



## Critique of Essay "11 reasons why it is inappropriate for you to have children": Reason #1 - You are not fully enlightened.

October, 2006 – February, 2008

Author	Message
<p><b>Kaleo</b></p> <p>Joined: 06 Oct 2006 Posts: 209</p>	<p>Posted: Mon Oct 23, 2006 3:05 pm Post subject: Reason #1 - You are not fully enlightened.   </p> <p>I thought I would start a new post to follow up on Daniel's suggestion that we essentially deconstruct his essay, <i>Eleven Situations In Which It Is Not Appropriate For You To Have Children</i>, to help me in my quest for examples and analysis. Let the wild rumpus begin!</p> <p><b>Quote from Daniel's essay:</b></p> <div data-bbox="378 688 1495 867" style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 5px;"> <p>1) You are not fully enlightened.</p> <p>If you are not fully enlightened it means you still repress some degree of unresolved trauma. We all have a compulsion to act out our repressed traumas on our intimates, and all the more so on our vulnerable, needy children – because they cannot refuse it or escape. Therefore, where you are not enlightened you will abuse your children at least to some degree. This is inappropriate.</p> </div> <p>Well, heck, I didn't realize the first one would be the hardest. The standard of being <i>fully enlightened</i> is perhaps impossible to reach in a lifetime. But could a partially enlightened parent raise a healthier (or less-traumatized) child, who would then have less "distance" to go toward enlightenment, and thus mathematically continue to shrink the gap? Is this an unacceptable proposal? If we demand perfection or nothing, have we all lost out? Or do we lose out only by <b>not</b> demanding perfection? Is there even any such thing as <u>partially enlightened</u>, particularly in the context of being a parent, or is that in itself an oxymoron?</p> <p>Those are some of the immediate questions that come to mind. Others?</p> <p>Kaleo</p>
<p><b>manjushri</b></p> <p>Joined: 08 Sep 2006 Posts: 146 Location: UK</p>	<p>Posted: Mon Oct 23, 2006 4:02 pm Post subject:   </p> <p>Hi kaleo,</p> <p><b>Quote:</b></p> <div data-bbox="378 1415 1495 1482" style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 5px;"> <p>But could a partially enlightened parent raise a less-traumatized child, who would then have less "distance" to go toward enlightenment, and thus mathematically continue to shrink the gap?</p> </div> <p>This is what I was hoping too! In some ways I think that what you say here is 'objectively' true, but I'm not sure if the second generation will perceive it as such, (as a child knowing that there were starving children in Africa never helped me in the task of eating butter beans!) I've met and worked with many people who 'objectively' did not endure (and I'm excluding people who simply don't remember) the level of abuse I did in my family but who were/are nevertheless restricted, stunted and deformed emotionally by the level of abuse they did suffer. The fact that this might have been less than their own parents wouldn't have been any consolation to them I'm sure.</p> <p>I guess if one already has children the thought that one will use ones child to contain ones own split off pain LESS than ones own parents did is a consolation and if one hasn't had children it probably means you have to face up to the fact that ethically you shouldn't have them. Tough stuff! 😞</p> <p><b>Quote:</b></p>

If we demand perfection or nothing, have we all lost out?

Great question! I'm not sure what the answer is! I guess less abuse is going to be better than more abuse & no abuse at all is better than less. The only way to guarantee not using our children to meet our own unmet childhood needs is not to have them at all though.

**Quote:**

Is there any such thing as partially enlightened, or is that in itself an oxymoron?

I just think of enlightenment as something I'm aiming for! Sometimes I'm in a fog and don't feel sure whether I'm heading toward it at all other times I feel great clarity and can glimpse it in the distance! Also I think that, for me at least, in some way I'm pretty enlightened and in others am pretty backward. So I guess I'm enlightened in some areas and not in others but I'm definitely more enlightened than I was in the past! Hmm not sure if that's clear at all!

Best wishes,

Rebekah

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

**kaleo**

Posted: Tue Oct 24, 2006 11:22 am Post subject:

 quote  edit  X  IP

Joined: 06 Oct  
2006  
Posts: 209

Hi Rebekah -

Nice to hear from you! I know you were musing on motherhood on another post, so your input is especially nice to hear. I don't know if reading Daniel's "Eleven Situations" would have made me decide not to have a child, but it's certainly making me think retroactively about why I did.

One problem I'm struggling with is this: if people begin to accept that only fully enlightened people should have kids (or be wise enough not to have them), the least enlightened will be the last to catch on. Rather than solving the issues of overpopulation and abuse - as posed on this site, anyway - might it not exacerbate them, at least temporarily?

Now that I think of it, I'm also grappling with how to work within the framework Daniel has set out. I think that's only fair to him. But at the same time, I'm not sure I'm comfortable with the idea of judging who is "less" or "more" enlightened, especially when I myself have far to go. Some days I wonder, who am I to assume I'm better than, say, Wal-Mart shoppers? It's all just a matter of degree, and I've been the minority in so many ways. Sometimes it's hard not to feel like that means I'm just wrong or out of touch with reality, whatever that is. Or worse, that it makes no difference at all whether I'm right.

Don't know if that makes any sense to you... I am so interested in hearing more of your thoughts on whether to have children, particularly in the context of "Eleven Situations", if you're willing to share!

cheers,  
Kaleo

**manjushri**

Posted: Wed Oct 25, 2006 4:21 am Post subject:

 quote  edit  X  IP

Joined: 08 Sep  
2006  
Posts: 146  
Location: UK

Hi kaleo,

**Quote:**

I don't know if reading Daniel's "Eleven Situations" would have made me decide not to have a child, but it's certainly making me think retroactively about why I did.

Well I found it both helpful and painful to read those 11 situations I must say! I had known for a long

time that what Daniel was saying in that essay was true (I'd begun reading Miller over 10 yrs ago at the beginning of my own recovery from a traumatic childhood and over the years came to pretty similar conclusions to Daniel) but it was still a shock to see it there in black and white let alone to find I wasn't the only 'lone looney' out there! Also I was in the midst of a process of doing some **more** deep level grieving for the child that I had been as well as the one I would probably never have- because I knew I wouldn't pass my own test and Daniel's essay confirmed that for me! In some ways I'm still wishing nobody had confirmed those beliefs 😊 because there are parts of me that would love being a mother! I just recognise that in some (though not in all) ways that feeling of loving to be a mother is NOT about my ability to provide what I think my child would deserve but is about unresolved stuff of my own backed up by the physiological stuff!

**Quote:**

One problem I'm struggling with is this: if people begin to accept that only fully enlightened people should have kids (or be wise enough not to have them), the least enlightened will be the last to catch on. Rather than solving the issues of overpopulation and abuse - as posed on this site, anyway - might it not exacerbate them, at least temporarily?

I know what you mean here Kaleo! its a quandary for me too (I've posed these questions elsewhere on the forum) and one I can't claim to have fully processed! I'm thinking maybe us (at least partly) enlightened people *should* be reproducing because our children will have a shorter journey to enlightenment and they will be able to speed up the evolutionary process after we've gone but on the other hand if I know I can't protect my child from pain and suffering caused by **me** can I, in all conscience, give them life? I'm not sure if I'm fully in tune with Daniel's idea that we can pass on the benefit of our (partial) enlightenment to others AND do less harm to future generations by not having our own children (at least before full enlightenment) but the bit of me that resists that idea may be the sick bit thats wants a child for all the wrong reasons! I'm still working on it!! I don't know if the partially enlightened having children would make things worse overall but I do wonder if not having them is the answer! Hope that makes sense!

I'm definitely no where near full enlightenment and I can hear that in my situation I shouldn't reproduce so I don't think you have to be fully enlightened to get what Daniel's saying -I mean he doesn't claim to be enlightened himself!

**Quote:**

But at the same time, I'm not sure I'm comfortable with the idea of judging who is "less" or "more" enlightened, especially when I myself have far to go.

I'm definitely very uncomfortable with it! On the other hand I know that the mothers hitting their little children in the supermarket probably wanted to be mothers and didn't have the possibility (not having been exposed to these ideas) of considering how their child would feel having them as a mother! They didn't have access to the idea that they should be healing themselves first rather than making a child and giving him or her the job of healing their mother! Given that belief I just find it impossible to avoid what seems the logical conclusion that I therefore believe some people just shouldn't have children in the first place! Even though it makes me feel uncomfortable to think that.

I guess I should say that I've arrived (however unwillingly!) at this conclusion despite the fact that I can see the pain and suffering of these abusing parents and have some compassion for that along with my other feelings. I very well know what its like to be in a supermarket with only the emotional resources of a child yourself with a little child ('having a tantrum') you're responsible for who's humiliating you and drawing attention to your failure- I was in that situation many times as a teenager with much younger siblings and always handled it more or less abusively though I would say not as abusively as my parents did!

**Quote:**

I've been the minority in so many ways. Sometimes it's hard not to feel like that means I'm just wrong or out of touch with reality, whatever that is. Or worse, that it makes no difference at all whether I'm right.

I have also been a minority in any ways (including culturally) throughout my life and in some ways I think its kind of prepared me for this! In others I wonder if my comfort (and discomfort) at being in a minority has caused me to choose it again with this stuff as a repetition compulsion! I do know that my beliefs make a difference to my lives and the lives of my clients! I'm sure your beliefs make a difference to your own life and that of your son too!

**Quote:**

I am so interested in hearing more of your thoughts on whether to have children, particularly in the context of "Eleven Situations", if you're willing to share!

Happy to! I hope I've begun that here!

Best wishes,  
Rebekah

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

**Daniel Mackler**  
Site Admin

Posted: Wed Oct 25, 2006 3:53 pm Post subject: Re: Reason #1 - You are not fully enlightened.

 quote  edit  IP

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

**kaleo wrote:**

Let the wild rumpus begin!

Yes! And let us travel to the land...Where The Wild Things Are! (I have seen several people in New York City with a tattoo of Sendak's "Max" on them, and if I were a tattoo type of person I might join them with one!!!)

**kaleo wrote:**

The standard of being *fully enlightened* is perhaps impossible to reach in a lifetime.

And DEFINITELY impossible if we don't make it a life's devotion. Probably easier to become an Olympic athlete than to become fully enlightened.

**kaleo wrote:**

But could a partially enlightened parent raise a healthier (or less-traumatized) child, who would then have less "distance" to go toward enlightenment, and thus mathematically continue to shrink the gap?

Good point – and definitely true. But, the partially enlightened parent would still traumatize his child to some degree, and from the child's perspective this is still horrible and painful and emotionally devastating. Less so than if he were more traumatized, but still awful nonetheless. And where a parent is not fully enlightened they will not fully be able to empathize with their child – and not be able to mirror him fully. That partially leaves the child emotionally out in the cold. No child deserves that.

**kaleo wrote:**

Is this an unacceptable proposal?

Depends on your point of view. From the point of view of the child being traumatized, no. From the point of view of slowly and gradually changing the world, perhaps yes.

**kaleo wrote:**

If we demand perfection or nothing, have we all lost out?

If one wants kids and defines the ultimate value in one's life by having kids, and one does not reach full enlightenment by the time one is still of child-bearing age, then yes. But if we define the value of life by how much inner connection with our true self we attain, then no.

**kaleo wrote:**

Or do we lose out only by **not** demanding perfection?

In my opinion, yes.

**kaleo wrote:**

Is there even any such thing as partially enlightened, particularly in the context of being a parent, or is that in itself an oxymoron?

No, it's a definite truth. I myself am partially enlightened, and much more enlightened than I was several years ago, and as such – not just based on intellectual arguments, but on my observations of myself in reality – I would be a much better parent now because of my increased connection with truth.

**kaleo wrote:**

Those are some of the immediate questions that come to mind. Others?

Good questions so far!

Daniel Mackler

<http://iraresoul.com>

**kaleo**

Posted: Wed Oct 25, 2006 5:19 pm Post subject: Re: Reason #1 - You are not fully enlightened.

 quote  edit  X  IP

Joined: 06 Oct 2006  
Posts: 209

A Max tattoo... now *that* I could do!

Though you're couching everything in general terms, it goes without saying I'm applying your ideas to my own life. Obviously, one of the hopes I have is that I will not come to the eventual conclusion that I shouldn't have had my son. That's one reason this path is so horrendously fearful to tread as a mother. It seems to me that to truthfully attempt to understand your point of view, I have to remain open to that option. Do you think that's true?

So far I can say with certainty that I do not drink, smoke or do drugs, and that I did not have him to complete my life in any way. On the contrary, I had him *because* my life felt complete to me. I very consciously didn't want to put a burden on anyone of filling a void, nor was I subject to the ticking clock feeling.

As to the rest of your criteria, I am still working through them. I know I am not fully enlightened, so have not passed muster in that regard. Though, ironically, I don't think your site would have interested me as much if I weren't a mother.

onward,  
Kaleo

**Daniel Mackler**  
Site Admin

Posted: Thu Oct 26, 2006 12:13 pm Post subject:

 quote  edit  X  IP

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

**manjushri wrote:**

I guess if one already has children the thought that one will use ones child to contain ones own split off pain LESS than ones own parents did is a consolation and if one hasn't had children it probably means you have to face up to the fact that ethically you shouldn't have them. Tough

stuff! 😊

I agree – and agree that this is tough stuff.

**manjushri wrote:**

The only way to guarantee not using our children to meet our own unmet childhood needs is not to have them at all though.

...or to heal our unresolved childhood trauma and through this figure out how, in a mature way, to meet our ancient unmet childhood needs...

**Quote:**

Is there any such thing as partially enlightened, or is that in itself an oxymoron?

**manjushri wrote:**

I just think of enlightenment as something I'm aiming for! Sometimes I'm in a fog and don't feel sure whether I'm heading toward it at all other times I feel great clarity and can glimpse it in the distance! Also I think that, for me at least, in some way I'm pretty enlightened and in others am pretty backward. So I guess I'm enlightened in some areas and not in others but I'm definitely more enlightened than I was in the past! Hmm not sure if that's clear at all!

Makes sense to me.

-Daniel

Daniel Mackler

<http://iraresoul.com>

**Daniel Mackler**  
Site Admin

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

Posted: Thu Oct 26, 2006 12:28 pm Post subject:

 quote  edit  ip

**kaleo wrote:**

I don't know if reading Daniel's "Eleven Situations" would have made me decide not to have a child, but it's certainly making me think retroactively about why I did.

I don't think discovering the stuff I've discovered would primarily make me decide not to have a child, rather, primarily that I would want to devote the BEST of my energy in life to becoming enlightened. And I think even if one is a parent – and as I've said, especially if one is a parent! – the quest for enlightened remains a huge priority.

**kaleo wrote:**

One problem I'm struggling with is this: if people begin to accept that only fully enlightened people should have kids (or be wise enough not to have them), the least enlightened will be the last to catch on. Rather than solving the issues of overpopulation and abuse - as posed on this site, anyway - might it not exacerbate them, at least temporarily?

Interesting point, but I don't agree, because I see the logic as flawed. I think what happens instead is that as more people become more awakened/enlightened, everyone begins to catch on. If the most enlightenment people don't lead the way, then nobody figures it out, and THEN of course the least enlightened people will never have any hope of catching on.

The logical error I think you have expressed here (sorry for being blunt) is the assumption that if the most enlightened stop having kids then the least enlightened will somehow have more. I don't see that as the case at all. But I think this idea you express does touch on something that is very real in many

people's psychology, and I sense it around – and sometimes hear it overtly from people. It's this idea that there's a competition about who can have the most children, and put the most children into the next generation. Siblings compete, friends compete, races compete, cultures compete, whole nations even compete. And to me that is sheer insanity, considering the damage that our overpopulation and our over-consuming species is doing to the world. I think the job of the most enlightened people is to take personal responsibility however they can me of most benefit to the world. And I personally don't see having children as doing that.

**kaleo wrote:**

... I'm not sure I'm comfortable with the idea of judging who is "less" or "more" enlightened, especially when I myself have far to go. Some days I wonder, who am I to assume I'm better than, say, Wal-Mart shoppers?

How about and replacing the word "judging" with "assessing" – takes some of the sting out of it. I think that yes, it can still make us look arrogant to even assess someone's level of enlightenment, but by the same token, I still think varying levels of enlightenment really do exist, and that there are some overt criteria by which we can do this assessing (though of course many would not agree with my criteria). And I think part of not doing this assessing is based on a fear of being JUDGED by the less enlightened people, who need to project their self-hatred onto anyone who calls them out on the carpet for their very real unhealthiness. Translation: if I label someone as primitive or immature – especially when they really are – they protect themselves by calling me arrogant, crazy, self-deluded, etc., to protect themselves from having to look in the mirror.

**kaleo wrote:**

It's all just a matter of degree, and I've been the minority in so many ways. Sometimes it's hard not to feel like that means I'm just wrong or out of touch with reality, whatever that is. Or worse, that it makes no difference at all whether I'm right.

I see us all as partially deluded and crazy – in our unhealed/unenlightened parts – and that's what makes this assessment of reality, and of the pathology of others, complex. But let's face it, just because I'm a little bit screwed up doesn't that still give me the right to assess a maniac pervert serial killer as being a very sick and damaged person, and sicker than I am?

Does this hit on what you were addressing? I don't know if I addressed it exactly.

---

Daniel Mackler

<http://iraresoul.com>

**Daniel Mackler**  
Site Admin

Posted: Thu Oct 26, 2006 12:44 pm Post subject:



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

**manjushri wrote:**

Well I found it both helpful and painful to read those 11 situations I must say! I had known for a long time that what Daniel was saying in that essay was true (I'd begun reading Miller over 10 yrs ago at the beginning of my own recovery from a traumatic childhood and over the years came to pretty similar conclusions to Daniel) but it was still a shock to see it there in black and white let alone to find I wasn't the only 'lone looney' out there! Also I was in the midst of a process of doing some **more** deep level grieving for the child that I had been as well as the one I would probably never have- because I knew I wouldn't pass my own test and Daniel's essay confirmed that for me! In some ways I'm still wishing nobody had confirmed those beliefs 😊 because there are parts of me that would love being a mother! I just recognise that in some (though not in all) ways that feeling of loving to be a mother is NOT about my ability to provide what I think my child would deserve but is about unresolved stuff of my own backed up by the physiological stuff!

Thank you for posting this. I appreciate hearing it, and it gives me a sense of comfort. I relate to it strongly. Part of me would love to be a father, and I'm often told that I'd be a great one, but when I

really stop and think about bringing a child into this world, I just can't imagine myself doing it. I can't pass my own test! Maybe someday, but I really suspect that I will never have children. But lord, if I can fully heal my own child within, and really come to full maturity in my own life, then I believe I have a chance to offer the world something really great. This is my hope. This is what I really work toward...year after year.

**manjushri wrote:**

I'm not sure if I'm fully in tune with Daniel's idea that we can pass on the benefit of our (partial) enlightenment to others AND do less harm to future generations by not having our own children (at least before full enlightenment) but the bit of me that resists that idea may be the sick bit that wants a child for all the wrong reasons!

I hear you, and relate to this from personal experience, but at the same time, look at what we're doing here – spreading a message, and something is growing in us because of it, something new that we surely radiate in our daily lives, if only subliminally. And the more we heal the more we surely do less abusive things to others with whom we interact, and this only benefits future generations. But having kids...hmm...why should any child be brought into the world by someone who will even partially abuse him? I can't get past that one. I just don't see it as fair to the child.

**manjushri wrote:**

I'm definitely no where near full enlightenment and I can hear that in my situation I shouldn't reproduce so I don't think you have to be fully enlightened to get what Daniel's saying -I mean he doesn't claim to be enlightened himself!

I often wonder how far I have yet to go on my quest for enlightenment. I think I have a long ways yet. I may never make it in my lifetime, but then again, I may. I've surely come a long way, and by extrapolating that outward into my future, I can only imagine my growth process will continue.

I think part of wondering how far I have to go means really assessing how damaged I am, that is, how much I really was damaged in my childhood, how much I was stripped of my conscious connection with my inner perfection. I think I was damaged a lot – a lot less than the norm (and oddly, this is largely to my parents' credit), but still a lot (for which I primarily blame my parents). Complex, eh?

**kaleo wrote:**

I've been the minority in so many ways.

**manjushri wrote:**

I have also been a minority in any ways (including culturally) throughout my life and in some ways I think its kind of prepared me for this!

Me too! Did you get a chance to catch my essay about how every child – every true-self-to-be – is a minority in his family of origin...when, that is, his parents are not fully enlightened?







<http://iraresoul.com/minority.html>

**manjushri wrote:**

In others I wonder if my comfort (and discomfort) at being in a minority has caused me to choose it again with this stuff as a repetition compulsion!

The search to be one's own true self, at whatever risks of alienation and marginalization from the norm, is no repetition compulsion. The search to be true is the deepest hope of life! (Hope that didn't come across as preachy...)

-Daniel

<p><b>kaleo</b></p> <p>Joined: 06 Oct 2006 Posts: 209</p>	<p>Daniel Mackler</p> <p>Posted: Thu Oct 26, 2006 2:48 pm Post subject:  <a href="#">quote</a>  <a href="#">edit</a>  <a href="#">IP</a></p> <hr/> <p><b>Quote:</b></p> <div data-bbox="378 352 1495 527" style="border: 1px solid gray; padding: 5px;"> <p>The logical error I think you have expressed here (sorry for being blunt) is the assumption that if the most enlightened stop having kids then the least enlightened will somehow have more. I don't see that as the case at all. But I think this idea you express does touch on something that is very real in many people's psychology, and I sense it around – and sometimes hear it overtly from people. It's this idea that there's a competition about who can have the most children, and put the most children into the next generation.</p> </div> <p>I take your point, Daniel; if the more enlightened devote their energies toward enlightening others rather than repeating history by having their own children, it will positively affect the entire population, even if the child output for the masses remains constant for a while, thus tipping the balance toward enlightenment for all. Right? And I do agree there is a competition mentality about having children and all aspects of parenting. Right now I'm sticking to raising one child well, but I see lots of families with six or seven kids and it makes my jaw drop. Or is the difference only one of degree at that point?</p> <p>Nevertheless, I'm deeply troubled by the idea that I maybe shouldn't have had a child according to this logic and trying to work through (weasel out of?) it honestly. Do you have any suggestions on how to address it? As you said somewhere else, you're essentially dealing with emotion, not logic... And you are not primarily aiming toward parents, I know.</p> <p>headed to lunch, Kaleo</p>
<p><b>Daniel Mackler</b> Site Admin</p> <p>Joined: 03 Aug 2006 Posts: 525 Location: New York City</p>	<p>Posted: Fri Oct 27, 2006 12:04 pm Post subject:  <a href="#">quote</a>  <a href="#">edit</a>  <a href="#">IP</a></p> <hr/> <p><b>kaleo wrote:</b></p> <div data-bbox="378 1104 1495 1224" style="border: 1px solid gray; padding: 5px;"> <p>I take your point, Daniel; if the more enlightened devote their energies toward enlightening others rather than repeating history by having their own children, it will positively affect the entire population, even if the child output for the masses remains constant for a while, thus tipping the balance toward enlightenment for all. Right?</p> </div> <p>I think it would work this way.</p> <p><b>kaleo wrote:</b></p> <div data-bbox="378 1360 1495 1455" style="border: 1px solid gray; padding: 5px;"> <p>And I do agree there is a competition mentality about having children and all aspects of parenting. Right now I'm sticking to raising one child well, but I see lots of families with six or seven kids and it makes my jaw drop. Or is the difference only one of degree at that point?</p> </div> <p>I don't exactly understand your question... Meanwhile, I think having one child, if someone is going to have a child at all, is the ideal. It really decreases the child's tendency to have to compete for the resources of the parents (who are limited due to their lack of full enlightenment). Of course, one could argue that it deprives the child of a sibling as a playmate or buffer, but all the more reason for the parent to connect his or her family to others and live more communally... Just a thought...</p> <p>Also, if everyone had only one child it would contribute massively to population reduction.</p> <p><b>kaleo wrote:</b></p> <div data-bbox="378 1770 1495 1864" style="border: 1px solid gray; padding: 5px;"> <p>Nevertheless, I'm deeply troubled by the idea that I maybe shouldn't have had a child according to this logic and trying to work through (weasel out of?) it honestly. Do you have any suggestions on how to address it?</p> </div> <p>Only you can ultimately answer that question for yourself. I still think there are some basic bottom</p>

lines in the equation. Let me write in hypotheticals:

- A person has a child.
- The person discovers my website and some or all of what I write resonates.
- The person may feel lousy because he considers the possibility that he had a child prematurely, to the detriment of the child.
- This can take the parent in some different directions.
- One is that the parent feels miserable and guilty and rotten and becomes depressed and ultimately becomes a worse parent, less available.
- Or, the parent blocks out what I'm saying because it's too troubling and radical, and just instead denies it and labels me nuts
- Or, ideally, the parent would use what I'm saying to help himself better devote his life to being a better and more enlightened parent
- After all, regardless, the child is here, the decisions to create the child have been made, and the child still needs love and needs an enlightened parent to optimally help him grow. See: <http://iraresoul.com/manifesto.html>

-I don't see it as the worst thing in the world that a parent – or any person – who reads my site has regrets or is deeply troubled by past errors that come to light by reading my point of view. There is a healthy thing called appropriate regret! In my own healing process I've discovered many painful and awful past things that I've done, and still discover new things. Many of these have actually been self-destructive, and I have to mourn these losses.

I don't know if this is exactly what you were asking above, but I do see my site as being a potentially valuable resource for parents.

**Kaleo wrote:**

As you said somewhere else, you're essentially dealing with emotion, not logic... And you are not primarily aiming toward parents, I know.

I would say I'm dealing with the logic of emotions – because they do have an intense logic. Also, I'm not primarily aiming what I say toward parents because so few are open to what I have to say! That doesn't mean that what I say does not apply to them, or that I see them as beyond hope. I think it applies vitally to parents, and to all. Heck, I think it even applies to pet owners! (People act out these same unconscious dynamics on their pets too, that's for sure!)

Ciao,  
Daniel

---

Daniel Mackler

**cc**

Posted: Fri Oct 27, 2006 12:38 pm Post subject:



Joined: 06 Oct 2006  
Posts: 47  
Location: Long Island, NY

**Quote:**

Heck, I think it even applies to pet owners! (People act out these same unconscious dynamics on their pets too, that's for sure!)

Yep! So true.

**kaleo**

Posted: Fri Oct 27, 2006 1:00 pm Post subject:



Joined: 06 Oct 2006  
Posts: 209

**Quote:**

Of course, one could argue that it deprives the child of a sibling as a playmate or buffer, but all the more reason for the parent to connect his or her family to others and live more communally.

I just brought up siblings in the False Memories post...

I guess what I meant is that if having any children at all before being enlightened is erroneous in your view, then having one is simply less of an error than having seven - but an error nonetheless.

Thanks for the hypotheticals. In terms of having had my son prematurely based on your standard, I'll admit that's true. Whether that's to his detriment at this point depends on how well I am able to take steps toward enlightenment now that he is here. He is an amazing little soul, and I am open to anything that makes his life better. To say I "regret" him seems fruitless to me. I don't. However, if it turns out that I cause him pain I could have avoided, **that** I would regret. To say I could become a better person/mother by healing own my "inner child" does give me a sense of hope.

My writing is getting a bit sloppier here, as I'm not intellectualizing in theory now. Sorry. It's hard, and I'm trying to stick it out. Reminds me of mile 11 on a half-marathon, but I'm probably closer to the starting line...

Kaleo

**Daniel Mackler**  
Site Admin

Posted: Sun Oct 29, 2006 3:17 pm Post subject:

 quote  edit  IP

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

**kaleo wrote:**

In terms of having had my son prematurely based on your standard, I'll admit that's true. Whether that's to his detriment at this point depends on how well I am able to take steps toward enlightenment now that he is here. He is an amazing little soul, and I am open to anything that makes his life better.

Wonderful. That's the only way. I would think that everything a parent does should keep in mind the potential positive benefits for the child.

**kaleo wrote:**

To say I "regret" him seems fruitless to me. I don't.

No time for regrets – life moves forward! We can only try to make the future better – though often we have to really dig into the past to do it. But not through regretting.

**kaleo wrote:**

To say I could become a better person/mother by healing own my "inner child" does give me a sense of hope.

It's the ultimate hope, in my opinion.

**kaleo wrote:**

It's hard, and I'm trying to stick it out. Reminds me of mile 11 on a half-marathon, but I'm probably closer to the starting line...

I feel like I'm running a marathon all the time – and yet no one's told me how long it will go on for. I see the endpoint as enlightenment. Perhaps I'll run forever. If so, so be it – what better way to live?

Daniel Mackler  
<http://iraresoul.com>

**manjushri**

Posted: Mon Oct 30, 2006 7:26 am Post subject:

 quote  edit  IP

Joined: 08 Sep  
2006  
Posts: 146  
Location: UK

Hi Kaleo and Daniel,

Kaleo, it seems like in arriving at your current understanding of your situation you've more than just begun the marathon of healing!  
Just getting to this point in what seems like a relatively short space of time since joining the forum (not to imply that your journey wasn't already well underway before you started coming 'here'!) It must have been since it seems like you were very

ready to hear this stuff. Daniel's experience in the past with in denial parents blasting him ad hominem really makes it clear that if a person isn't ready to hear this stuff they would probably just abuse the current participants. I find my self feeling really curious about the other parents you've mentioned directing here!

Despite 'failing' the 11 reasons not to have children 'test' (this kind of language seems a bit inappropriate to me but I hope you'll get what I mean!) your commitment is extremely inspiring, I actually was beginning to wonder if I would ever come across a single parent who could take this stuff on board- so many thanks for doing just that!

Daniel, I too have that marathon feeling and sometimes I need to stop running and just be STILL too! Remind myself that I can't fix the world but can only facilitate and witness it fixing itself! 😊

Best wishes,  
Rebekah

**kaleo**

📅 Posted: Mon Oct 30, 2006 11:47 am Post subject:

 quote  edit  IP

Joined: 06 Oct  
2006  
Posts: 209

Thanks, Rebekah! And good to see you as always. I'm not looking for "credit" for doing this - though it's nice to hear, of course. I've not learned all this in such a short time as you think. In my work and life, I've been thinking about these issues a lot; Daniel just put a framework to them that I can understand and apply, at least in part. Maybe that's what you meant by being ready to hear his ideas?

I posted in the thread on Alice Miller about an experience with a friend of mine who came to many of the same conclusions by herself somehow. I think there ARE people who have or are ready to accept these ideas, if they knew how to get here. Heck, I stumbled onto this forum through an Amazon review!

The other parents I referred to the site are women on a board that deals with health issues. A couple of them read and agreed with The Baby's Manifesto, but I don't know that they will post here or want to engage at the level this requires.

I've asked Daniel to consider reframing some of his essays to apply to parents, without diluting his message. One example: the Eighteen Steps essay mentions being single, not having sex, and not reproducing. What if you are doing those things already, as I have? And if you do have children, *don't be single* seems to be a corollary (not that I've decided I agree entirely with that yet). Anyway, hope he'll undertake the task and look forward to what he comes up with. What a demanding woman I am!  
😊

All the best to you. How did you come up with your name, Manjushri, by the way (if that's not too nose - I'm from India)?

Kaleo

**Daniel Mackler**  
Site Admin

📅 Posted: Mon Oct 30, 2006 4:11 pm Post subject:

 quote  edit  IP

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

Nice to hear from you, Rebekah.

**manjushri wrote:**

Kaleo, ...it seems like you were very ready to hear this stuff. Daniel's experience in the past with in denial parents blasting him ad hominem really makes it clear that if a person isn't ready to hear this stuff they would probably just abuse the current participants. I find my self feeling really curious about the other parents you've mentioned directing here!

I tell you, I have met few parents open to my ideas: FEW. But I get positive emails from some once in a while, though few have ever posted on the bulletin board. Oddly enough, most of the parents who

seem to be open to my ideas are those who...you know, I was going to say had hit some sort of bottom in their lives, but perhaps that's not the case. I'm not sure what it is. I have had parent open to my ideas, and then when they really realized at an emotional level what I was talking about, and that it really applied to them, they freaked out and headed for the hills and pathologized me to kingdom come.

But some are more open. They are rare. But then again, when you also consider that only a VERY small percentage of people who don't have children are open to my ideas either, then that opens up the mystery. People have to have something special to be open, no two ways around it. I can not really predict who will like it and who will not. Generally more risk-taking radical types – in an emotional sense – tend to like what I say more.

But I could also picture that a parent who deeply and genuinely loved their child with way less BULLS\*\*T and projection than the average would be more likely to be drawn to what I had to say.

Just some thoughts...

**manjushri wrote:**

Despite 'failing' the 11 reasons not to have children 'test' (this kind of language seems a bit inappropriate to me but I hope you'll get what I mean!) your commitment is extremely inspiring, I actually was beginning to wonder if I would ever come across a single parent who could take this stuff on board- so many thanks for doing just that!

Agreed. But I know FEW, FEW, FEW parents who come close to meeting more than one or two of the criteria on my eleven situations. Heck, I myself would only qualify on a mere few of the criteria, if that!

**manjushri wrote:**

Daniel, I too have that marathon feeling and sometimes I need to stop running and just be STILL too! Remind myself that I can't fix the world but can only facilitate and witness it fixing itself! 😊

Yeah! My real priority in life, above all else – above career, above being a good helping therapist, above saving anyone or changing the world – is just to heal myself. To fix my own inner mess. All else pales before that.

---

Daniel Mackler

<http://iraresoul.com>

**manjushri**

📧 Posted: Mon Oct 30, 2006 4:19 pm Post subject:



Joined: 08 Sep  
2006  
Posts: 146  
Location: UK

Hi Kaleo,  
Thanks for your warm greeting 😊!

I really meant what I said about finding your posts inspiring (Its not meant to be empty flattery!) More that I always thought it would be easier to think of people having children if I ever came across a parent trying to live by the guidelines that are implicit in Millers work! It actually means alot to me to hear from someone who is able to take it on board rather than just shooting the messenger! I recognise what a painful challenge it must be. You got my drift exactly about being ready to hear the message and of course a lot of life experience goes into getting to that point!..

I read your post about your friend and hear what your saying with the fact that people can come to these conclusions on their own through their own experience. I do believe that this is only possible if they have been able to listen to themselves and have some faith in their own perceptions, sadly many people's childhood experiences make them completely unable to connect with this level of their inner truth-its something that, in order to survive they have had to cut themselves off from hence the repercussions! Also I totally agree that having a framework really helps, when I was 20 and first read

Thou Shalt Not Be Aware I could hardly contain my joy although it was a intensely PAINFUL time when my own childhood came home to roost big time!

I also think there could be some value in writing a parents version of the points Daniel raises- I wasn't sure actually about this mission- whether there would be much mileage in it, its a very challenging job though I guess you are living proof that it is possible for a parent to make use of these ideas!

Its not nosey at all to ask about Manjushri...You may know that Manjushri or Manjugosha (Jamyang in Tibetan) is the bodhistava of wisdom, he carries a flaming sword of wisdom that dispels ignorance and illusion (denial) whenever he comes into contact with it! And he does it with compassion! Quite a warrior for truth -despite misgivings about the dissociated nature of the practice of Buddhism I always liked the thanka images of Manjushri -compassion and fearless confrontation of denial... something for me to aspire to I guess!

Best wishes,  
Rebekah

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

**Daniel Mackler**  
Site Admin

Posted: Mon Oct 30, 2006 4:19 pm Post subject:



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

**kaleo wrote:**

I posted in the thread on Alice Miller about an experience with a friend of mine who came to many of the same conclusions by herself somehow. I think there ARE people who have or are ready to accept these ideas, if they knew how to get here.

Agreed. I think in time we're all going to find each other. Like little drops of water sprinkled all over the place, but when there are enough drops they form a giant pool. Sort of like the analogy of the fish from the classic kid's book "Swimmy." Do you know that? Brilliant!

**kaleo wrote:**

The other parents I referred to the site are women on a board that deals with health issues. A couple of them read and agreed with The Baby's Manifesto, but I don't know that they will post here or want to engage at the level this requires.

I've referred a tons of people – colleagues, friends, and otherwise – to my site, and most people just respond...with silence. Oh well...NEXT!

**kaleo wrote:**

I've asked Daniel to consider reframing some of his essays to apply to parents, without diluting his message. One example: the Eighteen Steps essay mentions being single, not having sex, and not reproducing. What if you are doing those things already, as I have?

I think a person with a child can apply them to him or herself.

Be single. Translation: be your own person. Focus on your own inner healing. Be an autonomous being, even in a relationship. We are all in relationships to one degree or other, after all, even if we are "single."

Don't have sex. Translation for a parent: stay in a relationship but...don't have sex! Of course, that might frustrate a partner who wants sex – but that's one of life's challenges, to change in a mature direction (assuming you agree that celibacy is a mature direction) in a gentle way that doesn't hurt a partner and respects his or her point of view.

Don't reproduce. Translation: Don't reproduce any more. Stick with what you've got.

Funny that you bring these points up, because I've been working on the essay you suggested, and I

address all these in there.

**kaleo wrote:**

And if you do have children, *don't be single* seems to be a corollary (not that I've decided I agree entirely with that yet). Anyway, hope he'll undertake the task and look forward to what he comes up with. What a demanding woman I am! 😊

No, no – you'd made a good suggestion, and set a good challenge for me.

Daniel Mackler

**kaleo**

Posted: Mon Oct 30, 2006 5:37 pm Post subject:



Joined: 06 Oct  
2006  
Posts: 209

Aw, "Swimmy"! I love that book. Right now, we're in the Eric Carle phase, and "Animalia" - a great book for adults, too.

**Quote:**

Be single. Translation: be your own person. Focus on your own inner healing. Be an autonomous being, even in a relationship. We are all in relationships to one degree or other, after all, even if we are "single."

I totally agree with you on this, and it's one thing I feel I am doing right. In fact, I would have reversed what you said: we are all single, even if we are in relationships. Ultimately, we have only our own selves to whom we must answer.

**Quote:**

Don't have sex. Translation for a parent: stay in a relationship but...don't have sex!

Well, anyone who has a kid knows this is a [given](#). Only joking.

I'm hearing you on this, but I'm not sure how to discuss it without getting personal. I have read your essays on this topic and find nothing to latch onto at all personally. I can certainly see how dysfunctional sex can be, but **MUST** it be? Can sex never simply be about two people who love each other expressing that love physically? Can you articulate exactly what you believe abstinence would accomplish in a balanced, stable relationship?

**Quote:**

Don't reproduce. Translation: Don't reproduce any more. Stick with what you've got.

Okay, that I understand, though I believe my siblings are the most valuable witnesses I have to our past.

Look forward to your essay...

best,  
Kaleo

**kaleo**

Posted: Mon Oct 30, 2006 5:43 pm Post subject:



Joined: 06 Oct  
2006  
Posts: 209

Hi Rebekah -

Thanks for the background. What a wise choice of name for you. It's always good to know that people know why they use a nickname and what it means. Mine (Kaleo) means "the voice" in Hawaiian. When I lived in Hawaii, my local friends called me "Kaleopono", the voice of righteousness, which they later joked was because there was no direct translation for "self-righteousness". 😊 Oh, well.

I do appreciate your kind words.

Kaleo

**Daniel Mackler**  
Site Admin

Posted: Tue Oct 31, 2006 3:09 pm Post subject:



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

**kaleo wrote:**

Right now, we're in the Eric Carle phase, and "Animalia" - a great book for adults, too.

Is he The Hungry Caterpillar guy? If so, brilliant! I think he has a kid's museum of his work somewhere in the Midwest.

**Daniel Mackler wrote:**

Don't have sex. Translation for a parent: stay in a relationship but...don't have sex!

**kaleo wrote:**

I'm hearing you on this, but I'm not sure how to discuss it without getting personal. I have read your essays on this topic and find nothing to latch onto at all personally. I can certainly see how dysfunctional sex can be, but MUST it be? Can sex never simply be about two people who love each other expressing that love physically? Can you articulate exactly what you believe abstinence would accomplish in a balanced, stable relationship?

All good questions. Quick caveat: I hope you also realize that when I write my ideas and prescriptions for living I do so not as forced advice - but just as expressions of my perspective. Although I wholeheartedly believe what I write, I write it with the attitude of "take what you like and leave the rest."

Now your questions.

**kaleo wrote:**

I can certainly see how dysfunctional sex can be, but MUST it be?

Where we are unconscious and have unresolved childhood traumas - at any level of subtly - I think it's impossible to not transmit projections through sex. And I don't see that as healthy. Quite the opposite. But dysfunctional? Teasing out "functional" versus "dysfunctional" is not my battle, because tons of very sick and unhealthy stuff can fall into the category of "functional" - and can look and even feel very healthy. Tons of relationships thrive on it, and it feels good. For example, most extreme narcissists feel the best when someone is totally narcissistically gratifying them - that is, blowing smoke up their a\*\*. (Pardon the unintended pun.) It feels good, and feels totally healthy to them - but it's not. And I think we're all "narcissistic" at some level - until we become fully enlightened.

**kaleo wrote:**

Can sex never simply be about two people who love each other expressing that love physically?

I don't think so. I don't buy it.

**kaleo wrote:**

Can you articulate exactly what you believe abstinence would accomplish in a balanced, stable relationship?

I love the question! Probably worth an essay. A few quick thoughts: less projection, more focus on the actual emotional dynamics, less narcissistic gratification, more frustration that brings to the surface the pathology that sex may be disguising - and thus give the partners a chance to address and work out the issues, and not just act them out sexually. Just a few thoughts. Often balanced and stable

relationships are very unhealthy under the surface, and many a very sick relationship was kept balanced and stable by years of "good sex."

**Daniel Mackler wrote:**

Don't reproduce. Translation: Don't reproduce any more. Stick with what you've got.

**kaleo wrote:**

Okay, that I understand, though I believe my siblings are the most valuable witnesses I have to our past.

Can be quite true, but no parent has more children so that his already partially abused children can someday have more witnesses to help him remember the past.

---

Daniel Mackler

<http://iraresoul.com>

**Daniel Mackler**  
Site Admin

Posted: Tue Oct 31, 2006 3:15 pm Post subject:

 quote  edit 

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

**kaleo wrote:**

When I lived in Hawaii, my local friends called me "Kaleopono", the voice of righteousness, which they later joked was because there was no direct translation for "self-righteousness". 😊  
Oh, well.

Funny, I've seen no evidence – not even close – of self-righteousness from you here. I don't consider self-righteousness to be a compliment, so I wonder what they were thinking. Very curious.

---

Daniel Mackler

<http://iraresoul.com>

**Daniel Mackler**  
Site Admin

Posted: Tue Oct 31, 2006 3:32 pm Post subject:

 quote  edit 

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

**kaleo wrote:**

When I lived in Hawaii, my local friends called me "Kaleopono", the voice of righteousness, which they later joked was because there was no direct translation for "self-righteousness". 😊  
Oh, well.

Funny, I've seen no evidence – not even close – of self-righteousness from you here. I don't consider self-righteousness to be a compliment, so I wonder what they were thinking. Very curious.

[I now reply to a previous posting of John's, the original of which I do not have.]

**John wrote:**

I'm not so sure that the "realistic" option Daniel puts forth will work and may block trauma release.

I actually think celibacy (and not masturbating) are not a realistic or emotionally healthy option for most people. I think most of the stuff I say is not a realistic option for most people. My options, for most of humanity, are extreme, and most cannot handle them, and if they tried them it would probably just engender repression, and as you say, "blocking." But that doesn't mean that celibacy – even extreme celibacy – cannot be INCREDIBLY productive in some people as a propellant toward

enlightenment.

Perhaps I didn't make this clear enough in my essays. I think I made it clear, though, in my masturbation essay: <http://iraresoul.com/masturbation.html>

**John wrote:**

I've posted this on the other Miller forum, but it really comes to life under the celibacy question. These people don't mention RST with it's "aim your anger at the parent" focus. But imagine aiming anger at the parent before, during or after mood-altering sexual relationships ( or masturbation). Sound out there? Read the neurological evidence. Take a look at the article here. Look at what neurochemicals are involved. Now add RST. Get it?

You and Dennis turned me on to RST and Elnora Van Winkle, but I'm not sure if you saw my other post in the "Alice Miller and psychological writers" section of this forum. I've heard about Van Winkle for years, from a few different people who knew her well, I realize – and I look forward to getting an interview about her on paper. The clear indicators are that she was, to the end of her life, a very disturbed woman, and thus I believe it's worth taking what she said with a grain of salt. That said, I've read her pages and others' pages about RST and it seems there's some real value in it, so I'm not writing it off at all as a potentially excellent form of self-therapy. Her neurochemical explanations, though, seem VERY simplistic to me and probably not true (though I'm no expert on that). I probably could get some more expert opinions on the neurochem though, if you wanted.

**John wrote:**

It throws a real wrench into celibacy. Leaving celibacy and going into total projection and dysfunction for trauma cleaning is a "super-charge" towards healing. Imagine the missed opportunity by staying celibate.

We're talking about different types of celibacy. You are probably right in what you are saying here, at least to some degree. But I don't see you talking about healthy celibacy, as I define it. I see you talking about totally premature celibacy. Also, this sounds like the "Tantric Buddhism" argument, and I never really bought that anyway.

---

Daniel Mackler

<http://iraresoul.com>

**kaleo**

📅 Posted: Tue Oct 31, 2006 3:50 pm Post subject:

 quote  edit  X  IP

Joined: 06 Oct  
2006  
Posts: 209

**Daniel Mackler wrote:**

Is he The Hungry Caterpillar guy? If so, brilliant! I think he has a kid's museum of his work somewhere in the Midwest.

Yes, that's the guy. It's good to see classics endure over time...

**Daniel Mackler wrote:**

Although I wholeheartedly believe what I write, I write it with the attitude of "take what you like and leave the rest."

I'm glad. Not that I want to choose only the easier options (in my case, don't drink/smoke/do drugs), but as you've said here, I am finding some of these expectations unrealistic and extreme.

**kaleo wrote:**

Can sex never simply be about two people who love each other expressing that love physically?

**Daniel Mackler wrote:**

I don't think so. I don't buy it.

Wow. That to me is actually the most extreme concept so far. Again, hard to discuss it without getting into Too Much Information. I'm going to have to think about how to approach it.

**kaleo wrote:**

Can you articulate exactly what you believe abstinence would accomplish in a balanced, stable relationship?

**Daniel Mackler wrote:**

Often balanced and stable relationships are very unhealthy under the surface, and many a very sick relationship was kept balanced and stable by years of "good sex."

Agreed.

**Daniel Mackler wrote:**

no parent has more children so that his already partially abused children can someday have more witnesses to help him.

Again, agreed if you put it that way. I think the question - okay, *one* question - is whether the benefits of siblings outweighs the disadvantages. In your view, they don't; in mine, they do. I need to think about why.

All just the seeds of thoughts to be spun out...

Kaleo

**Daniel Mackler**  
Site Admin

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

Posted: Tue Oct 31, 2006 4:06 pm Post subject:

 quote  edit  IP

**kaleo wrote:**

Can sex never simply be about two people who love each other expressing that love physically?

**Daniel Mackler wrote:**

I don't think so. I don't buy it.

**kaleo wrote:**

Wow. That to me is actually the most extreme concept so far. Again, hard to discuss it without getting into Too Much Information. I'm going to have to think about how to approach it.

I hear how it comes across as extreme what I'm writing, and my first reaction was to come on here and say "no, I'm not as wacko as I come across," but then I really thought about your question word for word, and I realize that pretty much I stand by what I say. But with one caveat: the only time your question would be fully true is with two fully enlightened people, and yet I don't believe two people who were fully enlightened, and thus had NO unconscious motives, would want to be expressing their love for each other physically through sex.

Actually, not to attack (because I love this dialogue, which I hope you realize!!!), but I find your question worded in a particularly extreme way: with a "NEVER" in it, and with followed by a "SIMPLY."

To rephrase your question according to how I'M hearing through your words, it reads: "Do you think

sex can ever be about two people just 100% totally having a physically affectionate interaction, with no projection or unconscious motives or unconscious dynamics taking place at all?"

That's how I translated your question in my mind, and that's why I answered, essentially, "No."

Is that what you meant with your question?

P.S. A drop more explanation: implicit in my answer here is that I do not see projection or unconscious motives or unconscious dynamics as being physically loving, so if they're involved in the interaction then it's not SIMPLY physically affectionate. There are other things involved. Do you follow my logic?

P.P.S. No need for Too Much Information. There's always ways around that!

**kaleo wrote:**

I think the question - okay, *one* question - is whether the benefits of siblings outweighs the disadvantages. In your view, they don't; in mine, they do. I need to think about why.

Don't get me wrong, I think siblings can be a beautiful thing for each other, and it's not all about abuse and horror and projection, but I'm coming from the angle that one kid is already too much for a not fully enlightened parent. And I'm not even getting into the whole overpopulation argument. With two fully enlightened parents in a world of non-overpopulation I would say two children per family is a beautiful thing.

---

Daniel Mackler

<http://iraresoul.com>

**Daniel Mackler**  
Site Admin

Posted: Tue Oct 31, 2006 4:07 pm Post subject:



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

**kaleo wrote:**

Can sex never simply be about two people who love each other expressing that love physically?

**Daniel Mackler wrote:**

I don't think so. I don't buy it.

**kaleo wrote:**

Wow. That to me is actually the most extreme concept so far. Again, hard to discuss it without getting into Too Much Information. I'm going to have to think about how to approach it.

I hear how it comes across as extreme what I'm writing, and my first reaction was to come on here and say "no, I'm not as wacko as I come across," but then I really thought about your question word for word, and I realize that pretty much I stand by what I say. But with one caveat: the only time your question would be fully true is with two fully enlightened people, and yet I don't believe two people who were fully enlightened, and thus had NO unconscious motives, would want to be expressing their love for each other physically through sex.

Actually, not to attack (because I love this dialogue, which I hope you realize!!!), but I find your question worded in a particularly extreme way: with a "NEVER" in it, and with followed by a "SIMPLY."

To rephrase your question according to how I'M hearing through your words, it reads: "Do you think sex can ever be about two people just 100% totally having a physically affectionate interaction, with no projection or unconscious motives or unconscious dynamics taking place at all?"

That's how I translated your question in my mind, and that's why I answered, essentially, "No."

Is that what you meant with your question?

P.S. A drop more explanation: implicit in my answer here is that I do not see projection or unconscious motives or unconscious dynamics as being physically loving, so if they're involved in the interaction then it's not SIMPLY physically affectionate. There are other things involved. Do you follow my logic?

P.P.S. No need for Too Much Information. There's always ways around that!

**kaleo wrote:**

I think the question - okay, *one* question - is whether the benefits of siblings outweighs the disadvantages. In your view, they don't; in mine, they do. I need to think about why.

Don't get me wrong, I think siblings can be a beautiful thing for each other, and it's not all about abuse and horror and projection, but I'm coming from the angle that one kid is already too much for a not fully enlightened parent. And I'm not even getting into the whole overpopulation argument. With two fully enlightened parents in a world of non-overpopulation I would say two children per family is a beautiful thing.

Daniel Mackler

<http://iraresoul.com>

**kaleo**

Posted: Tue Oct 31, 2006 5:38 pm Post subject:



Joined: 06 Oct  
2006  
Posts: 209

**Daniel Mackler wrote:**

I find your question worded in a particularly extreme way: with a "NEVER" in it, and with followed by a "SIMPLY."

To rephrase your question according to how I'M hearing through your words, it reads: "Do you think sex can ever be about two people just 100% totally having a physically affectionate interaction, with no projection or unconscious motives or unconscious dynamics taking place at all?"

That's a correct rephrasing. I suppose my question was absolute because your answer sounded absolute.

**Daniel Mackler wrote:**

I do not see projection or unconscious motives or unconscious dynamics as being physically loving, so if they're involved in the interaction then it's not SIMPLY physically affectionate. There are other things involved. Do you follow my logic?

I think so, and I agree when it's put that way. It's the assumption that those dynamics must inherently exist that I find difficult. It is hard for me to go here without sharing more than I feel comfortable. Can you suggest a way around the TMI issue? I probably need to get more creative. Or maybe we can use an analogy. Isn't eating sometimes just about the pleasure of food - no disorders, no calorie-counting, no diet, just me and some tiramisu? I realize the food analogy leaves out the other person, but it still pertains. Or maybe I'll come back and edit this if I later decide it's an idiotic comparison after all.

**Daniel Mackler wrote:**

Don't get me wrong, I think siblings can be a beautiful thing for each other, and it's not all about abuse and horror and projection, but I'm coming from the angle that one kid is already too much for a not fully enlightened parent. And I'm not even getting into the whole overpopulation argument. With two fully enlightened parents in a world of non-overpopulation I would say two children per family is a beautiful thing.

Nicely put. Still pondering it. Also, I hope I don't sound like I'm indirectly fishing for you to tell me I am that enlightened parent. I'm not, you and I know it. It's one of the issues someone raised in another

thread: what are anyone's real motives for engaging this way? I often check back with myself to make sure I'm not just doing some false validating of myself. If you catch me sounding that way, call me out, okay?

(Oh, and I can be self-righteous sometimes, but usually just in jest!).

Kaleo

**Daniel Mackler**  
Site Admin

Posted: Wed Nov 01, 2006 4:10 pm Post subject:

 quote  edit  IP

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

**Daniel Mackler wrote:**

I do not see projection or unconscious motives or unconscious dynamics as being physically loving, so if they're involved in the interaction then it's not SIMPLY physically affectionate.

**kaleo wrote:**

It's the assumption that those dynamics must inherently exist that I find difficult. It is hard for me to go here without sharing more than I feel comfortable. Can you suggest a way around the TMI issue?

I think being creative is best, as you did. Also, if you share personal information it probably won't help much anyway because I rarely debate people on their personal experience. If I don't agree or see flaws in the argument I just pull away – otherwise, in my mind, it's stepping over a boundary. That feels inappropriate.

**kaleo wrote:**

I probably need to get more creative. Or maybe we can use an analogy. Isn't eating sometimes just about the pleasure of food - no disorders, no calorie-counting, no diet, just me and some tiramisu?

I think it's a somewhat fair analogy, and yet I'm not so sure of the answer. I believe that when people are getting comfort and pleasure from the taste of food it is meeting some deep psychological needs. Why not? And of course food addiction can be taken to the pathological extreme, though for most of us it's just pretty mild, so mild as to be considered within the range of healthy.

I'll still stick to my arguments with sex: when people have unresolved emotional issues they will infiltrate the sexual experience. I don't see how it could be any other way. Even with masturbation – and that's just sex for one (probably closer to the food analogy). It's largely about a self-soothing emotional experience that channels split-off unmet emotional needs.

**kaleo wrote:**

Also, I hope I don't sound like I'm indirectly fishing for you to tell me I am that enlightened parent.

...or that I'm indirectly fishing for you to tell me that I'm a perfect therapist or writer!

**kaleo wrote:**

I'm not, you and I know it.

We're growing and searching, and that's what counts. I don't know if I'll ever become fully enlightened. I really don't know. I think the key for me is that I'm working as hard as I can to get there, and plowing forward in spite of the obstacles life has thrown in my path. We all just do our best with what we're given. I really believe we all work just as hard as we can. Even totally HORRIBLE parents.

**kaleo wrote:**

It's one of the issues someone raised in another thread: what are anyone's real motives for engaging this way? I often check back with myself to make sure I'm not just doing some false validating of myself. If you catch me sounding that way, call me out, okay?

Ultimately it's only my responsibility to call myself out on my own stuff – not to call out anyone else on theirs. Granted, it helps to have other zap me once in a while, but given hard inner work and time I can figure it all out myself... After all, we all have the answers and the perfection within each of us – even that Chickadee person from the other forum – and if we look within, we can find the answers in there.

---

Daniel Mackler

<http://iraresoul.com>

**eve**

Posted: Tue Feb 12, 2008 12:56 pm Post subject:

 quote  edit  IP

Joined: 12 Feb 2008  
Posts: 6

I know this thread went off in the direction of Celibacy Issues....but it did start out discussing parenting. When I read the Piece on 11 Reasons not To Have a Child as well as some of the other material on parenting, I felt the rage build up in me. I wanted to stop reading. I took a deep breath and told myself...."Just read it."

At first, I thought that the rage was at myself.....I've done damage....we all do damage.

But, the more I thought about the depth of the rage (even though it was only momentarily-it was powerful), I started to believe that the rage was at my mother. Because in all honesty, with so much unresolved stuff, am I really yet capable of having compassion for others (which would account for rage at myself for being a "bad" mother)....probably not (but hopefully, some day).

What I was most aware of was how I incorrectly believed that I was enraged at myself. This was easier than accepting the rage at my mother. This is how scared I still am. What a long trip this is going to be.

Eve

**manjushri**

Posted: Wed Feb 13, 2008 5:37 am Post subject:

 quote  edit  IP

Joined: 08 Sep 2006  
Posts: 146  
Location: UK

Hi Eve and welcome to the forum! 😊

Just a quick reply to say good to hear from you! I will reply a bit more (and to your other post ) when I get a chance. As you can see things have been quiet around here for a while and very often threads explore all kinds of things that the initial heading of the thread doesn't cover!

Thank you for your thoughtful posts and sharing your reactions to the 11 reasons. Although I'm not a mother (I was lucky to find some of this stuff out before I chose that path) I find your honesty refreshing and can only begin to imagine the pain of reading that essay as a Mum. Your description of the emotional reactions you experienced is striking and I think will really help other parents who might come to the forum. What you seem to have managed to do is understand your rage as being about your experience rather than displacing it onto the author of the essay which I think is what usually happens to parents reading this stuff!

Thanks, look forward to hearing more from you,

best wishes,  
Rebekah

**eve**










Posted: Wed Feb 13, 2008 5:11 pm Post subject:

 quote  edit  IP

Joined: 12 Feb 2008

Hi Rebekah,

Thanks for the response.

Posts: 6	<p>I have been pouring over this forum. I've read so much; I feel like my head could explode (like one of those fruit gushers commercials).</p> <p>But, it's all good.</p> <p>Eve</p>
<b>Daniel Mackler</b> Site Admin  Joined: 03 Aug 2006 Posts: 525 Location: New York City	<p>Posted: Wed Feb 13, 2008 10:02 pm    Post subject: <span style="float: right;"> quote  edit  IP</span></p> <hr/> <p>Hi Eve,          welcome here! i just replied to another of your posts as well.</p> <p>i relate to what you are writing, even though I am not a parent. I often wonder how parents who read my writings respond. i would imagine it would be easy to just ignore or write off what I write. what's odd is that sometimes i step away from what i have written and come back after a period of time, read it, and find it very surprising - intense! i'm not used to reading stuff like that, and it sometimes catches me off guard, and makes me laugh in a bit of shock - and yet i wrote it!!</p> <p>i have stepped away for a while from doing this kind of writing, as other projects have surfaced, but i look forward to coming back to this and giving it my full attention. it's really where my heart lies - and it's the subject that motivates me more than any other. the problem is, it's so taboo in this modern world, and most people either look at me as a nutcase when i write or speak about this stuff - or they just ignore it completely, like it's not even there...</p> <p>well, onward - bedtime!</p> <p>take care, and welcome again,          daniel</p> <p>_____</p> <p>Daniel Mackler</p> <p><a href="http://iraresoul.com">http://iraresoul.com</a></p>
<b>eve</b>  Joined: 12 Feb 2008 Posts: 6	<p>Posted: Thu Feb 14, 2008 7:37 am    Post subject: <span style="float: right;"> quote  edit  IP</span></p> <hr/> <p>Thank you, Daniel for your feedback.</p> <p>I found your site while on amazon. I am trying to write my autobiography and whenever I get insecure, I go look up other writers. I think it was a review of Judith Herman, which than lead to Alice Miller. I must admit, I may be one of the few people who has never read Alice Miller.</p> <p>I see that this forum is filled with very intellectual people who have read many books on many topics. I am a bit insecure, as I don't see myself in this light. I'm not sure if that is what I was looking for. But, I never underestimate the possibility of my subconscious bringing me where I may need to go, even if I don't think so.</p> <p>I think that I was looking for personal accounts of how people go about saving their own soul. Perhaps, I havent gotten to those posts yet. I've read a lot but not everything. I am a lonely traveller, people in the world don't think like me and I can't bend to their way of thinking and so, they have to "kill" me (with hatred-not weapons). When I first read the other site with all of the essays, I thought...I am probably going to be one of the only people to venture on to the forum. I am glad that this was not so.</p> <p>I am enjoying the reading (except when my head feels like it's going to explode).</p> <p>So...Right On, Daniel...Write On.</p> <p>Eve</p>
<b>Daniel Mackler</b> Site Admin	<p>Posted: Sat Feb 16, 2008 4:19 pm    Post subject: <span style="float: right;"> quote  edit  IP</span></p>

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

Hi Eve,

Good luck writing your autobiography. What a great venture - so valuable.

No worries about not having read Alice Miller. Tons of therapists I know haven't read her, and even more so aren't even interested! Such is life...

Anyway, glad you found my site. I hear you about the head exploding stuff. This stuff is intense!!

-Daniel