









License to Procreate

January 27, 2007 – February 1, 2007

author	Message
<p>manjushri</p> <p>Joined: 08 Sep 2006 Posts: 146 Location: UK</p>	<p>  Posted: Sat Jan 27, 2007 4:10 am Post subject: License to Procreate  quote  edit  IP </p> <hr/> <p>HI everyone,</p> <p>I really enjoyed reading Daniel's License to Procreate!</p> <p>http://www.iraesoul.com/license.html</p> <p>I've actually developed a right to reproduce 'bill' which is quite similar! The major difference being that Parents are supported financially by the state and their communities! In an ideal world children have the full time attention of both parents and since this is an exercise in ideal world thinking I see no reason for parents to be away from their child in order to 'live'. Parenting is a full time, 24-7 job which demands the adults full time focus and should ideally supercede all other priorities!</p> <p>Something occurs to me thats important about ideal world thinking- I wonder if the stipulations of the LtP are only valid so long as the fact that very few people will 'hear' them remains? Were a miracle to happen and everyone on the planet to read and agree with it, the human race may well die out within a hundred and something years, partly because there just isn't the infrastructure to support such a shift. However negative I feel about the impact of human beings on each other and the planet (and the universe ultimately) I don't want the human race to vanish- we have so much POTENTIAL!</p> <p>AS a philosophical exercise I do think 'blue sky thinking' is incredibly valuable- (we generate true aims and goals from this type of work). I also feel that, once the ideas are out there, we have a responsibility to be thinking about how to make them practicable too! Even if it involves <i>relatively</i> tiny steps and stages to work toward making it practicable, (such as healing ourselves?). Just imagine researching one couple prepared to submit to such a licensing procedure!</p> <p>I more or less agree entirely with the LtP BUT there's something jarring for me about a philosophy thats ultimate validity remains only so long as it isn't actually practised by everyone -even though thats what it clearly demands! Of course its possible to argue that in thinking in this way, healing ourselves, disseminating this thinking to others via this forum, and working with people, both therapeutically and educationally we are working toward making the license to parent practicable so maybe I'm just being impatient!</p> <p>What do other forum members think?</p> <p>Best wishes to all,</p> <p>Rebekah</p> <hr style="width: 20%; margin-left: 0;"/> <p>'To be disillusioned is better than being under an illusion!'</p>
<p>kaleo</p> <p>Joined: 06 Oct 2006</p>	<p>  Posted: Mon Jan 29, 2007 3:16 pm Post subject:  quote  edit  IP </p> <hr/> <p>I generally agree with the thought process behind this essay and the requirements Daniel has outlined. What a great exercise to go through.</p>

Posts: 209

I would take issue with a couple of his points, as follows:

The age limits: I think there are distinct advantages to being an older parent that can outweigh the potential disadvantages. I know I am more physically fit at 40 than I was at 25, also more socially and self-aware. An older parent is also more likely to meet the other criteria outlined (long term relationship, financial stability) simply by having been around longer and had more time to meet these standards.

Mandated psychotherapy and couple's therapy: I am resistant to this idea, because I don't think I want to put the decision as to whether I am a fit parent in the hands of any particular professional field whose collective judgment I don't necessarily trust (no offense, Daniel, I don't trust lawyers either!).

This is probably a risky thing to say on a therapist's site. Still, I think it raises a fundamental question: who should judge whether potential parents have demonstrated that they meet the standards?

Kaleo

Daniel Mackler
Site Admin

Posted: Mon Jan 29, 2007 4:04 pm Post subject: Re: License to Procreate



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

manjushri wrote:

I really enjoyed reading Daniel's the License to Procreate !

Glad you liked it. It came to mind out of some of the discussions on this forum, and over the years I've also heard people talk about needing a license. So...I decided to draft one...

manjushri wrote:

I've actually developed a right to reproduce 'bill' which is quite similar!

I'd be curious to see it.

manjushri wrote:

The major difference being that Parents are supported financially by the state and their communities!

I'm not quite sure what this means. I know too many parents in New York City who are supported by the state (welfare, disability) – and all too often the end result is that they have to take no responsibility, and just have kids with no forethought whatsoever because they know the state's got their back covered.

manjushri wrote:

In an ideal world children have the full time attention of both parents and since this is an exercise in ideal world thinking I see no reason for parents to be away from their child in order to 'live'. Parenting is a full time, 24-7 job which demands the adults full time focus and should ideally supercede all other priorities!

Well said.

manjushri wrote:

Something occurs to me that's important about ideal world thinking- I wonder if the stipulations of the LtP [license to procreate] are only valid so long as the fact that very few people will 'hear' them remains?

I'm a little lost here, but I think I follow... Meaning, if in an ideal world where parents followed these "stipulations" they would no longer be relevant?

manjushri wrote:

Were a miracle to happen and everyone on the planet to read and agree with it, the human race may well die out within a hundred and something years, partly because there just isn't the infrastructure to support such a shift.

I don't see the human race vanishing at all if parents suddenly became better parents. I see the human race, instead, changing dramatically – along with the infrastructure of our societies and our ways of interacting. I don't see the traumatizing of children as necessary for the survival of our species.

manjushri wrote:

However negative I feel about the impact of human beings on each other and the planet (and the universe ultimately) I don't want the human race to vanish- we have so much POTENTIAL!

I definitely agree.

manjushri wrote:

AS a philosophical exercise I do think 'blue sky thinking' is incredibly valuable- (we generate true aims and goals from this type of work).

Yes, in thinking ideally I try not to be bound by obvious impracticality. That's what makes this essay theoretical writing.

manjushri wrote:

I also feel that, once the ideas are out there, we have a responsibility to be thinking about how to make them practicable too!

Agreed. My basic way, and I come back to it again and again in my personal life and in my writings, is that the best gift we can give the world – and the best contribution we can make toward evolution in general – is to heal our own traumas. Very practical, very realistic, and makes a major shift in the world – but one hell of a challenge!

manjushri wrote:

Even if it involves *relatively* tiny steps and stages to work toward making it practicable, (such as healing ourselves?).

I see I wrote my previous lines before reading your next one!

manjushri wrote:

Just imagine researching one couple prepared to submit to such a licensing procedure!

Sounds like an interesting prospect.

manjushri wrote:

I more or less agree entirely with the LtP BUT there's something jarring for me about a philosophy that's ultimate validity remains only so long as it isn't actually practised by everyone -even though that's what it clearly demands!

Jarring in a good or bad way? I think it's validity is not based on its practicality but on its underlying psychological truth. An analogy (one I used recently in a slightly different way): Da Vinci's blueprints for the helicopter were valid even though at the time impractical for building.

manjushri wrote:

Of course it's possible to argue that in thinking in this way, healing ourselves, disseminating this thinking to others via this forum, and working with people, both therapeutically and educationally we are working toward making the license to parent practicable so maybe I'm just being impatient!

Yes!!

Thanks for bringing this up, Rebekah.

-Daniel

Daniel Mackler

<http://iraresoul.com>

Daniel Mackler
Site Admin

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

Posted: Mon Jan 29, 2007 4:17 pm Post subject:

**kaleo wrote:**

I generally agree with the thought process behind this essay and the requirements Daniel has outlined. What a great exercise to go through.

Yes, and it was fun to "play god" (or "play legislator") and write it too!

kaleo wrote:

I would take issue with a couple of his points, as follows:

The age limits: I think there are distinct advantages to being an older parent that can outweigh the potential disadvantages. I know I am more physically fit at 40 than I was at 25, also more socially and self-aware. An older parent is also more likely to meet the other criteria outlined (long term relationship, financial stability) simply by having been around longer and had more time to meet these standards.

Agreed, all true. I could probably stretch the age a few years, but I was just being idealistic...

That said, I primarily chose the older age because of genetic issues. That said, technically if you already have a child at forty you would not have been "denied a license" because of age reasons...

kaleo wrote:

Mandated psychotherapy and couple's therapy: I am resistant to this idea, because I don't think I want to put the decision as to whether I am a fit parent in

the hands of any particular professional field whose collective judgment I don't necessarily trust (no offense, Daniel, I don't trust lawyers either!).

Agreed – I was being idealistic again. I don't trust many therapists myself, and I was speaking of therapy idealistically. So if you take umbrage with this criteria, I'm on your side 100%.

Also, so you know, as a therapist I would never want to be in a position to judge any parents' fitness. When I worked in clinics I hated writing disability reports. And I hate diagnosing as well. I see it as so pathologizing. Who am I to judge?

kaleo wrote:

This is probably a risky thing to say on a therapist's site.

Not at all! You show the limitations of my License To Procreate. I wrote it in a different frame of mind than most of my other essays. I wrote it less as a real draft for a license than as an exercise in thinking outside of the box – to make a point and stimulate thought (my own, primarily).

kaleo wrote:

Still, I think it raises a fundamental question: who should judge whether potential parents have demonstrated that they meet the standards?

Good point. Your question sounds like a good chance to study an extreme case. Let's say you have two potential parents in front of you who are both paroled pedophiles and who say to you that they are 100% GOING to molest their future children. Do you have a right to judge and say they are unfit to become parents? I would say you (or I) do.

That said, again, I don't want to be in the position of judge and jury on others' lives, but I still think there's validity in expressing my point of view.

Daniel Mackler

<http://iraresoul.com>

Daniel Mackler
Site Admin

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

Posted: Mon Jan 29, 2007 4:26 pm Post subject:



kaleo wrote:

Still, I think it raises a fundamental question: who should judge whether potential parents have demonstrated that they meet the standards?

I'm going to re-answer this. Who should judge whether a person has a right to get a license to drive a car? Not that you're really criticizing, but I ask myself this: what's so wrong about having some standards about who does the most precious and important work in the world. Okay, maybe my License To Procreate is extreme, but even implementing a few of these criteria would have a profound effect on our society. I see the deeper issue here as being how so many people believe it is a person's inalienable right to have children, whenever, wherever, however – even if they're totally unfit. The issue I see is that no one takes the child's side. Who speaks for the child who is going to have to live with these potentially TOTALLY unfit future parents? I think the reason people don't take the child's side much at all is that they don't take their own past child's side. They instead side with their past abusive parents, whom they idealize, and like their past abusive parents did, they pathologize and thus sell out (or better yet block out) their inner child...

-Daniel

Daniel Mackler

<http://iraresoul.com>

kaleo

Posted: Mon Jan 29, 2007 5:08 pm Post subject:



Joined: 06 Oct
2006
Posts: 209

Daniel Mackler wrote:

Yes, and it was fun to "play god" (or "play legislator") and write it too!

Muhahaha! It's also a great way to think outside the box, as you said. And it's not like there's any danger of making the standards too high.

Quote:

That said, I primarily chose the older age because of genetic issues. That said, technically if you already have a child at forty you would not have been "denied a license" because of age reasons...

Thanks! I tried to read this once as applied to myself and once "objectively".

Quote:

Let's say you have two potential parents in front of you who are both paroled pedophiles and who say to you that they are 100% GOING to molest their future children. Do you have a right to judge and say they are unfit to become parents? I would say you (or I) do.

I agree. **Someone** has to judge; the question is who should it be? Obviously, the majority of people currently think the majority of people are fit to have kids. That's a problem, and I see it. On the other hand, who am I to judge? (said humbly). How to resolve those two conflicting views? Or AM I/you/therapists/a panel of experts in fact fit to judge?

That question of relativity to me is a fascinating dilemma that underscores all of this discussion. I think relativity is dangerous to children, but I don't know how to get around it.

Kaleo

kaleo

Posted: Mon Jan 29, 2007 6:50 pm Post subject:



Joined: 06 Oct
2006
Posts: 209

Daniel Mackler wrote:

I'm going to re-answer this. Who should judge whether a person has a right to get a license to drive a car? Not that you're really criticizing, but I ask myself this: what's so wrong about having some standards about who does the most precious and important work in the world.

Daniel -

I absolutely agree there should be standards, and that raising a child is THE most important work any one could do in this world. It's what I've devoted myself to at this time.

But look at what the standards are for a driver's license (or any other license) and how they are derived. They are a set of COMPROMISES by legislators and the public, based on competing interests. Here in my state the age for driving is 14 1/2 - that is frightening, eh? It's because it's rural here and kids have to drive early in life.

I think what you're aiming for is the opposite of that process. There's no room for compromise, nor for the majority rules approach. That's why my question remains as to WHO is best qualified to make this judgment? Parents? We know there are problems with that. Non-parents (sounds like *non-pareils*)? I have some concerns with that too. Who does that leave?

Kaleo

John

Posted: Mon Jan 29, 2007 8:10 pm Post subject:



Joined: 22 Oct 2006
Posts: 269

Kaleo wrote:

Quote:

That question of relativity to me is a fascinating dilemma that underscores all of this discussion. I think relativity is dangerous to children, but I don't know how to get around it.

Exactly. It is maddening. It's like being in a dysfunctional family and you see yourself and other members being abused.....and it looks like another generation is on the way. The "family" in this case is society. I think the end of the quote here is the most healthy of all. "I don't know how to get around it". That can evolve to "I admit I don't have control". That can start to really take shape with...."live and let live". And then it goes on out from there. What would be most important of all would be to make sure that anyone who was administrating such a control policy of interference was themselves entirely focused on their own life. Who would do that? You can see the squirrel cage. People not entirely focused on their own identity fall into ..."but WE have to do something". Yes we do. We even have an obligation to. But judgment is gone if the root isn't EXPLICITLY focused on the individual and his own process.

How many of us in alcoholic or dysfunctional families have tried to change other members. Has it EVER worked? Once? How about OBLIGING people to love themselves? How about a functional equivalent of an "anti-spanking law"? No spanking....or no outwardly obvious behaviour, but the key is that a parent LOVES HIMSELF. You can't legislate that. You can't make a person love themselves no matter what. People in a primal process KNOW that self-awareness is necessary. And then you have to love what you find.

It's fun to conjecture away.....but people are missing the main point. Interference. The road block of "but we have to do something" is a knee-jerk. Once that has passed and more serious reflection is made, we can see that what's true for a relationship is true for a family and is true for a whole community....society...and even the world.

Organic, organic, organic. You can't make anyone love themselves and benevolent well intentioned fascism is still fascism. Love of the state is an illusion....as is "love of the child"....some faceless child. The child to love is mine. It grows from there. Lack of control is a reality. I agree with some level of protection in place and doing our best. Anything beyond that lacks connection to the reality of the human being and how he socializes and what he is.

John

manjushri

Posted: Tue Jan 30, 2007 11:57 am Post subject:



Joined: 08 Sep
2006
Posts: 146
Location: UK

HI Daniel,

Quote:

Rebekah wrote: The major difference being that Parents are supported financially by the state and their communities!

Daniel wrote: I'm not quite sure what this means. I know too many parents in New York City who are supported by the state (welfare, disability) – and all too often the end result is that they have to take no responsibility, and just have kids with no forethought whatsoever because they know the state's got their back covered.

I realise I could've made this clearer Daniel so thanks for pointing this out!- my 'right to reproduce bill' was part of a fictional work in which a very select minority were allowed to procreate and the bill laid out the requirements people had to fulfill in order to be allowed to go ahead! In this fictional society parenting was regarded as the ultimate vocation and was recognised and respected by all, there was training (part of your license too!), supervision, and 'pay' . Because of the high status of parenting as a vocation in this society non parents contributed a voluntary 'tax' (since they recognise that, essentially, society relies on the appropriate parenting of its children in order to exist). This 'tax' was used as the remuneration for the couples doing the 'job' of parenting which is, after all, currently unpaid (this is an issue which causes some neglect of children who have to do without one or both parents in order to survive financially!) Since we're talking blue sky we may as well go for it right!

Quote:

Rebekah wrote: Something occurs to me that's important about ideal world thinking- I wonder if the stipulations of the LtP [license to procreate] are only valid so long as the fact that very few people will 'hear' them remains?

Daniel wrote: I'm a little lost here, but I think I follow... Meaning, if in an ideal world where parents followed these "stipulations" they would no longer be relevant?

What I was getting at here Daniel was that a tiny minority will hear what I/you/we say about parenting but the LtP couldn't actually be a 'fact of life' because it would demand things that society isn't willing/ ready/ able to give! If everyone suddenly became enlightened the likely outcome is they would all decide not to reproduce right? As Kaleo and yourself have said who would want to be a judge of who should be allowed to parent! In my fictional world people are generally more evolved so there is a panel and everyone that's interested serves a term (a bit like a jury) on the panel but the guidelines stay the same from case to case....

Quote:

Rebekah: Were a miracle to happen and everyone on the planet to read and agree with it, the human race may well die out within a hundred and something years, partly because there just isn't the infrastructure to support such a shift.

Daniel: I don't see the human race vanishing at all if parents suddenly became better parents.

Not if people who already had children became better parents no but that's not what we're talking about here (or have I misunderstood?) The lack of infrastructure (appropriate therapists etc) means that even if everyone on the planet wanted to go through the licensing procedure they couldn't! In fact in reality I can't think of anyone

I've ever come across who would be able to fulfill its stipulations so what that would mean is that there wouldn't be any more children born!

Quote:

Daniel: I see the human race, instead, changing dramatically – along with the infrastructure of our societies and our ways of interacting.

Well yes, I see very gradual and fragile shifts occurring in society as a whole – these are indeed radical on the level of the individuals but infinitesimally small at the global level!

Quote:

Daniel: I don't see the traumatizing of children as necessary for the survival of our species.

No way, me neither!

Quote:

Daniel: My basic way, and I come back to it again and again in my personal life and in my writings, is that the best gift we can give the world – and the best contribution we can make toward evolution in general – is to heal our own traumas. Very practical, very realistic, and makes a major shift in the world – but one hell of a challenge!

It occurs to me that 'stories' which I think your license to parent (and some of your other writing too) could come under can serve as inspiration right! Something to make clear what we're working towards even if they aren't 'workable' in the here and now!

Quote:

Daniel: I think it's validity is not based on its practicality but on its underlying psychological truth. An analogy (one I used recently in a slightly different way): Da Vinci's blueprints for the helicopter were valid even though at the time impractical for building.

I hear you and I can see your point! I think for me once I've begun to establish a philosophical paradigm I want to think about making it real and how that might happen –for me my healing journey in some ways started with the theory (Miller) and only later got into the application- so that's they way I tend to approach everything I guess! Sometimes attempting to apply a theory kind of 'invalidates' the philosophical ideal though, I think this is basically because the level we're at now is one where we can peer into the future and imagine what we might like to see but we can't quite envisage all the steps we need to get there! As you have said, a truly enlightened person would probably loose interest in reproducing anyway!!! and of course if they were fully enlightened and they did want to reproduce they wouldn't need the LtP! I can also see where John's coming from with his 'benign fascism is still fascism' position too!

Best wishes, Rebekah

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

Daniel Mackler
Site Admin

Posted: Tue Jan 30, 2007 4:45 pm Post subject:

 quote  edit  IP

kaleo wrote:

Thanks! I tried to read this once as applied to myself and once "objectively".

Joined: 03 Aug 2006

Posts: 525
Location: New
York City

I tried to write it from an "objective" – that is, to my mind, fair – perspective, despite my knowing that by doing so I would prevent myself from qualifying for the license!

Quote:

Daniel wrote: Let's say you have two potential parents in front of you who are both paroled pedophiles and who say to you that they are 100% GOING to molest their future children. Do you have a right to judge and say they are unfit to become parents? I would say you (or I) do.

Kaleo wrote: I agree. **Someone** has to judge; the question is who should it be? Obviously, the majority of people currently think the majority of people are fit to have kids. That's a problem, and I see it. On the other hand, who am I to judge? (said humbly). How to resolve those two conflicting views? Or AM I/you/therapists/a panel of experts in fact fit to judge?

Let's call us experts. Certainly we're more experts than the norm who don't even consider these issues at all. Sure, why can't we judge. I feel I have good judgment and that makes me a fit judge. Also, if people really listened well to children – to the plight and pain of their children – they too could be good judges. But most cannot listen. It's too painful. It would mean that would have to listen to their own psychic pain.

kaleo wrote:

That question of relativity to me is a fascinating dilemma that underscores all of this discussion. I think relativity is dangerous to children, but I don't know how to get around it.

I don't worry too much about relativity. I believe in some things that are basic truth. Hurting children is wrong, plain and simple, and when people have unresolved traumas they will act them out on their kids. That to me is wrong. People who are inappropriate parents are committing wrongs. Okay, sounds moralistic, but what the heck, I'm fighting for the rights of kids. Granted, my License To Procreate might cut out a few people who could make halfway decent parents, but it would sure cut out a HUGE number of people who have no business having kids.

And what's the worst thing with preventing a few potentially decent parents from procreating when millions or billions who will be terrible parents will be stopped at the same time. People who would make decent parents but get shafted by my License To Procreate can go and contribute their skills in a million other ways. Let them become therapists, teachers, social activists, lawyers for the downtrodden. Let them volunteer with children. There are many ways to contribute.

Daniel Mackler

<http://iraresoul.com>

Daniel Mackler
Site Admin

Posted: Tue Jan 30, 2007 4:56 pm Post subject:



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

kaleo wrote:

But look at what the standards are for a driver's license (or any other license) and how they are derived. They are a set of COMPROMISES by legislators and the public, based on competing interests. Here in my state the age for driving is 14 1/2 - that is frightening, eh? It's because it's rural here and kids have to drive early in life

I think what you're aiming for is the opposite of that process.

Well, in theory I have no room for compromise, but in reality I am very flexible. I'd never survive for a minute as a therapist if I couldn't compromise, be diplomatic, be patient, etc.!

I just set the bar high in the License To Procreate because it's theory.

kaleo wrote:

There's no room for compromise, nor for the majority rules approach. That's why my question remains as to WHO is best qualified to make this judgment? Parents? We know there are problems with that. Non-parents (sounds like *non-pareils*)? I have some concerns with that too. Who does that leave?

It's simple: the people who make the rules and judge should be the people who side most with the child. This is about what's best for children, after all. If children themselves were totally free to speak their mind – babies included – then they would be the ideal ones to judge, but since families to one degree or other squelch their abilities to speak the truth then we need people who can speak it for them.

That's why I feel more-or-less qualified to judge. Not 100%, but inching closer...

Yes, some parents relate better to children than do the average non-parent, but many parents are radically clueless about the feeling and rights of their children because of what they project onto their kids.

My thoughts on the best way to relate to a child: keep in touch with one's inner child, heal one's unresolved traumas, keep alive the life force...

Daniel Mackler

<http://iraresoul.com>

Daniel Mackler
Site Admin

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

Posted: Tue Jan 30, 2007 5:03 pm Post subject:



John wrote:

It's fun to conjecture away.....but people are missing the main point.

I don't think so.

John wrote:

You can't make anyone love themselves and benevolent well intentioned fascism is still fascism.

Is it fascist to make laws that make it illegal for parents to sexually abuse their children?

It is fascist to make laws that make it illegal to drive drunk?

Where does mature, emotionally-connected legislation end and fascism begin?

Should be suddenly have no laws?

Daniel Mackler

	http://iraesoul.com
Daniel Mackler Site Admin	📄 Posted: Tue Jan 30, 2007 5:16 pm Post subject: 🗨️ quote 📄 edit ✖ IP
Joined: 03 Aug 2006 Posts: 525 Location: New York City	<p>manjushri wrote:</p> <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 5px;"> <p>my 'right to reproduce bill' was part of a fictional work in which a very select minority were allowed to procreate and the bill laid out the requirements people had to fulfill in order to be allowed to go ahead! In this fictional society parenting was regarded as the ultimate vocation and was recognised and respected by all, there was training (part of your license too!), supervision, and 'pay' . Because of the high status of parenting as a vocation in this society non parents contributed a voluntary 'tax' (since they recognise that, essentially, society relies on the appropriate parenting of its children in order to exist). This 'tax' was used as the remuneration for the couples doing the 'job' of parenting which is, after all, currently unpaid (this is an issue which causes some neglect of children who have to do without one or both parents in order to survive financially!) Since we're talking blue sky we may as well go for it right!</p> </div> <p>Very interesting! Sounds like it was fun to write, and would be fun to read.</p> <p>manjushri wrote:</p> <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 5px;"> <p>What I was getting at here Daniel was that a tiny minority will hear what I/you/we say about parenting but the LtP couldn't actually be a 'fact of life' because it would demand things that society isn't willing/ ready/ able to give!</p> </div> <p>I don't see it this way. Sometimes legislation can think beyond the limited perspective of the majority. I think of the newer anti-smoking laws in New York City (no smoking in bars/restaurants, etc.). Many were so against them at first, and felt they were dictatorial laws, but in time people calm down and obey them, and after a while even get to like them and see the healthiness in them.</p> <p>And Dennis has written about the effects of the anti-spanking laws in Sweden, and how many were against them at first but over time have become MUCH more supportive of them. The laws sparked maturity in the populace.</p> <p>manjushri wrote:</p> <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 5px;"> <p>If everyone suddenly became enlightened the likely outcome is they would all decide not to reproduce right?</p> </div> <p>Not necessarily at all. I think what would happen, on the contrary, is that the more people became enlightened the more they would want to procreate for the right reasons – and would do a much better job at it too.</p> <p>manjushri wrote:</p> <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 5px;"> <p>As Kaleo and yourself have said who would want to be a judge of who should be allowed to parent!</p> </div> <p>I kind of took it back. I'd be fine to be a judge. I was just being meek and politically correct at first.</p> <p>manjushri wrote:</p> <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 5px;"> <p>In my fictional world people are generally more evolved so there is a panel and</p> </div>

everyone that's interested serves a term (a bit like a jury) on the panel but the guidelines stay the same from case to case....

Sounds good!

manjushri wrote:

The lack of infrastructure (appropriate therapists etc) means that even if everyone on the planet wanted to go through the licensing procedure they couldn't! In fact in reality I can't think of anyone I've ever come across who would be able to fulfill its stipulations so what that would mean is that there wouldn't be any more children born!

Good point. To argue the reality angle of my License To Procreate I could envision a transition period in which the criteria of the license are slowly implemented. After all, if you took the criteria to get a driver's license in New York City back 75 years in time no one then would have been able to get a driver's license either!

manjushri wrote:

It occurs to me that 'stories' which I think your license to parent (and some of your other writing too) could come under can serve as inspiration right!

Hopefully, yes!

manjushri wrote:

I think for me once I've begun to establish a philosophical paradigm I want to think about making it real and how that might happen -for me my healing journey in some ways started with the theory (Miller) and only later got into the application- so that's the way I tend to approach everything I guess!

Ditto for me.

manjushri wrote:

As you have said, a truly enlightened person would probably loose interest in reproducing anyway!!! and of course if they were fully enlightened and they did want to reproduce they wouldn't need the LtP!

Not 100%. Who knows. Maybe a world full of fully enlightened people would want to procreate. I'm rethinking this one...

manjushri wrote:

I can also see where John's coming from with his 'benign fascism is still fascism' position too!

How so?

Daniel Mackler

<http://iraresoul.com>







Phil

☐ Posted: Tue Jan 30, 2007 9:07 pm Post subject:

 quote  edit  x  ip

Joined: 10 Nov

Hi Daniel,

<p>2006 Posts: 45</p>	<p>I like your license to procreate. No real likelihood, in my opinion, of such a law being put in place. But I think there should be laws which limit family size. On the lines of what China had. China's law had many problems, especially with abuses with enforcing it, but the world has limited resources which are soon going to be used up. The world will be so crowded that many people will be living lives not worth living. Some countries already have such conditions.</p> <p>I guess laws limiting our right to unlimited procreation could lead to further restrictions. But nothing much ever seems to happen until emergency conditions approach, as in China.</p> <p>Phil</p>
<p>Dennis</p> <p>Joined: 20 Oct 2006 Posts: 140 Location: Sweden</p>	<p>☐ Posted: Wed Jan 31, 2007 6:58 am Post subject:  quote  edit  IP</p> <hr/> <p>I guess I'm the only one here who didn't like Daniel's License to Procreate. It's good to discuss options how to deal or stop inappropriate parenting but if he wants to start a new religion, here are its dogmas.</p> <p>First, what will happen to pregnant women who don't have the license? Forced abortion clinics? Forced sterilization methods? What about the black market which a license will create? To me that looks like a dark scifi movie, not an ideal picture of happy parenting.</p> <p>What if the partner dies? What about external factors in which parenting becomes more stressful?</p> <p>I see an underlying frustration to the poor and dumb, which Daniel - again - points to the global problems this world has. Reading point 8; Applicants must complete a college degree, seems to sum that up.</p> <p>People without a college degree are not the ones who manufacture the latest versions of weapons of mass destruction, have engineered a gigantic chemical industry that puts the climate under pressure, have installed cruel hospital methods regarding birth, send young soldiers to far away countries to fight wars, invent pills to manage people's behavior, to name a few.</p> <p>Except for the age factor, I would fail every single point in the list, which put me in the same box as all the terrible (future) parents.</p> <p>A child is not something a parent needs to work on 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, something to shape into a fine, adjusted citizen, someone who needs to rescue the resources of the Earth. What a nightmare scenario putting future parents through these ordeals just to be able to have a child. A child that they have high expectations of, undoubtedly.</p> <p>Dennis</p>
<p>manjushri</p> <p>Joined: 08 Sep 2006 Posts: 146 Location: UK</p>	<p>☐ Posted: Wed Jan 31, 2007 7:38 am Post subject:  quote  edit  IP</p> <hr/> <p>HI Daniel,</p> <p>It was huge fun to write and its not finished yet- more of a work in progress! The right to reproduce part is about 10 years old now so I'm trying to rescue it from an old floppy disc! Might need to be re written from notes- I'll let you know when I manage it!</p>

Daniel wrote:

I don't see it this way. Sometimes legislation can think beyond the limited perspective of the majority. I think of the newer anti-smoking laws in New York City (no smoking in bars/restaurants, etc.). Many were so against them at first, and felt they were dictatorial laws, but in time people calm down and obey them, and after a while even get to like them and see the healthiness in them.

And Dennis has written about the effects of the anti-spanking laws in Sweden, and how many were against them at first but over time have become MUCH more supportive of them. The laws sparked maturity in the populace.

I do agree with what you say here Daniel and I'm familiar with the Swedish research and the reaction to their law and how its changed over time... I guess even were such a law (the license to procreate) to be enacted here and now the lack of infrastructure would still be a problem though... WE can't even get the no smacking law passed in the UK and I'm part of the campaign for that!

Daniel wrote:

Not necessarily at all. I think what would happen, on the contrary, is that the more people became enlightened the more they would want to procreate for the right reasons – and would do a much better job at it too.

I'm glad you seem to be revising your position on this one actually, I was always a wee bit uncertain about it! Partly because I'm not so sure I KNOW what I would feel like about reproducing were I fully enlightened so I don't feel I can be sure about enlightened people generally.

Daniel wrote:

I kind of took it back. I'd be fine to be a judge. I was just being meek and politically correct at first.

I like your courageous stance on this Daniel, I can see where you're coming from too and of course I'm 100% confident that I'm a better judge than simple biology (which is the only current judge after all)! What I was meaning though was that I wouldn't be keen on having myself SOLE responsibility for such decisions, that's why in my writing I've got a rotating panel – I'm thinking there'd also need to be rules about who was on the panel though (AARRGGHH! All these rules!! they are essential though!)

Daniel wrote:

Good point. To argue the reality angle of my License To Procreate I could envision a transition period in which the criteria of the license are slowly implemented. After all, if you took the criteria to get a driver's license in New York City back 75 years in time no one then would have been able to get a driver's license either!

Yes and actually we are probably already in this very earliest stages of this transition period- some of us are beginning to work on our own 'stuff' and starting question these issues so this is edging toward a place in the future where such laws might indeed be enactable. I see the gradual development of anti smacking laws (proposed & voted against repeatedly in the UK parliament) as part of this transition too. In England a parent still has the legal defence of using 'reasonable chastisement' (a Victorian term!) when hitting a child although hitting with implements has become harder to defend. In Scotland (which has a very different legal system from England) it is now illegal to smack a child under the age of 3. Slow progress, frustrating progress but progress nonetheless!

Daniel wrote:

Not 100%. Who knows. Maybe a world full of fully enlightened people would want to procreate. I'm rethinking this one...

I was deliberately being a bit provocative here by referring back to this statement of yours! Looking forward to hearing more about this rethink- what's made you reconsider?

Daniel wrote:

I can also see where John's coming from with his 'benign fascism is still fascism' position too!
How so?

As we discussed with Cesar some time ago on the thread re sterilisation, but I do agree 100% that if we wait till everyone agrees (like smoking & smacking) it'll never happen. We do, however, need a certain amount of support- I'm not up for organising a military coup to take over the free world in order to force these ideas on unwilling populace!- It would be counter productive I think and probably lead to more abuse of children. Having said that I bloody feel like it sometimes seeing people beating up their kids in the street!

Best to all!

Rebekah

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

manjushri

Posted: Wed Jan 31, 2007 9:09 am Post subject:



Joined: 08 Sep
2006
Posts: 146
Location: UK

HI Dennis,

good to hear from you.

Dennis wrote:

I guess I'm the only one here who didn't like Daniel's License to Procreate. It's good to discuss options how to deal or stop inappropriate parenting but if he wants to start a new religion, here are its dogmas.

I agree that its good to discuss options about how to stop inappropriate parenting and that's what we're doing here! I found it pretty clear that the ideas floated here weren't about saying 'everybody has to get out there and make it happen by any means necessary' so it felt more like 'blue sky thinking' than setting up a dogma to me.

Dennis wrote:

First, what will happen to pregnant women who don't have the license? Forced abortion clinics? Forced sterilization methods? What about the black market which a license will create? To me that looks like a dark scifi movie, not an ideal picture of happy parenting.

As Daniel mentioned in his last post, even if such a license were to exist it would have to be phased in! I see it more as the ideals enshrined in the license being something we are working towards - ie that people not have children inappropriately! My fantasy would be that such a license wouldn't come into force until a critical mass of people being in support of such a philosophy came to be.

Dennis wrote:

What if the partner dies? What about external factors in which parenting becomes more stressful?

Life isn't controllable in every respect as you say here, but we could at least make things safer for children even if it does mean curtailing some adults right to behave how they'd like! Wouldn't it be great if people controlled themselves to NOT inflict pain on others- Daniel's analogy with the smoking ban seems pertinent here- if smokers want to smoke in their own homes who can stop them? If they'd like to inflict their smoke on others we can legislate to prevent them doing so! It seems to me that the only reason that someone would want to defend the right of one person to hurt another would be if that someone also wanted to hurt that other - (and I'm not intending this to mean you!) which in itself would be an unresolved personal issue I guess....

Dennis wrote:

I see an underlying frustration to the poor and dumb, which Daniel - again - points to the global problems this world has. Reading point 8; Applicants must complete a college degree, seems to sum that up.

People without a college degree are not the ones who manufacture the latest versions of weapons of mass destruction, have engineered a gigantic chemical industry that puts the climate under pressure, have installed cruel hospital methods regarding birth, send young soldiers to far away countries to fight wars, invent pills to manage people's behavior, to name a few.

This is a good point & I too share some reservations about this point in the license, so thank you for raising it. I think I would, however, want to see a compulsory education in parenting! As Daniel points out, who would want an untrained surgeon messing about in their insides! I also agree with Daniel's point that having parents who are educated does give children a better chance in life but I wouldn't necessarily prioritise academic education over other things- A dyslexic carpenter may not be able to get a college degree but we all need tables right?

Dennis wrote:

Except for the age factor, I would fail every single point in the list, which put me in the same box as all the terrible (future) parents.

I wouldn't be able to pass and Daniel's said he wouldn't either! I know I wouldn't be a 'terrible parent' by any means- especially not compared to the parents I see around me and the parents of the people I work with but I also don't think I'd be able to parent at the standard a child would deserve.

Dennis wrote:

A child is not something a parent needs to work on 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.....

I agree with you here Dennis, but I think **being a parent** IS something that in an ideal situation does need 24-7 work for most people. I certainly wouldn't think 'working on a child' would be a recipe for good parenting either- children aren't lumps of clay after all!

I really enjoyed reading your post Dennis!
Best wishes,

Rebekah

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

Daniel Mackler
Site Admin

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

Posted: Thu Feb 01, 2007 12:26 pm Post subject:

 quote  edit  IP

Phil wrote:

Hi Daniel,

I like your license to procreate.
No real likelihood, in my opinion, of such a law being put in place.

No, probably no chance of it becoming reality anytime soon. I suppose I wrote it sort of as science fiction.

Phil wrote:

But I think there should be laws which limit family size. On the lines of what China had.

Agreed!

Phil wrote:

China's law had many problems, especially with abuses with enforcing it, but the world has limited resources which are soon going to be used up.

Yep!

Phil wrote:

I guess laws limiting our right to unlimited procreation could lead to further restrictions. But nothing much ever seems to happen until emergency conditions approach, as in China.

Yes, very true – our world is generally very last-minute in its thinking. It's very much like how addicts behave. Many have to hit rock bottom and lose everything – lose homes, money, family, teeth, health, youth, jobs, self-respect – before they change. And many not even then. Hopefully our world can be more enlightened on its journey...

Daniel Mackler

<http://iraresoul.com>

Daniel Mackler
Site Admin

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

Posted: Thu Feb 01, 2007 12:43 pm Post subject:

 quote  edit  IP

Dennis wrote:

I guess I'm the only one here who didn't like Daniel's License to Procreate. It's good to discuss options how to deal or stop inappropriate parenting but if he wants to start a new religion, here are its dogmas.

Hmm. How do I respond? I respect your point of view, Dennis, but I didn't see myself starting a new religion. I'll do my best to answer your post – I like the challenge.

Dennis wrote:

First_ what will happen to pregnant women who don't have the license? Forced

abortion clinics? Forced sterilization methods?

Good points. I have no good answer, as I wrote the License To Procreate less as a sweeping law that would address all the contingencies, but as a little shake-up to stimulate thinking (my own primarily). I could answer all your questions with ideas I spin off, but it would be only more fantasy. I guess the key for me is to think about the children who are being presently created to incompetent and abusive parents, and I wrote my License To Procreate essay from the point of view of siding with the child. Your questions are all about protecting the rights of the parents – and not that that’s a bad thing, but I didn’t take parental rights that much into consideration in writing the License To Procreate essay. Any thoughts on this?

Dennis wrote:

What about the black market which a license will create? To me that looks like a dark scifi movie, not an ideal picture of happy parenting.

I can see your point again. And again, my License To Procreate (as I believe I wrote) offers no guarantee of good parenting.

Dennis wrote:

What if the partner dies? What about external factors in which parenting becomes more stressful?

I thought of these two (good) questions as I was writing the essay, and I just put them aside, because again, I wrote the essay from the point of view of siding with the perspective and needs of the child, and not of the parent.

Dennis wrote:

I see an underlying frustration to the poor and dumb, which Daniel - again - points to the global problems this world has. Reading point 8; Applicants must complete a college degree, seems to sum that up.

Yes, true again. But all other things being equal, if I were a child again I would rather have a parent who had money and was educated. Yes, a poor and uneducated parent could be wonderful, and a rich and educated parent could be atrocious, but my essay was not dealing with this contingency.

Dennis wrote:

People without a college degree are not the ones who manufacture the latest versions of weapons of mass destruction, have engineered a gigantic chemical industry that puts the climate under pressure, have installed cruel hospital methods regarding birth, send young soldiers to far away countries to fight wars, invent pills to manage people's behavior, to name a few.

True, but this doesn’t mean that because someone does have a college education they have to use it for destructive purposes. The college education is not the problem – it’s the unresolved childhood traumas lurking in the unconscious that’s the problem.

Dennis wrote:

Except for the age factor, I would fail every single point in the list, which put me in the same box as all the terrible (future) parents.

Actually I never said a parent who didn't meet a criteria would be terrible. In fact, I fail on many of the criteria and I think that by and large, both objectively and compared to the norm in society, I'd make a fantastic parent. Not perfect, but pretty darn good.

Dennis wrote:

A child is not something a parent needs to work on 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, something to shape into a fine, adjusted citizen, someone who needs to rescue the resources of the Earth.

Agreed, and I get sickened by parents who see their children as a project – just a narcissistic extension of themselves. But being there for a child – according to the child's needs – is different from “working” on a child.

Dennis wrote:

What a nightmare scenario putting future parents through these ordeals just to be able to have a child.

From a certain perspective I could see it being a nightmare as well. I mostly hated college and grad school myself, and resent that I needed to get a stupid and largely useless degree in order to do healing work as a therapist. I worked hard on my inner self to AVOID having the conventional education system break me.

But in my License To Procreate I envisioned a different kind of “education” for parents – perhaps more along the lines of Summerhill (which I believe you liked), though, if you read my review, you will see that I had some radical criticisms of Summerhill. In this vein, amazon.com removed my review of Summerhill and despite my repeated attempts to repost it they have not put it back up. Frustrating!

Thanks for the thought-provoking reply, Dennis.

Daniel Mackler

<http://iraresoul.com>

Daniel Mackler
Site Admin

Posted: Thu Feb 01, 2007 12:49 pm Post subject:



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

Hi Rebekah,

manjushri wrote:

...I wouldn't be keen on having myself SOLE responsibility for such decisions, that's why in my writing I've got a rotating panel – I'm thinking there'd also need to be rules about who was on the panel though (AARRGGHH! All these rules!! they are essential though!)

Yeah, I wouldn't want to be sole dictator of the universe. Ick!

Also, I generally hate rules, because my experience with them is that they pinch out the best of me and try to get me to conform to sick standards.

But I think some rules and laws are good.

Quote:

Daniel: Maybe a world full of fully enlightened people would want to procreate. I'm rethinking this one

Rebekah: I was deliberately being a bit provocative here by referring back to this statement of yours! Looking forward to hearing more about this rethink- what's made you reconsider?

Interesting topic. Perhaps you could start it as a new thread, because I think it would just get lost in this one...

Daniel Mackler