

THE HUMANIST COLLECTIVE:

alexis dolgorukii © 1998

What is the "Humanist Collective"? Is there really such a thing? Oh yes, there most certainly is, but it is the definition of what it is that presents some problems.

The Humanist Collective is an extremely informal and loosely inter-connected, almost totally unorganized collection of men and women, in relatively equal proportions, sometimes more of the one, sometimes more of the other. This amorphous association dates back, as far as we can tell, at least to the third millennium prior to the common era. It has no hierarchy, nor can it have one. Hierarchy is dichotomous with the goal of the collective.

The men and women who comprise this "collective" have one very broadly stated common goal, that goal is: to make this world a better and more amicable place for all people, indeed for all sentient beings, to live in.

What this means is to provide ever more opportunity for freedom of action and movement, and ever more open options and choices. So, what must be accomplished is the removal of all barriers to such freedoms. This means that the primary work of the "collective" has been the gradual lessening of oppression of all kinds. The sources and causes of oppression and hostility have got to be extirpated. The "work" has been "in progress for five thousand years, but I do believe there is beginning to be "light at the end of the tunnel".

The Humanist Collective is not connected or associated with any government or form of government; nor is it connected or associated with any religion or form of religion. Its goal is the provision of equality of opportunity and the end of oppression, how then could it be connected with either government or religion which are the primary sources of oppression and the denial of opportunity?

The Humanist Collective is an entirely (or almost so) inchoate collective of consciousnesses. "Incarnate" (physical), "excarinate"(formerly physical), and "discarnate" (never physical) consciousnesses. Are there "qualifications for membership"? Well, yes and no. Among the discarnate, of course not. Among the incarnate and excarnate? Well there is a genetic component, some of which has to do with intelligence and talent, but I think there's more to it than that. But what is important is that these individuals are born with an undeniable urge to make the world a better place. A NEED to make the world a better place, and in acting upon that urge, in trying to meet that need, they insensibly become a part of the collective.

Within the collective there are many roles to play. For the most part incarnate members serve primarily as "iconoclastic catalysts" which means that they

challenge the "status quo", they demand that "authority be questioned", and they demand that people examine themselves and their motivations. However, an almost equal number, some of them identical to the foregoing, serve to either add to, or preserve, the knowledge and understanding of science, of medicine, of society itself. But in all truth, they work in every conceivable area of human endeavor and interest, for the improvement of the human milieu requires all sorts of input. They all of them, each man or woman in their unique and individual fashion assist in the creation of significant and substantive change.

The incarnate "do what they do" and that seems to be the provision of balance and guidance and inspiration. They are the companions and allies of all that is incarnate. That they exist is something of which I am absolutely certain, experientially certain. The totality of their functions, the extent of their activities? I have no idea. And I am absolutely certain that no one else does either.

The Humanist Collective is NOT something one can "aspire to join"; in fact it is not a thing that someone "joins". One either is a member or one is not. What makes it even more fascinating is that by far the greater majority of the membership are totally unaware that they "belong" to the collective, though they learn of it almost immediately upon becoming incarnate. This means that no individual can "decide" to join or "apply to join" for to whom would they apply? Nor can anyone be "invited" to join for there is no one with the authority to do so, in fact in the collective there is no one with any "authority" at all! Membership in the collective is a thing that a person BECOMES in the course of a life that is, consciously or not, devoted to the goals of the collective. There is absolutely no ATTAINMENT involved as attainment is simply a function of the individual ego.

The next thing I want to discuss is what "The Humanist Collective" is **NOT!!**

It is not "The Illuminati" , nor is it "The Rosicrucians", nor is it "The Masters of the Wisdom" or "The Great White Brotherhood" (notice the intrinsic sexism of those last two), but it is the reality that gave rise to those "fairy tales". Those "fairy Tales" by the way, are almost totally harmful to human development. This is so because their totally authoritarian and hierarchical nature is oppressive. It is also a tissue of falsehoods and that is always harmful. The individuals who compose the collective are not wonder working magicians and authority figures, they are far more likely to be self-effacing, almost faceless "toilers in the vineyards", and while they may individually do wonderful things, and indeed some of them become world-famous and attain to positions of power and influence, that is always because of what they do and not who they are. One of their more important functions, in fact it is perhaps their most important function; is that they gladly share, and that entirely freely, with what they have learned with anyone who wishes to learn too.

This is the first, and introductory essay in what is going to be a developing series on the subject.