fuzzy logic. But there's no reason to think or believe that that 20%, again, the 80-20 is an approximation, but there's no reason to believe that that 20% is split evenly between the avatar nature or the troll nature. It's just that they both exist, and they each have their own vision, their own values that they're embodying. And this is their guiding principles in the course of thought and the course of events that they contribute to and is made manifest. So with that said, I'm just going to take – again, I try not to speak in specifics of current events because I know that when you do that,

when one does that in any discipline, you're sort of – I don't know how to say it. You're sort of attaching, you're sort of anchoring that concept, that information in the present. And I know there's a continuum, and so these are what I refer to as enduring and endearing principles and practices. So I try not to anchor them in the here and now because I know that the existence of these enduring and endearing principles and practices aren't anchored. They are always prevalent, and they always prevail. However, for the purposes of this illustration, for the purposes of an example of what I'm referring to, is right now, in 2017, there is a claim by individuals whose discipline it is to track belief systems. That can be political, religious, economic. There are many, many different types of belief systems, but they all come down to the guiding principles, the vision and values that these individuals share. I've referred to these as teams and tribes, and I can get into that later. But statistically, I've heard in different current event newscasting commentary that our country, the United States of America, is divided in an approximate 51% versus 49%. So if I accept that as a close approximation of what is true, of course it's constantly in flux. Then there's a competing vision and competing values of these two opposing views, two opposing, what's the word I'm looking for? Well, I'm not going to say opposing. I'm going to say competing systems, competing visions, and that's really what it comes down to. It's really competing visions. So with that said, I don't know that it's as simple as one is more influenced by the avatar nature and the other is more influenced by the troll nature. I would like to think it was that simple, but given the complexity of the dynamics of human beings and their beliefs and what they will make a stand for, I don't know that it's quite that simple. But again, the thing that concerns me, I think, this kind of reminds me of the yin-yang. I believe that the competition between these visions is healthy. I think because, as I've stated many times before, to me the magic is in that delicate balance. My limited understanding of that delicate balance, I think it's quite possible that the delicate balance is not something that is established and maintained. I don't know. I would think that could be possibly a very magical state for us to exist in, but I think more likely it's sort of like the pendulum that swings back and forth. Everything's in flux, and so that center may not be a fixed point. It may itself be somewhat varying, and then so the pendulum, in order to try to adjust to that center, is constantly swinging back and forth, trying to approach center, even though center, that balance, is constantly in flux and varying, that adjustment, those course corrections, are constantly taking place. So in the yin-yang balance of harmony, I believe the competition is healthy, but I think the thing that I've

come to somewhat understand is it can be healthy as long as that resonant cavity, as long as that hollowed-out manifestation, as long as that hollowed-out void of fear doesn't grow. Recognizing the value of the competition and recognizing the value of opponent would not lead one collective of the competing visions to wish to destroy the other. It would lead to, again, to competition, and honestly, it can be very entertaining workplay, and that's kind of what I'm really driving at in the end for all of us. So again, I think it's just a matter of recognizing that these are competing ideas. I think one of the words that came up during the conversation that kind of got us on this track was ideologies. These are competing ideologies, and competition, I think competition is good. It allows the questioning of one idea, one vision, or one set of values. It allows a questioning and a comparison with other ideas or visions or systems of values. And so now with all that said, falling back on what I just, you know, just in the heat of the conversation, I made that statement. It makes me understand why, it makes me understand where that welled up from, because we shouldn't always be acting in fear with destructive intent. In fact, somewhere in my notes, I wrote that if we're to survive, our inclination to be destructive, to act destructively, must diminish as our capacity to destroy increases. And that's, you know, this is constantly evolving and our capacity to destroy is evolving and increasing as we evolve as a species and as we become more and more technological. And the destruction isn't just by, you know, war and the cost of human lives and the resources that are expended during conflict, especially armed conflict. But this destruction is also to our environment and to our, I was going to say spirit, but to our humanity, to the exaltation of our conscious presence, of our consciousness. This is, to me, this is the highest cost that there is. So, anyway, I think that pretty much captures what I was trying to approach. It's understanding how this void, how this vacuum of fear can become established and how easily it can grow once it has created, once it's been created, once it has a presence. And I see, you know, when I read, when I listen to the news, there's so many active agents that are feeding into the excitation of that fear, into the resonant cavity of that fear. Some people call them fear mongers. I've referred to them that way a few times myself. And what it comes down to is these are herding castings. These are casting of spells to cause a course correction in the herd that that particular herder is influencing. And, you know, it can be to the benefit or to the detriment of humanity. And that is both a blessing and a curse. It's, you know, it's just like any instrument. It's like any knowledge. It can be used for benefit or for detriment. So it's exciting and it's of concern. I think that's where wisdom comes in, you know, about acting prudently,

acting with wisdom. Understanding the potential impact and potential costs. Now, I know, I'm sure some would not care, but I do. And I think that's really what it comes down to, that if a person cares, if they're caring. You know, it's kind of like I said, enduring and endearing principles and practices. If they're caring, I think it's endearing to us. It moves us in their direction. And I hope of all the beacons that there might be, that's probably the one that is our greatest hope as a species of surviving, of being able to sustain the human condition. And, you know, again, it's a sustainability versus extinction. And I look at this, you know, as a playground for the children, an amusement park. And what it really comes down to is, are we going to keep this amusement park open? Is it going to be a place that people can choose to come? This existence, this state of human affairs, of humanity, the age of man, is this amusement park going to remain open? That's really what it comes down to, at least from my perspective, my view. Well, that's all for now. Signing off.