




Adoption

March, 2007

| Author | Message |
|--|--|
| <p>manjushri</p> <p>Joined: 08 Sep 2006 Posts: 146 Location: UK</p> | <p>Posted: Sun Mar 18, 2007 4:54 am Post subject: Adoption</p> <p style="text-align: right;">  quote  edit  IP </p> <hr/> <p>Hi Daniel & everyone,</p> <p>I wanted to start a new thread in response to Daniel's essay on adoption.</p> <p>I should start by saying that broadly I agree with Daniel's thesis about the "illness in the motive" of adoptive parents and the idea that, to varying degrees, people have children in order to be rescued by them and this is likely to be the case with adoptive parents too. I'm not sure if I agree that adoptive parents are MORE likely to be sick in their motives. I'd also like to acknowledge that this essay was clearly written in the spirit of theoretical rather than practical approaches to parentless children, nevertheless I'm interested in the practical issues of adoption so I'd like to consider them a little here- this is not a criticism of the fact that they're not encompassed in the essay though!</p> <p>Quote:</p> <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 5px; margin: 10px 0;"> <p>And often it [adoption} makes the illness more virulent, because many adoptive parents feel more justified acting out their unconscious needs in exchange for the service they've done.</p> </div> <p>I'm curious about what makes you assert this Daniel? I have a some experience (friends I've known who were adopted as well as professional experience working with young adopted children and adult adopted children) and have definitely come across adoptive parents who behave as you describe here, including ones who've tried to 'give their children back' to social services because they've become 'too difficult!' (What were they expecting I wondered? Imagine the traumatised and rejected child's experience of this. The mind boggles.) I also agree that some adoptive parents think they've <i>more</i> than earned the right to be unconditionally loved (ie: obeyed, healed, adored, forgiven every mistake etc. etc.) by their children (in some cases even more than biological parents). Also of course the 'nobody ever rescued me so you should think yourself lucky' mob- such beliefs are often quite unconsciously held. I have also worked quite extensively with people from cultures where the informal 'adoption' of children by other family members has produced almost identical feelings. Though this type of informal adoption is often regarded as a strength of those cultures where its common the children rarely experience it as such, even when they are objectively and subjectively 'better off' with the aunt or grandparents or whomever the wound of rejection by the biological parents usually festers.</p> <p>Quote:</p> <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 5px; margin: 10px 0;"> <p>An adopted child has suffered the primal loss. His biological parents failed him, and in his deepest soul he knows it. There may be a beauty in adoption, but underneath it there is a hell.</p> </div> <p>I agree here, I've never come across an adoptive person who wasn't tortured by the primal rejection of its birth parents. of course its harder for adopted people to deny that they weren't loved/wanted by their birth parents -though many retain fantasies of having been loved/wanted despite the evidence. I do realise that most biological parents 'give their children away' with pain and believing its the right thing to do. Adopted children they always 'know' at some level, even (as used to be the case more so than these days) when they are not told they are adopted.</p> <p>Quote:</p> <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 5px; margin: 10px 0;"> <p>People drawn to adopt have not dealt fully with the hell of their own abandonment, and think they can undo their own denied childhood truths by becoming saviors. They cannot. They may help the adopted child, and may enhance his chances in life, but they cannot inoculate him from receiving their own denied wounds.</p> </div> |

I agree here too except to say that, practically speaking even if the adoptive parents merely refrain from what is currently generally accepted as abuse the adopted child has hugely increased life chances (including chances of achieving enlightenment!) compared with a child brought up in care. In the UK more than a third of people in prison have been through the care system-it doesn't care for them. I'm wondering if adoption would actually be the logical choice for the fully enlightened? After all there is serious overpopulation on the planet and a massive number of abused and unwanted children. Would a fully enlightened person want to increase the life chances for someone already on the planet more than they'd want to have their own biological child? I don't know I'm just throwing it out there, what do others think?

Quote:

Truth seekers must first take full responsibility for the inner child orphaned within their own breast. They must nurture him, guide him, and let him grieve the losses of his own tragedy. This is the only way to achieve enlightenment. Until then, whenever they are given full responsibility for a child's life, be he their biological child or not, they will not be able to provide him with the full emotional nourishment he needs to become enlightened himself.

Yes I pretty much agree here except actually the first fully enlightened person will, by definition, NOT have had fully enlightened parents- that would be impossible by your argument here Daniel. So actually the first fully enlightened person won't be one who never had any wounds to heal- it will be someone who has successfully healed their wounds. This means an adopted person has as much chance of being the first enlightened human as anyone else providing their parents are "partially" enlightened at least... I see this as a philosophical conundrum at the heart of this debate about enlightenment- that it must be possible for an abused person to become fully enlightened. I suppose we simply don't know what such a person's biological child could be! Something other than "fully enlightened" in the sense of fully healed though because they wouldn't be fully healed never having been wounded, unless by some source other than their parent which their parent would have been able to help them deal with in an enlightened way!

Looking forward to hearing from others on this one...

best wishes,
Rebekah

'To be disillusioned is better than being under an illusion!'

kaleo

Posted: Tue Mar 20, 2007 12:23 am Post subject:

 quote  edit  IP

Joined: 06
Oct 2006
Posts: 209

Hi Rebekah -

Just wanted you to know I am thinking about your questions. I haven't had much time to be on here. Didn't want you to think your post was being ignored... Will post more when I have time and thoughts.

cheers,
Kaleo

manjushri

Posted: Tue Mar 20, 2007 6:08 am Post subject:

 quote  edit  IP

Joined: 08
Sep 2006
Posts: 146
Location: UK

Thanks for your note kaleo! Looking forward to hearing from you.
Rebekah

**Daniel
Mackler**
Site Admin

Posted: Wed Mar 21, 2007 3:22 pm Post subject: Re: Adoption

 quote  edit  IP

Joined: 03
Aug 2006

Hi Rebekah-

Sorry it took a while to reply – I'm just so busy!!

Posts: 525
Location:
New York
City

Thanks for the thoughtful reply to my essay, and I'd like to address a few points of your post.

manjushri wrote:

I'm not sure if I agree that adoptive parents are MORE likely to be sick in their motives.

I don't think I said that. I think what I said was that parents who adopt often feel more justified in acting out because they didn't create the child.

manjushri wrote:

... nevertheless I'm interested in the practical issues of adoption so I'd like to consider them a little here- this is not a criticism of the fact that they're not encompassed in the essay though!

Agreed – I just wrote a tiny essay addressing one facet of adoption. Other issues about adoption interest me as well...

Quote from Daniel's essay:

Daniel's essay: And often it [adoption} makes the illness more virulent, because many adoptive parents feel more justified acting out their unconscious needs in exchange for the service they've done.

Rebekah: I'm curious about what makes you assert this Daniel? [/quote]

It's based on things I've heard about, witnessed, and surmised in many adoptive parents. The level of parental entitlement can be mind-boggling.

Some of the experiences I've had are similar to the ones you described above.

manjushri wrote:

I do realise that most biological parents 'give their children away' with pain and believing its the right thing to do.

Yes, and yet you would probably agree with me that the pain the parents suffer in giving their kids away is not even in the same realm as the pain their children suffer and will suffer because of the abandonment.

Quote from Daniel's essay:

Daniel: People drawn to adopt have not dealt fully with the hell of their own abandonment, and think they can undo their own denied childhood truths by becoming saviors. They cannot. They may help the adopted child, and may enhance his chances in life, but they cannot inoculate him from receiving their own denied wounds.

Rebekah: I agree here too except to say that, practically speaking even if the adoptive parents merely refrain from what is currently generally accepted as abuse the adopted child has hugely increased life chances (including chances of achieving enlightenment!) compared with a child brought up in care.

"Care" being "foster care," I presume. I would agree with you here – foster care is horrible. The foster care system in New York City is terrible – kids getting murdered and tortured, etc. Lots of foster care kids who are "tough cases" just get stuck in psych wards, and so foster parents just deal with the kids' emotional problems by sending them to the psych ward and having them placed on antipsychotics. It's truly scary.

manjushri wrote:

In the UK more than a third of people in prison have been through the care system-it doesn't care for them.

Makes sense. So sad.

manjushri wrote:

I'm wondering if adoption would actually be the logical choice for the fully enlightened?

I wonder. Perhaps it could be. I could understand it, that's for sure.

I just focus instead on the best option for the partially enlightened (which is my own experience): to devote myself to my own healing process, and basically to adopt my own wounded inner child.

manjushri wrote:

After all there is serious overpopulation on the planet and a massive number of abused and unwanted children. Would a fully enlightened person want to increase the life chances for someone already on the planet more than they'd want to have their own biological child? I don't know I'm just throwing it out there, what do others think?

I think it would make sense. In a world of massive overpopulation it seems pretty darn selfish to procreate.

Quote from Daniel's essay:

Daniel: Truth seekers must first take full responsibility for the inner child orphaned within their own breast. They must nurture him, guide him, and let him grieve the losses of his own tragedy. This is the only way to achieve enlightenment. Until then, whenever they are given full responsibility for a child's life, be he their biological child or not, they will not be able to provide him with the full emotional nourishment he needs to become enlightened himself.

Rebekah: Yes I pretty much agree here except actually the first fully enlightened person will, by definition, NOT have had fully enlightened parents- that would be impossible by your argument here Daniel. So actually the first fully enlightened person won't be one who never had any wounds to heal- it will be someone who has successfully healed their wounds. This means an adopted person has as much chance of being the first enlightened human as anyone else providing their parents are "partially" enlightened at least... I see this as a philosophical conundrum at the heart of this debate about enlightenment- that it must be possible for an abused person to become fully enlightened. [/quote]

I'm a bit confused by what you're saying, but let me take a stab at it. Let me break it down piece by piece.

manjushri wrote:

Yes I pretty much agree here except actually the first fully enlightened person will, by definition, NOT have had fully enlightened parents

Agreed. That is a given.

manjushri wrote:

- that would be impossible by your argument here Daniel.

I do not see how it would be impossible, nor how my argument contradicts itself.

manjushri wrote:

So actually the first fully enlightened person won't be one who never had any wounds to heal- it will be someone who has successfully healed their wounds.

Right. Only a child who was never abused would never have any wounds to heal. But even that child would not be born fully enlightened. He wouldn't be enlightened at all. He would just be born full of truth. Enlightenment requires truth connected with consciousness, and newborns don't have consciousness. That develops naturally with age.

I'm not sure if that was what you didn't get in my argument. Could you clarify?

manjushri wrote:

This means an adopted person has as much chance of being the first enlightened human as anyone else providing their parents are "partially" enlightened at least...

Yes, in some ways this would be true, but I think an adopted child would probably – at least statistically – be less likely to become the first fully enlightened person because the trauma of being rejected by one's biological parents is so primal, and some people have not suffered that degree of primal trauma.

manjushri wrote:

I see this as a philosophical conundrum at the heart of this debate about enlightenment- that it must be possible for an abused person to become fully enlightened.

Oh, I believe wholeheartedly that it is possible for an abused person to become fully enlightened.

manjushri wrote:

I suppose we simply don't know what such a person's biological child could be! Something other than "fully enlightened" in the sense of fully healed though because they wouldn't be fully healed never having been wounded, unless by some source other than their parent which their parent would have been able to help them deal with in an enlightened way!

If someone was never wounded and developed consciousness they would by definition be fully enlightened. When I say enlightenment is synonymous with full healing I only mean that full healing is like being "as good as new," basically that full healing is the same as never having been wounded in the first place. No traumas lodged in the unconscious, and an unconscious that has dissolved because it no longer serves a purpose.

I hope I addressed your points!

Best,
Daniel

Daniel Mackler

<http://iraresoul.com>

manjushri

Posted: Wed Mar 21, 2007 4:37 pm Post subject:

 quote  edit  IP

Joined: 08
Sep 2006
Posts: 146
Location: UK

Hi Daniel, thanks for your reply.

Quote Daniel:

I don't think I said that. I think what I said was that parents who adopt often feel more justified in acting out because they didn't create the child.

It was the 'more virulent ' statement that made me infer that's what you meant, so thanks for pointing out the difference!

Quote Daniel:

Yes, and yet you would probably agree with me that the pain the parents suffer in giving their kids away is not even in the same realm as the pain their children suffer and will suffer because of the abandonment.

Of course, definitely. Also as times have changed in the UK there are fewer and fewer children 'given up' (interesting phrase no?) for adoption. Most of the children who are available for adoption have been forcibly removed from their parents because their parents have failed to parent them and that usually involved what we here would consider very extreme abuse/neglect of one sort or another.

Quote Daniel:

"Care" being "foster care," I presume.

Yeah but in the UK children who are removed from their families of origin enter what was (presumably until someone realised the sickening irony) called, officially 'the care system' and were said to be 'in care'. Such children are now officially called 'looked after children'. They include children who live in residential children's homes as well as those who are fostered both long and short term. Once a child is adopted and is no longer under the 'care' of the state and social services its no longer 'looked after' in the official sense. The system is a bit different from the one in the US in various ways I think.

Quote Daniel:

I would agree with you here – foster care is horrible. The foster care system in New York City is terrible – kids getting murdered and tortured, etc. Lots of foster care kids who are "tough cases" just get stuck in psych wards, and so foster parents just deal with the kids' emotional problems by sending them to the psych ward and having them placed on anti psychotics. It's truly scary.

Yes foster care is dreadful from the child's POV, by its nature its a temporary & therefore impossible situation for a child. There were newspaper headlines today about a woman jailed for horrifically abusing her foster children over 19 years.

<http://uk.news.yahoo.com/20032007/344/foster-mother-guilty-child-abuse.html>

Adults who provide foster care (which is usually temporary although its becoming more L/T & even permanent these days) continue to receive support from social workers, can access additional 'therapeutic help' for the children and importantly continue to receive money from the state. Once a child is adopted all this stops.... Its not so common for children and adolescents to be hospitalised in the UK as in America I think, it really only happens here with adolescents and then only if they are self harming/eating disordered at a life threatening level. Perhaps this is a hidden advantage of not having much of a private healthcare system! But though Ritalin is becoming increasingly popular I know of quite a few children's parents who've tried to get it for their kids and been refused, same with anti depressants. Many of the young people I've worked with who suffer moderate to severe depression are not offered drugs by their GPs- I think there is slightly more reluctance to medicate children over here.

Quote Daniel:

I think it would make sense. (for the enlightened to adopt) In a world of massive overpopulation it seems pretty darn selfish to procreate.

Yes and a fully enlightened person would be in the best position to parent a very wounded child after all.

Quote Daniel:

I'm a bit confused by what you're saying, but let me take a stab at it. Let me break it down piece by piece.

Sorry if I got a bit garbled here- you seem to have broadly understood what I was getting at though!

Quote Daniel:

- that would be impossible by your argument here Daniel.
I do not see how it would be impossible, nor how my argument contradicts itself.

What I meant here when I wrote 'by your argument here' was here in the more general sense of this forum rather than in this particular essay- my point being that I think enlightenment as in 'achieving full healing' necessitates wounds to heal from. So when you say

Quote Daniel:

they will not be able to provide him with the full emotional nourishment he needs to become enlightened himself

It seems like a contradiction (unless I've misunderstood something- very possible!) in that you say that a child needs 'full emotional nourishment to become fully enlightened' whereas you also say an abused person (such as we all are here!) can become enlightened so such a person did not need fully enlightened parents to become enlightened themselves. Maybe both are different routes to enlightenment and not contradictory at all! But maybe there needs to be two different words (or maybe I'm complicating matters unnecessarily) to represent someone who has healed from a position of woundedness as opposed to the (as yet hypothetical) person who was born to fully enlightened parents....Hope that makes what I meant a bit clearer!

Quote Daniel:

Right. Only a child who was never abused would never have any wounds to heal. But even that child would not be born fully enlightened.
He wouldn't be enlightened at all. He would just be born full of truth. Enlightenment requires truth connected with consciousness, and newborns don't have consciousness. That develops naturally with age.

I agree that such a child wouldn't be born fully enlightened but for him or her the path to enlightenment would simply involve developing consciousness ie. growing up. Certainly NOT healing in the way our paths to enlightenment involve healing right?

Quote Daniel:

I think an adopted child would probably – at least statistically – be less likely to become the first fully enlightened person because the trauma of being rejected by one's biological parents is so primal, and some people have not suffered that degree of primal trauma.

Of course there are different ways people are wounded, adoption isn't so much 'worse' a wound than enduring extreme abuse I wouldn't think (I know you're not saying that they are by the way!) Sounds a bit like 'the less abused [which you may not think is synonymous with 'primally wounded' as you use it here] you were the more chance you have of achieving enlightenment' which I think, sadly, is probably true except, as I've said before, your abuse has to be life limiting enough to make you realise you need to heal in the first place!

Quote Daniel:

If someone was never wounded and developed consciousness they would by definition be fully enlightened. When I say enlightenment is synonymous with full healing I only mean that full healing is like being "as good as new," basically that full healing is the same as never having been wounded in the first place. No traumas lodged in the unconscious, and an unconscious that has dissolved because it no longer serves a purpose.

Hmm I need to think a wee bit more about this one! My first reaction is to disagree. I think someone who achieved full enlightenment from a starting position of woundedness, though in some senses they would be 'as good as new' that 'good as newness' wouldn't be the same as never having being wounded in the first place at all- that's something radically different I suspect. I'll think some more on that though!

Thanks for a really thought provoking post!

Rebekah

'To be disillusioned is better than being under an illusion!'

Daniel Mackler
Site Admin

Posted: Fri Mar 23, 2007 4:27 pm Post subject:

 quote  edit  IP

manjushri wrote:

What I meant here when I wrote 'by your argument here' was here in the more general sense of this forum rather than in this particular essay- my point being that I think enlightenment as in 'achieving full healing' necessitates wounds to heal from. So when you say "they will not be able to provide him with the full emotional nourishment he needs to become enlightened himself" it seems like a contradiction (unless I've misunderstood something- very possible!) ...

You make a fair point. In much of my writing I assume the only way to become fully enlightened is to heal one's wounds – because I make the more basic assumption that everyone gets wounded along the way. Of course, this might be a flawed assumption if someone had fully enlightened parents and were raised in a fully enlightened world. Perhaps that person would never be wounded or traumatized at all, and as they gained consciousness they would grow right into enlightenment. Wow – a lovely thought! I can only hope it someday becomes a reality for every child...or even for one...

manjushri wrote:

Of course there are different ways people are wounded, adoption isn't so much 'worse' a wound than enduring extreme abuse I wouldn't think

Yes – though I have to be careful getting into comparing whose abuse is worse. I've heard Jews and Blacks in New York City compare which was worse, the Holocaust or Slavery. Seems so ludicrous to me – both totally awful!

Quote:

Daniel: If someone was never wounded and developed consciousness they would by definition be fully enlightened. When I say enlightenment is synonymous with full healing I only mean that full healing is like being "as good as new," basically that full healing is the same as never having been wounded in the first place. No traumas lodged in the unconscious, and an unconscious that has dissolved because it no longer serves a purpose.

Rebekah: Hmm I need to think a wee bit more about this one! My first reaction is to disagree. I think someone who achieved full enlightenment from a starting position of woundedness, though in some senses they would be 'as good as new' that 'good as newness' wouldn't be the same as never having being wounded in the first place at all- that's something radically different I suspect.

You're probably right. Frankly, though, I'd take either form of enlightenment, though if I could have my druthers I'd rather never have been wounded in the first place.

My guess is that someone who was never wounded would have extremely HUGE empathy for everyone, and for all wounded souls. Kind of like Kaleo's son empathizing with a deflated balloon... I've seen amazing acts of empathy from very young and healthy children... It often fades as they grow older and get eaten up by their parents and the world...

Until the next post...and thanks for the topic-

-Daniel

Daniel Mackler

<http://iraresoul.com>

Joined: 03
Aug 2006
Posts: 525
Location:
New York
City

manjushri

Posted: Sat Mar 24, 2007 3:06 am Post subject:

 quote
  edit
  IP

 Joined: 08
 Sep 2006
 Posts: 146
 Location: UK

Thanks for your thoughts here Daniel, no time to reply properly right now but really enjoyable ideas coming up here!

Where is everyone by the way?

Best
 Rebekah

manjushri

Posted: Sun Mar 25, 2007 3:01 pm Post subject:

 quote
  edit
  IP

 Joined: 08
 Sep 2006
 Posts: 146
 Location: UK

Hi Daniel

I've got a wee bit more time tonight to reply..

Quote Daniel:

Yes – though I have to be careful getting into comparing whose abuse is worse. I've heard Jews and Blacks in New York City compare which was worse, the Holocaust or Slavery. Seems so ludicrous to me – both totally awful!

I agree and thats why I put 'worse' in quotation marks!

Quote Daniel:

You're probably right. Frankly, though, I'd take either form of enlightenment, though if I could have my druthers I'd rather never have been wounded in the first place.

Yeah I tend to agree. It would have been better never to have been wounded! I suppose I was playing with what sadly remains a hypothetical notion of the unabused child! There is also something important to me abt my struggle/the journey which I don't want to denigrate

Quote Daniel:

My guess is that someone who was never wounded would have extremely HUGE empathy for everyone, and for all wounded souls.

Yeah and for themselves! My mind boggles imagining what such people could be- I find it great fun and day dreaming abt it often stimulates insight for me abt my own stuff though!

Quote Daniel:

Kind of like Kaleo's son empathizing with a deflated balloon... I've seen amazing acts of empathy from very young and healthy children... It often fades as they grow older and get eaten up by their parents and the world

I enjoyed that story of Kaleo's and I've also witnessed this in other children. It seems to go hand in hand with a child's connection to their true selves which I think we all start with (though I don't want to ignore what damage can occur in utero and childbirth). This connection to self and concomitant high empathy seems to get forced 'underground' because parents find children's emotions so unacceptable as a rule and hurriedly teach them to 'disconnect or die'. People lose this connection at varying rates depending on how and in what manner they are abused as they grow up. This process is often thought of as civilising the child, teaching her to be well behaved etc and much of this process is simply brutalisation. Kaleo's dilemma about how to help her son with the present giving situation could have been just such an opportunity for brutalisation -happily one which is preventable with sufficient parental healing and awareness.

Interestingly I find working with young people they can be more in touch with their 'true selves' than are adults- of course they are also still dependent on their parents for survival too hence (perhaps)

their particular vulnerability to artificially mood altering

all for now, best wishes,

Rebekah