

## Re: Re: Quest for the CFers

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.econ/2004-09/0923.html>

---

*nilkids\_at\_invalid.com.au*

**Date:** 09/17/04

Date: Fri, 17 Sep 2004 00:45:36 GMT

This should have gone yesterday, just checked sci.econ, couldn't find it, checked outbox and found that posting had failed for some reason. Possibly tried to send as link timed out?

=====

In

Message-ID: <ce9f3a02.0409150612.79870872@posting.google.com>  
posted on 15 Sep 2004 07:12:45 -0700, abacus wrote:

*>Since you asked, I'll respond. However, since many of your newsgroup  
>regulars don't care for posts by people who don't share their outlook  
>and attitude regarding children, I'm crossposting this to sci.econ.  
>It's another group I lurk in regularly and occasionally post to.*

Fair enough, although I think I can almost guess the economic arguments as our system does somewhat depend on continuing growth, or is thought to.

Personally, though, I don't consider economics as a "science". I wouldn't even consider medicine or psychology as sciences.

I don't consider humans as being all that predictable. How many economists have accurately predicted various stock market booms or, more importantly, busts?

However, will crosspost to the group as suggested, although not sure will have enough time to keep up with another group.

>

*>In addition, I think the regulars there might provide some interesting  
>answers to your question regarding why people choose to have children.*

Perhaps, we will see.

> *However, anyone who responds to this post should delete the group  
>alt.support.childfree to avoid further irritating those childfree  
>posters who are irritated by those with different POV's and come to  
>this group for solace and companionship with those who feel the same  
>as they do.*

[Shrug!] alt.support.childfree is an unmoderated group,  
and moderated groups on this subject are available.

As in any usenet group they don't have to follow this  
particular thread, or they can killfile both of us if they  
wish.

I feel the same way that most of them do, and may even  
appreciate solace and companionship rather than hostility.  
....However, I have no inclination to kiss the ass of  
certain members in order to try to achieve this improbable  
objective. :-)

>  
>*I'm also going to snip quit a bit to make this post of a more  
>manageable length. Interested readers may backtrack.*

Yep, OK, no objections to that.

>  
>*nilkids@invalid.com.au wrote in message news:<dg5ck0hkfv5tdc9h078q3rhvqam0dbqqmsg@4ax.com>...*  
>> *In*  
>> *Message-ID:<ce9f3a02.0409131109.3aea7fc6@posting.google.com>*  
>> *posted on 13 Sep 2004 12:09:53 -0700, abacus wrote:*  
>>  
>> *>I'll delurk to respond here.*  
>>>  
>> *Actually, I am curious about why people who aren't childfree  
>> want to post on this newsgroup, but I don't know if others  
>> are or not.*  
>  
>*I decided to post after reading your response. You dismissed the OP's  
>original impression of your group as having a significant number of  
>"rabid fucking child haters" as being strange. Whether the majority  
>of posters actually feel that way, I can't say. Certainly some do.*

Many believe that most human communication is non-verbal,  
some claim that as high as 70% is non-verbal. Which is why  
many people want personal meetings rather than Internet  
links, telephone calls, or e-mails.

Pure text is capable of a lot of misinterpretation, by both  
sides, whatever the point of view.

>*I also know that people often vent on newsgroups and their words may be  
>stronger than their actual feelings. Still, that's how an awful lot  
>of the regular posters come across and the OP was drawing a reasonable*

>conclusion based on the posts in your group.

Again, though, that can be a matter of semantics, of imperfect communication. As you probably know, most people tend to be emotional and jump to conclusions.

It definitely isn't "my group", incidentally. Am a newcomer here, and many, if not most, people on have expressed their dislike of me. Some have even ordered me to "move on" :-)

>

>> *If you are a breeder, how do you justify bringing children into an already overcrowded and rapidly deteriorating world?*

>

>*If you are alive, how do you justify breathing, eating, and consuming resources of all sorts in an already overcrowded and rapidly deteriorating world?*

I cannot, of course, but it was not my choice to be here, and my religion discourages suicide. :-). . . Am sure some on the group will be disappointed to hear this. :-)

>

>*Overpopulation does concern me to some extent – it's one of the reasons I had myself fixed after my second was born.*

OK, that is at least a partially positive response. Unfortunately, though, most people don't even do this much.

A century or more ago, even in the US, people tended to have much larger families. There were reasons for doing same, of course.

Firstly, the society was mainly agricultural, and the more children the more free or low cost labor was available.

Secondly, there were few if any social services, and children hopefully provided for the parents, especially in their old age.

Thirdly, since the man was the head of the house, male children were more likely to provide for the parents than daughters...who had few opportunities for independent employment at the time, and when married off to someone else might not have been able to influence their husbands to provide much help to parents.

Fourthly, then, the obvious strategy was to have as many sons as possible, but no way to guarantee the sex of any planned child. Might have a string of daughters before managed to produce at least one son, and he might turn out

to be a fairly frail reed to lean upon. So ideally, would want 2 or more sons. The more the better, actually. So would might need a large family to provide the desired number.

Fifthly, there was the complication that a lot of children died at the time. Not only the premature ones, but epidemics were pretty common in the days before immunization for childhood diseases. Could have six kids of various ages, and lose them all to epidemics of common childhood diseases within a year or two.

Now the problem is that human nature changes very slowly and doesn't keep up with technological advance. Today, in advanced countries at least, if have only two kids there is a good chance that both will survive.

However, from memory, human nature changes very slowly, and perhaps people have two fewer children than their parents did, rather than going from 8 or 10 or 12 down to a more reasonable number.

> *But*

>*overpopulation is a problem with a build-in solution. It's just that*

>*the solutions that nature will provide are extremely unpleasant.*

Would, broadly agree, although we might or might not quibble about the definition of "nature".

It is scientifically pretty obvious that the present rate of population growth cannot continue indefinitely, so it seems likely that a drastic crash will occur sooner or later.

>*From a scientific view, my view is that it could well occur sooner rather than later.*

>*From my Christian point of view, perhaps God will chose to end the world and call an end to the experiment before the human race manages to completely end the species by its own efforts. :-)*

So, for the sake of argument, perhaps we could presume that the human race will suffer a great population crash, or even manage to wipe itself out, in the next 25 or 50 years.

The possibility has existed for decades, but God may intervene of course.

If any of these apply, then why bring children into the world at all?

Will admit am biased. As pointed out in an earlier post on this group, I wouldn't repeat adolescence knowing what I knew then for any conceivable amount of money. Nor would I ever want to have a child and expose either a son or daughter to such misery.

If reasonable normal, they can even grow up and be sent off to wars whether they wish to go or not, and become trained killers.

>> [snip]  
>> >>  
>> >> > *What*  
>> >> > *makes you so angry and hostile towards society's weakest link.*  
>> >>  
>> >> *What makes you think that children are definable as such?*  
>> >> *Just how do you define the this term? Seriously, some of us*  
>> >> *are curious.*  
>> >  
>> > *That is the generally accepted view of children.*  
>> *Can you \_prove\_ this? Have never heard such a claim myself.*  
>> *Feel free to quote URLs.*  
>>  
>> > *What makes you think*  
>> > *they aren't? How do you define the term such that children wouldn't*  
>> > *qualify?*  
>>  
>> *I didn't quote the term. The original poster did. Am still*  
>> *waiting for a definition of the term. No point in*  
>> *discussing the term until we can agree on a definition.*  
>  
> *Whether you want to admit it or not, the majority of people in all*  
> *cultures regard children as being weak and needing to be nurtured and*  
> *protected. That seems to me a reasonable way to define "society's*  
> *weakest link" – requiring the help of others to survive.*

Am not arguing that aspect. Am questioning the need for more children at all.

If talking about the survival of human society, though, can leave out children at all. What do you think is the weakest link that would endanger the survival and happiness of the human race? I could suggest a few, but am interested to see what others might suggest. :-)

>  
> *Who else do you think would qualify as "society's weakest link".*

OK, if you insist on an answer, how about militarism, human stupidity, the sheeplike willingness of humans to be led by others?

>*Quadriplegics? The comatose? The profoundly retarded?*

Offhand, I cannot think of any instance of someone born comatose, although it may well be possible. Nor can I think of any case offhand where a child was born a quadriplegic, although does depend on definition. For instance, a CP child can be effectively quadriplegic.

No question that a certain percentage of children are born with various degrees of severe retardation or other severe handicaps, including conditions which almost insure a miserable childhood and death before puberty.

Do you intend to argue that if severe defects can be detected by amniocentesis, ultrasound, etc. that the child should proceed to term regardless?

Children can be born with very severe defects. Am not thinking of minor retardation here, but major defects such as anencephaly.

---

"Anencephaly Information – Anencephaly is a congenital malformation that occurs in approximately one in one thousand pregnancies. Anencephaly is a neural tube defect, just as is spina bifida. Life expectancy for an anencephalic baby is just a few hours, sometimes a few days at most. As the malformation is usually detected during a pre-natal scan, parents are often confronted with a choice between life and death. A choice made with very little information of what is in store for them. It is with this in mind that we have made the choice to share the stories of the brief, but wonderful lives of our anencephalic babies. I hope that it will be of help to you and impart courage."

><http://www.anencephaly.net/><

---

> *And how would*

>*you perceive people who regarded any of those groups in the way that*

>*CF's regard children?*

I couldn't even give you an answer about how I regard such cases, let alone speculate about how others on the group might regard them.:–)

I will observe, though, that most cases of quadriplegia, paraplegia, coma, etc. are the results of civilian accidents or military injuries.

A few years ago in Australia a guy in his mid fifties, from memory, was out surfing, got dumped by a wave, ended up with a high cervical fracture which meant that he ended up in hospital not only paralyzed from the neck down but not even able to breathe on his own, let alone suicide.

Some kind person assisted him to suicide. Or would you see this as an act of kindness and mercy? Please do try to reply to this question, incidentally.

>> >> > *This*  
>> >> > *newsgroup is chocked full of posts that encourage and find humor is*  
>> >> > *children being maimed abused and killed.*  
>> >>  
>> >> *Encourage? Find humor? Where do you get those weird ideas?*  
>> >  
>> > *By reading your newsgroup. That's how many of the posts come across*  
>> > *to me as well.*  
>  
>> *Why bother to read it then?*  
>  
> *I find it fascinating to listen to people talk who have ideas and*  
> *values so divergent from mainstream society.*

OK, that is understandable enough. I must admit a certain macabre fascination with people who can believe in a flat earth, UFO's, and the desirability of children, war, and so on. :-)

>  
>> > *An opinion shared by others. The CF people posting here come across to*  
>> > *this lurker as being less tolerant of children than white supremacists*  
>> > *are of niggers. Frankly, I've been stunned at the level of hostility*  
>> > *presented here. It's been an education for me.*  
>>  
>> *That is OK, no charge for it, the info is free. Actually,*  
>> *there is more hostility to the people who are irresponsible*  
>> *enough to have children, not the children themselves. They*  
>> *cannot help being born. They were given no choice in the*  
>> *matter.*  
>>  
>> *If you have children, don't you ever feel any guilt for*  
>> *bringing them into the world? If not, why not?*  
>  
> *No, I don't feel guilt. Why not? Why should I? I don't feel guilt*  
> *for having children anymore than I feel guilt for being alive, for*  
> *eating, drinking, and polluting the world with my bodily wastes.*  
> *Should people feel guilty for peeing? For breathing in oxygen and*  
> *breathing out carbon dioxide?*

Just because your parents cursed you with life doesn't mean that you have to perpetuate the mistake, does it?

>

>*I'll look for your response in sci.econ. Regards.*

You will see it in both groups. Thanks for the post. I do realize that you are sincere and that perhaps you and I just view the world from very different points of view.

However, the basic question may be why people are so intolerant of other points of view on any given issue.

In questions of religious belief, why should the members of any religion try to convert others by force? The Bible enjoins Christians to spread the word, but not, from my point of view, to insist that others accept it.

Humans have free will. When they hear the word, they can take it or leave it.

The Bible enjoins Christians to "preach the Gospel to all nations" , before the end comes. It doesn't state that all or even a majority need believe it, only that they have a chance to accept it.

Your post indicates to me that you are at least a fairly logical and polite person, not a slave of your emotions, and one who doesn't go out of your way to insult others who have different opinions on various issues.

I don't know if you are religious or non-religious, nor do I really care. Information is freely available, and you seem quite capable of determining whether you believe in the Bible or not.

Anyway, though, have spent too much time on this particular post and have others to deal with. Nevertheless, looking forward to any replies from either group, although cannot promise to answer them all at such length. :-)

Regards,  
"nilkids"