

Global Nonkilling Working Papers
ISSN 2077-141X (Print); ISSN 2077-1428 (Online)

**The Mark of Cain:
A Depth Psychology Commentary
on the Nonkilling Paradigm**

By Ramon Lopez-Reyes, Lt.Col. (ret.)

5 • 2013



Center *for* Global **Nonkilling**

Global Nonkilling Working Papers
ISSN 2077-141X (Print); ISSN 2077-1428 (Online)

Edited by Joám Evans Pim

Nonkilling Research Committees (partial list)

Douglas P. Fry (Anthropology) <i>Abo Akademi University</i>	Noam Chomsky (Linguistics) <i>Massachusetts Institute of Technology</i>
Olivier Urbain (Arts) <i>Toda Institute</i>	Ubiratan D'Ambrosio (Mathematics) <i>State University of Campinas</i>
Johan Galtung (Economics) <i>TRANSCEND Peace University</i>	Jake Lynch (Media Studies) <i>University of Sydney</i>
George Psacharopoulos (Education) <i>University of Athens</i>	James W. Prescott (Neuroscience) <i>Institute of Humanistic Science</i>
Caroline Baillie (Engineering) <i>Queens University</i>	Jan Narveson (Philosophy) <i>University of Waterloo</i>
James A. Dator (Futures Studies) <i>University of Hawai'i</i>	William V. Smirnov (Political Science) <i>Russian Academy of Sciences</i>
James Tyner (Geography) <i>Kent State University</i>	Daniel J. Christie (Psychology) <i>Ohio State University</i>
James A. Mercy (Health) <i>Centers for Disease Control</i>	Burton M. Sapin (Security) <i>George Washington University</i>
Jacques Semelin (History) <i>CERI-CNRS</i>	Kathryn Feltey (Sociology) <i>University of Akron</i>
Richard A. Falk (Law) <i>Princeton University</i>	Daniel Smith-Christopher (Spiritual Traditions) <i>Loyola Marymount University</i>



You are free to share, copy, distribute and transmit this work*

Under the following conditions:

- ⓐ **Attribution.** You must attribute this work in the manner specified by the author/licensor (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work).
- ⓑ **Noncommercial.** You may not use this work for commercial purposes.
- ⓒ **No Derivative Works.** You may not alter, transform or build upon this work.

* For any reuse or distribution, you must make clear to others the license terms of this work.

* Any of the above conditions can be waived if you gain permission from the copyright holders.

Nothing in this license impairs or restricts the Authors' moral and legal rights.

© The Authors, 2013
© Center for Global Nonkilling, 2013 (for this edition)

Disclaimer: Views expressed are those of the authors, and do not necessarily reflect those of CGNK.



Center for Global Nonkilling

3653 Tantalus Drive
Honolulu, Hawai'i 96822-5033
United States of America
Email: info@nonkilling.org
<http://www.nonkilling.org>

The Mark of Cain: A Depth Psychology Commentary on the Nonkilling Paradigm

Ramon Lopez-Reyes, Lt.Col. (ret.)
Center for Global Nonkilling

Summary

The nonkilling paradigm has been in the making at least as far back as the Book of Exodus in the Holy Bible when Yahweh commanded of his chosen people, "Thou Shalt Not Kill." Regrettably it seems that not much progress has been made toward a Nonkilling Paradigm. In fact, events in the Twenty First Century suggest that killing has not abated but perhaps may be more rampant. Modern weaponry can now produce huge mass killings as was the case in Hi-roshima when a single atomic bomb fell on that city. And compared to that bomb, the current nuclear arsenal is many times more killing. The nightmare of humanity destroying itself with a nuclear winter has become a possibility.

Introduction

The nonkilling paradigm has been in the making at least as far back as the Book of Exodus in the *Holy Bible* when Yahweh commanded of his chosen people, "Thou Shalt Not Kill." Regrettably it seems that not much progress has been made toward a Nonkilling Paradigm. In fact, events in the Twenty First Century suggest that killing has not abated but perhaps may be more rampant. Modern weaponry can now produce huge mass killings as was the case in Hiroshima when a single atomic bomb fell on that city. And compared to that bomb, the current nuclear arsenal is many times more killing. The nightmare of humanity destroying itself with a nuclear winter has become a possibility.

The Mark of Cain

This commentary sketches the author's more than fifty years of exploring the issues of peace and war. The commentary flows from the author's experience both as a depth psychologist and professional soldier who served in war. In war the reality of killing is clear and accepted as appropriate behavior. Humans have killed humans to protect themselves from threats. Humans have killed animals for nourishment. Humans have killed sentient beings because they may be irritants. But there also are killings that are not acceptable whether of human, animal or other sentient being. Notwithstanding the amount of killing that occurs, humans live mostly a nonkilling existence and most desire to end the killing at least of other humans. This then is the rub: a propensity to kill in certain circumstances but a desire to end the killing.

The commentary begins with an examination of the Western roots of killing, that is, in Cain's killing of Abel, and ends with recommendations for realizing the Nonkilling Paradigm. Some of the recommendations may well seem utopian as does the notion of a Nonkilling Paradigm. The idea of nonkilling is not utopian; today it just makes good common sense. Since *Homo Sapiens*, as a species, is disposed not to kill members of the species, what is needed are certain developments, some of which are already in the making, to take hold in order for a Nonkilling Society to emerge. The threat of weapons of mass destruction has added pressure to stop the killing, and thus renders utopian thinking less utopian and much needed.

On Killing: An Imprinted Pattern of Behavior in Humans

Although killing has been part of human behavior for a very long period of time, there are no instinctual prime directives that direct humans to kill. In this sense, it is possible to believe that killing can cease to be part of the human lexicon. Needless to say, ending the practice of killing will not be rapid since it is sufficiently ingrained in the pattern of behavior. The killing of fellow humans is goes back to the early foundation of Western culture. A killing of a human by a human appears in the first book of the *Holy Bible (Book of Genesis)*, namely, Cain's murder of his brother Abel.

It is striking that the very first human conceived after expulsion from the Garden of Eden is a killer. This story of the "first" killing is very instructive. To the Lord's inquiry as to

where his brother was, Cain replied "I do not know. Am I my brother's keeper?" We deduce from the biblical story that Cain killed Abel because Cain was angry that the Lord (Father Deity) favored Abel's offering rather than Cain's who was the older brother. It is said that the Lord "did not respect" Cain's offering of the land (fruit) but the Lord 'respected' Abel's offering of "the firstlings of his flock and of their fat." Cain's shame was wrapped in rage and he killed the younger brother. The writers of *Genesis* do not hold the Lord in any manner responsible for inciting such rage in Cain.

It is possible to say today that modern fathers know that accepting one son's offering and rejecting the other son's offering will inflame sibling rivalry. The modern father would be conscious of the consequences of his behavior. We can further inquire why the Lord rejects fruit of the land and accepts a firstling of the flock? Did the Lord reveal a bias by favoring a pastoral offering (Israelites being pastoral) and not an agricultural offering (early inhabitants of the Promised Land being agriculturalists and probably devoted to the Goddess Ashtare, also depicted as Whore of Babylon)? But no matter how good or bad the Lord (Father Deity) behaved, Cain is ultimately held responsible for his killing of Abel. (In passing it can be said that Yahweh's curse of Cain further links Cain with an agrarian community. Yahweh called out, "When you till the ground, it shall no longer yield its strength to you." In short, Yahweh is also cursing the matrifacial agrarian society that populated Israel before the Israelites arrived.)

Cain's reply, "Am I my brother's keeper, is instructive and suggests a way to a Nonkilling Paradigm: be thy sister and brother's keeper. Be keeper of their lives! Were he keeper of his brother's life, there is a good possibility that he would not have killed Abel. And by keeper it is not meant to imply owner or master, but responsible guardian. In short, the story of the first killing reveals that humans, caught in deep emotions, can kill the other but might be less inclined were they more concerned about the other.

Cain's murder is all the more shocking because it is fratricide. There is an innate sense that one should be protective (keeper) of family (tribe) members' welfare. Family and tribe members support and mostly do not threaten. They generally support. Outsiders however, are unknown and therefore can easily be perceived as a threat. And what threatens, whether

The Mark of Cain

human or animal, can be killed. Once the potential threat is categorized "enemy" he can be killed.

Later, in Chapter 4 of *Genesis*, Lamech, son of Cain, admits that "I have killed a man for wounding me." Lamech claims that a young man hurt him. Lamech calls out for the same protection from revenge that was given to his father, Cain: "If Cain shall be avenged sevenfold [on anyone who would harm Cain], then Lamech seventy-sevenfold." The cause for Lamech's killing is different from that of Cain's. Lamech claims that his act was just and therefore any harm done to him would be seventyfold more avenged than what would be avenged on his father whose killing deed was not considered just. Here is laid out the basis for "just killing" (just war): the right to kill in self-defense. Regardless of what this age-old claim may suggest, there is no imperative that programs humans, after being hurt (attacked), to counter by killing. There is, however, a bio-chemical reaction that activates a fight response. There also is a "killing" biological system that works autonomously in human, namely, the immune system.

When the body is "attacked" by bacteria, the immune system mobilizes its biological forces to counter the assault. The counterattack is not concerned with taking "prisoners" but in defeating the invader. While this process occurs under a biological imperative such is not the situation with human psychological behavior which is mostly guided by the ego. The ego is not automatically programmed to counterattack when assaulted physically or psychologically, although a fight response is possible. In recent time, this fight response has manifested itself in a nonviolent manner.

How ingrained killing is in humans can be deduced from Chapter 6 in *Genesis*: "Then the Lord saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every intent of the thoughts of the heart was only evil continually. And the Lord was sorry that He had made man on the earth, and He was grieved in His heart. So the Lord said. I will destroy [kill] man whom I have created from the face of the earth, both man and beast, creeping thing and birds of the air, for I am sorry that I have made them." It may be argued that the Lord reacts as Cain and Lamech; his "emotions" incite his wrath.

One can question why the beasts, creeping things and birds have to suffer destruction although they did no evil. But in an anthropocentric world, other sentient life has little value.

It can be killed without any feeling of wrongdoing. For example, Abel did not obtain permission from the firstling of the flock for it to be sacrificed (killed) to the Lord. Able just acted unilaterally with impunity.

Later in Exodus, the Lord passes on to Moses certain morals which he desires the Israelites to follow. But if these morals are not followed he threatened: "My wrath will become hot, and I will kill you with the sword; your wives shall be widows and your children fatherless." The wrathfulness and vengeance of Yahweh is pronounced. In Numbers, Yahweh tells Moses: "Take vengeance for the children of Israel on the Midianites.... So Moses spoke to the peoples saying, Arm some of yourselves for the war, and let them go against the Midianites to take vengeance for the Lord on Midian.... Now therefore, kill every male among the little ones, and kill every woman who has known a man intimately. But keep alive for yourselves all the young girls who have never known a man intimately."

But if Cain's killing is wrong how then can the killing of Midianites be good? Such a question is not asked. It is repressed. Meanwhile if there is any taint from killing Midianites, it is removed by rites of purification, as were done by Moses' soldiers. In contrast to the killing of Midianites, Cain's killing was wrong because it was done against a fellow tribesman. For this killing there is no purification. Rather Cain is marked forever as killer. But killing Midianites was acceptable because they were an "enemy" and not members of the tribe. Here then is the psychology behind the commandment,

Thou Shalt Not Kill

In the development of society, it became critical to prohibit the killing of family/tribal members (likes those committed by Cain and Lamech). If society has achieved a modicum of restraint on intra-family/tribal killing, much less has been achieved to stop non-family/tribal killing. Today killing a nonmember of the tribe goes mostly unpunishable. In brief, one cannot kill a member of the tribe, but one can kill another from a different tribe, particularly an enemy tribe. Such analysis suggests that Lord Yahweh is a Tribal Deity. This conceptualization leads to the conclusion that nonkilling will be more likely when all humanity identifies with a Global Tribe and the Deity is perceived as Global if not Cosmic rather than partisan to one tribe.

The Mark of Cain

In its early days, *Homo sapiens* slowly expanded to the planet's four corners as the population steadily increased. Once humanity was settled throughout the globe, the population started to implode approximately five thousand years ago. As humans populated the planet they developed different bodily characteristics, languages, religions and cultures which served as the basis for personal identity. The patterns of identify were slowly enlarged. First identity may have rested on the clan, subsequently on the tribe and more recently on the nation.

As the enlarged global population started to implode, the differences that had emerged incited tensions among peoples as they came upon each other. A case in hand, were the Israelites, a pastoral tribe, that came upon a more sedentary agrarian people. The differences allowed each side to view the other as not-one-of-us, a stranger and even an enemy. It cannot be said that all meetings were bellicose, some may have led to cooperation between the parties. But when friction arose the differences between the contending parties tended to harden. Over millenniums of conflicts and varied conquests, the patterns of identity grew. Larger segments of population assumed similar patterns of identity. It is conjectured that this sequence of enlargement will continue as the imploding process gives way to the convergence of the specie under one planetary pattern of identity. And once such a global pattern comes into being, humans will be able to view the other as member of the same "tribe," and there for under the jurisdiction of the commandment "Thou Shalt Not Kill." It is likely that smaller patterns of identity, such as those based on language and religion, will continue along side the larger global identity.

Although from a biological-evolutionary point of view, the species itself rather than the individual is the important agent. Yet it is the individual's DNA that is the prime bio-evolutionary substance. Mammals, in general, tend not to kill members of the same species. There are notable exceptions for example, a male lion killing cubs that it did not sire; chimps killing other chimps that cross into the former's territory. Killing members of the same species makes little sense evolutionary. The human operates between advancing his own survival and that of the collective's. The individual is laden with responsibility both biological and psychological not only to insure its own survival but also that of its progeny. It is here that killing finds a chink in the common sense proposition that killing members of the same

species is counterproductive: "mine above the others." This means a struggle between advancing one's DNA over another's DNA. Thus the newly arrived male lion kills existing cubs so that the cubs that it sires will receive the mother's full attention and have less rivals to compete against. In brief, such killing gives the new born cubs a better chance to survive.

This initial exploration of killing suggests that humanity has come to accept killing behaviors in certain circumstances. Killing is accepted in *just defense* (Lamech killing youth who wounded him). Killing is accepted as *punishment* for harmful and disobedient behaviors (Yahweh destroys humanity for disobedience and wrongful behaviors). Killing is acceptable to *obtain what is needed* to assure survival (Joshua killing the Midianites in order to possess the Promised Land). But killing is not accepted when it is perpetrated on a member of the same tribe (Cain killing Abel).

Suicide and Altruism

Society, in general excoriates self-killing or suicide. Evolutionary speaking, it makes little sense for a life force to be born and then intentionally self-destroyed. It is in the preservation of life that humans come closest to be bound by an instinctive directive. At all costs, life is to be preserved. Such is the underlying motive for condemning abortions. However in certain cultures, suicide is seen as an honorable reaction to shame or dishonor.

Camus viewed suicide as the "one true central philosophical issue." Perhaps only those who have approached suicide seriously may understand Camus' thesis. Suicide is a statement that life either has no meaning or lost its meaning. Rejecting suicide is implicitly a pro-life statement.

And those who brought themselves to the edge between pro-death and pro-life forced upon themselves a decision whether life has value and meaning.

In contract to suicide that is a statement that life has no value, the altruistic sacrificing of life for the preservation of another life is a special case of suicide. Contrary to how suicide is generally viewed, altruistic suicide is accepted and even idealized. In a manner of speaking, altruistic suicide is all about being keeper of a brother's life. Altruistic suicide holds that the other's life is more important. The expansion of altruism, therefore, may be the way towards realizing the Nonkilling Paradigm;

The Mark of Cain

toward resolving Cain's reply, that is, toward being a keeper of a brother's life. But altruistic suicide still involves the killing of one's own life. Should suicide bombers of the Middle East fall in the category of altruistic killing or are these suicide bombers more a weapon system than altruistic behavior?

The death of Jesus Christ may be viewed as an altruistic sacrifice of life. But it is puzzling in that it can be viewed as murder. The perplexing issue is the bifurcation of the Godhead between Father who orders the sacrificial death (to save humanity from its sins) and Christ, the son, who comes to accept the death imposed upon him. Perhaps this bifurcation is part of the inner turmoil that takes place with altruistic suicides (those not of spontaneous reaction). As the story unfolds Christ's death becomes a killing with responsibility for it placed on the Jewish hierarchy (the Romans washed their hands of responsibility). Where Cain is not his brother's keeper, Christ, in acquiescing to his death, becomes, metaphorically speaking, his brother's keeper (assuring eternal life to his brother). Indeed it may take a godly deed to take up being keeper of a brother's life.

If there is to be an exception to killing in a Nonkilling Society, perhaps the altruistic giving of life to save another's would be that exception. For above all, altruistic suicide is about being protector if not keeper of life. Perceived in this frame of reference, the way to a Nonkilling Society is through the encouragement of altruism. Theoretically, altruistic self-killing serves both death and life at same time but its principal intension is pro-life.

Altruism is not necessarily a product of higher psychological or spiritual development. It is more an attitude that comes when strong communal ties exist as for example, among combat buddies in the same unit and among family members. Altruistic suicide requires great courage. It is no easy matter to surrender a life force that is still vibrant and growing. Interestingly altruism often comes to the fore in the maddening world of war. Here in the wreckage of the death force, altruism demonstrates life's superiority by making life the primary issue and death a secondary one. The question which begs more study, is how to expand altruism among humans.

Raising Human Consciousness on Killing

Humanity has not progressed much since Cain killed Abel. Humans are prone to give into their rage, anger or call for vengeance. The danger of killing is heightened among males given their greater strength. At the same time not all humans kill other humans although the vast majority could be incited to kill in defense of self, family member, or in support of a cause against a "vicious ruthless evil" enemy. If a nonkilling society is ever to emerge then humanity must raise its level of consciousness and expand its sensitivity if not compassion for life itself. The way out from being duped into killing is to develop strong and mature egos which enable individuals to arrive at their own conclusions. Such ego strength and maturity can be achieved psychologically (particularly through the analysis of the psyche) or spiritually (particularly through meditative practices), or philosophically (by subscribing to an ethical code). Without raising consciousness sufficiently and without self-knowing, individuals remain with narrow or one-sided reasoning.

There are legions who believe that fear, incited by painful consequences, is the best way to curb killings such as Cain's. But fear is not foolproof, when rage dominates fear is less of a restraining factor. Moreover, killing the killer does not address the essential issue of the Nonkilling Paradigm. Killing the killer perpetuates the killing behavior.

Given its wide acceptance, the last sort of killing that may gain disapprobation is killing in self-defense. The belief in the righteousness of self-defense has not altered much since the days of Lamech. But Mahatma Gandhi and later Martin Luther King Jr. advanced the doctrinal practice of a nonviolent fight response. When seen at its roots, nonviolent fight takes more courage than a violent fight response. In a nonviolent fight situation, the unarmed participant is likely to be harmed physically. Gandhi rallied the people of India to topple the British regime through a nonviolent fight campaign. But the righteousness of opposing oppression violently will not give way easily. The United States of America was born from violent action against oppressive British rule. The modern Chinese, Russian, and Mexican States came about through violent revolutions where millions were killed. Looking back, the Chinese, Russian Mexican and even the United States' violent revolutions bred a tendency for the use of violence to obtain objectives. An ex-

The Mark of Cain

amination of these violent (killing) revolutions affirms that violent means produce violent ends. If reason could grasp this reality, there would be greater reluctance to support violent means to achieve an objective.

While the right to kill in self-defense has many adherents, nonviolent fight behavior has gained only a smattering of support. The peaceful ascendancy of an Afro-American person to the presidency of the United States came about because of the nonviolent civil rights campaign waged mostly by Afro-Americans. There is reason to believe that an individual becomes a nonviolent fight activist when s/he arrives at the conclusion that violent means will most probably produce violent ends, the very opposite of what is desired.

From time immemorial, armies have been on the move because a Deity called upon them to do so. Armies are set in motion to acquire territory/possessions (oil for example) to improve the attacker's way of life, or to undo an injustice. In Joshua's situation, he fought to obtain a land promised by his Deity. The enemy was faceless or a no-body. And no-bodies could be killed since they did not belong to Joshua's tribe. Such killing flows from the principle that "might makes right." Just apply enough might and one is right. The alternative is to enter into cooperation rather than confrontation and pursue the objective nonviolently.

Increasingly all corners of the world are slowly coming to understand that cooperation is better than confrontation. Needless to say that cooperation requires compromise which at times is very scarce. Cooperation generally is a slow way to achieve an objective but it provides opportunity for not one but both views and needs to be heard and respected. A notable example of cooperation's success can be found in the work done by the Association for the Security and Cooperation in Europe (ASCE, later known as OSCE). The idea behind ASCE was for NATO and Warsaw Pack States to cooperate first in reducing armed forces in Europe and later by advancing human rights in each State. Out of these (Helsinki) Accords, a body of trust grew in Europe. The very opposite was occurring in the Soviet Union; its self-imposed contradictions began to undo the Soviet Empire. Of great importance is that the demise of the Soviet Empire came about nonviolently. If conditions in Joshua's time made compromise unlikely, such no longer should be the situation in the 21st Century. Today States advance their interests beneath the cloud of nuclear

arsenals States, Relying on war to achieve objectives increasingly makes the State less secure. Given this understanding, a policy of "mine-or-else" unilateralism, no matter how strong the State, is counter productive.

Patriarchy and Killing

The examples of killing provided in the *Holy Bible* are carried out by men. The actions associated with the Lord (Yahweh), Cain, Lamech, and Moses-Joshua suggest that killing is mostly a male thing. This is probably so largely because the *Holy Bible* is a product of a patriarchal society. In the Third Chapter of Genesis, the Lord subjugates the feminine to the masculine. Because of Eve's role in eating the forbidden fruit of the Tree of Knowledge she (the feminine) is placed under masculine control: "Your desire shall be for your husband and he shall rule over you." Such one-sidedness of the patriarchal order breeds excessiveness if not hubris in the masculine. In repressing the feminine, human behavior tends to flow from a masculine orientation. Missing is the balance that would be present were the "life-giver," the feminine perspective given equal opportunity to influence behavior. This is not to say that feminine, by nature, is fully committed to a practice of nonkilling. Rather, the point is that the feminine, given its commitment to birthing and nurturing of new life is probably a bit less inclined to support the killing option.

A patriarchal system, without independent feminine input, over emphasizes masculine values and reasoning. It encourages masculine competitiveness, on the one hand, and on the other, tries to control and utilize this competitiveness. In this manner, a patriarchal society praises competitiveness and employs it to carry out patriarchy's designs, for example, the waging of war.

If one way of advancing the Nonkilling Commandment is to expand the pattern of identity so that all humanity is conceived as members of the 'one tribe' (Homo sapiens), another way is to upend the existing patriarchal order that favors masculine competitiveness and control. In this regard, it is equally important that the existing Deity go beyond a tribal configuration. A co-gender divinity that oversees humanity from Above might be more apt to establish a Nonkilling "Above" (Heaven) to serve as a model for the "Below" (Earth). In this manner, right modeling in the Above might induce the Below to end its killing ways.

Re-configuring the Above

It would served humanity well if the prevailing Deity did not prefer one segment of the species over another. What is needed is a Deity of the Homo sapiens species, not a tribal Deity that advances a particular code of morality. What is needed is a Deity that does not have a chosen people but includes the entire breath of humanity. The Western rendition of the Deity rests, in part, on the Ten Commandments. One commandment prohibits coveting a neighbors' goods.

When Moses received the commandment it was taken to mean, not to covet the property of a tribal neighbor, and did not relate to coveting a foreigner neighbor's goods. For example, shortly after receiving the commandment, Moses ordered Joshua to take the "goods" of those who occupied the Promised Land.

Joshua has no compunction to take from the Midianite what his tribe desires. Somewhat startling, no dissonance arises in Moses when he issues what seems two contradictory edicts: from the Lord, the commandment not to covet the neighbor's goods and to Joshua that he take the Midianites' goods. The Midianites neighbors were viewed as "enemies" who could be simply destroyed with impunity and without experiencing feelings of guilt for having offended the deity's code of behavior.

In the 21st Century, as the planet begins to "shrink," neighbor no longer should be construed to mean solely a neighbor who is a member of the same tribe but more so, a "neighbor" found any place on the planet. The tribal conceptualization of the divinity leads, keeps society fragmented. What society needs is a truly Planetary if not Cosmic Divinity. Allegiance to a tribal deity more often than not instigates conflict with others who profess a different allegiance.

It is critical that humans do not take the easy way out and hold that these standards and codes come directly from God. What is likely to occur is that God must then be wrathful when the standards and codes are disobeyed. Otherwise the code has no "teeth." On one occasion Yahweh became so wrathful, when "His" edicts were not being followed, that he destroyed Homo sapiens except for Noah and his kin.

Humans must also not force upon the deity partisan actions. When God is called upon to bless America, is God to bless America in all its behaviors such as waging imperial war? Such demand to be the chosen ones of God is likely to turn

the deity into a War God. Such was the situation when the Israelites considered themselves the chosen people of God and therefore blessed in their endeavors to obtain the territory that they needed in order to prosper. God was "on our side," "he destroys the enemy and clears the way to victory." A deity that is both wrathful and a War God is highly dangerous in that some humans may feel called upon to vent the War God's destructiveness and God's wrath. This is to say that if the "Goddom" engages in wrath and war then humanity on earth will also be caught up with wrath and war.

The Role of Evil, Death Force and War God

Yahweh's destruction of humanity is not evil when viewed as a Deity's right to punish disobedient humans. But Cain's killing is evil for it breaks what can be called a natural law: do not kill a fellow Homo sapiens particularly kin. Over years, Cain's evilness became linked with Satan; Cain was evil for killing under Satan's influence. Abel, however, was favored by God. It seems that death also became associated with Satan and evil. Although rooted in human biology, the death force was shunned to Satan's dark recesses from where it opposed the life force.

Satan projects the force working against human life. Satan seeks to diminish what humanity constructs by sowing division among humans so that they destroy each other. As a figure cast down from Heaven, Satan represents the perennial force plying vengeance on God's created life.

Satan blackens the human life force by creating havoc and destruction. He "opposes the life and happiness of mankind." "Existence becomes for him a thing solely of destruction: the only meaning remaining in life is to cause the ruin of mankind." Milton described him "Stirr'd up with Envy and Revenge..." Another depicted Satan with hatred:

... 'tis time
To be revenged for our wrongs: with hate
Irreconcilable and furious craft
The Heavens to persecute and circumvent
In their own image, man, and him
To smother at his birth...
...Lo! miseries forwith
Shall follow aft in Adam's wake, and spread,
From age to age, throughout the whole wide world.

The Mark of Cain

When Satan is removed from a “mythic” background, his aim to dim human life and wield destruction coincides with the actions of the death force. In short, Satan is the theological name for the dead force.

If the question is asked whether evil (or Satan) is a concoction of human biases or an independent dynamic working along side human intercourse, then the same question must be asked about the death force? Theologians may claim that evil boasts of an independent existence. Others not comfortable with the religious overtones of evil or Satan might advance that a death force is at work in killing. The death force is clearly discernible in humans: every hour thousands of cells die (as well as are born). Moreover, humans are knowledgeable that an “independent” aging process is taking them toward death. In this context, it can be said that the death force goes independently about its business to oppose the life force in the individual (as well as in the species). The death force operates according to its own “nature” and stands outside the human sphere, but this “nature” is rooted in a universal source. Humans are not powerless vis-a-vis the death force. Humans can control the degree to which the death force impacts on the life force. Aside from the aging or accidental occurrence of death and ruling out natural disasters, the death force cannot enter into human intercourse without an invitation. For example, Cain’s jealousy invited the death force into the “living field.”

Evil, Satan and death force join in the archetypal manifestation of the Black War God (destroy to ashes), The Black War God becomes Satan’s agent in the struggle against the White War God, that is always on “our side.” (Although the White War God tends to be on God’s side, it would be naive to deny that the White War God is also an agent of the death force. Many are killed during the White God’s forages which can be as voracious as those of the Black War God’s excesses.)

As the archetypal manifestation of the death force, the War God is all about “killing fields” notwithstanding the heroic overtones given to war. Ares, the Greek God of War was highly regarded by Hades, the Lord of the Underworld. Hades welcomed Ares’ endless killings that populated the former’s realm. In Genesis, it is said “[earth] has opened its mouth to receive your brother’s [Abel’s] blood from your hand.” In a mystical manner, life and death are constantly struggling. The blood of those killed in war, metaphorically speaking, fertilizes the earth

for subsequent birth to emerge. The Underworld welcomes the blood that soaks down deep into the nether caverns.

Killing and war are but two of the agents that the death force utilizes to defeat the life force. Given the persistent determination of the death force, humans must be careful not to activate any form of the War God particularly one armed with nuclear weapons. The death force, although ever present is mostly reactive, that is to say, while the death force openly claims life at its moment of physical death, the death force, prior to that moment, tends to manifest itself only in reaction to human behavior, for example, the decision to wage war. Once given an opening, the death force seeks to anchor itself in the opening. This reactive aspect of the death force lies behind the statement, "violent means produce violent ends." To employ violent means is to open the door to the death force that then sweeps in and keeps ensuing circumstances violent.

Although the War God has been a prominent figure in many pantheons, modern society tends to dismiss the archetypal expression of the War God. In this matter, contemporary analysis is bound to fall short in its assessment. In Exodus, Yahweh clearly wears a War God's mantle. Yahweh says, "Observe what I command you this day. Behold, I am driving out from before you the Amorite and the Canaanite and the Hittite and Perizzite and the Hivite and Jebusite..... For I will cast out the nations before you and enlarge your borders..."

The Christian world has produced its own images of the War God, most notably, St James who had the epithet "Killer of Moors." St. James led the Spaniards in their seven hundred years war against the Moslems. Subsequently, St James led the Spaniards to conquer the Aztecs, Mayas and Incas in the Americas. The Hindus openly acknowledge the existence of the War God. In Roman, Greek and Aztec civilizations, the War God played an important role in their respective pantheons. One can ponder what manifestations of the War God archetype are at play in the Palestine, Iraq and Afghanistan wars. There is no doubt that individuals from all warring sides take time out to call upon their respective Deity to kill (defeat) the enemy.

It is theorized that the death force and life force are part of the cosmic web where, it may be said, both forces contend with each other in the give and take of galaxies born and destroyed; an ever ongoing process of creation and death. Each life force, whether geological or biological, reaches a point of maximum life

The Mark of Cain

before it begins a decline toward death or extinction. Although rooted in the cosmos, this tandem interface is also carried out on earth both geologically and biologically. Humanity is also caught up in this existential dance between death and life. (During the period of life, it may be said, that the life force is primary, that is, life force “heavy,” death force “light” but bent on destruction. In context of a belief in reincarnation, during the period of death (Bardo), the death force is primary, that is, death force “heavy,” life force “light” but seeking reincarnation.)

Rationally, the idea of the death force interacting independently in human affairs is difficult to accept. If an independent death force exists, a raising of consciousness by itself will not bring about a Nonkilling Society. Even though the death force may seem to act independently in human affairs, its manifestation depends on how humans conduct their affairs. Bad governance which oppresses and, in turn, incites revolution, opens the door for the death force to manifest itself. Similarly, personal depression gives the death force the opportunity to wedge itself in the psyche and dim an individual's life force. If lodged deeply, it will be difficult for the life force, when rallying the psyche to work through the depression, to eject the insidious grip of the death force.

Since to be human is to experience depression and other emotive crises, every one will, in one manner or another, invites the death force. And with the death force present, every one will also experience an “inner war” to eject the death force from the psyche. In a mythic rendition, the death force activates the Black War God to overcome the ego, dim the life force and leave it in ashes. The death force is likely to establish a foothold in the psyche by using as entry points the ego's contradictions and flaws that keep the ego in turmoil. To wage the inner war competently, the ego needs to activate the psycho-spiritual aspect of the War God Archetype, the Blue War God, in order to tap the deep life force energy needed to overcome psycho-spiritual exigencies (often called battle for the soul). Contrary to the Black War God, that finds expression both in the external and internal wars, the Blue War God operates only in inner wars. (The White War God associated with self-defense and the Red War God associated with pursuit of justice operate in the external wars to combat the Black War God. And to stress the point again, notwithstanding their noble gestures, any external expression of the

War God carries out the intent of the death force. Of the varied manifestations of the War God Archetype, only the Blue War God is not in the service of the death force.)

The Blue War God wages its campaign by assisting the ego to utilize the deep substance of the life force which some might call the soul. This deep substance, in turn, strengthens the ego not only to correct its contradictions and flaws, but also to secure a stronger identity of self-in-the-cosmos (some might call it a relationship with the Divine). While the Blue War God is a great asset, not all egos are able to access it. Consequently the ego by itself has to carry on the heroic struggle to eject the death force. Needless to say the individual is likely to experience less inner turmoil were the ego to correct early on its contradictions and flaws and thereby, minimize the opportunities for the death force to penetrate the psyche and dim the life force.

Preventing a Nuclear Winter

Given that the call for nonkilling can be traced to past ages, is there something special with the present emphasis on nonkilling? Why are individuals advancing the notion that a nonkilling society is possible? The answer may rest in modern technology. Technology has placed at the disposal of the War God/death force weapons systems that can obliterate the human species. It no longer is a matter of the War God killing a certain number who subsequently descend to Hades (or upward to Valhalla). Killing can now be a massively frightful event. Humanity has reached a certain point in its development where war-making no longer makes sense; it is nearing mid-night for the coming of a Nuclear Winter. Consequently there is great need to call upon the life force to forge a Nonkilling Society so that a Nuclear Winter never becomes a reality. Just as the present grave economic slide was thought to be out of the question only a few years ago ("the bankers and financiers know what they are doing"), so too exists the reasoning that it is "impossible" to have a nuclear exchange ("statesmen know what they doing") because there is too much to lose with a nuclear exchange. Beyond this facade of trusting something that no longer can be trusted lingers the possibility that the death force will gain the upper hand, place nuclear weapons in the Black War God's hands and usher in a new "dark age."

Anthropocentrism and Inter-species Killing

A truly viable Nonkilling Society may not evolve until humans end their wanton inter-species killing. It may be enough for humanity not to kill members of its own species. But what about inter-species killing? Buddhism is quiet clear about including sentient beings in a nonkilling world. Some may argue that the nonkilling of sentient beings is no more than a good intention rather than a reality. Humans have hunted, killed and eaten many forms of living creatures. In recent decades, vegetarianism has gained some converts who do not wish to participate in the killing of animals. There have been demonstrations to demand better care of the creatures that are bred, killed and subsequently eaten by humanity. Moreover there is much to be said about a human compassion that honors other sentient life and refuses to kill it recklessly. While such sensitivity may not be widespread, its growing presence hints that humanity is beginning to grasp that the planet is occupied by many sentient beings and that together they constitute the earth's true population. Humanity needs to go beyond the self-imposed anthropocentrism that gives humanity the belief that it is more important than all other forms of life and therefore fit to dominate them. But humanity is only one of many species that shares the planet. In the West, humanity's claim for superiority is found in the First Chapter in Genesis where the Lord says that humans "have dominion over the fish of the sea, over the birds of the air, and over every living thing that moves on the earth." If indeed *Homo sapiens* has such stewardship then humanity's has not done well. As humans move forward toward realizing a Nonkilling Paradigm, it is hopeful that they improve their stewardship of earth's sentient beings.

Toward a Nonkilling Society

In view of the anxiety caused by weapons of mass destruction, it makes tremendous sense to support the realization of the Nonkilling Paradigm. While arms control, social policy and diplomacy (to mention a few actions) have their usefulness in reducing killing, greater consciousness, increased psychological development and altruism can play a significant role in controlling if not eliminating intra-species killing. The above commentary touched upon numerous dynamics that affect the practice of nonkilling. For the most part, these dynamics have

been but scarcely examined. In what follows several recommendations are advanced (some of which may be considered quite expansive) that may lead to the realization of the Nonkilling Paradigm. Clearly, further discussion and study are necessary before such recommendations can be acted upon at the level that is required. While some of these recommendation may require an additional degree of evolutionary development, they nevertheless address the development that is needed to bring about the Nonkilling Paradigm.

1) *Develop the Nonviolent Fight Response.* On being assaulted and wounded Lamech's responded in accordance with his upbringing: an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. This is the way of "natural defense" which is carried out by the human immune system. But a violent response is not the only response a human can make to an assault, a person can fight back nonviolently. On the way to a Nonkilling Paradigm it will necessary to put into widespread use the Nonviolent Fight Response. Clearly the Nonviolent Fight Response requires great courage for one remains mostly defenseless and vulnerable to bodily injury. In modern times both Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King Jr. demonstrated the success of Nonviolent Fight Response in overcoming aggression and injustice.

2) *Advance a Cooperation rather than Confrontation Policy.* Yahweh called upon Moses and Joshua to destroy the armies that stood in the Israelites' way to occupy the Promised Land. Such confrontation causes mass killings. Confrontation tends to reject compromise; it is about intimidating in order to obtain what is desired. Cooperation requires compromise but also forges the way for trust to emerge. The Midianites perhaps were not accommodating. Of course they would be uncooperative if an army advanced toward them. But a promise had been made, the Tribal God had given word that the Israelites would occupy the Promised Land, and no two ways about it. In this "stuck" position, there was no leeway for cooperation: either the Midianites acquiesced to Joshua's demands or engaged in battle.

What Yahweh and Joshua did not grasp is that the "ends" are always derived from the "means" employed: violent means produce violent ends. Mahatma Gandhi based his philosophy and practice of nonviolence on this principle. It is not clear what would have happened had Joshua offered to cooperate rather than confront. There is slight possibility that the outcome would have been different. But Joshua would have had to

The Mark of Cain

compromise regarding the Promised Land. If cooperation was near impossible in Joshua's day, the situation in Palestine seems no less the same in the 21st Century. A slight different, however, exists today. It is clear that the final solution will require compromise. It is also clear that a Nonkilling Society will never come about until cooperation-rather-than-confrontation becomes the norm between contending parties.

3) *Establish Planetary Identity: Convergence of the Species and Emergence of Global Tribe.* On the one hand Yahweh commands Moses to inform the Israelites that they should not kill. On the other hand, Yahweh commands Moses and Joshua to kill the Midianites. Such behavior reveals when killing is forbidden and when it is acceptable.

It already has been discussed that Cain was punished because he killed a tribal member and that killing was forbidden. Midianites could be killed because they were not tribal members. The solution to this duplicity is to be found in the establishment of a Global Tribe. In the 21st Century various developments (such as communications, trade, environment, travel, nuclear weapons) are guiding humanity toward the establishment of a planetary identity. There is a movement of convergence that is causing humanity to merge into "one people." This trend toward larger geographic patterns of identity has been going on for millenniums: from group to clan to tribe to nation and soon to planet. Once a global identity is established the commandment not to kill would apply to all.

4) *Fashion a Global Deity.* The deities recorded by humanity to a large degree appear in tribal dress. Continuation of this partisanship perpetuates the confrontation between the deities. Even though it is said that Muslims, Christians and Jews acknowledge the same deity, the practice seems to be that for the Jews their God continues to maintain a special contract only with them. The Christian Deity is subdivided among the different denominations. Methodists find it difficult to adhere to Roman Catholic worship of the Deity. Which Christian denomination or Jewish temple would utilize Islam's conceptualization of the Deity? In the 21st Century, religious sectarianism foments great discord if not wars. For those who believe in a divine deity there is a great need for a deity which is global if not cosmic in scope. Such a Global Deity would include all humans as the chosen people. In short, there is a need for a God of Homo sapiens. The issue is not that humans

should "invent" a special type of divinity, but that humans should apprehend correctly the divine for the 21st Century. Not long ago a book appeared with the title, *The Coming of the Cosmic Christ* which inferred that Christ was being viewed as something less than Cosmic. Christians may be ready for a Christ more cosmic and less provincial.

5) *End Patriarchal Order both in the Above and Below: Re-installment of the Feminine in the Above.* In Genesis, Yahweh voices dissatisfaction with his creation that he previously called "good." He entertains no discussion to his decision to destroy humanity. He acts unilaterally with impunity (as Gods are wont to do, meaning that Gods do not have to be ethical as human do). Such behavior suggests that the Above Domain of Yahweh is actually a one-sided patriarchal regime. There was no feminine voice to discuss whether killing everybody was appropriate. This behavior of indiscriminate killing, particularly of children, is likely to occur when masculinity acts arbitrarily. Patriarchal order tends to heighten competition which, in turn, promotes masculine excessiveness such as mass killings. A patriarchal order, at bottom, is dysfunctional in that a masculine orientation precludes full grasp of a situation. The result is critical judgement based on one-sided knowing.

It is advanced that so long as the Above Domain remains patriarchal and mostly dysfunctional, the Below of human engagement will also remain dysfunctional. There is great urgency that the Above of Christians, Muslims and Jews end the patriarchal reign of their respective heavens.

There is a great need for the feminine to re-instate itself in the Above so that guidance issued from the Above not be narrow, excessive and punitive. A patriarchal Above Domain, as that of Yahweh's, can easily ignite wrath in reaction to the Below's inconsistencies (disobedience) and flaws (waywardness). And once ignited, God's rage may know no bounds with innocent and guilty caught in the ashes.

The return of the feminine to the Above becomes of critical importance if the Nonkilling Paradigm is to take root. The feminine liberation struggles in the West, dating back to the mid 19th Century and currently centered on who controls the female's body, must continue. Regretfully when masculinity guides masculine action the result may be masculine excessiveness and therefore cannot be trusted. When the feminine guides the masculine, there is a higher probability that masculinity's actions will not be

The Mark of Cain

excessive and can be trusted. For this reason feminine guidance should be enthroned in the Above Dominion. Feedback that such has occurred might be found were the "Our Father" prayer to begins with, "Our Mother and Father who art in Heaven....." If the feminine continues to be denied co-gender equality in the heavens, humans can expect periodic explosive masculine rages from their Deity.

So long as the heavenly abode remains patriarchal it remains dysfunction. Accordingly, the alchemical saying "As Above So Below" becomes "As [Dysfunctional] Above So Below."

The restoration of the feminine to the Above is already underway. It can be seen in the ordination of women as ministers in many Protestant denominations. Mythically, it can be seen in the declaration of Mary's Assumption into Heaven, that is, acknowledgment that Mary lived life without sin and ascended into Above where she was crowned Queen of Heaven.

6) *Comprehend the Dynamics of the Death Force and War God in Human Affairs.* Of symbolic interest is the mark placed on Cain to shield him from being killed in revenge of his killing Abel. The biblical story does not say what constituted Cain's mark. Psychologically, Cain's Mark is humanity's legacy which is imprinted in the collective shadow (the unconscious contents flowing from a Homo sapiens experience and manifested mostly in archetypal form). It stands out to identify for posterity that Cain is a killer.

Metaphorically, all humanity carries Cain's Mark; a reminder of the killer in the human psyche. Put differently each life force confronts an opposing death force. Cain was the first life force born on earth; he also was first born agent of the death force. In short, Cain's mark lies deep within human psyche. It is a witness to the death force's presence in human affairs; it is testimony that the life force is ever in struggle against the death force.

In the evolving years, Cain's killing was linked with the work of Satan/evil. His mark became the mark of evil. But rather than a mark associated with Satan/evil, it might well be viewed as the mark of the death force. Unknowingly, Cain became the first human caught up in the eternal struggle between the death force and life force. This struggle cannot be avoided as witnessed by the constant hourly death of human cells. Sigmund Freud never completed his study of the Death Instinct and this may account for the absence of psychological

discourse on the topic. A half century ago a psychoanalytic oriented scholar wrote an insightful book on this topic, *Life Against Death*. But in general the subject has been avoided. Clearly more study of the death force is called for.

If the death force seems somewhat too remote to comprehend, the concept of the War God is more amenable to grasp as part of the human experience. Untold societies have included War Gods in their mythic pantheons. The aspect of the War God most related to the death force is its killing prowess. The War God wield its havoc to create ashes. Hitherto, the War God's role in society was that of cleansing; to bring about destruction so that new birth might occur. Today destruction can mean total ashes without any possibility for the Phoenix to rise. With the current weapons of mass destruction the death force has gained much leverage vis-a-vis the life force.

While it may be said that the death force goes about its business in an autonomous manner, similar to the immune system in the biological world, becoming conscious of the death force can assist humans to impede its actions. A rise in the collective ego's development may enable humanity to implement policy that prevents the outbreak of war. Policy, that advances cooperation rather than confrontation and supports social justice or fosters equality, thwarts the War God from carrying out its destruction. Needless to say, there is a long way yet to go before society's psychological development is such that it can promulgate and execute "right" policy. Without such psychological development the death force and its agent, the War God, may cause humanity to engage in increasingly deadly wars.

7) *Raise Level of Consciousness*. If humans are to engage with a nonviolent fight response, advance cooperation over confrontation, establish a global identity, eliminate the patriarchal order and fashion a more balanced Above, then there is great need that they raise their level of consciousness. It is critical that the psychological development of humanity accelerate if it is to bring about a Nonkilling Paradigm in the near future. This is more likely to occur if the raise in consciousness enables individuals to comprehend how the death force and its agent, the War God, manifest themselves in human affairs.

Cain killed because he could not work through a jealousy complex. In order to have worked through his rage, Cain would have had to raise his consciousness and assert greater control over his emotions. He would have had to respect as

The Mark of Cain

sacred Abel's right to exist (i.e. become "keeper" of Abel's life). Cain's failure to individuate left him prey to the rage which his emotions produced. Primary in the process of individuation is gaining insight into one's psychological contradictions. It requires a penetration of the persona and shadow in order to make conscious those elements that would cause one to kill. In general, most humans are able to control their emotions, except perhaps the psychopath who is unable to establish a moral code. The situation is highly complicated for those who are able to control their personal emotions but nonetheless participate in killing. This dilemma comes about during times of war when a government leads a people into war (either directly or indirectly) against members of another tribe who are not protected by the tribal commandment, "Thou Shalt Not Kill." Individuals need to raise their consciousness so that "nationalism" or some other creed does not hinder them from arriving at their own conclusions regarding killing.

In the West the psychological way of individuation has been only recently explored. Spiritual practices, some Christian in origin, however, have been followed for some time. Eastern spiritual practices are also found in the West and they have enabled numerous individuals to deepen their compassion and achieve greater psycho-spiritual development. Practicing any of the various ways of individuation suggests a meaningful approach for ego to mature and thus be more competent to advance the Nonkilling Paradigm and ward off the looming nightmare of mass killing.

The belief that a Nonkilling Paradigm can emerge and take root is derived from the growing understanding that humanity is in a self-made race between technology's ability to cause mass killing and the ability of the collective ego to hold back such killing. The recent interest in depth psychology and spiritual practices, as well as the emergence of the idea of a Nonkilling Society, in part, have surfaced as though to balance technology's increased destructiveness.

Humans contains dark urges any of which, when constellated into a complex, can become independent of the ego's control and therefore, able to do harm if not kill. There are thousands of Cains living today who harbor dark killing rages in the personal shadow. Most have sufficient ego strength to abide by a Homo sapiens natural law not to kill a member of the species (reinforced by tribal law "Thou Shalt Not Kill" a tribal member). The

reality that there are both fanatics and individuals unable to control raging emotions incites great anxiety particularly at a time when weapons of mass destruction may get into their hands.

The situation with Joshua differs from that with Cain. Joshua's killings were sanctioned by the Deity. He did not question whether invading another people, particularly a people who had not harmed the Israelites, was in any manner wrong. He was content to use the contract with Yahweh to authorize the invasion. As so many generals before and after him, he implemented the orders that he received, even the slaying of all Midianite male children. Today's level of consciousness would classify his action against the Midianites genocidal. Joshua confronted a truly human dilemma: although Gods do not have to be moral, humans do. Joshua, like the vast majority of humans, had not developed his ego to the degree that he could call upon himself to judge whether what the Deity ordered was moral or not, and whether to obey it or not. He chose to follow orders, but in doing so he gave way to killing. Joshua was caught-up with the "theism" of "My God Right or Wrong." He was gripped by the notion of entitlement: entitled to the Promise Land that was "wrongly" occupied by the "other" (enemy). Such sense of entitlement precluded full-measured reasoning. Rather, the situation, as set up, called forth ruthless killing (genocide). With such greater consciousness individuals will be in a better position to question the appropriateness of 'orders' to kill, that is, the appropriateness of inviting the death force into human affairs.

The death and life forces are grounded in the same earthy-cosmic origins. But is there meaning in all of this? Outside of religious speculation, there is no indicator or evidence that point to a definitive meaning of life. Yet humans tend to "know" that life has a special meaning. And it is in context of such meaning that life carries out its struggle with the death force. The life force intuitively binds itself to meaning when, in rejecting suicide (death), it celebrates life. And one way humans celebrate life deeply is through the expression of love. The ego's task is to raise consciousness and in so doing, strengthens the life force. At the same time, the maturing of the ego is all about enabling the creative energy of the life force to manifest itself through love, compassion and altruism. Through love humans acquire a special type of grounding, which, in turn, enables the life force to keep the death force in check.

The Mark of Cain

Love is a power nascent in the life force. Just as the death force has at its disposal the means to produce all-to-ashes, so too does the life force have at its disposal the capacity to produce all-to-bloom. Cosmically, the life force and death force manifest their nature directly, but such is not the case with humans who depend on the ego, a very fragile psychological regulatory agent, to harness the deep substance of the life force. Without tapping the powers of the life force, such as love, the ego fares badly against the inroads of the death force. Without tapping love and the deep substance of the life force (that some would call soul), too many humans live a dimmed existence. It is only with a strong mature ego and receptivity to the life force's cosmic creative powers (some might call Divinity) that humans are likely to tap the life force's healing energies.

8) *Encourage Altruism.* It is all good and proper to advance psychological insight but unless such insight takes root in the human heart before it is translated into behavior, humanity will fail to achieve the quality of consciousness that is necessary to fashion a Nonkilling Society. Altruism may be all the more possible were all persons members of the same tribe. Altruism reflects the degree to which an individual cares for the well being of others. In this regard, the joint objectives of establishing a planetary identity and raising the level of altruism enhance the likelihood that a Nonkilling Society will take form. With technology becoming increasingly deadlier, the death force may have gained leverage over the life force. In a manner of speaking, humans would do well to become more altruistic in order to bolster the life force so that it can balance the increase destructiveness of the death force.

9) *Establish Just Governance.* Much of the world's oppression which incites rebellion and protest comes from unjust governance. With poor governance the revolutionary call for justice may incite the use of nonviolent opposition but is more likely to draw a violent response. Without good governance the Nonkilling Paradigm will remain an idea rather than a practice. It may be said that the art of governance rests on three imperatives: political, defense and economic/social. The political imperative enables the collective unit to administer itself and to further its interests; it represents the will of the unit. The defense imperative permits the collective unit to defend itself and protect the unit's interests; it represents the convictions of the unit. The economic-social imperative directs the unit to produce the

resources to sustain itself and provide the wherewithal to maintain security and prosper; it represent the potential power of the unit. The mere practice of these three imperatives does not preclude bad governance. For example, a democratic nation, such as the United States, could proclaim its support for freedom but yet oppress part of its people.

During the past hundred years of mostly violent struggles to end oppression, three new initiatives began to take form and are on the verge of coalescing into imperatives: human rights, peace-building, and environment protection. The human rights imperative represents the commitment of governance to practice a comprehensive and inclusive justice. The human rights imperative clarifies that the governance pertains primarily to the security of people and not to the security of those favored by the governing elite. The human rights imperative acts on the political imperative to champion genuine democratic practices; it acts to rectify the political imperative's abusive use of power. The peace-building imperative represents the commitment to cooperate rather than to confront. This imperative, bred by fear of a nuclear winter, holds that peace is inviolable; it acts to constrain the arrogance and impunity of the defense imperative. The environment protection imperative represents the commitment to desist from harming the earth. Bred by the recognition that the planet and not a political entity sustains humanity; it acts to confine the acquisitive tendency of the economic-social imperative. Together, the six imperatives may be able to produce good governance which, in turn, may produce less oppression and hence less violent rebellion. In the final analysis it is good governance that will provide the foundation for the emergence of a Nonkilling Society.

10) *Respect for all Sentient Being.* A truly comprehensive Nonkilling Paradigm might well include the Nonkilling of other sentient beings. Followers of the Jain religion place great emphasis on not killing other sentient beings. But in general, humanity has accepted the killing of animal life both to prevent an assault and for nourishment. Notwithstanding this general acceptance, wanton killing and mistreatment are being increasingly condemned. Some individuals even question whether hunting for pleasure-sport should be condoned. For the time being it may be enough for the realization of the Nonkilling Paradigm if intra-species killing were abolished. Meanwhile a growing debate is taking place regarding humanity's killing of other forms of life.

Conclusion: The Riddle of Cain's Mark

In conclusion, the realization of a Nonkilling Paradigm rests on the degree of consciousness and ego development that Homo Sapiens are able to achieve; on the ability to advance both a Nonviolent Fight Response and policy of cooperate-rather-confront; on apprehending

that a race is taking form between technology's weapons of mass destruction and psychological development that would prevent such use of technology; on rectifying the contradictions and masculine excessiveness in the existing patriarchal order; on forging a "Goddom" that provides feminine guidance; on fathoming the role of the death force/War God in human affairs and on implementing policy that restrains the death force and War God from plying their destructive natures. But no matter how important the raising of consciousness may be, the ultimate success in forging a Nonkilling Society will rest on the degree to which individuals live from their "heart" that is, how in touch they are with their concern and compassion for the other; with their willingness to be keeper of their brother and sister's life.

The story of Cain's killing has become imbedded in Western civilization but its source is rooted in the ancient civilizations of the Middle East. The mythic tale indicates that killing has been part of humanity's repertoire. Important in this tale is that Cain's punishment is not death; the outcome is not an eye for eye and tooth for tooth. Rather the punishment is a mark. Although Cain becomes a marked man, he is not to be killed, and if harmed, Cain would be avenged sevenfold. The question to ask is why? What value is there in having Cain's mark ever present?

Is the value to be found in that very fact; the mark is there simply to be seen by others, as a reminder that killing or better said, the death force has been with humanity since "the beginning" and is ever present. The mark also poses forever the tension, 'will you or will you not be your brother's keeper?'

In the 21st Century humans should take particular note of Cain's mark which lies deep in humanity's collective shadow. Humans need recognize the lurking death force or killer within themselves and make effort to heighten and strengthen their psychological development so as to keep the killer at bay. But more important, humans would do well to develop altru-

ism and a compassion of heart so that they may become keepers of their brother's life. Otherwise the death force may appear in a modern-day Cain who rejects "keepership" of his brother and triggers massive killing, or incites war among nations and thereby lets loose the Black War God to belch forth mass destruction. The killing force of this "second Cain" could well devastate the earth. Framed in this context, Cain's mark may represent a flowing banner inviting humanity to reject killing, become keeper of the brother's life and take up the Nonkilling Paradigm, that is, take to heart and practice "keepership" of our brothers and sisters.

The fact that humans live mostly a nonkilling life and mostly desire to end all killing, should not be minimized. The common sense of human experience has advanced a golden rule: "do not do unto others what one does not want done to self." In its desire to create a nonkilling environment, humanity has imposed constraints upon itself in order to end the killing. The general abhorrence for killing is perhaps witnessed in the commandment "Thou Shalt Not Kill." Therefore, there are grounds to be somewhat optimistic that with additional consciousness and special developments (as outlined above), humans should be able to live without war and free of killing (except for the exceptions committed by deranged individuals). Today, given the stage of humanity's evolution, the idea of a Nonkilling Society may still appear pure utopian. Nonetheless, there is great need for humanity to translate utopian ideation into every day practice, otherwise the problems that are plaguing society in the 21st Century may set back humanity to an earlier stage of civilization. Of particular importance humans need to access the life force's power of love so that they may be able to fend off the death force's debilitating affects and maintain a bloom on earth.

References

- Brown, Norman O. *Life Against Death: The Psychoanalytical Meaning Of History*. New York: Vintage Book; 1959
- Camus, Albert. *The Myth of Sisyphus*. New York: Vintage Book; 1959
- Colon, James. *Geo-justice: a preferential option for the earth*. San Jose, CA: Resource Publication; 1990.

The Mark of Cain

- Eisler, Riane. *The Chalice and the Blade*. New York: Harper and Row, 1988.
- Fornari, Franco. *The Psychoanalysis of War*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana Press; 1977,
- Fox, Matthew. *The Coming of the Cosmic Christ*. New York: Harper and Row; 1988.
- Freud, Sigmund. *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*. London: Hogarth Press (S.E. vol 18); 1920.
- Fromm, Erich. *The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston; 1973.
- Grossman, Dave. *On Killing*. New York: Back Bay Books; 1995.
- Hedges, Chris. *War is a force that gives us meaning*. New York: Anchor Books, 2000.
- Hillman, James. *A terrible love of war*. New York: Penguin Press; 2004.
- HOLY BIBLE, St James Version.
- LeShan, Lawrence. *The Psychology of War*. New York: Helios Press; 2002.
- Lopez-Reyes, Ramon. "Flight/Fight Response and Nonviolence," in *The Frontiers of Nonviolence*. Eds: Chaiwat Satha-Anand and Michael True. IPRA: Nonviolence Committee; 1998.
- Lopez-Reyes, Ramon. "Regional Governance, Human Security and Zones of Peace," in *Ocean Yearbook #15*. Eds. E. Mann Borgese, A Chircop, M McConnell. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 2001
- Milton, John. *Paradise Lost*. New York: Odyssey Press; 1935.
- Neumann, Erich. *The Origins and History of Consciousness*. New York: Pantheon Books; 1954.
- Paige, Glenn. *Nonkilling Global Political Science*. Xlibris Corporation; 2002.
- Panikkar, Raimon. *Cultural disarmament: the way to peace*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press; 1995.
- Stevens, Anthony. *The Roots of War & Terror*. London: Continuum; 2004.
- Warner, Samuel. *The Urge to Mass Destruction*. New York: Grune and Stratton; 1957.

Guidelines for Contributions

Following the Center for Global Nonkilling's mission of "promoting change toward the measurable goal of a killing-free world", the *Global Nonkilling Working Papers* are dedicated to theory and research incorporating original scientific works that tackle issues related to the construction of nonkilling societies, where killing, threats to kill and conditions conducive to killing are absent. The series have a multidisciplinary perspective, open both to theoretical and empirical works on topics such as:

- Nonkilling and neuro-bioscience
- Nonkilling and gender relations
- Nonkilling and education
- Nonkilling and economics
- Nonkilling and the environment
- Nonkilling and the media
- Nonkilling, science, and technology
- Nonkilling in spiritual and philosophical traditions
- Nonkilling and the arts
- Nonkilling and sports
- Nonkilling and the professions
- Role of the military and police in nonkilling social transformation
- Nonkilling futures
- Nonkilling and leadership

A wider list of possible research topics can be found in the two following publications: *Nonkilling Global Political Science* (2002; 2009) by Glenn D. Paige and *Toward a Nonkilling Paradigm* (2009), edited by Joám Evans Pim, both available for free download.

The series are published on an occasional basis as texts are delivered by authors and reviewed by the Nonkilling Research Committees. Every issue will be distributed both on print and on-line, and will be available for free download through the Center's website. Authors will remain as sole holders of the legal copyright for their texts, but a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 will be applied through the series to guarantee wide distribution and fair educational use.

Authors must submit a title, a 100 word summary and a 80 word biographical sketch, prior to acceptance of the complete proposal. After approval, authors will have four months to complete the final text, with an extension between 10,000 and 20,000 words. The Chicago Manual of Style should be used for reference.

For additional information contact Editor Joám Evans Pim at jevans@nonkilling.org

Published Issues

1. **Are Humans Inherently Killers?** A Critique by Robert Sussman and Joshua Marshack Followed by a Response by Richard Wrangham (2010).
2. **Examining Domestic Violence as a State Crime: Nonkilling Implications.** By Laura L. Finley (2010).
3. **Nonkilling Political Science: A Critical Evaluation.** By Balwant Bhaneja, Joám Evans Pim, Piki Ish-Shalom, Chaiwat Satha-Anand and Yoon-Jae Chung (2010).
4. **Socioeconomic Democracy: A Nonkilling, Life-Affirming and Enhancing Psycho-Political-Socio-Economic System.** By Robley E. George (2010).
5. **The Mark of Cain A Depth Psychology Commentary on the Nonkilling Paradigm.** By Ramon Lopez-Reyes, Lt.Col. (2013).
6. **Gandhi's "Soul Force" and Paige's "Software" for a Nonkilling Society.** By Maorong Jiang (2013).
7. **Political Art and Craft: The Story of Nonkilling Global Political Science.** By Clayton K. Edwards (2013).