All Children Deserve Far Better Than What This World Too Readily/Frequently Throws At Them

Frank Sterle Jr.

In the book *Childhood Disrupted:* it’s written that even “well-meaning and loving parents can unintentionally do harm to a child if they are not well informed about human development” (pg.24). Regarding early-life trauma, people tend to know (perhaps commonsensically) that they should not loudly quarrel when, for instance, a baby is in the next room; however, do they know about the intricacies of why not? Since it cannot fight or flight, a baby stuck in a crib on its back hearing parental discord in the next room can only “move into a third neurological state, known as a ‘freeze’ state ... This freeze state is a trauma state” (pg.123).

This causes its brain to improperly develop. It’s like a form of non-physical-impact brain damage. Also, it is the unpredictability of a stressor, and not the intensity, that does the most harm. When the stressor “is completely predictable, even if it is more traumatic—such as giving a [laboratory] rat a regularly scheduled foot shock accompanied by a sharp, loud sound—the stress does not create these exact same [negative] brain changes” (pg.42).

Furthermore, how many of us were aware that, since young children completely rely on their parents for protection and sustenance, they will understandably stress over having their parents angry at them for prolonged periods of time? It makes me question the wisdom of punishing children by sending them to their room without dinner.

Meanwhile, general society perceives and treats human procreative ‘rights’ as though we’ll somehow, in blind anticipation, be innately inclined to sufficiently understand and appropriately nurture our children’s naturally developing minds and needs.

Meantime, in protest to newly mandated elementary school curriculum that teaches something undoubtedly controversial, a picket sign read, “We don’t co-parent with the government”. But maybe a lot of incompetent yet procreative parents nowadays should.

People will procreate, some prolifically even, regardless of their questionable ability to raise their children in a psychologically functional/healthy manner. Thus I wonder how much immense long-term suffering might have been prevented had the parent(s) of a future tyrant received, as high school students, some crucial child development science education by way of mandatory curriculum? After all, dysfunctional and/or abusive parents, for example, may not have had the chance to be anything else due to their lack of such education and their own dysfunctional/abusive rearing as children.

Owing to the Only If It’s In My Own Back Yard mindset, however, the prevailing collective attitude (implicit or subconscious) basically follows: ‘Why should I care—my kids are alright?’ or ‘What is in it for me, the taxpayer, if I support social programs for other people’s troubled families?’ While some people will justify it as a normal thus moral human evolutionary function, the self-serving OIIIMOBY can debilitating social progress, even when social progress is most needed. And it seems this distinct form of societal penny wisdom but pound foolishness is a very unfortunate human characteristic that’s likely with us to stay.

As a moral rule, a physically and mentally sound future should be every child’s fundamental right—along with air, water, food and shelter—especially considering the very troubled world into which they never asked to enter. And the health of all children needs to be of real importance to everyone—and not just concern over what other parents’ children might or will cost us as future criminals or costly cases of government care, etcetera—regardless of how well our own developing children are doing. Simply mindlessly ‘minding our own business’ often proves humanly devastating.

I believe that high-school students should be educated for the most important job ever, even those who plan to remain childless. Understanding the science behind every child’s healthy/functional development can at least enable a prospective parent to make an educated decision on how they wish to go about rearing any future children.
If nothing else, child-development science curriculum could offer students an idea/clue as to whether they’re emotionally suited for the immense responsibility and strains of parenthood.

It would also teach how children’s mind/emotional development begins as early as gestation. Inside the womb, children are already aware of their mother’s emotions—and perhaps even later emotionally damaged by them.

According to a 2003 online article by Linda Marks: “When a mother both consciously and subconsciously wanted to be pregnant and welcomed her baby, the child thrived. When the mother either consciously or subconsciously wanted the baby, the child was fine. When the mother neither consciously nor subconsciously wanted the baby, the child felt the effects of this hostile emotional climate. I remember a story of a woman who not only didn’t want her baby but also resented his intrusive presence in her body.

“When the Italian doctor would use an ultrasound to view the baby as the mother talked about her resentments of him and the pregnancy, the baby would curl up in a tiny ball in a corner of the uterus, trying to make himself very small. Even in utero, a baby can feel the power of his/her mother’s heart. When considering having children, making a thoughtful, heartful, integrated decision is important for the overall wellbeing of a child.”

Neurodiversity Could Be a Very Valuable Lesson

Along with the K-12 Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity curriculum already taught (at least in Canadian public schools), cerebral diversity curriculum could also be implemented. Through this the incidence of vicious bullying against, for example, students with an autism spectrum disorder might be reduced.

When all teachers are fully educated on ASD, there could be an inclusion in standard high school curriculum of a child development course, albeit not overly complicated, which in part would teach about the often-debilitating condition.

It would explain to students how, among other aspects of the condition, ASD people, including higher functioning autistics, are often deemed willfully ‘difficult’ and socially incongruent, when such behavior is really not a choice for them. Furthermore, when around their neurotypical peers, people with ASD typically feel compelled to “camouflage” or “mask”, terms used to describe their attempts at appearing to naturally fit in when around their neurotypical peers, an effort known to cause their already high anxiety and/or depression levels to worsen. And, of course, this exacerbation is reflected in the disproportionately high rate of suicide among ASD people.

If nothing else, such child-development science curriculum would offer students an idea/clue as to whether they’re emotionally/mentally compatible with the immense responsibility and strains of parenthood, especially with special-needs children.

There could also be instruction in regards to children born with ASD. Low-functioning autism is already readily recognized and treated, but higher-functioning ASD cases are basically left to fend for themselves.

Perhaps in great crises, every parent would go all out in an attempt to make their child feel secure; however, in stable times those parents may not notice their more subtly dysfunctional rearing. For instance, how many people are aware that even a parent’s prolonged silent yet nonetheless noticeable anger towards his/her young child can, if frequently practiced, leave the growing child with a strong sense of vulnerability? The perceptive child relies on the parent(s) for survival and is therefore susceptible to hunger, etcetera, if the angry parent’s protection/provisions are withdrawn.

Meanwhile, general society perceives and treats human reproductive “rights” as though we’ll somehow, in blind anticipation, be innately inclined to sufficiently understand and appropriately nurture our children’s naturally developing minds and needs.

As a moral rule, a physically and mentally sound future should be every child’s fundamental right—along with air, water, food and shelter—especially considering the very troubled world into which they never asked to enter."