

The female roots of child abuse

If you, as a man, want to know how a baby will be neglected by a certain potential mother, I suggest the following procedure.

- 1) Find a woman you are sexually attracted to.
- 2) Make sure she likes you too, and would sleep with you. (If this requires much dating, do it.)
- 3) Openly express your sexual desire for her – should you have it. Touch her, attempt to kiss her, smell her hair... whatever; only make sure that you initiate this behaviour.

The resulting behaviour is probably how her own baby will be treated. And this, for a baby, is abuse.

I am perfectly happy with swapping the roles, as it makes no difference for the purpose of the argument in this article. If it was mainly women who chase men, and men those who give birth – or dribble around the thought of babies – then this article would be called “The male roots of child abuse”. All the same. Being a woman is accidental; *choosing* to own a baby is not.

Avoid touching a baby, and it will die. The baby’s nervous system registers everything that happens through the sense of touch – and perhaps also the smell and the taste (the quality of the mothers’ milk has been observed to vary with, for example, the sex of the baby) and is very accurate at knowing what is going on in the soul of anyone who is in contact with it with respect to it – not necessarily just the mother.

The baby’s demand for a true, deeply intimate and loving touch, as a continuation of the unity that had taken place in the womb is, thus, of the first order.

Now, what is a need an adult human being has, which is also of the first order – especially in a world where other basic needs are not a concern? Do you think there is any chance that your sexual needs have to do with a baby’s need to be soothed and accepted by what is, essentially, just another warm body?

The baby is, indeed, the initiator of a behaviour that is grounded in the need to blend with another body, just like you are in the process suggested above.

As it happens, most (all?) babies cry and appear very unsatisfied with the way they are handled – which is usually dismissed with a “that’s what they do” type fallacy, in a glorious display of denial. You may repress it, but you - man or woman – also cry when you don’t get what you want from your partner - or yourself - in terms of sexual satisfaction. You are – perhaps forever – hooked on this drug, just like a mother’s withdrawal of affective touch seems like forever to the baby.

Any adult slavery is, essentially, sexual slavery, ultimately stemming from the sensual

enslavement of the baby – typically by the mother. This is why violence in the adult world does not need to be, and rarely is, explicit. Violence in the adult world is simply making use of people's broken ethical compass, their actions fuelled by the power of an attachment mechanism broken off in early childhood.

A baby's physiology is pretty much just like yours or mine. Do you really think there is any chance you would be satisfied with what is happening around you if you cried the way a baby does? Do you think there is any chance this emotional expression is a response to something that is objectively happening with caregivers? Or do you think nature and evolution would produce a creature so randomly and horribly fanciful – and yet so successful as a species?

Even in ancient tribes of hunter-gatherers such as the african bushmen, babies are considered a property of the woman who gives birth to them. The woman owns this child, to the point that she will even kill it, if the social or environmental conditions so warrant – or if it is deformed or unfit. This is an exceptional measure, which does bring great suffering and sorrow to the bushwoman.

Babies, however, are programmed for survival, as one would expect, and will demand sufficient confirmation that they are wanted and that they are safe.

But bushman women are much more consistent with the way biology dictates babies should be handled. Not coincidentally, bushman tribes are also more relaxed about monogamy – though sexual partners still have to endure taboos, repression and self hatred to levels as ridiculous as ours – and will allow a man to have several wives, or a woman to divorce and marry several times. Similarly, babies get much more and varied touch, just as bushmen generally take great pleasure in their children and understand the importance of play. Therefore, the chance that a baby is not being handled properly is less (although I am sure not ideal, since child ownership is the base of their society too – thousands of years old).

By comparison, the traditional western monogamous family is a prison for the baby. The woman owns it at the most important stage of his or her life, when the need for confident sensual interaction – and the resulting health of the brain and nervous system – is most critical.

However, it is not the purpose of this article to criticise the fact that women are not confident mothers, but the fact that they are *confident owners* and believers in the moral premise that the child is "bad" for having these needs - an immense narcissistic hypocrisy. It's not easy to control your digestion, or coordinate your movements when you are unsure – and have yourself been broken in the same way by your own parents – but it is well damn easy to realise the fact that you are choosing to keep your child in the face that you have serious trouble bonding with it, as evidenced by the child's conspicuous behaviour.

Let's face it: mankind was not born in a monogamous household.

Evil was born in the choice and practice of owning children, which is at the cognitive level – of reason and ethics. It is not touch, but it manifests through touch – in the early and most sensitive phase of infancy – when the child is thus given a unique pattern of sensual stimuli by

its unique parents. Evil, and this unique pattern, makes for a certain type of adult sexual actor, which will seek to repeat the cycle with his or her choice to own children...

I am sure you see how this old choice led, not only to the domestication of children by monogamous couples, but to their domestication of the land.

As I will talk about in other articles, early hunter-gatherers were easily displaced by farming tribes precisely because they were good – or better – people. Similarly, real authority (being led by the most skilled) was replaced by *brutal* authority in a new breed of people who were more sexually dysfunctional and repressed.