

## **Non-parenting and infertility: a natural response to the energy of anxiety and over-population**

There is the belief that people “choose” to have children, “I’ve decided to become a parent and find a partner” (or the other way around!) and that’s established in the ideology that this is a choice that’s being made. In fact there is no choice, the so-called “choosing” of a supposedly “right” partner or appropriate situation within which it’s possible to have children is not personal, even though it seems to be incredibly so. It is simply something which occurs when there is a universal movement for that to happen, it isn’t based on individuals, even though it appears as very individualistic, “my” partner or baby or family.

So that’s the first issue we have to look at, because if isn’t a personal issue then it has a much larger parameter. Rupert Sheldrake (<http://www.sheldrake.org/>) talks about there being a morphogenic or bio-electromagnetic field produced by animals, which is the fundamental understanding of all the ancient world, which is that everything is one field of energy. So all humans resonate within the human energy field, which at this time is resonating at a fever-pitch anxiety. Anxiety is a flight-or-flight response and the charge produced in that situation creates an addictive, over-sexualized population. This becomes a population explosion because of anxiety about the incipient destruction of society, in order to try to compensate for that quality of impending doom. It leads an accelerated or exponential charge to society.

Conversely what you also get with anxiety is a natural blocking of fertility, an infertility that can come in many different forms. What is becoming much more prevalent, especially with women in cities who hold high managerial positions, is they work very hard in their twenties, land a significant job in their thirties, but then also want to have children. By this time they have expended so much energy through overworking and becoming increasingly over-anxious in the attempt to form the female body into a masculine nature, that the lower body energy, that of fertility, is completely reduced and instead rises into the upper body and head. This causes an infertility problem, so these people will turn their attention to IVF treatment and other alternatives, in an attempt to force the body to create something that it essentially cannot sustain. When a woman becomes pregnant naturally, Nature knows that she can be pregnant, that she can see through the whole pregnancy and beyond, and that she can breastfeed, without Nature knowing that process she just won’t get pregnant.

So infertility usually occurs when there is either insufficient energy for the mother’s body, even without having a child, therefore the energy required for reproduction is over and above that which she would naturally need to power her body. This is caused by living in a particular way, with a particular way of thinking, using the upper body, brain, visual cortex and cognitive process way beyond the amount they are using the lower body, the feet, sensory perception, the active expression of the physical body. While this is also true with men of this nature, male infertility is just as much of a problem as it is for the female, it is more associated with women, they expend all their energy throughout their working day, then they’ll go to the gym, dispersing any remaining energy they may have. So this is basically Nature’s way of naturally preventing society adhering to the ideals of the city, the cognitive and the mind, and all those things that are formed by the “self”. Essentially “self” *is* infertility, “self” creates infertility.

The other manifestation of this occurs in people who have no physical problem in their body, but they have an awareness that the energy in the world around them, the situation of growing up within that world and how that feels, the sensory perception of it, and that brings about a realisation that they don't want to bring a child into the world as it is. Though it seems that people have evolved and "chosen" not to do this, the nature of the isolation of the nuclear family and of the "self" in society, creates the feeling of "why do I want to reproduce", or the energy of non-reproduction. Reproduction only really happens when there is a complete closeness of the human being, a wanting to be close to one another, to join into a family together. That energy occurs when there is a natural non-"self", a blurring of the edges between "me" and "you".

A profound example of this is in the monastic movements all over the world, where the monks take vows of celibacy and try to form a way of communication, which within their monasteries is completely unified, and about brotherly or sisterly love. This is non-sensical, because they are all sexual beings, to some degree there's a pretence going on, so to negate this aspect is to negate what one truly is as a human being. On the other hand, the monks are also an expression of the aspect of the human energetic field that wants to stop its constant growth based on anxiety....there is a realisation that there is sexual energy but that the situation of the human-condition does not allow for that energy to be free, which is in fact encountered by all those people who believe they have made the "decision" not to have children. Monasticism in its true form therefore cannot be a choice either it is actually therefore unnecessary for vows to be made because by nature true-monks would find no hardship in chastity as they actually naturally would not want sexual contact, many monks therefore are not as monastic as they think! Like a dog going round and round in its basket trying to get comfortable, then continuing to move round again, there's a kind of agitation and that's really the energy that's expressed in normal society where basically there's a complete irritation and discomfort about the nature of relationship, of connection to other people and antipathy towards the nuclear family, which results in us feeling unable to engage with natural parenthood because it doesn't actually exist in the society within which we live. In a sense it would require there to be a completely different set-up between humans for natural fertility to be possible.

Again, what Nature is creating through the thought processes and by moving into those situations where there is an obstruction of the process of birth is as a response to the whole self-orientated nature of society. People who are aware of that may not have children because they have a clear sense that there's something wrong with that situation, usually those who've been through very abusive situations in their lives, or who have a lot of sensitivity to the pain, stress and suffering of others. They see themselves as broken aspects rather than part of a whole picture, as outsiders rather than being connected.

So it is never about specific blood-lines being champions over others, the notion of survival of the fittest is absurd, especially when it comes to blood-lines, because what we're talking about is the whole expression of humanity. If all areas of that humanity are feeling this way then eventually and inevitably, especially as the Third World try to emulate the so-called civilized world there will also be infertility in that direction as well. Interestingly, infertility and monasticism are majorly associated with the

aristocratic aspect of the world, the “highest” order, as you move into those zones you feel increasingly isolated and that you’ve lost something.

Of course there are already plenty of children in the world without parents. Even looking on the local scale, which is actually more important to the sensitivity of human beings, one’s own family, we rarely think that my brother or sister has a child, and therefore I have a direct relation to being that child’s parent. The thought is always that is my brother or sister’s child, it is theirs, I don’t have the responsibility or connection that they have. But of course in natural tribal societies when a child is born they immediately have fifty mothers and fifty fathers, the child is born into the tribe and it is implicitly understood that the birth mother and *every* mother in that tribe is equal to the child that is born. Children born at the same time will easily be able to breast-fed by several different women, which greatly encourages the strength of that child because it has more exposure to more energy in its environment. That process worked extremely well and without question, but now that ethos has been eroded. In today’s society, even within our own family we look at each other’s siblings and their families as being separate from Ourselves. Too when there is a misdemeanour such as one member of a tribe hiding food or resources, not sharing somehow, this is seen by the whole tribe as an issue for the whole tribe, they go to the “perpetrator” and they by some way or means show some kind of connection/ love for this person bring them back into the union with the tribe. What has happened is that the tribe knows that separation has occurred and this separation is actually a dis-ease process so this person needs healing as their response of not-sharing is something that is a sickness that means they are suffering and the whole tribe therefore has a problem if one of their members is suffering truly One for all, all for One, because it is actually all One. When there is no judgement an realization of the nature of suffering, there is no notion of blame.

Innately every human woman is a mother, a daughter and a sister, every human male is a father, a brother and a son and those aspects exist completely within those experiences. Whether or not that woman or man can have children biologically, they are by-nature still an aspect of that expression. In the world they will be able to find and connect with that expression naturally, because of the way they are. Whenever we have contact with a person younger than ourselves, we are in a situation of fathering or mothering them, which is absolutely parenting, even though we did not directly bear this child. However, a child can be born and there is a natural response of the mother to look after it, yet when it begins to grow up and more readily expresses its nature, it can often become clear that parent and child are not necessarily so strongly connected. When the nature of the child and the parent allows them to understand one another strong bonds will be easy, but in many families that will not happen, mother and child will be of utterly different energetic qualities and just won’t “get” each other, so the key thing is that having your own child doesn’t necessarily mean you’ll automatically get on.

What does parenting in itself actually mean? Again we’re talking about the adult world being imposed on the child, whereas in fact the child is much closer to an understanding of total unity, and of energetic resonance with each other, a kind of non-autistic state, when adult society is certainly in an autistic state. Therefore children should be encouraged to find and follow their own direction, one can hold the child’s hand and allow it to go and come back as and when it needs to. It’s not

about leading a child, making sure they understand and know certain things, which engenders a belief and a kind of pride that “I have brought up” these children. That is essentially living through the child as an extension of the parent’s individualistic ideas of “self”, which instigates the process of the child being told they are very “good” at something and if they carry on with it, they will become “even better”. The child thereby immediately has a sense of a good and bad.

Haruchika Noguchi wrote a book specifically relating to this, entitled “Scolding and Praising” ([http://www.zensei.co.jp/books/store?genre\\_id=7](http://www.zensei.co.jp/books/store?genre_id=7)), in which he describes natural parenting, understanding the nature of the child and therefore the need to explain things in a way they understand by-nature, not through the enforcement of the adult’s ideologies onto them, also removing the adult perspective of the world in order that the child can grow up naturally. One of the ways he expresses this is to allow a child to come to their own natural talents and abilities without impressing a praise-based pattern onto their nature. For example, there was a very famous musician who, when he was a child of about three, sat at the piano listening to his mother as she played a difficult piece of music, and then the child repeated it on the piano, it was amazing that he could do this. Usually the response to this situation would be, “that’s absolutely wonderful, it’s amazing you can do that, we must take you to a music school and allow you to use your talent and become a superstar!!!!!!”. However, this mother didn’t do that, her response was to simply ask the child what he thought and felt about playing the music. He said he really liked it, and she said no more about it. As a result the child embarked on a musical career in a very different way, and when it came to concerts and performances he wasn’t under any stress about needing to perform in a particular way, or to be something he wasn’t. He simply played what he liked to play in a very relaxed way.

This is an example of a kind of non-parenting, where the child is left to its own devices, allowed to be what they are without the ideology of good and bad, right and wrong. But for a child who is essentially subjected to the dualism that is created by the “self” and all that comes with it, there is the more usual situation where a child derives no pleasure from the music and is essentially always tense, which creates a burn-out mentality. The child will keep on urging themselves to get better and better, and while they may in fact become extremely proficient, at the age of about thirty they begin to feel the enormous pressure of having to stay on top of their game, having to be the best at everything and to push themselves forward. Of course this doesn’t only happen in music, but in every aspect of life one can think of, where there is a pressure to forge ahead, not only with individuals, but also in families and in society. Once again, this is all driven by society, which has a desire for over-production, over-population, over-expansion and no interest in the importance of sustainability, connection, natural reproduction and communication, and no understanding of the need for an ending of the “self” in order for there to be a consolidated expression.

When there is a movement towards being a unified body, a connected group, then many of the boundaries between people dissolve and this becomes a very different world. It’s not something that can be striven for, it is already happening, and the nature of infertility both of the physical body and of the way of thinking is simply a symptom and a direction back to the essence of what lies at the core of society and of

the human being - and at this core it's empty, there is no "Self" and this changes the whole format of how we engage.

David Nassim  
20/02/2012