

Finally, the book the whole world has been waiting for! In clear and practical detail, 'Peaceful Parenting' applies the logic and reason of science, psychology, evidence and rigorous morality to the healthy and ethical raising of our greatest treasures – our own children...

# Peaceful Parenting

Condensed Version

The morality, psychology, and  
science of ethical child-raising.

Audiobook: [www.fdrurl.com/pp](http://www.fdrurl.com/pp)

Stefan Molyneux, MA

---



Peaceful Parenting – by Stefan Molyneux, host of Freedomain, the largest and most popular philosophy show in the world!

This is the condensed version of the book – for the free full version, please visit <https://www.peacefulparenting.com>

This book is FREE – and I hope that you will share it as widely as possible.

If you would like to help out the show, you can visit <https://www.freedomain.com/donate>

## Table of Contents

Prologue .....	7
Do We Love Our Children? .....	18
Childism.....	20
Why We Punish Children.....	22
Children Reasoning?!?.....	23
Power versus Virtue: A Love Story .....	25
Reversing Principles .....	27
Imaginary Obligations .....	28
Conclusions.....	29
PART 1: THEORY .....	30
Peaceful Parenting: What Is It?.....	30
The Non-Aggression Principle.....	31
What The World Should Be .....	32
Moral Reversals .....	34
What the World Should Be Part 1 .....	35
What the World Should Be Part 2 .....	36
What the World Should Be Part 3 .....	38
What the World Should Be Part 4 .....	40
“Parenting is really hard!” .....	42
“We did the best we could with the knowledge we had!” .....	42
“I had a bad childhood, so it was tougher for me to be a good parent!” .....	42
Children and Control.....	43
Childism.....	44
Parenting in the Media .....	46
Peaceful Parenting Media Training.....	49
Reasoning in Media – The Answer Part 1 .....	50
Reasoning in Media – The Answer Part 2.....	53
Sexual Success .....	54
Parental Compliance.....	55
Reversing Aggression .....	56
Negotiation versus Violence .....	57
The Duality of Modern Parenting .....	58
Parental Hypocrisy .....	59

Aggressive Parenting: The Steelman Case .....	60
Peaceful Parenting: The Rebuttal.....	63
Spanking .....	64
Verbal Abuse .....	64
Tantrums .....	65
Childhood Paralysis .....	66
Tantrum Appeasement.....	68
“But My Childhood...” .....	69
Spanking and Free Will.....	69
Childhood and Moral Free Will .....	70
Humanity Versus Power.....	71
The Restraint of Power .....	73
The Most Hidden Secrets.....	75
The Rules of Peaceful Parenting.....	78
Peaceful Parenting and Moral Mistakes Part 1 .....	80
Peaceful Parenting and Moral Mistakes Part 2 .....	81
The Ethics of Peaceful Parenting .....	83
How Should You Parent Your Children?.....	83
What If My Children Lie to Me? Part 1 .....	85
What If My Children Lie to Me? Part 2.....	86
What If My Children Lie to Me? Part 3.....	87
Credibility Is the Opposite of Vanity .....	88
Part 2: Practice .....	89
Parenting and General Integrity .....	89
Full Responsibility .....	92
Parenting and Moral Instruction .....	93
What We All Agree On .....	93
Fat Fitness Trainers.....	94
Peaceful Parenting and Ego Part 1 .....	95
Peaceful Parenting and Ego Part 2.....	96
Peaceful Parenting and Ego Part 3.....	98
Peaceful Parenting and the Voluntary Family .....	99
Loyalty to Virtue? .....	101
Blank Slate.....	102
Preferences and Identity Part 1 .....	104

Preferences and Identity Part 2 .....	107
The Benefits of Having Children .....	109
Discipline Without Violence Part 1 .....	110
Discipline Without Violence Part 2.....	113
Discipline Without Violence Part 3.....	114
Imposing Standards.....	116
Peaceful Parenting and Timeouts.....	118
What is a Timeout? .....	119
Sibling Aggression Part 1.....	122
Sibling Aggression Part 2.....	123
Compliance and the Teenage Years Part 1 .....	125
Compliance and the Teenage Years Part 2 .....	126
Peaceful Parenting: Clean Your Room! .....	127
Why Is It Important? Part 2 .....	129
Have I Modelled the Behaviour I Want in My Children? .....	132
Peaceful Parenting and Peer Pressure Part 1 .....	133
Peaceful Parenting and Peer Pressure Part 2.....	135
Family and Bullying Part 1 .....	136
Family and Bullying Part 2 .....	137
Siblings .....	138
Brothers.....	139
Sisters.....	139
Sibling Potential Part 1 .....	141
Sibling Potential Part 2 .....	141
Extended Family and Peaceful Parenting Part 1 .....	143
Extended Family and Peaceful Parenting Part 2 .....	145
Extended Family .....	146
Dealing with Family Bullies .....	147
Family Loyalties .....	149
Blowback from Boundaries .....	151
How to Apologize Part 1.....	152
Apologizing to Children Part 1 .....	158
Apologizing to Children Part 2 .....	160
Apologizing to Children Part 3 .....	161
<b>Apologizing to Children Part 4</b> .....	163

Restitution .....	165
Child Abuse and Power Part 1 .....	166
Child Abuse and Power Part 2 .....	167
Child Abuse and Power Part 3 .....	170
Peaceful Parenting and Reconciliation Part 1 .....	171
Peaceful Parenting and Reconciliation Part 2 .....	172
Peaceful Parenting and Reconciliation Part 3 .....	173
Defining the Cycle of Abuse Part 1 .....	175
Defining the Cycle of Abuse Part 2 .....	177
Defining the Cycle of Abuse Part 3 .....	179
Defining the Cycle of Abuse Part 4 .....	180
Defining the Cycle of Abuse Part 5 .....	183
Defining the Cycle of Abuse Part 6 .....	185
Breaking the Cycle of Abuse .....	186
The Effects of Child Abuse over the Lifespan .....	187
Neglect .....	188
The Effects of Neglect Part 1 .....	190
The Effects of Neglect Part 2 .....	191
The Effects of Neglect .....	191
Sadism and Neglect Part 1 .....	193
Sadism and Neglect Part 2 .....	194
Empathy Part 1 .....	195
Empathy Part 2 .....	197
Empathy Part 3 .....	199
Empathy Part 4 .....	200
Strength .....	201
Moral Clarity .....	203
Education .....	204
Conclusion .....	206
The Syllogisms .....	206
The Empirical Evidence .....	208

## Prologue

I am fully aware that it seems melodramatic and precious to write an introduction that is basically a giant trigger warning – but it needs to be done.

This book is the culmination of forty years work in the fields of philosophy, self-knowledge, parenting and ethics.

Through my show Freedomain, I have had the privilege of having in-depth conversations with thousands of people about their early childhood experiences, and the effects that trauma has had over the course of their adult lives. They contact me in the hope that my training and experience in self-knowledge and moral philosophy will help them untangle the problems in their lives – I hope that I have served them well.<sup>1</sup>

I have interviewed many experts in the fields of parenting, child abuse, family structures, therapy and self-knowledge – these interviews are also available on my website.

I myself experienced significant levels of child abuse. I was raised by a violent and crazy single mother, who ended up being institutionalized when I was in my early teens.

I did talk therapy for three hours a week, for almost 2 years.

At the end of my therapeutic process, and after months of trying to repair my relationship with my family, I decided to separate from them. I have not talked to my mother for twenty-five years. My father left when I was a baby, and I had little contact with him – he died a few years ago.

I have been happily married for over twenty years, and have been a stay-at-home father for the past fifteen years to my wonderful daughter.

My daughter is homeschooled, and we are part of a truly great community of like-minded parents.

My daughter and I do comedy shows together – mostly movie reviews – which are also available on my website.

Now for the trigger warning.

This is a very intense book.

I have tried to write it twice before, but faltered at the depth and enormity of the task.

As a child, I experienced a constant, deep and genuine bewilderment. I was surrounded by people who claimed to be good – and who also claimed to be experts at identifying and punishing immorality. My relatives, my teachers, my parents, my boarding school masters, the

---

<sup>1</sup> These conversations are all available on my website <https://www.freedomain.com>.



priests who instructed me, my neighbours – they all claimed to have the ability to accurately identify immorality and take strong steps to contain and punish it.

I was punished in school – caned in boarding school – and in church, and by parents and relatives – all because they said that I had behaved badly, and deserved to be punished.

But it was most strange...

None of the hundreds of adults who judged and punished me over the course of my young life ever recognized that my mother was an evildoer who violently beat her own children.

They were able to detect subtle signs of rebellion or disobedience in my demeanour, and sharply or aggressively punish me – but they were utterly unable to identify my mother's obvious mental and moral dysfunctions – or ask me how I was doing, and take any actions to protect me, and oppose the violence I was subjected to.

I have been wrestling with this massive issue for over half a century.

How is it possible that adults can punish children for minor transgressions – I was once caned for climbing over a fence to get a soccer ball – but are utterly blind and helpless in the face of adult abusers of dependent and innocent children?

When I was a child, I watched endless movies and television shows about heroes confronting, combating and overcoming evildoers. The heroes were good, the villains were evil – the fight was clear, the victories tough but certain.

I was taught about religious and historical figures who found and fought evildoers almost to the death – and sometimes beyond it, sacrificing themselves to save the world from immorality...

These were the stories, the histories, the theology – yet *no one in my life* was able to detect or act against a clear evil in their midst – even in their own family, against their own flesh and blood...

Some expert trackers claim the ability to put their ears to a train track, and hear a locomotive coming from many miles away – if such a man were to claim this ability, and offer to listen to a train track – while failing to notice a giant thundering train bearing down on him, not 20 feet away, wouldn't that be rather – bizarre?

Wouldn't that be a sign that he was, in fact, insane?

Imagine hiring a safari guide to lead you deep into the jungle so you could take pictures of an incredibly rare white tiger. Imagine standing in the camp before you left, listening to him tell you all the complicated and mysterious tricks he was going to use to track this white tiger – and then imagine his speech continuing without pause as a white tiger walked up and sat right at his feet!

And your guide saw – *nothing!*

He just keeps rambling on and on, telling you how brilliant he was at tracking and spotting incredibly rare tigers, without noticing *at all* the giant animal at his feet!

Again, would he not be a candidate for a mental asylum?

Would you trust this madman to lead you deep into a trackless jungle?

This is the world.

The world of children.

The world of the victims of abuse.

We victims pass through the world – a world that claims deep expertise in the identification and punishment of evildoers – getting soundly punished for our most minor transgressions – while our abusers are either invisible, praised, or protected and defended.

This is, of course, why the abuse continues to exist.

Moral punishments are only meted out to helpless victims – never powerful aggressors.

If, at a family dinner, an adult victim of child abuse finally reveals the horrors he faced, his family will generally be more upset at the open mouth of the victim, rather than the closed fists of the abuser.

This is just the reality of where and how we live.

Our world is a long way from heaven – it is hell for the victims, a sadistic paradise for the abusers – and a weird kind of purgatory for the enablers of abuse, who wander around in a foggy disconnected avoidance, claiming virtue, but only punishing the victims who speak out.

Many people have been awaiting this book with great anticipation.

I am sure that I will disappoint them.

I'm sorry – I really am, but this book has to be the way it is.

Countless people have begged me for years to write this book – I am sure that I will both shock and disappoint them as well.

I'm sorry for that too.

But I stand by the necessity of what I have done.

People expect a book on peaceful parenting to be – well, peaceful, you know?

It makes sense, I get that...

But bringing about a peaceful world means exposing and opposing evil and violence.

You can bring peace to a town in the wild West, but you have to take down the bad guys first – and that is not very often a pretty process.

This book is not about being nice to children – though do I talk about that.

This book is not about reasoning with children – though I talk about that too.

This book promotes peaceful parenting by removing the obstacles to it.

This is not a pretty process.

I'm not sure how many people will ever listen to me, but I will say it anyway...

If you have hit your children, I beg you to engage with a good therapist before reading this book.

If you have yelled at, neglected or called your children names, same.

If you have significant unprocessed trauma from child abuse, same.

If you don't have a kind and trusted heart in your corner, this book is likely to be extremely destabilizing.

Philosophers and theologians have written about good and evil for thousands of years – but almost never about the ethics and virtues of children and parents.

Socialists have talked about the evils of power disparities – economic and political – for hundreds of years, but have never taken on the greatest power disparity in the human universe: the difference in power between parents and children.

Feminists have talked about the evils of the patriarchy for decades, claiming that men have economic and political powers far greater than women – but have never talked about the infinitely greater power that mothers have over their children – and how often it is misused and abused.

Communists talk about how the owners of the means of production exploit their workers by paying them less than the value of what they produce – but they never rail against the national debt, which is an exploitation and enslavement of the unborn – surely the greatest predatory theft in the history of mankind!

Everywhere in the world, you see this wild avoidance – people shout their moral condemnations from the rooftops – screaming into the faces of the abstract classes, the political elites, the wealthy and well-connected – but never make their way into the nurseries, into the darkened rooms of hidden and broken children.

You hear endless diatribes against the power of marketing, propaganda, and the evils of manipulative advertising – but how often is the rampant social programming inflicted on helpless and captive children in government schools even *acknowledged*, let alone condemned?

This book will take on all the hypocrisy, lies and manipulations that enable and cover up the abuse of children in our society – all around us.

In your family.

Because – you know, right?

You *know* some kid in your environment – that maybe you see every day – who is shy and downcast and avoidant and shaky, as if crushed under the weight of an invisible burden.

As he is, of course.

As she is...

The burden is not primarily the abuse he or she is suffering – but *your* silence and avoidance.

Of course, society is so configured that it is very hard to know what to do in situations of child abuse. If we try to protect the child, that might further provoke the abuser, who still maintains brutal power over the helpless child.

If we confront the abuser, same.

I used to think that all the adults around me failed to protect me because they were afraid of further provoking my mother – I dreamed that they would wait until I was independent, free of her, before sitting me down and giving me their sympathies, telling me their reasons for failing to help me.

I kicked my mother out when I was fifteen.

I worked three jobs, took in roommates, paid my bills, made my way.

I was free.

And I would sometimes look at the phone – my red dusty rotary-dial phone – waiting for it to ring, for the sympathy and explanations to pour in.

Nothing...

I waited a long, long time for all of this.

In my mid-twenties, when my relatives came into town for a family wedding, I spent days with them, waiting for a word, an acknowledgement – an apology, perhaps.

Again – *nothing*...

It's been thirty years since then – they are all dead now.

Pretty sure that old phone is never going to ring.

But they *have* helped me, in a way – and through their help, I hope to help the world.

The adults around me when I was a child did not lecture and punish me because they had moral understanding, a clear capacity to identify wrongdoing, and a strong will to correct immorality.

No – there was another reason *entirely*...

I will talk about that later.

You can join me, if you dare.

But it won't be pretty.

The authority figures of my childhood were not waiting until I was an adult to tell me how badly they felt that I was being abused.

They either didn't notice, or didn't care.

That is unacceptable.

Another family used to take me in regularly – half as a refugee from the violence – and met my mother many times.

Again, in my mid-twenties, I met up with this family again, and the mother asked me, with great sympathy and tenderness, “How is your poor mother doing?”

Jaw-dropping, really.

I do remember – even as a child – thinking that, if I ever got to any kind of public prominence, that I would do everything in my power to help the victims of child abuse.

While I have personally confronted aggressive parents in public, the bulk of my work has been online, listening to thousands of adult victims of child abuse, sympathizing with them, and providing moral clarity about their desperate situations.

How many of them ever told me that the adults in their lives tried to help them, when they themselves were children?

I understand that this is a self-selecting group, but the answer has been grindingly consistent.

Zero.

No adult in their life – past or present – has ever shown the slightest shred of awareness, understanding or sympathy for the abuse they suffered as children – even the adults who directly witnessed that abuse.

For 18 years, I have had an open channel to anyone and everyone to talk about whatever philosophical issues are on their minds. I have invited debates on ethics, metaphysics, epistemology, free will – you name it.

Any topic is open and welcomed.

And – what do people want to talk about, when they can talk about anything at all?

Their childhoods, almost every single time.

It sometimes feels like I am the only person in the world who will always listen, always sympathize, and always provide moral clarity to those who have suffered from evildoers.

I never tell anyone what to do, of course – I am a staunch believer in free will, and I would never try to get anyone to substitute my thoughts for their own judgement.

Perhaps I give people a car – but I never tell them where to drive.

Morality without control – morality that informs and liberates, rather than shames and punishes – can be deeply disturbing.

If you don't understand this yet, you will over the course of reading this book.

I'm telling you this: if you choose to read this book, you will quickly realize why it has never been written before.

The arguments are not complicated – the moral clarity is disarmingly simple.

This is not a book detailing the mathematics of quantum physics, the wild contradictions of superstring theory, or how to navigate hyper-complex tax laws – or how to balance personal interests, social acceptance, and moral integrity.

This is a book that even a child can understand.

This is the book that your inner child has been waiting for.

I have always been impressed by the fact that Socrates never used technical language when discussing philosophy with people – you can't find a single example of him using the word "epistemology," for instance.

While I have certainly written more technical works of philosophical examination, I have worked *very hard* to keep this book as clear and accessible as humanly possible.

There is no point writing a complex moral manual for the improvement of the planet as a whole.

I normally write in fairly lengthy paragraphs – this book is mostly bullet points.

Bullets indeed.

If you were abused as a child – and most children in the world are, that is the way of the world – then you have my deepest and most heartfelt sympathies.

It was wrong, it is unacceptable – and it *must* change!

No one was there for me, and that is a real shame.

Some people inflict their pain on the world – some people provide what they were denied.

I'm so sorry that you are hurt – it was horribly unjust.

I'm so sorry that – most likely – no one helped, or noticed – either then or now.

I'm so sorry that no one was there for you.

With this book, I can be there for you.

Here for you, now.

It's time.

Let us begin.

## Introduction

If the world is hell, it is because of childhood.

The unhappiness, misery, pain and violence of the world have all been “explained” according to various theories, all designed to distract us from the central, core and highly personal issue.

Socialists tell us that the world is hell because of economic and environmental exploitation – without ever asking *why* people end up so coldhearted that they can use and dispose of their fellow human beings via the chilly physics of grim economic utility.

Theologians explain that the world is hell because we are born sinful, and have to be beaten and terrorized into even a remote approximation of virtue.

Educators explain that the world is hell because children are willful and disobedient, and have to be threatened and bullied into pursuing knowledge and accepting conformity.

Antiracists explain that the world is hell because people mistrust and hate other ethnicities – without ever asking *why* people end up xenophobic, hateful and afraid.

Feminists explain that the world is hell because men hate and fear women, and thus lust to bully and control them – without ever explaining *why* men might hate and fear women – especially when they are raised by women!

Evolutionary biologists explain that the world is hell because mankind is an animal, with an animal’s lusts and passions and thirst for dominance. No one ever explains why science is possible for mankind – but not for any other species – but virtue is not.

Every civil rights movement has striven to bring excluded groups into the moral center of society. Morals – both legal and social – that were set up to exclude various races, sexes and classes, have all been challenged and overthrown. The goal of the inclusion of all excluded groups into the core moral principles of society has been avidly pursued – and often achieved – often to the betterment of all.

Why has there never been a civil rights movement for the most abused, controlled and exploited class in society – the *children*?

All will be explained.

What else?

Well, skepticism of artificiality has also been a central thrust of modern thought – avoid plastics, chemicals, pesticides and so on. Buy organic, live naturally, embrace the wisdom of your ancestors – countless communities pursue these goals with avid abandon.

We have terms for sexism, racism, homophobia, Islamophobia, xenophobia, fatphobia, classism – the list these days is virtually endless. Fear and hatred of the “other,” it is said, leads to hateful language, violence, terrorism – war, even.

For all our modern moral wisdoms, one word remains conspicuously absent from our endless patrolling of language, exclusion and contempt.

Where is the word “*childism*”?

Why do we not even have a *word* for prejudice against children?

“Ah,” you may say, “this is because society treasures its children, devotes endless energies to training and raising its children – therefore it would make no more sense to have a word called ‘childism’ than it would to have a word called ‘loveism.’ We cannot be prejudiced against that which we love!”

Interesting...

But – is it true?

It is certainly true that society *claims* to worship and love its children, and does devote endless energies into training and raising them.

What do we always hear?

“The children are our future, our heritage, our worlds, the purpose of our life and being, the foundation of our civilization...” – you name it!

The late singer Whitney Houston had a famous song “The Greatest Love of All” which started off thus:

*I believe the children are our future  
Teach them well and let them lead the way  
Show them all the beauty they possess inside  
Give them a sense of pride to make it easier  
Let the children's laughter remind us how we used to be...*

Sadly, Whitney was a victim of childhood sexual abuse who grew up to be a drug addict – enacting all the inevitable abuse and neglect on her own daughter, who, like her mother, also died in a bathtub with a large number of drugs in her system.

Whitney sang about virtue, but lived a deeply broken and destructive life.

But – what is the general theory?

Well – that children are *loved* by society, and therefore we would never *need* a word to describe society's prejudice against its own children!

If you love chocolate, how can you be prejudiced against chocolate?

If you love your wife, by definition you cannot hate and exclude her.



What on *earth* are you talking about, Stef?

Well, philosophy is all about skepticism – and the longer the claim has been going on – and the more widespread it is – the more philosophers are inclined to question it.

The institution of slavery was universally accepted and practiced through the world, for all of history – until moral philosophers and theologians eventually questioned it.

The modern world is founded on skepticism of traditionally-accepted “wisdom.”

Science, technology, engineering, medicine – these are all founded on skepticism of formerly-accepted “absolute truths.”

The battles against exclusion were all founded on skepticism of the accepted wisdom of excluding other races, sexes, classes and groups.

Reason demands that we judge others – and ourselves – by deeds, not words.

If a man claims to passionately value a woman, then ghosts her after sex, would we accept his protestations of affection?

No – surely we would judge his actions, rather than his words.

Good words often camouflage bad actions.

Con artists charm us before robbing us; seducers woo us before exploiting and abandoning us. Politicians promise us heaven, then deliver hell. People pretend to be injured to bring you close, then rob you blind. Scammers pretend to want to help you, then steal from you.

And – believe it or not – criminals generally claim to be innocent, even when guilty.

Imagine a world where mere statements equaled objective truth.

If you fail an exam, but you tell your teacher that you passed it, then she would have to adjust your mark!

If you fail to pay your taxes, but then inform the government that you *did* in fact pay them, that would have to be accepted.

If you were caught shoplifting, you could tell the store owner that you are *not* stealing, and he would have to let you go.

You could claim to be a doctor, and no one could disagree with you.

As a toddler, you could be caught with chocolate all over your face, but justifiably deny that you had ever touched any chocolate!

If you were tired of making mortgage payments, you could simply phone the bank and tell them that you in fact owned the house free and clear, and all would be well!

Society would crumble in about forty-eight hours if mere statements were always accepted as truth.

No, we have standards of evidence and empiricism and logical consistency and proof – in order to separate liars exploiting morality from honest people pursuing virtue.

What do we say, if we are rational?

“This is your claim, what is the truth?”

This is the essence not of just philosophy, but society, rationality, functionality – and survival.

Imagine a primitive hunter coming home empty-handed, but claiming to have felled a giant deer. Would anyone eat?

Imagine a man in the jungle being hunted by a tiger – could he save himself by closing his eyes and repeating over and over, “there is no tiger, there is no tiger”?

Of course not – these examples are almost too foolish to mention.

We all understand that we only empower and embolden liars by refusing to look for reason and evidence.

Society claims to love its children – very well, let us look for reason and evidence.

Before we take this journey, though, I need to repeat my warning.

This book will be horrible for you – but the alternative is far worse.

Some medical treatments can be horrible, but they beat dying.

It is horrible to look in the mirror and accept that you are fat, but it beats getting diabetes and heart disease.

It can be horrible to be self-critical, but it beats the corruption and decay of avoiding rational self-correction.

Learning is pain – but the alternative is usually far worse.

This book will be painful for you because it is not about abstract topics, windy philosophical ideals or gentle exhortation to future virtue.

This book is about your pain.

This book is about your life.

This book is about your childhood.

This book is painful – but the alternative is infinitely worse.

If society does in fact love its children, and raises them wisely, virtuously and well, then we are truly doomed – because the current hell is the best we can ever expect.

If you exercise and eat sensibly, but gain weight every week, something is seriously wrong with your body.

If you eat too much and don't exercise, then you have a solution to your weight gain – eat less, and exercise!

We must truly hope and pray that society does *not* love and treasure its children – otherwise little can ever be substantially improved!

In other words, if you're already doing the best you can, you can never improve the outcome.

If society treats its children wonderfully, then there is no path to improvement. The violence, discord, loneliness, lovelessness, exploitation, betrayal – all the evils that fester and grow in the human heart – and our social world – can never be cured.

We have spent the past few hundred years attempting to become more inclusive and create harmony in society, but disharmony is only increasing.

We have spent countless millennia trying to stop war, but war remains.

We have spent an eternity combating immorality, but evil still grows.

Either we are missing something essential, or we are truly doomed.

I choose hope.

However...

Choosing hope means accepting pain.

So be it.

We will ask and answer this question:

*Does society truly love its children?*

## Do We Love Our Children?

Love and violence are opposites.

A man cannot claim to love a woman if he beats her.

A woman cannot claim to love her cat if she starves it.

A bully cannot claim to love his victims.

What about love and exploitation?

Can a boyfriend claim to love his girlfriend while secretly running up her credit card bills?

Debt enslavement is the opposite of love.

Let's try a thought experiment.

Imagine a purple-skinned race.

Society claims to love these "purples."

Claims of affection aren't proof of love – abusers, stalkers, cults and exploitive corporations often claim to "love" their victims.

Now, imagine that, in the society that claims to love "the purples," the following facts are true:

1. It's illegal to hit anyone except the purples. Hitting purples is praised for "maintaining social order."
2. Genital mutilation is illegal except for male purples – for whom it is encouraged and praised.
3. Using future earnings of unborn purples as collateral for government spending is popular, legal and encouraged.
4. Running up debt and forcing others to pay is illegal except for purples. Newborn purples inherit massive debts they must pay off throughout their lives.
5. Purples are regularly sexually assaulted; about one in three females and one in five males experience this. Prosecutions are rare despite the illegality.
6. Behaviors unacceptable in society are accepted and praised when inflicted on purples. Yelling at a purple for mistakes is considered good.
7. Verbally intimidating retail workers is scorned, but threatening purples is praised as being *good* and *noble*.
8. Physically punishing or traumatizing people is unacceptable, but it's allowed for purples as long as there's no permanent injury.
9. Forcing others to live with you is kidnapping, but purples can be kept in homes against their will, and they are punished if they try to escape.
10. Trapping people and indoctrinating them is illegal, but purples endure forced indoctrination for over six hours a day for twelve years.
11. Involuntarily drugging someone is unthinkable, but purples can be drugged if they fail to pay attention or misbehave.

These facts would totally contradict society's claim of "love" for the purples.

If these were women, we'd call it sexism.

If these were blacks, Indians, or Hispanics, we'd call it racism.

Yet we don't even have a word for prejudice against children.

That's not an accident.

"Childism" isn't even a word.

Why not?

## Childism

What is "childism"?

It is the universal, relentless – and often institutional – prejudice against and hostility towards children.

All across the world, parents hit their children, force them to stay seated, or confine them to a room. They deny them food, yell at them, and dump them crying into daycares. Children are stuck at home and cannot leave.

A society that loves its children would not have national debt or unfunded liabilities. It would not force children into schools where their interests are ignored and where they are drugged for failing to pay attention.

Children are happiest in two-parent households with a mother who stays home. A society devoted to children's safety would promote the nuclear family. It would not encourage mothers to separate from their newborns – this benefits employers and governments but harms the mother-child bond, leading to future chaos and violence.

It would not pay mothers to leave their families through welfare, alimony and child support.

A society that loves its children would prioritize their needs and happiness in social and legal decisions. Every important question would be driven by:

- *Is this best for our children?*

Should children be spanked?

The answer is simple: Spanking is disastrous for children.

Should we yell at children?

The answer is also simple: Verbal abuse is disastrous for children.

Should we put children in government schools?

Children do very badly in government schools.

Should we fund society's current greed by enslaving our children to future debt?

The answer is self-evident.

To see if society truly loves its children, ask:

- *What sacrifices does society make to ensure the best outcomes for its children?*

Would a politician suggesting spending cuts to pay off the national debt for the sake of the children sake *ever* be elected?

Would school unions accept curricula changes based on what was empirically best for children?

Would it be considered good to criticize those who inflict the lifelong pain of divorce on children?

What about women who have children out of wedlock? Or men who abandon their children?

Those accused of verbal bigotry are shunned and ostracized - but those who objectively harm their children are praised.

People are destroyed over words but praised for harmful deeds.

Using slurs is unacceptable, but yelling at, hitting, confining, and indoctrinating children is praised.

Why is there war, promiscuity, addiction, crime and violence?

Because children are abused.

And we lie about it, and claim we love them.

It is simple.

The world is hell because of childhood.

## Why We Punish Children

Do you think this case is too strong, too radical?

All right - let's listen to the other side!

The counterargument is:

“Children must be hit or controlled because they lack a sense of consequences. You stop a child from running into traffic or grabbing boiling water. Children are impulsive and unaware of dangers, so you use physical consequences to prevent worse outcomes.”

This argument falls apart with a moment's thought.

It's childism – bigotry against children – to argue that:

“It is appropriate to use violence against those with limited cognitive abilities.”

If a cognitively impaired adult makes a mistake, is it acceptable to yell, beat, or punish him?

No!

If your elderly mother is cognitively impaired, can you beat her if she forgets her keys?

No!

So – the idea that we beat children because they are cognitively limited is false.

Every group in society that shares characteristics with children is protected – except children.

If a mother says she hits her children because they don't listen, she lies.

Imagine a mother at work explaining to her boss how something can't be done, but he won't listen. Does she drag him across her knees and beat him?

No!

She would be arrested for assault!

If she told the officers she beat her boss because he *didn't listen*, or *defied her*, what would they say?

“Ma’am, you don’t get to beat someone just because he doesn’t *listen* to you!”

Imagine a politician making it legal to beat anyone who didn’t listen or agree.

People would regard his campaign as morally insane.

Yet we accept this as a “reason” why parents hit their children.

If we say we arrest black people for stealing – but let every other race go free for the *exact same behavior*, it is a lie to say we arrest black people for stealing.

If we insult, hit, and punish children for mistakes and not listening – but never do this to others, we are lying about our moral motivations.

Everywhere you look, you see the same pattern: *Punishment and violence are morally evil for us, but morally good for children!*

*That* is childism.

People also say: I hit my children because they can’t reason!

Imagine this in society.

Is the world full of people deeply dedicated to reasoning?

No.

So – is it morally good to beat people if they don’t reason? No.

Do you see how insane this is?

Do you see how our supposedly “universal” moral rules reveal the vicious prejudice of *childism*?

## Children Reasoning?!?

You may be surprised to learn that even *babies* can reason – starting at about fifteen months, they can perform deep moral reasoning. The grim reality is most parents don’t believe this because they have never tried reasoning with their children.



For many parents, ‘reasoning’ means agreeing.

“I’ve asked you nicely!” usually precedes coercive escalation.

Disagreement or inconvenience often leads to violence, either physical or emotional.

This is madness.

If you pull out a gun during an argument, and your opponent punches you, it’s not proof he is unreasonable - you provoked the violence!

Similarly, parents don’t try reasoning for months before hitting their children; they hit them from the start, thus *preventing* the development of reasoning abilities.

The hitting comes first – the “kids can’t reason” excuse comes much later.

Morally, society holds two central principles.

The first is:

- A genuine incapacity should never be punished, but rather gently accommodated. If a child or adult cannot hear, we don’t punish them; we accommodate their limitation. If we believe children can’t reason, we should view this as an incapacity and never punish them for it. We wouldn’t punish a baby for peeing on the carpet, knowing they can’t control their bladder.

Yet, children, physically limited in their reasoning capacity, are punished for this *all the time*. If a guest writes on our walls, we don’t yell, hit, or punish them.

Adults are *forgiven*; children are *punished*.

This isn’t about virtue; it’s about power.

*Why* do we punish children?

Because we are good, and they are bad?

No.

Because they refuse to reason, leaving aggression and violence as our only option?

No.

We punish children *because we can*.

When slavery was legal, slaveowners beat their slaves because they could. If we hit, scream at, punish, or call children abusive names – but never attack adults – it's just because we can.

The second moral standard in society is:

- As power disparities increase, moral standards also increase. A man can ask a woman out, perhaps even at work. However, a boss shouldn't ask out an employee due to the power imbalance. A policeman abusing power is worse than an abusive private citizen because of the power disparity. A corrupt judge is punished more severely than a corrupt salesman.

The more power that exists, the more virtue is required. A man in a coma isn't praised for his morality, because he has no capacity to do good or evil.

A broke woman is not despised for not giving to charity, but a billionaire would be.

## Power versus Virtue: A Love Story

We all accept the following as morally foundational: the greater the power disparity in a relationship, the more virtue is required from those who hold the most power.

This is the most basic fact: *there is no greater power disparity than that between parents and children*.

We punish a boss asking out his secretary because of the power disparity. More power requires more virtue. If a prisoner threatens a guard, it means little – if the guard threatens the prisoner, it means everything.

Imagine the power dynamics of parenthood in a marriage.

Bob and Sally are married. Sally was assigned to Bob and had no choice. She cannot leave for at least eighteen years. Sally can only leave the house with Bob or someone with authority over her. She can never leave on her own for the first eight to ten years.

Bob has total control over Sally. He can hit, restrain, refuse to feed her, cut off her social contacts, confine her, scream at her, and call her names. She cannot leave or defend herself. If Bob hits Sally and she resists, Bob can call the police, who will lecture Sally about her need to be more obedient.

If Sally complains about Bob's violence and abuse, everyone tells her to forgive Bob, to stay with him for life, care for him, give him money, and surrender to his preferences without expecting an apology or change.

Talking to Bob about his abuse will upset him, they say – he is "doing his best."

Sally is constantly reminded of Bob's difficult past and told her job is to love and understand him – and *never* leave.

After twenty years of abuse and begging for change, if Sally leaves Bob, she must keep her new freedom a total secret, knowing that people condemn her for not supporting her "loving" husband.

If Sally ever even *mentions* escaping her abusive relationship, she faces coldness, rejection and hostility.

Sally notices that women who voluntarily entered and left marriages are praised for their courage, while she, who was forced as a child into an abusive marriage, is condemned.

The world seems sane only if you refuse to think. This is the standard Sally faces: *leaving a voluntary relationship is praised; fleeing an abusive, involuntary one is condemned.*

Children depend on their parents and cannot leave. This is not a moral or legal issue but a biological fact. The fact that children are involuntarily trapped with their parents is not a problem to be solved – since there is no solution – but a power disparity to be recognized.

It is deeply strange that we expect the greatest morals from the most powerful people – except parents, who have the most power in the universe and can do almost anything!

This is a bizarre moral reversal – we have a principle that, as power increases, moral standards must also increase – except at the very summit of power, where wild immoralities are accepted and praised!

This would be as bizarre as a feminist claiming that inappropriate comments, glances, and touches are evil – but patriarchal leaders are only moral if they abuse and rape at will.

It is also strange that many who oppose violence and corruption refuse to address the abuse of parental power against children. Billions panic about possible climate changes 100 years from now, while stepping over the countless broken bodies of broken children.

If the environmental movement is driven by concern for children and their future – and concerns over using nature's scarce resources – it should oppose divorce, which harms children and wastes resources.

For thousands of years, moralists have condemned and opposed war – while avoiding society's endless war against its children.

Millions who support the nonaggression principle avoid condemning the greatest violation of this principle: physical and verbal violence against children.

## Reversing Principles

We cannot claim to be moral if we reverse principles at will.

We cannot say it is *wrong* for a boss to ask out his secretary due to power disparity but *right* for a parent – who has far *greater* power - to hit a child.

The secretary can file a grievance, quit, or refuse advances. Abused children cannot leave, fight back, or get support. If they complain, they are dismissed. If they fight back, punishments escalate to mortal danger. Children have no independence, no legal standing, no choice, no freedom, no self-defense, or ability to avoid tormentors.

If the parent is the bully, there is no escape.

Let's return to Bob and Sally.

If Bob wants his wife to love him, but she is forced to marry him and cannot divorce, what can he do?

Involuntary relationships have a deficit - they are not chosen. A joyful marriage might start at plus ten; a forced marriage starts at minus ten.

People who choose marriage start at plus six to eight – the happiness of getting married but some uncertainty as to the future. To reach plus ten, they need 2 to 4 extra points of happiness.

Forced marriages start at minus ten—to reach plus ten means *twenty* extra points of happiness.

To achieve a happy marriage, Bob must think: “My wife cannot leave, so I must be so great she *would choose me if she could*. I must act as if she could leave anytime, and maintain the highest standards of love, humor, and virtue.”

The involuntary nature of the relationship demands the highest standard from Bob to turn it from *unchosen* to *chosen*.

(Adults can leave abusive parents after eighteen years, but it costs them almost all relationships—like a wife leaving her husband after eighteen years, but losing all social and familial ties.)

Parents *choose* to have children; children do not *choose* to be born or *choose* their parents. Children are trapped with their parents—a biological reality, not a moral or legal issue. It is an arranged marriage—arranged by parental choice.

In order to be truly loved, parents must think like Bob.

Bob says: “Sally never chose me, so I must act so that, given a choice, she *would* choose me.”

Similarly, parents must say: “My children never chose me, so I must act so that, given a choice, they will still choose me.”

If Bob continually snarls at Sally: “You owe me obedience and love, and I will punish you if you disagree, disobey, or inconvenience me!” - what are the chances Sally would love Bob?

To ask the question is to answer it.

## Imaginary Obligations

One way to abuse someone is to create imaginary obligations and then punish them for failing to meet these “debts.”

Imagine a man who thinks that buying dinner entitles him to sex. If his date refuses, he gets angry. This is abusive.

Similarly, parents create obligations like “obedience” or “respect” - and then punish their children for not meeting these imaginary debts.

“Entitlement” is believing you are owed something you have not earned. A man who believes women *owe* him sex is dangerous. An employee expecting a paycheck without working is deranged.

Many parents believe their children owe them and use aggression if children don’t comply.

Your children do not owe you obedience, respect, love, support, resources, attention, time, phone calls, money, or care in your old age.

Creating imaginary obligations is easier than earning genuine respect. Threatening people to claim they “love” you is easier than earning true love. It’s easier to steal, copy an MP3, and kill than to create, write music, and raise life.

Bullying children into obedience is easier than inspiring them through virtue.

Forcing a woman to obey and say she “loves you” makes you a bully.

Imagining that children owe you obedience then bullying them into compliance is immoral.

## Conclusions

If you grow up believing that the world is flat – because it looks that way, everyone says so, and dissenters are called insane and ostracized – are you to blame?

We should have sympathy for the effects of the errors imposed on us.

If you’re a parent, it doesn't take much thought to understand that your children didn’t choose you.

We hold those in power to higher moral standards and treat those with disabilities more gently.

We don't encourage violence against the vulnerable.

These simple principles are accepted by everyone.

It’s one thing to believe the world is flat when it looks that way and everyone says so. It’s quite another matter after being in orbit and seeing the spherical planet.

Most of us experienced contempt, hostility, aggression, violence, and abuse as children. Whether through direct experience or by seeing the difference in better families, we know the truth.

We will discuss facts, reason through ethics, and break the prejudice of childism – we will live up to our claim of loving and treasuring our children. We will do the hardest thing. We will accept only honesty, truth, and virtue. We will endure our pain to reach our moral destination.

We will do this because the alternative is not just hell, but death. There is no other path. We must confront these truths to create a better future for our children.

## PART 1: THEORY

### Peaceful Parenting: What Is It?

The strangest thing about peaceful parenting is that it is what we practice in most of our daily lives.

Peaceful parenting is not alien, revolutionary, or contradictory. It is what you teach your children, how you live, what you praise and prefer in almost everything you do.

Is this incomprehensible?

Look at the bigger picture.

Peaceful parenting is the greatest moral revolution in history, aligning with and extending all prior moral progress.

What do I mean?

Science, technology, and morality progress by eliminating exceptions. Simplifying principles into universals gives us more power over knowledge, nature, and ourselves.

Early commandments forbade stealing only within one's tribe. Outsiders were fair game, but the property of fellow believers was to be respected.

Imagining a flat Earth creates exceptions to universal laws.

In many societies, rights are reserved for some, while lower castes, women, and slaves remain unprotected. Why allow these complications?

It's about power. Complexity masks corruption.

Changing one variable can simplify the system, transforming it from corrupt to moral.

When Earth was considered the center of the universe, the retrograde motion of Mars was explained with the Ptolemaic system, requiring hundreds of calculations. The Sun-centered

model of the solar system simplified everything: Earth sometimes moves faster around the sun, making Mars appear to move backward. Simple.

Newton's gravity theory states that everything falls: apples, Earth, and moons.

Einstein simplified understanding with relativity and  $E=MC^2$ , rejecting the theory of universal ether.

Extending self-ownership, property rights, and voting rights to all adults eliminated the moral justifications for slavery.

Every human owns himself and his the effects of his actions – this is the foundation of political liberty and property rights.

Conditional morality, on the other hand, exempts some people from general principles.

“Everyone can enter contracts – except women!”

“Everyone can vote – except slaves!”

“Only the King has free speech!”

Some religions reserve divine access for priests; others offer it to all.

What moral principles currently need universal extension?

## The Non-Aggression Principle

We all accept and enforce the nonaggression principle (NAP), which states it is immoral to initiate the use of force against another person. Self-defense is acceptable in extreme danger, but you cannot use violence against someone unprovoked.

Historically, NAP has been applied selectively. Nobles could sell land without selling themselves, but serfs were tied to the land and sold with it. Members of an in-group had to respect NAP among themselves but could hit or steal from outsiders.

So, what is peaceful parenting? It simply extends the nonaggression principle to children, making it immoral to initiate the use of force against them.



Peaceful parenting means it is immoral to use force against children, enter contracts on their behalf, or borrow against their future earnings.

The extension of NAP to children means that it is immoral to beat, hit, confine, spank, or physically restrain them.

I know many arguments against this principle are erupting in your mind, and I sympathize with that. I will address these concerns throughout this book. But consider this:

Wouldn't it be simpler to have one moral rule for everyone, rather than separate rules for adults and children? Wouldn't it be less confusing for children told not to hit to not be hit themselves? Shouldn't authority figures follow their own rules and not hit others?

A significant proportion of you (about 10-20%) agree that hitting children is wrong, and I appreciate that. But peaceful parenting also recognizes that verbal abuse against children violates NAP.

Verbal abuse includes calling children stupid, lazy, selfish, or telling them the world will end soon or that they are evil for being born. If you kidnap and brainwash a woman, it's considered psychological abuse and forcible confinement. We seek legal damages for emotional pain and punish cult leaders for indoctrinating.

Children can't leave abusive environments and are deeply affected by parents' words. We have laws against libel and defamation because words cause harm.

We ban physical violence and damaging verbal abuse against adults – why not against children too?

Science, technology, and morality advance by extending simple, accepted rules universally. Moral laws protect those who can't protect themselves – and children are always the most vulnerable. Yet, children are excluded from protections granted to powerful adults.

Free, powerful adults are protected; dependent, trapped children are not. This is unacceptable. It's time to change.

## What The World Should Be

Why do we find it so hard to live our values?

This is by design.

Pretending to be virtuous in order to do evil is the oldest con.

“Virtue” was invented to exploit us.

Don’t believe me?

Good! You shouldn’t just take my word for it.

Think of two warring tribes – the Hatfields and the McCoys.

The Hatfields respect property rights; the McCoys do not.

The Hatfields can own land, machinery, make and sell weapons – they trade, specialize, and become wealthy.

The McCoys steal from each other, so no one plants crops or develops weapons.

When they clash, the Hatfields win with stronger warriors, superior weapons, and extra food.

Every group benefits from respecting property rights. Christianity spread by teaching “Thou shalt not steal,” creating wealth that elites could tax and use to control the masses.

“Honesty” is a virtue when those in power want information from you. It’s punished when inconvenient truths are told, labeled “rude,” “blasphemous,” “seditious,” or “hate speech.”

“Courage” is praised in soldiers serving the elites but called terrorism and treason when opposing them.

If you unpack these “virtues,” you’ll see they always benefit those in power and are punished if they don’t.

A soldier is rewarded for killing an enemy, but punished for killing a citizen.

Virtues like “honesty” and “courage” are good. My goal is not to make you cynical about morality but to help you understand why it’s difficult to apply consistently.

What is good for the goose is good for the gander...

## Moral Reversals

If an action is good in one situation but evil in another, this a *moral reversal*.

Sadly, we experience these moral reversals from the very start of our lives.

For example, parents teach us to tell the truth, but punish us when our truths are inconvenient.

When children are asked who broke a lamp, truth is praised - but if children mention seeing a parent kissing another person, it is not!

If you say that you refuse to kiss your Aunt Edna because her breath stinks, you're punished for "rudeness" rather than praised for honesty.

Virtues are praised when they serve those in charge and punished when they don't.

School teachers want you to tell the truth, except if it's about them being boring or incompetent.

They teach nonviolence but go on strike to get what they want.

They say to stand up to bullies, but don't support you when you report bullying.

Virtues are described as universal but not applied universally, and this contradiction is ignored.

This is why we don't notice society's claimed love for its children - while continually abusing and exploiting them.

Morality is often a cover for exploitation.

A moral philosopher who urges the consistent application of universal values causes great fear because historically, living by *consistent* morals has been extremely risky.

Deep down, we understand:

"These morals are universal, but living by them can lead to destruction. Talking about these contradictions is also dangerous."

Killing without the approval of those in charge is murder; with approval, it earns medals and parades.

We feel safe *speaking* about universal ethics while actually doing the opposite – and never noticing the contradiction.

Recognizing this moral reversal is humiliating, revealing our fundamental enslavement.

The world is hell mostly because it pretends to be heaven.

## What the World Should Be Part 1

Let us imagine a world where we truly live our values of loving and treasuring our children.

Imagine every decision impacting children is designed to benefit them the most.

Let us begin this journey.

Children care most about the virtues of their parents, as consistent positive actions form loving bonds and emotional security – which children crave most.

In a world devoted to children's happiness, men and women would choose each other based on virtues, not just looks. Attractive faces indicate health, but love stems from virtue, and children need virtuous parents to love and respect.

It's hard to imagine a company hiring someone without verifying his skills, or an employee working without knowing her salary. Economic relationships define mutual values upfront.

That's not how dating works – especially today.

Dating should exist for the sake of future children, creating a secure and positive environment for raising a family. Dating is not for vanity, sexual satisfaction, or social media. Dating means *checking compatible values before starting a family*.

In the past, tribal elders managed dating, ensuring shared values. Now, we are in charge and often avoid moral discussions in order to pursue physical attraction. This leads to breakups, weakening our ability to bond over time.

Multiple relationships make us suspicious, hard to love, and less able to bond. Like clear plastic sticky tape, the more bonds we make and break, the less we can bond. In our thirties, panicking about fertility, we try to settle down and have kids but struggle to bond with our spouse and children, leading to anxiety and depression.

If you don't bond with your children, parenting becomes hard, and depression sets in easily. Seeking identity and purpose in work, not family, only makes things worse.

We are designed to pair-bond with those who share our values – good moral values, not random preferences. Countless couples date for years without discussing whether they want children or how to raise them. They never negotiate their inevitable value divergences, leading to emotional, familial and legal bonds with no ability to navigate opposing ideas and approaches.

This would be insane in any other relationship. Would you take a job without discussing responsibilities or salary? Would you have a child without considering what life will look like afterwards? Would you sign a 40-year mortgage without discussing interest rates or payments?

Of course not.

People date for reasons of lust and enjoyment – fun and sex – hijacking the purpose of dating and sexuality, which is to filter for value alignment and emotionally pair-bond with mutually compatible morals. Since dating comes before children, any society that truly valued its children would start by reforming dating.

Dating should look for empirical evidence of value compatibility. Before a date, you talk about values. Once compatible values are established verbally, dating tests these claims. If a man claims he wants to provide for a family, dating confirms his education, assets, income, and potential. If a woman claims she resolves conflicts peacefully, dating tests this through disagreements.

Power tends to corrupt humanity, and dating gives another person escalating power over your happiness and security. No one starts as a CEO – employees gain responsibility progressively.

Dating asks and answers questions about virtue: Is the person on time? Thoughtful? Kind and courageous? Honest? Reliable? Does he enhance my life? Do I enjoy her company without sexual opportunity? Is he good with children? Does she have vices like gambling or drinking? Is he conscientious?

By focusing on these values, we can create a world where the well-being of children is truly prioritized, starting with the foundation of healthy, virtuous relationships.

## What the World Should Be Part 2

Once emotional trust is established through verifying value statements, pair-bonding and sexual activity commence.

Sex should be a reward for value compatibility. Modern dating misuses sex as a reward for attraction, leading to disaster and lies.

Parents who divorce - including those who never married but separate after having children - do not act in their children's best interests. The data on this is clear.

Single mothers often claim their children are their highest value, which is false. If children were their priority, they would have avoided unreliable men.

If a woman's partner abandons his children, two possibilities exist:

1. He was a bad man initially.
2. He was a good man driven away by her.

Either way, her children are not her highest priority.

To place children first, society must reform dating to align pair-bonding with the best outcomes for children. Marriage, welfare, and divorce laws should promote stable marriages, providing children with security.

After conception, what is best for children includes:

- Pair-bonding with the mother
- Breast-feeding
- A stay-at-home mother for at least the first five years

Women should stay home, love, and breast-feed their babies to live up to the values of nurturing children. This reduces GDP and economic activity in the short run but raises men's wages by reducing competition.

Prioritizing economic activity over children's well-being leads to encouraging women to use daycare, benefiting the economy but harming early childhood bonds.

Do we value children or political power and money? Do we want happy babies or higher economic indicators?

Few women earn enough to cover taxes, expenses, and daycare. Most abandon their children for a pittance, or even a net loss. The average mother makes only a few dollars an hour after expenses.

If we cared about children, this would not happen.

To verify if we care, we ask: what is best for children? Then see if society does that.

If society doesn't do what is best for children, it either doesn't want to or doesn't know what is best.

If I claim to want to lose weight but avoid learning about it and get angry at good advice, it's clear I don't really want to lose weight.

We don't point out hypocrisy in order to shame but to prevent wasting time trying to reform hypocrites.

## What the World Should Be Part 3

If my friend claims to want to lose weight but keeps gaining weight, and I point out he's overeating and avoiding exercise, and he yells at me, it's clear I shouldn't help.

He doesn't actually *want* to lose weight – he just talks about it to feel better.

If a woman claims she wants a moral man but keeps dating losers, a good friend will point this out. If she yells at him, it's irrational to keep helping her.

Some people change when their hypocrisy is pointed out – this is worth further investment.

This is the exception.

We all do wrong – we recover when we admit fault, make restitution, and prevent recurrence.

If a man cannot admit fault, he cannot prevent recurrence or make restitution.

If restitution is impossible, fault is rarely admitted.

If you hit someone's car, you can pay for the damage.

If you hit someone's car and kill his wife, restitution is impossible.

If a parent snaps at a child, the parent can apologize and work on anger management.

If a parent abuses a child for fifteen years, no restitution can make the child whole.

Restitution occurs when emotions become neutral.

If someone dings your car, pays for the repair, and compensates you for your time, that's reasonable restitution.

If you had a terrible childhood, what would make you okay with it?

When we work for pay, we do things we wouldn't do without being paid.

Restitution for working is \$20 an hour.

But childhood is different.

Picture this...

Imagine seeing your life before birth, knowing your childhood is full of abuse.

Would you choose life if it meant 18 years of abuse?

How much would you need to be rewarded for being born into 18 years of abuse?

If you wouldn't choose to live no matter the reward, no restitution is possible.

Your abusers can never make it right.

They are unforgivable.

If this analogy is too mystical, consider your present life.

If someone offered to pay you to surrender to 18 years of abuse, would you accept?

No sane person would.

Most people pay taxes and obey laws to avoid jail, where abuse is likely.

Since no money would make you surrender to 18 years of abuse, and you had an abusive childhood, you can never receive restitution.

A person who refuses to apologize and make restitution cannot be forgiven – forgiveness is earned, not granted.

No one can be forgiven if their wrongdoing is beyond restitution.

Virtues that serve those in power are praised, while the same virtues that harm them are condemned – forgiveness follows the same pattern.



As a child, if you made a mistake and were punished, you were not forgiven!

Punishment was the ideal, not forgiveness.

When you confront your parents for their wrongs, suddenly forgiveness is the ideal, not punishment!

Do you remember?

If you failed to study for a test as a child, you were punished, not forgiven – you got a failing grade and were probably yelled at, spanked, or confined to your room.

This happens to billions of children aged seven, eight, or nine.

## What the World Should Be Part 4

Parents often get angry when children bring last-minute school projects needing parental time and resources, such as a spelling bee practice, science project materials, or permission slips.

We all know the parental response...

“You’ve known about this for *weeks*; why are you telling me now?”

The principle here is clear:

Failing to prepare for deadlines is very bad!

Parents often punish children for failing to prepare ahead of time.

This reflects the moral madness of society: *children are held to higher standards than adults!*

Refusing to forgive children for being unprepared is seen as virtuous – refusing to forgive unprepared *adults* is condemned.

From the time people learn how babies are made to actually having a baby, parents have *years* to learn how to parent.

Most parenting books since over the past 70 years discourage hitting and yelling at children, advocating positive reasoning and spending time with them to make them feel loved.

People have *years* to study parenting best practices before having children.

Quick question: which is more important – a Grade 7 spelling bee or peaceful, healthy parenting practices?

Who should be more accountable – a child with an immature brain or a fully-grown adult?

Society believes 40-year-old adults should *never* be punished for failing to prepare for parenting, while an eight-year-old *should* be punished for failing to prepare for a unimportant school quiz.

Parents who didn't read up on parenting are never punished for their failings.

A nine-year-old who forgets a quiz gets an 'F'.

Parents who failed to prepare for parenting must be forgiven.

If a child fails a test, they can't excuse it by saying *they did their best with the knowledge they had...*

If a man who can't drive crashes a stolen car, he can't escape punishment by saying *he did his best with the knowledge he had*.

Children are told it was their responsibility to study *before* the test – ignorance is no excuse.

Parents who never learned good parenting practices claim *they did their best with the knowledge they had*.

Children face the highest moral standards – but parents are outraged when held to those same standards.

If an adult victim of child abuse confronts her parents, the parents will deny, minimize, and demand forgiveness, claiming parenting is *hard* and they did their *best*.

Philosophically, we must extract the core moral principles from these excuses to see if they can be universally applied.

Immature people dislike moral philosophers because we strip them of their excuses.

“Parenting is really hard!”

Okay, is it acceptable for a child to fail a math test because, according to the child, math is really *hard*?

No, of course not – the child is told to work harder because math doesn’t come easily.

“We did the best we could with the knowledge we had!”

Is it acceptable for a child who fails a test to say he did his best with the knowledge he had?

No, he will be told he didn't study enough.

“I had a bad childhood, so it was tougher for me to be a good parent!”

Okay, is it acceptable for a child who fails a math test to blame it on finding math tough and having a bad teacher?

Of course not.

If a parent helps a child study and the child fails, can the child blame the parent as a bad tutor?

No, of course not.

Parents will say: “If you know you’re bad at math, you need to study extra hard. Knowing your weakness makes you *more* responsible for failing to study!”

If a child says his phone distracted him from studying, what do his parents reply?

“If you knew your phone was a distraction, you should have removed it! Knowing a problem means you’re responsible for fixing it. If you sunburn easily, you must use sunscreen!”

The principle is clear: if you know a weakness, you are more responsible for overcoming it.

If a child claims he can study and watch a movie at the same time, no one believes him!

When he fails the test, he can’t blame the movie.

Parents will say:

“You can’t study while watching a movie, so you’re responsible for failing the test!”

If a mother knows her bad childhood will affect her parenting, she must overcome it.

If a man knows he gets drunk with a particular friend, choosing to be with that friend is choosing to get drunk.

He can’t say: “I’m not responsible for getting drunk because I was with my friend!”

If a man gambles compulsively at a casino, he can’t claim he had no choice because he was *at the casino!*

Knowing cause and effect means taking responsibility for the effect.

If a boy knows his phone distracts him, he is responsible for failing to study because he keeps checking his phone.

Parents who know they had bad childhoods are *more* responsible for improving their parenting – not less!

If parents were held to the same standards they hold their children to, peaceful parenting would be achieved!

However, it’s even worse than that...

## Children and Control

In our society, children are punished for actions adults expect forgiveness for - and for things beyond the children’s control!

Meet two children: Bob and Sally.

Sally's parents encourage reading and provide a supportive environment.

Bob lives in chaos; his parents mock reading, and endless parties disrupt his sleep.

Both are judged by the same standards.

Bob often fails; Sally excels.

Bob is *punished* for his family situation, which he cannot control.

Sally is *rewarded* for her good fortune, which she didn't earn.

Children eating well are judged the same as those fed junk food.

We tell children: “You’ll be rewarded or punished for things utterly beyond your control!”

Society condemns adult children criticizing abusive parents.

Parents control the household but aren’t punished for bad choices.

Children have no control but are punished for their parents' choices.

Do you see the insane moral reversals in our society?

Do you understand the widespread, institutional bigotry of *childism*?

## Childism

In many ways, children are like slaves.

Slaves don't choose who has power over them – neither do children.

Slaves get food, shelter, and healthcare – so do children.

Slaves can't talk back or punish their masters – neither can children.

Slaves can be punished at their owners' whim – without accountability.

Same for children.

Masters can aggress against slaves – but slaves can't defend themselves against masters.

Slaves can't leave and have to follow arbitrary rules – same with children.

But there is one *huge* difference...

Masters don't pretend that society exists to love and elevate slaves.

Society doesn't claim slaves are its future, deserving respect and affection.

Slaves historically kept over half their production – children inherit only perpetual debt.

Slaves are owned, beaten, and sold without moral falsehood, sentimentality, or hypocrisy – through brute power.

Slaves who dare to escape are praised by moralists – not attacked for their “ingratitude.”

A slave's mistake is punished – a master's mistake must be forgiven.

A beaten slave gets little sympathy, as it's believed he brought it on himself.

We recoil in horror at historical punishments of slaves for their masters' sins.

In society, we always support the master over the slave regarding children.

If a master hits a slave, it's the slave's fault.

A slave who escapes is attacked for not forgiving the master - who is seen as not responsible due to being raised with slavery.

Masters are praised for not forgiving slaves – slaves are attacked for not forgiving masters.

Parents are praised for punishing children – adult children are attacked for holding abusive parents accountable.

The future will view today's parenting much like we view historical slavery.

We condemn past slaveowners while neglecting and abusing our own children.

We decry past dehumanization while verbally abusing our children.

We criticize past educational deprivation while subjecting children to mind-numbing school indoctrination.

We scorn past punishments of rebellious slaves while attacking those who advocate for children's rights.

We sympathize with historical heroes attacked for their righteousness - but attack current moral philosophers who fight for the rights of children.

We have no excuses anymore!

There are no rights without children's rights.

We have no morality if it is not applied to children first.

We have no honor if we punish children for the same actions *we* demand forgiveness for.

We lack integrity if we bury children in debt for our greed.

We condemn ancient child sacrifices, but sacrifice our children to the greedy demands of voters.

We attack our children, claiming ignorance of peaceful parenting.

This is a lie – everyone knows how to parent peacefully!

Just about everyone has received thousands of hours of training in peaceful parenting.

You don't believe this?

I can prove it quickly!

## Parenting in the Media

For decades, child abuse has been virtually absent from popular media and, if shown, it was utterly condemned.

Most parents hit their children – if they are comfortable with this, why is it never portrayed in family shows?

Consider the countless sitcoms since the 1950s where parents have conflicts with their children.

Did Fred McMurray beat his children in “My Three Sons”?

No – he reasoned with them.

Family Ties, Leave It to Beaver, The Cosby Show, Full House, Happy Days, Saved by the Bell, Everybody Loves Raymond, The Fresh Prince of Bel-Air, Who's the Boss? The Brady Bunch, The Partridge Family, Eight is Enough – all these shows modeled peaceful parenting and were watched by billions of people over decades.

Can parents who have consumed thousands of hours of peaceful parenting claim ignorance of it?

Imagine a sitcom showing a child being beaten or verbally abused.

Complaints would flood in, networks and actors would be boycotted.

Parents justify their attacks on their children as morally good. If this is true, why would they be outraged to see it on TV?

Sitcom creators test scenarios with audiences.

Every time abuse was shown, they recoiled from portrayals of their own parenting, claiming offense.

That's why we don't see children being hit or yelled at on TV.

Isn't this strange?

We don't see children being hit or yelled at on TV because it horrifies people, even though many do it daily.

If a man works out daily, he wouldn't be outraged to see exercise on a show.

If yelling at and hitting children is good, why don't parents want to see it on TV?

We don't see heroes like Superman or Batman doing evil. We want to see moral heroism on the screen.

If hitting and yelling at children is good, why do we never see it in popular entertainment?

Or, why is it always a villain doing these terrible things?

Parents on TV and in movies don't yell or hit, they reason with children positively.

Billions of people worldwide have watched thousands of hours of peaceful parenting depictions.

It's not foreign or unknown.

Countless children watched peaceful parenting shows more than they were actually parented.

People tune in to see and praise peaceful parenting, knowing it's good to reason with children.

Even with little children, TV parents are sweet and patient – they don't hit or yell.

None of it makes a shred of sense!

Why do parents recoil from the aggressive parenting they claim is moral?

It's like a policeman horrified at seeing an arrest on TV.



Or a doctor appalled at seeing someone taking antibiotics on TV.

It's almost beyond crazy...

Every good parent in movies and TV is a peaceful parent.

Everyone tunes in to see peaceful parenting.

Good parents on screen don't yell at, hit, or abuse children.

Everyone recoils from child abuse - but then gets up from watching TV and abuses their children.

People watch thousands of hours of peaceful parenting on TV – then claim ignorance of how to parent peacefully.

They demand that TV parents reason with children and never abuse them – and then claim they had no choice but to yell and hit their children because *they didn't know better!*

The world is an asylum pretending to be sane.

If parents have no knowledge of better parenting, why demand to see better parenting on TV - and be horrified if their own parenting is shown?

Because they *know*...

You can't demand something for decades, oppose any deviation, and then claim ignorance.

Good parenting is shown on TV to appeal to parental abusers and make abuse victims feel more alone.

This is why good parenting is consistently shown on TV – to make child abuse victims feel isolated, as if everyone else has a better life.

Parents know *exactly* how to parent peacefully. They see it every day on TV and enjoy it.

They cannot claim complete ignorance after watching countless examples of good parenting.

The contradiction is clear – they know the right way to parent but choose to ignore it, hiding behind the excuse of not knowing better.

The world continues to suffer because of this pretense of ignorance.

True change begins when we acknowledge the truth seen daily on our screens and choose to act on it.

## Peaceful Parenting Media Training

Why do parents who advocate aggressive parenting avoid shows depicting it?

It's not due to a dislike of conflict in art. Shows with children involve disagreements. If reasoning with children led to disaster, people would protest such shows.

Nutritionists would be outraged by shows promoting junk food to kids. Imagine them loving junk food shows and raging against healthy eating shows. Incomprehensible, right?

Healthy eating is about only health, not morality.

Imagine feminists enjoying media depicting women being humiliated, while complaining about any dignified portrayals of women.

If parents think reasoning with children creates entitled brats, they should protest shows promoting it.

Aggressive parents believe aggression is good for all families and society, while reasoning with children is bad. They think aggressive parenting prevents spoiled brats and instils *respect for authority*.

Would people who care for children want TV shows promoting dangerous activities? Imagine comedies showing kids crossing railway bridges at night or playing with poisonous snakes. Parents would protest!

Aggressive parents think children need coercive control to prevent injury or death, like burns from boiling water or running into traffic. They believe reasoning exposes children to danger.

Aggression saves lives; reasoning gets kids maimed or killed. By cheering shows promoting reasoning, aggressive parents believe they endorse practices leading to maiming, death, and selfish adults who destroy society.

Incomprehensible.

Almost...

But nothing in the human mind escapes philosophy.

## Reasoning in Media – The Answer Part 1

So – what on *earth* is going on?

Why would aggressive parents support shows that promote child injury and societal destruction?

Why do aggressive parents oppose shows advocating for safe, happy children and functional societies?

This is like an army teaching recruits to reason with opponents but rejecting weapon training – setting them up for combat failure and death.

What is the answer to this riddle?

In “The Remains of the Day,” a cold-hearted butler secretly enjoys romantic novels. In “American Beauty,” a homophobic neighbor is secretly gay. This Jungian approach shows exterior personalities reacting to hidden emotional opposites – a “reaction formation.”

Earlier, I talked about the unconscious “moral reversal.”

Believing something is moral while also believing its *opposite* is moral requires creating disconnected and opposing personality structures.

The psychological concept of ambivalence describes opposing forces in the personality. A woman loves bad boys but knows a good man is better for her. An addict both needs and hates his addiction. A boy feels desire and fear when asking out a girl. Opposing feelings are natural.

In parents, there are usually two personalities – one aggressive, one reasonable.

The “reasonable parent” tries talking to children; if they don’t listen, the “aggressive parent” takes over. It’s the good cop/bad cop switch.

If a woman tries reasoning with an abusive husband, but he becomes aggressive, she calls the police, turning over her self-defense to their aggression.

Parents use the same process.

“If you won’t listen, you must be controlled!”

Aggression thus results from the child not listening.

To children, this means “listening” is a charade.

It's like a thug demanding your wallet at gunpoint. His words are backed by the gun's threat.

Parents willing to resort to aggression aren't reasoning – their aggression is always part of the equation.

You can't reason with someone if failing to agree leads to violence.

A schoolyard bully isn't “requesting” lunch money with a raised fist.

A child who might be hit isn't being “reasoned with.”

The “nice” parent and the aggressive parent don't connect.

Victims of child abuse note that their parents restrain aggression in public but unleash it in private.

Children beaten at home aren't beaten in public.

Parents restrain aggression when there are negative consequences.

The peaceful parent dominates social situations; the aggressive parent emerges in private.

The peaceful parent enjoys sitcoms with happy families and respectful children.

If a TV parent hits a child, the *peaceful parent* would see abuse without transitioning to the *aggressive parent* – thus seeing the aggressive parent's actions without provocation.

We've often seen shows where a mass murderer has a sweet, innocent second personality horrified by the actions of the murderous one.

The aggressive parent believes children owe obedience, and if children don't comply, aggression is justified.

But this switch requires the presence of a disagreeing child.

How you feel about what you watch on screen often differs from your real-life reactions.

People enjoy true crime podcasts but wouldn't want to be victims of those crimes.

Women made “50 Shades of Grey” a bestseller, but would be appalled by real-life abuse.

The aggressive parent runs on the principle that “my children must be aggressed against if they defy me.”

However, TV children don’t trigger this belief.

Thus, a TV parent hitting a child gives the peaceful parent a glimpse of the aggressive parent.

Imagine finding irrefutable proof you were a mass murderer – it would destabilize your life and self-conception.

You’d likely feel rage against the person exposing your evil.

As a moral person, you’d want to get help and prevent further harm.

Imagine a dog owner discovering they terrorize their dog while sleepwalking. The shock would destabilize them.

Before knowing this, they’d enjoy pet videos and be appalled by abuse.

They’d report abusive videos to authorities.

Seeing abusive actions on TV gives parents a shocking glimpse of their aggressive side without the usual provocation. This unfiltered view can be deeply unsettling, revealing a side they might not consciously acknowledge.

Parents able to restrain aggression in public often let it out behind closed doors. Abuse is absent in malls or in front of teachers or police, but surfaces at home.

The peaceful parent enjoys shows with family harmony, but seeing a TV parent hit a child shows the aggressive parent's actions without the dissociating provocation of a disagreeable child. This duality, like discovering an unknown evil side, shocks the peaceful parent, causing deep rage against the exposure of their internal conflict.

Thus, understanding these dynamics helps us see why aggressive parents oppose shows advocating non-aggressive parenting, as it forces them to confront their own hidden aggressive tendencies.

## Reasoning in Media – The Answer Part 2

In “The Manchurian Candidate,” a man is programmed to murder upon hearing specific words, entering a fugue state. He commits the murder, escapes, then forgets the act.

*Moral reversals* create two opposing personalities that never communicate, to avoid exposing contradictions.

When the peaceful parent sees the aggressive parent on TV, it destabilizes them. The aggressive parent recoils, like a bank robber caught in the act.

The powers that be maintain power through these reversals.

In ancient times, Alexander the Great captured a pirate who argued that with more ships, he’d be a navy not a pirate.

In “Crime and Punishment,” a murderer questions why Napoleon, who killed millions, is celebrated, while he, who killed two, is imprisoned. This exposes the moral reversal.

In “The Godfather,” a crime boss compares his killings to those by political leaders in war.

The Joker in “The Dark Knight” notes that people recoil from city murders but accept mass murder in war, as it fits a *plan*.

We hate murderers but love soldiers.

We punish those who kill without permission but praise those who kill with it.

Moral reversal.

Antiwar activists often want more government power for social programs—different coercive actions.

We cannot oppose violence because we love, commit, justify, and advocate for it.

We cannot oppose elite predations because we prey on our own children.

We cannot reduce global violence until we confront our own.

An aggressive parent who sees her behavior on TV rails against it, as it mirrors her actions.

She empathizes more with a TV child actor than her own children.

It is unacceptable to hit a child on TV but moral to hit her own child.

It is wrong for a TV parent to scream at a TV child but necessary to verbally abuse her own children because they don't listen.

The world is an asylum founded on unconscious moral contradictions.

Here's a tip.

If you would hate seeing your parenting on TV, don't do it at home.

If it's appalling to see a pretend parent hit a pretend child, don't hit your real child.

Smashing a mirror for showing your obesity is crazy.

The problem is not the mirror, but yourself.

The camera doesn't add 10 pounds.

That's just how you look.

You must accept it to change.

To save the world.

To protect your children from your darker self.

## Sexual Success

When you are born, your parents are your templates for sexual success.

In small tribes, to succeed in dating and mating, you had to follow your father's actions, as the women would be mostly like your mother.

If your father beat you, it signaled that women in your tribe preferred men who beat their children.

If your mother screamed at you, it meant the men accepted women who screamed at their children.

Your genes prioritize reproduction over happiness.

If happiness aids reproduction, be happy. If unhappiness aids reproduction, be unhappy – just breed!

Men and women who prioritized reproduction over happiness reproduced more.

You are designed to breed, not to be happy.

Happiness helps breeding success and is encouraged, but any happiness that interferes with breeding success will be quickly eliminated.

Love serves the genes, not morality or personal happiness.

Human pair-bonding increases the chances of offspring reaching reproductive age.

Imagine you are a boy in a primitive tribe.

Your father beats you, your mother screams at you, but you plan to raise your children peacefully.

Everyone else in the tribe prefers aggressive parenting.

Who will mate with you?

Women avoid you because peaceful parenting puts your kids at a disadvantage.

You would be teaching your offspring a different language – one no one else in the tribe speaks.

If you lived in Japan and never learned Japanese, your reproductive odds would be very low.

Doing the opposite of what your parents did will likely lead to opposite outcomes – since your parents reproduced, you will not, and the genes influencing this behavior will end with you.

## Parental Compliance

The same pressure applies to complying with your parents.

Throughout evolution, resources were scarce, predators were everywhere, and competition was fierce.



Half of children died before age five, so parents sometimes withheld resources from sickly children.

With five children and limited food, the weak child often suffered.

This is about evolutionary pressures, not morality.

A defiant child wouldn't adopt cultural and reproductive customs.

Historically, rebellious children who fought their parents faced neglect.

Parents were slower to rescue them from predators, hesitant to give extra food, and less careful in protecting them.

Parents' instincts discouraged wasting resources on rebellious children.

Blind rebellion was selected out over tens of thousands of years.

Children had to submit to their parents, or their chances of reaching adulthood dropped considerably.

## Reversing Aggression

Ah, but a definite switch is required.

If parents are aggressive, children must submit to their will.

Rebellion is the most dangerous predator.

Upon reaching puberty, children must rebel and become aggressive, especially males.

Women raised by aggressive males see them as sexually successful. A submissive male is unattractive, contrasting with her aggressive father figure.

This pattern of children, particularly males, becoming aggressive during and after puberty is well-established.

Non-aggressive boys were not chosen as mates, so passivity vanished from the gene pool.

## Negotiation versus Violence

Understanding the recent miracle of using negotiation instead of violence to gain resources is crucial.

Trade requires property rights, a very new phenomenon in our species.

Property rights need peace, trust, a fair judicial system, empathy, literacy, education, and affordable contract enforcement - all uncommon throughout our evolution.

Property rights enable specialization and trade. A blacksmith trades his output for a farmer's food, making both wealthier.

Trading societies attract warrior societies, as it is easier to steal than create.

Excessive violence in raising children produces volatile adults who cannot negotiate.

Parenting styles must adapt. In trade-based societies, children need less violence and better negotiation skills.

For centuries, England eliminated its most violent criminals, evolving into a polite society enforcing morals through ostracism, not violence.

In peaceful societies, reasonable parents' children do better; in violent societies, bullies rule.

A boy raised by violent parents sees society as violent, believes women prefer violent men, and must submit to parents, then rebel. Submission ensures survival; rebellion attracts women.

Abuse was survival.

Moral philosophers can debate this, but it was a basic survival fact.

Every parent is both a coward and a bully.

The coward complied as a child; the bully rebels as a teen.

The child survives by bowing to parents; the teen reproduces by rebelling.

Throughout history, it was abusive to genes not to abuse children.

Modern complexities mean that resources are now gained by those pretending to be rational but profiting from violence.

Corporations collaborate with politicians for profit.

Politicians make millions trading stocks, likely with insider information.

What seems like peaceful negotiation is often violent predation.

Amateur thieves rob banks; professionals own them. (And the ultimate criminals own central banks.)

Poor people vote for free government money. It seems like negotiation but is in fact predation – taxes are collected, money printed and borrowed, forcing others to pay or go to jail.

Negotiation in public, violence in hidden practice.

Negotiation as a cover for violence.

Words camouflage fists.

You see how this relates to modern parenting?

## The Duality of Modern Parenting

Most modern parents pretend to negotiate in public, but use violence in private.

They mirror their society, which feeds off their parenting to bolster its power. It is the ultimate – and most literal – vicious circle.

People recoil from open violence, so it tends to be masked in rituals and conformity and language.

Everyone raised by an abusive parent knows the power of that random phone call. A parent can be screaming at the child, but if the phone rings, and the parent is expecting a call – sweet and gentle tones replace the yelling.

In this moment, the abusive adult is replaced by the compliant child.

This moral reversal has deep roots in early childhood.

A child hates being abused, but complies to survive. This bottled anger is released in adolescence, through cynicism, sarcasm and aggression.

As a child, you can't fully experience the horror of abuse; empathizing too much with yourself undermines the aggression needed for reproductive success.

Excessive empathy has historically hindered the violent traits necessary for survival and reproduction.

The psychological split from "I hate being hurt" to "I enjoy hurting others" is inevitable.

You can't empathize with others more than with yourself. If empathy with others interferes with reproductive success, it must be abandoned. If the only way to abandon empathy with others is to stop empathizing with yourself – well, you can't make an omelet without breaking a few eggs.

Evolutionarily speaking, violent parents protect their children by preparing them for survival through aggression.

## Parental Hypocrisy

The real issue is hypocrisy. Aboriginal tribes openly abused children without pretense, unlike modern parents who claim virtue in public while doing harm in private.

Moral hypocrisy is pretending to be virtuous while doing evil.

A parent who accidentally hurts a child during play apologizes and vows to take fewer risks next time. However, if a child complains about pain and the father smiles and repeats the act harder, he is a sadist.

Pretending to be good means knowing what goodness is, and how to achieve it. A hypocrite - unlike someone merely ignorant of virtue - cannot be reformed.

A lack of knowledge can be fixed by providing knowledge; hypocrisy is irredeemable because the hypocrite already knows what is good but chooses evil.

A con man knows exactly what trust is – and trustworthiness – which is why he pretends to be trustworthy in order to deceive.

Telling a con man that it is better to be trustworthy is a waste of time – he already *knows* the value of trust.

It's like instructing a counterfeiter about the value of currency – he already knows, which is why he counterfeits!

What bothers me about abusive parents is their pretense of virtue. This shows that they already know what virtue is, and how to be good.

They use virtue as camouflage, making true virtue forever inaccessible to them as a practice.

## Aggressive Parenting: The Steelman Case

Parents don't aim to harm their children; they believe they have the best of intentions. Spanking, they claim, teaches boundaries and respect. Parents argue that children are too young to reason, so immediate negative stimuli ensures safety. For example, a child playing with a knife could be hurt, and a few light smacks are a small price for safety. Similarly, vaccinations, though painful, prevent deadly diseases.

Parents need their child's respect and obedience so that commands like “STOP!” are followed without question. A bit of fear ensures safety.

Parents see consequences invisible to children. Children can't reason, so reasoning with young kids is futile. With multiple children, endless debates create exhaustion. Sometimes, kids need to follow routines without argument.

Children learn when they become aware of missing knowledge, but their immature brains often don't know what they lack. Life teaches painful consequences: sunburn from not using sunscreen, getting fired for skipping work, legal troubles for not paying taxes. As adults, neglecting health or responsibilities incurs severe penalties, far worse than a childhood spanking. Nature, bosses, and government demand compliance; adult life isn't a theme park but a harsh world of unforgiving consequences.

Endless discussions with kids won't prepare them for aggressive people and harsh realities. Debating with kids won't help them with cops, taxes, or bullies. They'll be helpless, unable to handle brutal absolutes. You're sending them as lambs to slaughter. As adults, these “reasoned with” children will face competition from those raised with strictness and consequences.

If you're betting on a race: choose the runner with a strict coach, not one who “negotiates.”

Reality: you must compete against those raised strictly, possessing iron will and discipline. Most people use manipulation, force, and threats. Raising children with "angelic virtue" won't prepare them for a Darwinian world.

If your child wants junk food and ignores vegetables, reasoning alone won't work. A "talk and talk" parent might meekly remind, and cross their fingers for a right decision. Total crap! Children making the right decisions defies the very essence of childhood. "Reasonable" parents know that children aren't adults. They know children's brains and bodies are undeveloped but still treat them as adults. They rely on reasoning and negotiation, which is ineffective, given children's developmental stage.

Strict parenting, though harsh, is a way to prepare children for an unforgiving world. Emphasizing discipline over discussion builds resilience, and the capability to navigate a world ruled by absolute consequences, not endless negotiations.

In a military context, forcing children to become soldiers is wrong. Being a soldier is an adult's job - as is making good decisions. We don't give children driver's licenses, bills to pay, jobs, or contracts to sign *because they are children*. We don't give mentally defective adults full rights and responsibilities, because they need to be managed. A thirty-year-old with the mentality of an eight-year-old cannot be a truly free, independent adult.

You think yelling and spanking is harsh? Parents use corporal or verbal punishment as a gentler form of consequences than nature or other people will. Exercise may be unpleasant, but it's better than muscle atrophy and bone degeneration. We make children exercise and eat well for their health. We take them to doctors for their health, and to coaches for sports excellence. All experts inflict pain for the benevolent goal of future health and excellence. Children don't know what's good for them, but parents do. Should parents let children eat junk food, avoid exercise, and become obese and diabetic? Should parents allow children to avoid the dentist and end up with rotten teeth?

Should parents let children play video games instead of reading challenging books that develop their language skills, empathy, and self-knowledge? Books train important skills; video games train stress and reflexes. When grown, will children thank parents for teaching discipline, or for being indulgent?

Parenting is instructing children on what they cannot know, due to immaturity, lack of experience, or inability to foresee consequences. The idea that you can instruct children without inflicting any negative consequences is insane and immoral. With one compliant child, it may seem fine, but not with a house full of boys.

Letting children run into the street, ride without helmets, play with knives, or handle boiling water is playing Russian roulette with their lives. Such laxness favors parental preferences, not the best interest of children. Disciplining is not fun - just like dieting or exercise - but it's necessary. "Peaceful" parents are pursuing their own peace of mind at the expense of their children's safety and maturity. They prefer being "best buds" over disciplining - they avoid criticism or hostility from their children. Their children will later criticize them as adults when they realize they've been crippled by a lack of discipline.

Give kids candy instead of vegetables - they'll like you momentarily, but hate you later for the damage. Boys who avoid suffering don't ask girls out; girls who get fat and lazy never get asked out. Rigid discipline is essential for success. It's better to teach discipline early through negative consequences like lectures, coldness, raised voices, or spanking. Success requires discipline, and it's better to learn it young when the stakes are lower and consequences less severe.

If you've ever tried learning a foreign language as an adult, you know it's much harder than learning as a toddler. Would you avoid teaching your children to read and let them figure it out as adults? That's a terrible idea - children have a critical language learning window which, if missed, leaves them struggling for life. Would you let your children sleep whenever they wanted, for as long as they wanted? Another bad idea - children with sleep disturbances grow into adults with sleep disturbances - and we all need to wake up for jobs! Children need to learn language, sleep hygiene, nutrition, exercise, and discipline early on so these habits are innate, rather than struggling with them later.

Pro-discipline parents ask: Will my children thank me as adults? Assertive parenting, sometimes called "aggressive," produces strong, disciplined, and healthy individuals who will appreciate it later. If a child fears the dentist and "peaceful" parents avoid dental visits, the child will face tooth pain and gum disease later in life. What kind of citizens will spoiled children - yes, spoiled! - become as adults? Will they respect the laws of society? No, because no rules were ever inflicted on them! Will they think deeply and reasonably about consequences? No, because their parents shielded them from bad effects! Will they be hard workers? No, since they've never faced discipline! Will they be strong and healthy? Unlikely, given their parents let them eat poorly and avoid exercise. Maturity means doing the things you *don't want to do!*

You don't need discipline to eat cheesecake, sit on the couch, or smoke a cigarette. Drinkers and gamblers don't need discipline to indulge further. Parenting teaches children the value of doing what they don't want to do. Children don't understand deferring gratification; they live for immediate pleasure. Try taking Halloween candy from a six-year-old for her well-being. She will cry - she's a child! "Peaceful" parents avoid disciplining because they find it unpleasant, modeling hedonism and expecting discipline to just magically appear. Spanking, for instance, shows parental willingness to endure short-term child dislike for the child's long-term benefit. Spanking teaches children to defer their immediate happiness for their long-term well-being.

"Peaceful" parents avoid the unpleasant for themselves and the child, teaching children to avoid negative experiences, resulting in self-indulgent, discipline-averse, narcissistic adults. I say "narcissistic" because these children grow interested only in their immediate pleasure and unused to sacrificing it for future happiness, even their own. Parents who sacrifice their own immediate happiness – through spanking – for the child's long-term benefit teach children to think of others' happiness, even at their own expense. As adults, they'll appreciate the importance of sacrificing immediate happiness for long-term well-being – their own and others'.

## Peaceful Parenting: The Rebuttal

Just a gentle reminder – a caution to help you, which is my greatest goal.

If you have had power over children, check with them.

If they have complaints, listen to them, and please consider talk therapy for unresolved traumas before continuing.

All right?

Good.

Here is an interesting challenge:

Saying children need to be spanked implies that hitting prepares them for adulthood - yet it's illegal to hit adults.

Saying verbal abuse is necessary conflicts with telling adults in abusive relationships to leave.

We don't teach reading and math skills only to make them illegal in adulthood. Teaching toddlers to walk is valued because walking lasts a lifetime – we're not jailed for walking at eighteen.

Think of teaching methods illegal for adults.

We teach children to care for their things, clean their environment, and groom themselves – habits praised in adults too.

A boss verbally abusing employees is not respected.

A boss hitting employees would be appalling and criminal.



Training children with abusive methods makes no sense if those methods are illegal or abusive for adults.

## Spanking

A child who is hit will change behavior short-term out of fear.

He hasn't learned the behavior's value – only avoiding pain.

What does spanking teach a child?

It teaches that those with more size and power can use violence if disobeyed or displeased.

He already knows parents are bigger and stronger.

He learns he has no physical autonomy, and pain can be inflicted at will.

He learns that “love” involves violence.

Although spanking is portrayed as self-controlled - with warnings and explanations - most spankers violate these standards.

Most spanking is done in anger - to punish, not instruct.

In other words, children are told to control themselves by parents who are out of control.

## Verbal Abuse

Verbal abuse – raised voices, intimidating words, insults – is regularly inflicted on children.

What does this teach them?

They are verbally abused for “talking back,” “defying orders,” or “not listening.”

Parents counter verbal misbehavior with verbal abuse.

This is like hitting a child while saying hitting is wrong.

Peaceful parenting asserts that it's immoral to expect behaviors from children that parents do not first model themselves.

You wouldn't punish a child for not knowing an untaught language.

If you want children to listen, model listening.

If you want respect, respect the child.

If you want reasoning, reason with the child.

You cause your child's effects.

Your child's choices reflect your decisions.

## Tantrums

Parents often say: "That's all well and good in theory, but what about when my child throws a tantrum due to extreme emotional upset?"

The ubiquity of child abuse leads to the myth of "natural tantrums."

This myth suggests children are prone to hyper-excitement and overstimulation, causing emotional meltdowns.

Childhood is seen as random emotional "seizures," which must be cured by ignoring or punishing them.

The mindset is:

"When contradicted, children escalate hysterical aggression, losing their minds. Patient parents must ride out this storm without giving in. Eventually, children will learn these meltdowns do not work and will stop."

This is the opposite of the truth.

To understand tantrums, imagine you are a diabetic waking up in a strange cage. People outside don't understand you.

You need insulin immediately, or your health is at risk.

When you try to indicate this, they laugh, ignore, or get angry at you.

You'd raise your voice, gesture frantically, beg, and plead.

The more desperate you become, the more they mock, laugh, and turn away.

Terrified, you show your emotional desperation.

But they walk away, leaving you alone, facing severe illness and death.

You scream and cry out, but they do not return.

Tantrums arise because children cannot satisfy their physical, mental, and emotional needs.

Children are in a powerless cage of need and frustration.

## Childhood Paralysis

We have reformed society to allow people in wheelchairs greater access to buildings, recognizing their inability to climb stairs.

Young children face similar disabilities.

They cannot get their own drinks, buy toys, or understand their body's aches and pains.

They need parents for comfort, only learning how to soothe themselves over time.

Expecting a child to comfort his own unhappiness is like expecting him to invent a universal language or grow his own food.

When upset, a child feels danger or a barrier and needs the parent's help – a test of love and connection.

A baby who drops a toy he can't retrieve will cry, much like you'd beg for life-saving medicine.

Babies and toddlers are effectively disabled and often mocked for their limitations.

Tantrums are natural panics that arise when children aren't listened to and then mocked.

Parents dismissing a child's distress over a dropped toy might get enraged themselves over trivial issues.

Everything is significant to a toddler who hasn't learned to prioritize.

Babies need parents' help to survive.

Ignoring your baby is akin to issuing a death threat.

Without care, supervision, and instruction, the baby dies.

Parents often find a baby's crying unpleasant, which is strange!

Like a toothache signaling a severe infection risking your life, a crying baby is trying to help you!

A crying baby doesn't want to die – the cry is to help you achieve your shared goal of survival.

Babies' cries aren't intrusive – failing to respond to them risks their survival.

Imagine a baby letting a mother sleep late and dying from starvation – the mother would be more miserable over a dead baby than from being woken up.

Crying babies are helping you!

Unless you're a sadist, you want your baby happy and healthy, right?

You need audio-visual cues from your baby to understand needs for survival and happiness.

Audio cues: crying or laughter. Visual cues: tears or smiles.

The baby's attempts are to help you achieve the goal of survival and happiness.

Parents react impatiently to children's cries, not realizing how much that hinders their emotional growth. Each cry or tantrum is a plea for help and connection, not an act of defiance. Treating these behaviors with understanding and empathy fosters a secure and loving environment, which is essential for a child's development. When parents dismiss or react harshly to their children's needs, they miss crucial opportunities to build trust and security. Understanding this can transform parenting approaches, leading to healthier, happier children who feel valued and understood.

Trying to helping someone - and receiving rage or indifference is frustrating.

Like holding a flashlight for your dad, trying to help in the kitchen, or giving honest opinions to friends, children showing their needs often face impatience, hostility, or indifference.

A tantrum is a desperate attempt to break through a parent's emotional hostility or indifference.

Children feeling unsafe due to unresponsive parents becomes hysterical, realizing they'll face a deadly world without parental help.

Rage in tantrums stems from feeling unloved: *Why have children if you won't care for them?*  
*Why have me if you don't love me?*

The dying down of an ignored tantrum signifies the death of connection and grim acceptance of finding ways to survive alone.

Consider the long-term effects: children who do not feel heard or valued develop insecurities and mistrust. These early experiences shape their future relationships and self-esteem. Consistent parental support and understanding transform these crucial years into a foundation for a confident, emotionally balanced adult. Thus, addressing tantrums with kindness and empathy not only resolves immediate distress but also builds a resilient and nurturing lifelong bond.

## Tantrum Appeasement

Is the solution to a tantrum to appease the child?

Not always.

If a child feels listened to and understood, tantrums are rare.

Tantrums occur when a child's emotions are mocked and ignored.

You know how frustrating it is when someone says 'NO' without listening.

When my daughter wanted candy, I'd say I wanted it too but had to think of my teeth and belly. I'd mime my teeth falling out and my belly getting huge, pulling my hand back from the candy.

We usually ended up laughing.

She has never had a tantrum.

## “But My Childhood...”

Many parents say they raise children the way they were raised.

If adult children criticize their upbringing, parents might eventually admit some issues but claim they parented as they were parented and couldn't have done better.

This argument is intriguing and worth exploring.

Parents who claim they had no choice but to parent as they were parented face an interesting objection:

*Are you using the same phone or computer from forty years ago? Do you have a car with air conditioning or GPS? Do you wear new clothes and follow new fashions? Are you still doing your teenage job? Have you learned any new words since childhood? Do you still have the same haircut? Have you ever changed your diet over the years?*

These questions emphasize a central point.

People continuously upgrade their lives—technology, clothing, housing, jobs, diet, education, language—so why exclude parenting, the most important aspect?

If your mother had tinnitus and a cure appeared, she'd surely use it to stop the ringing. People upgrade their lives constantly, and accept new treatments for illnesses - but can't read a few books to improve their parenting?

As a Chief Technical Officer in the software industry, I learned new technology and encouraged my employees to do the same. Parents adapt to credit cards and online banking, but claim they can't upgrade their parenting skills?

When parents claim they had no choice but to parent as they were parented, they imply they can upgrade everything—learn new tasks, skills, responsibilities—except parenting.

But it gets worse, as it usually does.

## Spanking and Free Will

If your mother hits you and later claims she had no choice because she was hit as a child, she's denying her capacity for peaceful parenting. Yet, she upgraded her parenting in public. When you misbehaved in public, she might have shot venomous looks or threatened you under her breath - but probably didn't hit you in places like the mall, a friend's house, or church.

Her claim of having no choice contradicts her consistent choice to *not* hit you in public. It's like moving to Japan and later complaining about not knowing Japanese, while fluently speaking it in public.

If a parent says he have no choice but to hit because he was hit as a child, but exercises the choice not to hit in public, he always had the choice.

If a father hits his son until the son hits puberty and grows strong, then the father always had the choice not to hit.

Gravity isn't a choice; parents can't avoid it - but if they say they had no choice in hitting, even one counterexample disproves their claim.

A man with epilepsy can't control seizures, a man with Tourette syndrome can't control outbursts, and a man without arms can't clap. Similarly, a man who claims disability only has to walk once to debunk his claim.

If your parents never hit you in public or in front of authority figures, they could *always* refrain from hitting you. That's how they hid it from the world. If they claim they had no choice but were never caught, their claim is false and continues the abuse.

## Childhood and Moral Free Will

But it gets even worse, as usual.

A thirty-year-old father who hits his five-year-old daughter assigns moral will and free choice to her. If he hits her for sneaking candy, he implies:

*I am hitting you because you took candy without permission – which you know is wrong and have the free choice to avoid doing!*

Later, when the father is fifty, and his daughter is twenty-five, she complains about being hit. He now claims he had no choice because he was hit as a child, suggesting she had full moral responsibility at five, while he had none at thirty. This is morally insane and corrupt beyond words!

The father knows that being hit stripped his own moral free will and responsibility, yet he hits his daughter, destroying *her* moral choice and free will!

His equation: *Children start with moral responsibility and free will – hitting them destroys it over time. I hit you knowing it will destroy your moral choice and free will – just as it did to me!*

It makes no sense for an adult to excuse his own behavior but punish a five-year-old. A father claims that he has no moral responsibility because he was hit as a child - but expects full responsibility from his five-year-old while hitting her.

Does being hit remove moral responsibility?

Apparently – *yes* for the thirty-year-old; *no* for the five-year-old...

Does knowing *why* you want to do wrong prevent you from doing wrong?

Apparently – *no* for the thirty-year-old; *yes* for the five-year-old.

It's almost impossible to imagine the moral viciousness and cowardice it takes to pretend that a five-year-old child has more moral responsibility and free will than a thirty-year-old adult.

The father says to his five-year-old: "You did wrong because you are *bad* – I wasn't wrong because I was *wronged!*"

"You as a child are *bad* and must be punished – I as an adult am a *victim* and must be sympathized with!"

"Five-year-old children must be punished, not forgiven – but thirty-year-old men must be forgiven, and never punished!"

I hope you truly understand how repulsive this all is.

I have to take a break and get some air.

## Humanity Versus Power

It is an old adage that human beings are corrupted by power. The greater the power, the greater the corruption.

A key distraction in history has been focusing on distant power instead of personal power. The Biblical question goes – why do you focus on the speck in your brother's eye while ignoring the log in your own?



Humans - especially males - are obsessed with controlling political power due to its danger. Feminists strive to control the patriarchy's power; Austrian economists focus on central bankers; political scientists aim to limit state power. This is largely nonsense - not because these abuses don't exist, but because they are distractions.

Most of us will never be presidents or kings, but most of us will be parents. The most power we will ever experience is our power over our children. In Western democracies, parents have *far* more power over their children than governments have over their citizens.

Laws affect us, but lawmakers don't live in our homes. They don't control us directly through spanking, restraint, hunger, time-outs, confiscation, and confinement. As adults, we can often conform to unjust laws and escape punishment.

Unjust parenting is designed to inflict punishment. "Rules" change constantly in order to perpetuate aggression.

Citizens have legal remedies against governmental abuse; children have no such recourse.

Citizens can avoid becoming the focus of government attention; children have no such options.

Children have no legal standing, no ability to enter contracts, and no recourse against injustice. They can't live alone or move countries like adults. Even soldiers fare better than abused children. Soldiers have rules and support and often choose their profession; children do not choose their families and have no such support.

Soldiers fight for a few years with breaks; abuse victims endure eighteen years under cruel individuals. Children are stressed in the womb as parents fight and are isolated in ways soldiers cannot imagine. Many children are maimed or killed by parents, like soldiers by enemies. In the USA, more children are murdered by parents every 18 months (2,630) than soldiers killed in Afghanistan over two decades (2,448).

Soldiers have staunch allies – children fight and suffer alone.

Soldiers are trained to fight back, children cannot. Child abuse shapes unformed personalities; soldiers are already adults. Childhood is like soft concrete, leaving deep impressions, unlike hardened adult personalities.

Adults can brush off insults from strangers. Verbal abuse deeply impacts children, defining their core personalities. Resistance escalates punishment, forcing them to conform. Abusive parents redefine actions into traits: one lie means the child is a *liar*; knocking over a cup means the child is *thoughtless* and *clumsy*.

Verbal abuse implants negative actions into the child's core personality. "You did" turns into "you are." Abusive parents label children with traits, not actions. Simple statements degenerate into harmful judgments.

If a parent says to a child: "I don't feel I can reason with you right now" – that is accurate. If the parent says: "You can't be reasoned with" – that is dishonest. Saying "You're irrational!" is worse. Hitting the child implies they are beyond reason and must be punished for "badness."

The power to define entire personalities by negative actions is a function of authority. The state brands you a "criminal." Government schools label you a "failure." Media calls you a "hater." Religion brands you a "sinner." Parents define you as "bad." This isn't just false – it's continued abuse.

Recognizing these false labels as abuse is crucial. Society's structures enforce harmful labels, perpetuating a cycle of control and manipulation starting in childhood. Redefining our approach to parenting could break this cycle, but it requires a profound shift in perspective and values.

## The Restraint of Power

So – how is power restrained?

What restrains *parental* power?

Think of a communist restaurant in the Soviet Union in the 1950s. The staff gets paid regardless of customers, service quality, or food. They're paid by the State, which takes money by force.

What incentives do they have to provide quality food and service?

None.

They have strong *disincentives*, finding it easier to serve bad food and play cards than to serve customers. Suppliers lack incentives for quality, doing the bare minimum.

There's an old Soviet joke: "A man who arrives at work early is yelled at for making others look bad; late, for being lazy; on time, he's sent to a Gulag because he must own a foreign watch."

The only cure for low quality is *voluntarism*.

If you're not forced to pay for the restaurant, it must earn your money with good food, service, and prices.

The transition from force to choice is from exploitation to service. A rapist doesn't need charm or good humor. Government-protected unions and monopolies are inefficient and don't strive to reduce costs or ensure customer satisfaction. Monopoly and exploitation go hand-in-hand. Coercion and abuse are two sides of the same coin.

How do we fix this in parenting?

Imagine you're a lazy government worker who learns your industry will be privatized in six months.

What would you do?

Well - you'd work efficiently to avoid being fired and losing your pension.

Parents provide services to their children but hold a monopoly position. Children can't choose parents like games or videos. Parents often don't improve because they get the benefits of parenthood without the effort.

What are the benefits of parenthood?

The lifelong devotion of their children.

However, children move from a coercive monopoly to a voluntary free-market.

Young children must obey and submit to their parents; adults do not.

In families, communism turns into capitalism; coercion becomes voluntarism.

Voluntarism is quality.

Coercion opposes quality because if it *was* quality, coercion wouldn't be needed.

Parenthood starts with monopoly and ends with voluntarism. Good parents act as if children could choose any parents in the world. Parenthood starts with power and ends with pleading. You are everything when your children are young, but they don't have to call you when older.

Imagine a man whose wife was forced to marry him, but the laws then change so she can divorce him soon.

What would he do?

Well, he'd become more thoughtful and loving, becoming a better husband.

Both the government worker and the entitled husband might be happier working harder and doing better. They might look back and be grateful for being moved into the light of actual love and productivity.

Most parents act as if their children will never have a choice about spending time with them. Many start with aggression and end with guilt trips and play-the-victim manipulations.

But adult children don't have to see their abusive parents. Rewarding abusive parents ensures continued abuse, much like a new owner who never fires unproductive employees supports laziness.

Parents must recognize that children grow up and gain the freedom to choose their relationships. Building loving, respectful connections is essential, knowing their children will ultimately have the choice to stay or leave. This transition from a monopoly to voluntarism in parenting mirrors the shift from coercion to quality in other areas of life, reinforcing the importance of genuine effort and care in maintaining lasting, positive relationships.

## The Most Hidden Secrets

There are many obvious secrets in the world that remain well-hidden.

Propaganda often tells us it's noble to leave an abusive relationship we *chose*, but selfish to escape one we *never* chose.

Who runs the world?

Those who propagate these moral contradictions.

Parents abuse children expecting no negative consequences.

Politicians start wars expecting no repercussions.

While we can't change the military-industrial complex, we can address our own parenting.

There are exceptional individuals who do right no matter the cost, but most people respond to incentives, doing what benefits them.

If abusive parents face no negative consequences, their abuse remains beneficial to them.

How do we know what people want?

By their actions when uncoerced.

A man who has an affair wanted it. A man at the beach instead of a classroom prefers the sand.

Abusers prefer to abuse because they choose to.

No one is forced to abuse children; it's not legally required.

*Not* abusing children is perfectly legal in the West.

A woman choosing to do something she isn't compelled to do shows she prefers it, even if she regrets it later.

A man smoking for forty years preferred it, despite his later regrets.

A woman who sleeps with a man *wanted* to, even if she regrets it later.

We know that abusive parents want to abuse because they *do*.

If parents face no negative repercussions for abuse and their adult children still provide for them, why would they stop abusing?

You can't stop evil without consequences.

You can't reform coercion without voluntarism.

Parents must face consequences to improve.

If you support abusive parents as an adult, you contribute to the world's problems.

Subsidizing evil increases it.

Lotteries would fail without payouts; abusive parents continue because they're supported.

Humans are corrupted by power.

Parents must remember the voluntary nature of adult child relationships.

Parental power must diminish as children grow to avoid contributing to societal decay.

If you were abused - talk to your parents, explain the wrongs, and seek acknowledgment, apologies, and restitution.

Best-case: they admit fault, seek therapy, and make restitution, possibly continuing the relationship.

Worst-case: they escalate, confirming the abuse won't stop, saving you from decades of horror.

If abusive parents double down, they'll abuse your children too, directly or indirectly.

It's painful, but necessary.

Tell your parents: "Experiencing negative consequences for bad deeds is essential."

If they ever hit you for talking back, they should accept accountability.

If they punish you for telling the truth, it proves their morality is a gas-lighting excuse.

Parenting improves when parents know their adult children may confront them and hold them accountable.

Understanding the lack of guarantees will drive better parenting.

If you continue to support abusive parents, you perpetuate a cycle of harm, both for yourself and for future generations. Your support validates their actions and encourages ongoing abuse.

Challenge the norm by refusing to enable abusive behavior. Confronting your parents can be a catalyst for change, emphasizing that abuse has lasting consequences. This confrontation, while difficult, can liberate you from the shadows of your past, paving the way for a far healthier future.

Reforming parenting starts with individual choices and societal shifts. By holding parents accountable, we set the precedent that abuse is unacceptable. This accountability is crucial to breaking the cycle of violence, and fostering a more compassionate society.

Your actions today shape the future. By refusing to tolerate abuse, you contribute to a world where compassion and respect are the norms. Your courage to confront and demand accountability protects your well-being and influences future generations to stand against abuse. Facing these difficult conversations can transform family dynamics, leading to a more just and loving world for all.

## The Rules of Peaceful Parenting

Peaceful Parenting is about applying your highest moral standards to your *children*.

If you wouldn't hit an adult, don't hit your children.

If you wouldn't insult your boss, don't insult your children.

If you wouldn't scream at a policeman, don't scream at your children.

If you wouldn't punish a waiter for a mistake, don't punish your children for mistakes.

If being forced to sit on stairs in public would humiliate you, don't give your children "timeouts."

Want your children to tell the truth? Tell the truth yourself and never punish them for it.

Want your children to respect property? Respect their property first.

Want your children to use words instead of fists? Use words instead of fists with them.

Want your children to treat others well? Treat them well first.

Want your children to respect you? Act respectably. You wouldn't respect someone who lost their temper, yelled, insulted, or hit defenseless children.

Want your children to listen? Listen to them first.

Don't want your children to become bullies? Don't bully them.

When upset by your children's behavior, ask yourself: *what did I do to create this?*

Your children reflect your behavior, just as a mirror reflects your face.

Want your children to resist peer pressure? Model resisting peer pressure.

Want your children to avoid bad company? Avoid bad company yourself – even if it's your own family.

Want your children to develop self-discipline? Develop it yourself – eat well, exercise, control your temper.

Want your children to use electronics less? Be more engaging than tablets.

If they play video games, join in or create more engaging activities.

If you want certain behaviors in your children, model those behaviors consistently for years.

You can't expect a toddler to learn English from you if you don't speak it yourself.

Morality is like a language.

Want your children to be good? Be good *yourself*.

Want them to have integrity? Model it consistently.

Want them to take responsibility? Take full responsibility for your actions.

Want them to apologize when wrong? Apologize to them when *you* are wrong.

Want them to stand up to bullies? Stand up to bullies yourself - again, even if they're family.

Want them to develop good habits? Model those habits for years.

Whatever you wish to see in your children, you must first manifest in your own behavior.

You can't teach a language you're only starting to learn. Preparing for parenthood means practicing the highest ethical standards for years before welcoming a child.

It's possible to be a Peaceful Parent without prior preparation, but acknowledge this deficiency and apologize for your lapses.

If you have abusive parents, they must apologize, reform, and make restitution – or you must accept the results of having abusers around your children.

Exposing children to abusive people tells them you prioritize appeasing bad people over protecting your kids.

They will see that abusers have power, and that "moral" people bend to their will.

Exposing children to abusers shows "virtue" as hypocrisy, masking enslavement.

Telling your children to be good, while deferring to evildoers, teaches them to lie about virtue and serve the immoral.



Parents wonder why their children roll their eyes at moral lectures.

You must first be good.

Show that virtue equals strength – control your impulses and keep evil at a distance, never giving it power over you or your children.

Children - especially boys - disdain weakness. Deferring to evildoers while claiming virtue provokes their contempt.

If you trained your children in martial arts but sent them into combat with their arms bound, how would they view your future instructions?

They would scorn you.

If they see you bullied by family, they will respect the bullies.

You lose respect for yourself and retain respect for the bullies – that's why you get bullied.

## Peaceful Parenting and Moral Mistakes Part 1

Now, if you can find a child who never wants to emulate adults, congratulations – you have found a child from an alien species!

Since adults are rarely punished, but children are, children see punishments as acts of *power*, not *morality*.

How do they know this?

Misbehaving adults are rewarded, not punished.

Adults have greater moral responsibility than children – yet those with the least excuse for bad behavior are rewarded, and those with the best excuse are punished.

It's not “punishment for bad behavior” but “punishment for weakness.”

Children are punished for being weak, while adults are rewarded for having power.

Children live in a world of vastly different sizes.

If an adult broke apart a fight between a fifteen-year-old and a five-year-old – and then punished the five-year-old, this would be incomprehensible, right?

When bigger teenagers bully smaller children, it's viewed as an expression of power, not morality.

If you punish children, but reward adults for similar behaviors, you're a bully, using your size and strength to "punish" the weaker.

You're worse than an obvious bully – at least the bully doesn't pretend to be moral!

Children cannot fight back, just as the little girl cannot resist the teenage bully – so they are aggressed against.

There is no principle called "punish people for their bad behaviors."

There is only: "Punish the weak and innocent, while rewarding the strong and guilty."

"Punish children" equals "Aggress against the weak for their behaviors."

Reward the guilty, punish the innocent.

Punish those with no control; reward those with control.

Punish victims, reward bullies.

And we wonder where power-lust comes from?

It comes from the desire to escape punishment, modeled by parents who punish the helpless and reward the powerful.

We've all been there.

Peaceful Parenting is the refusal to be a moral hypocrite.

We must teach our children virtue – let's do it honestly and consistently, not through bullying and hypocrisy.

## Peaceful Parenting and Moral Mistakes Part 2

No matter which way you look at it – there is no rational basis for punishing children.

Parents often get angry at teenagers for choosing peers over family – yet those parents may have previously prioritized careers, friends or relatives over their children.

If you have modeled bad behavior – not paying attention, hitting, yelling, name-calling, losing your temper, blaming the child for your faults – then your child is mirroring you. The fault lies with you, not your child.

If you've never modeled bad behavior, the child's behavior might come from someone else - like a dysfunctional uncle - or it might be innate.

If it's from someone else, it's still your responsibility as the parent because *you control who your children are exposed to*. If your uncle was the bad influence, punish him or yourself - not the child. If a tutor teaches your children rude words, blame the tutor - and yourself for hiring him - not the children.

If children must be punished for bad behavior, and your uncle behaves badly, blame *his* parents, not your own children!

If everyone around your child is somehow perfect and he still behaves badly, his behavior is innate, so punishment is unjust.

Children, especially boys, show aggression in infancy and toddlerhood, but it's instinctual and beyond their control, like waking up crying. It's thoughtless and rude for a roommate to wake you up by screaming, but a baby has no choice. Punishing children for unchosen, innate actions is immoral and abusive.

We don't punish children for epilepsy or asthma, because they have no control over these ailments. If children are innately bad and need punishment until they improve, why not apply this rule to adults in your life? If your uncle is a mean drunk, he should be punished until he stops, right?

However, if you keep inviting your abusive uncle to family gatherings, your children see that you don't believe in punishing bad behavior. They see you rewarding bad behaviors with social approval. They know punishment is just for children – adults can do whatever they want!

If you continually invite your insulting or demeaning parents over, your kids clearly see that you don't believe in punishing bad behaviors. They observe you rewarding bad behavior with dinners and enjoyable social events – and fully understand that being punished for "bad" behavior is only for children – adults get rewarded!

## The Ethics of Peaceful Parenting

Morality is curious – when you say something is wrong, people ask what should be done *instead*.

If I convince someone not to steal, should I tell him what to do instead?

If you advise to avoid a particular neighborhood, should I demand that you tell me where to live?

We accept that rape is evil – must the one who convinces us also tell us how to woo women and exactly who to marry?

Were those opposing slavery responsible for dictating what to do after it was ended?

Would that not - *extend* slavery?

If I convince you not to assault people, am I responsible for choosing your friends?

Defining immorality means it's wrong to do something – if *not* doing it means you must *do* something specific, where is your freedom?

Saying “don’t murder” doesn’t give you a life blueprint – any more than saying “You can’t live in my house” tells you where you have to live.

It shows how much people want to be ordered around that when something is banned, they immediately hunger for another order!

“If slavery is immoral, how am I to live?”

This is the demand of the endless slave: “Order me what to do after being ordered what to do.”

Which brings us to...

## How Should You Parent Your Children?

I don’t know!

I don’t know exactly how you should parent your children – no moral choice is meaningful if it’s an order or commandment!

If your doctor tells you to stop smoking, he's not commanding you to run marathons or take up heroin. He's just telling you what not to do.

If I say: "Don't beat your wife!" – I'm not directing your marriage decisions.

If I say: "Don't aggress against your children" – I'm just telling you what *not* to do.

Our addiction to aggression against children leaves us feeling lost when told to stop.

How long must you be bullied before the idea of freedom feels hopeless?

I ask with great love and sympathy...

How long have you been bullied? Long enough to demand that I bully you in return?

Ending slavery under the British Navy allowed the modern world to flourish. Slavery is deeply evil – violent and stifling of progress.

Enslavement robs the present and future.

Opposing slavery means freeing people to choose their lives.

I don't know how you should parent your children. I don't know how you should earn your living.

But I know you shouldn't be a slave or aggressive toward your children. You shouldn't threaten, hit, yell at, terrorize, confine, insult, or bully them. And you know it too, especially through reading this book.

Ending slavery led to great creativity and progress.

Rejecting aggression against children will lead to love, happiness, and tenderness – reshaping the world positively.

What does the world look like when children are reasoned with, not beaten?

Rational people lament the loss of reason. We weep over mental illness, exploitation, violence, and abuse. We rage against the cold-hearted, the manipulators, liars, and cheaters – the broken people who constantly break others.

We rage against war, debt, and theft by inflation.

We feel sorrow for the souls finding comfort in pets rather than human love.

We recoil from the false virtues paid for by subjugating others through taxes and debt.

We falter at those blaming others for poor choices, avoiding responsibility.

We weep for those rejecting adult responsibilities for self-pity.

We fear criminals who steal because their childhoods were stolen. We flee the violence inflicted on us that was first inflicted by parents.

We fear those attacking us due to our past failures to protect them.

I don't know how to parent – but I know what you *shouldn't* do.

I don't know who to marry – but I know you shouldn't *beat* your lover.

I don't know what you should get angry at – but I know you shouldn't assault or murder.

I don't know how to earn your daily bread, but I know you shouldn't steal.

It shows how brutalized we are when told to stop harming children – we have no idea what to do.

To lift this fog, let's examine some possibilities.

## What If My Children Lie to Me? Part 1

Spoiler...

Your children *will* lie to you, just as you will lie to them, to others, and yourself.

Religious morality contains commandments to follow regardless of relationships, prioritizing God. For instance, Christian forgiveness is often seen as a commandment, not earned by contrition.

I don't subscribe to this view. (For more, see my free book *Universally Preferable Behaviour* at [www.freedomain.com](http://www.freedomain.com))

Extreme pacifists reject violence, even in self-defense. Common-law tradition allows defensive violence when aggressed. Nonviolence is a relationship, not an absolute.

If you order a \$500 cell phone, you aren't obligated to pay if you don't receive it. Obligations are contingent on the seller fulfilling his part.

If someone steals your bike, it's morally acceptable to take it back. If you're cheated out of \$100, it's acceptable to lie to recover your money.

Many moral scenarios defy this reality. If a man demands to know where your wife is to murder her, are you obligated to tell him the truth? No sane person says 'yes' – so telling the truth isn't an absolute.

You don't owe a moral obligation to a man threatening murder, just as you don't owe marriage to a stalker. Ignoring the immorality of murderous threats in order to focus on truth-telling is like ignoring parental abuse to focus on the child's behavior.

Understanding that morality is a *relationship* is essential to peaceful parenting.

## What If My Children Lie to Me? Part 2

When your child lies, explain gently:

“So, you didn't tell me the truth, which I understand – it's natural to try and avoid trouble or gain something good. We all give in to temptation sometimes, but it's generally not good. Remember when I said we'd go to the playcenter and you were excited? Imagine if I never took you. Or if I promised a video game after we brushed our teeth but didn't follow through. You'd find it hard to trust me, right?

“If I lie to you, you wouldn't trust me or rely on my promises. I feel happier knowing we can trust each other, so I can plan my day knowing you'll do what you say.

“If you lie, is it fair to expect me to tell the truth? Like expecting candy without payment, or paying for a movie and being kept out. On Halloween, candy is free for the children – everyone understands that.

“Good things in society rely on trust. Stores don't lock everything up because they assume most people won't steal. Restaurants assume we'll pay at the end.

“Sometimes, you just can't keep your word. Like when we were late to the dentist because of traffic. That was an exception. But being late to every appointment would be problematic.

“It’s unfair to benefit from everyone else’s honesty while giving yourself permission to lie. It’s tempting, I understand, but it’s not really fair.

“If you lie, others don’t have to tell you the truth. If you break promises, others won’t keep theirs. You want to trust me, right? That we actually *will* go somewhere fun if I say so? That keeps the relationship fun and gives you things to look forward to, right?

“So, do we have a deal – you tell the truth, and I tell the truth too?”

Even toddlers understand this. They know a good deal when they hear it.

But if you keep your word and your child continues to lie, you may need to stop keeping your promises.

Promise an arcade trip and then break it if your child breaks her promises.

When they complain, remind them of their broken promises.

“Remember, I said I don’t have to keep my word if you don’t keep yours! You buy my honesty with your honesty! I’m happy to start keeping my word, but you need to as well! I wouldn’t pay an employee who didn’t work, right?”

## What If My Children Lie to Me? Part 3

Now, these speeches can be adapted to various situations, but they share a common theme:

1. Appeal to the child’s self-interest.
2. Refer to the behavior you have consistently modeled.
3. Remind the child that good behavior is a relationship, not an absolute.
4. Assert your authority through responsibility.

For honesty, remind the child she benefits from your truthfulness. Refer to your own honesty. Remind her that if she doesn’t tell the truth, you don’t have to either. Emphasize your responsibility for her behavior until adulthood.

These principles are easy to implement once you get used to them. The toughest is number two – consistently modeling the behavior you want in your child. Fix yourself if you’ve broken promises, as hypocrisy undermines credibility.



Model good behavior in all interactions – with family, siblings, and strangers. A child can't learn morality without the ethical consistency parental integrity provides.

## Credibility Is the Opposite of Vanity

Many of us had parents who wanted us to achieve for their own egos, which is demotivating and leads to self-sabotage.

If you want your children to obey you so that *you* feel better, they will resist.

We've all felt pressured by a salesman pushing something expensive without knowing our needs. Would you buy from him? Of course not.

It's the same with parenting.

If a rug salesman gets angry for not buying an expensive carpet after offering tea, would you buy it? I hope not!

Expecting your son to obey you because you're his parent relies on a *category*, not your own integrity.

You wouldn't expect your wife to obey just because you're her husband, right?

Never teach your child 'obedience.'

'Obedience' means surrendering your will to authority without self-interest.

We know how disastrous it is when people surrender their conscience to 'authority.'

Would you work hard for a boss who takes all the credit and bonuses? No.

You want your children to emulate your behavior, inspired by your example, and appeal to their self-interest.

Demanding "obedience" delivers them to future manipulators.

Teaching obedience is inflicting slavery.

Moral humans obey virtue, not others.

Obedying others is enslavement – obeying virtue is integrity and liberty.

Enforcing obedience requires fear and threats.

Think of those you obey without reason – danger is always at the root of compliance.

‘Obedience’ is negative economics.

‘Negative economics’ is acting to avoid a negative, not achieve a positive.

You give money to a mugger to avoid harm – this is negative economics.

You comply with a nagging wife to stop her complaints – this is negative economics.

You obey to avoid negative consequences – which brings resentment and rebellion.

Obedying people is like holding a balloon underwater – it will pop up eventually.

If you drive your children into negative economics, they will rebel.

If you call your mother out of guilt – that is negative economics.

If your children obey to avoid bullying or threats – that is negative economics.

Negative economics is unsustainable.

Countries that start as havens of freedom always turn into empires of enslavement and eventually collapse.

Some negative economics are inevitable, but we should strive for positive outcomes.

Those who inflict negative economics are confessing that they have nothing positive to offer.

## Part 2: Practice

### Parenting and General Integrity

One essential truth of Peaceful Parenting is: *If you model, you don't have to punish.*

Children naturally emulate their parents – a crucial survival skill developed over eons.

The central question is: If children are acting badly, where does it come from?

"Bad" behavior is either innate or environmental.

We don't typically punish people for innate traits. Punishing for skin color is racist; punishing a woman for being a woman is sexist; punishing for limited brain functions is wrong.

Punishing children – who naturally have limited brain functions – for being "bad" is irrational and immoral.

Innate traits aren't chosen. If "badness" is innate, the child isn't responsible for their behavior, and it is not "bad."

Babies can't walk at birth; they start around a year old. Imagine a mother calling her newborn baby "lazy" for not putting his toys away – we'd find this monstrous.

Infants naturally strive to roll over, sit up, crawl, and walk, driven by innate desires and parental encouragement.

Moral development happens similarly.

Babies initially focus on their own needs – they don't consider the burden on mothers when they cry for milk at night.

Within months, babies start empathizing with parents, like trying to feed them back during meals.

Toddlers go through a language boom, learning words rapidly, mimicking parents.

If parents are moral and empathetic, children follow that path. If parents are aggressive and punitive, children follow that instead.

You can't morally punish children for innate traits – we don't do this anywhere else. If children are born "selfish," you cannot punish them for "selfishness."

If bad behaviors aren't innate – and innate traits can't be judged morally – they must be environmental.

Children's behaviors can only come from nature or their environment.

Parents influence children's nature significantly through genetics – primarily by choosing a partner.

Genetics impacts personality. Preferring nervous partners might lead to nervous children.  
Preferring aggressive partners might lead to aggressive children.

IQ is largely genetic – choosing an unintelligent partner could result in less intelligent children.

If a mother is obese during pregnancy, children are more likely to gain weight.

Punishing children for weight influenced by parents' choices is monstrous.

Imagine a mother choosing a short partner and then punishing her sons for being short.

You and your partner chose your baby's innate traits by choosing each other.

Punishing a baby for traits *you* selected is beyond contemptible.

If bad behaviors aren't innate, they must be environmental.

So – who controls the environment of your babies?

Did they choose your household, family, neighborhood, or income?

Did they choose their sex and race, breastfeeding status, your attentiveness, empathy, or morality?

Did they choose if you stayed home or used daycare?

Did they choose your stress or distraction levels?

Did they choose any medical issues?

Did they choose if they get hit, yelled at, neglected, or loved unconditionally?

Of course not!

All babies would choose the best environment if they could. They must survive whatever environment they are born into.

*You* are responsible for your children's genetics and environment.

Both parents are entirely responsible for their children's environment.

If the child's father abandons him, both parents are 100% responsible for the child growing up without a father.

## Full Responsibility

It is essential to take 100% responsibility for your choices.

Saying “It’s 50-50” shifts responsibility onto others.

Even claiming 99% still blames others.

Anything less than 100% is an excuse. Take *full* responsibility – anything less is a dodge.

Accept 100% responsibility for your children’s environment and behavior.

You control your child’s genetics and environment, making you fully responsible for their behavior.

Have you been ever blamed at work for something your boss did? That’s how children feel when parents blame them.

Imagine cops planting evidence to frame the innocent.

It’s not your children who are bad – it’s you.

Projection 101.

Punishing children for behaviors you dislike in yourself is easier than improving your choices.

Single mothers angry with absent fathers often get angry with the eldest son. Is that fair?

Fathers angry with mothers take it out on daughters. Is that fair?

Teachers frustrated with bored students drug them with methamphetamines instead of admitting their own failures. Is that fair?

It’s monstrous!

You and your spouse each control 50% of your children’s genetics and 100% of their environment.

And you dare to blame and punish your *children*?

## Parenting and Moral Instruction

You cannot teach what you do not know.

I can't teach you to tie a knot, speak Japanese, or play piano if I don't know how.

You want to teach your children how to be good? Great!

But do you know what goodness is?

Is it blindly obeying authority?

I hope not!

Is it avoiding upsetting anyone? No, that leads to conformity and enslavement to peer pressure.

Is "backtalk" always bad? Should respect be earned?

If you want your children to pretend respect, you reward lying and punish truth.

So, is it good to lie or tell the truth?

You can't demand truth while insisting on lies. That's insane.

Is it good to hold those in authority to the same standards they inflict on others?

Is it better to have integrity or be hypocritical?

Is it hypocritical to impose strict standards on the weak and excuse the strong?

Is it good or bad to use aggression or violence to get what you want?

Can you love someone you fear? Is fear the same as respect?

These essential questions are often unasked and unanswered by parents.

## What We All Agree On

You'd be surprised how much we agree on clear questions.

No one believes it's virtuous to just obey, or that those in power should be exempt from moral rules.

No one thinks using force, hypocrisy, or lying is good.

Everyone supports peaceful parenting in theory – practicing it is harder.

To train others in fitness, piano, or medicine, you must first learn and master these disciplines yourself.

To teach your children to be good, you must first be good yourself.

So – model best practices rather than hypocritically punish “badness.”

## Fat Fitness Trainers

If you had a chain-smoking, obese fitness trainer, would you take him seriously?

If he needed you to get fit for a million dollars but lacked credibility, what would he do?

He'd be manipulative, aggressive, and bullying to make you comply.

With no credibility, you wouldn't respect him or follow his advice. But he desperately needs that million dollars!

This analogy is imperfect because you can tell an unfit trainer that he has no credibility.

Imagine an abused child telling a raging parent: “I won't learn goodness from you because *you are bad!*”

That child wouldn't do very well at *all!*

Instead of focusing on your *children's* goodness, ask yourself: *How good am I?*

If you try to teach goodness without being good, you face endless resistance, and end up resorting to pleading and bullying.

You cannot teach what you do not model. You cannot model what you do not know.

If you don't know and show goodness daily, expecting your children to obey or be inspired by you is ridiculous.

Physician, heal thyself!

## Peaceful Parenting and Ego Part 1

There is a strange phenomenon in the modern world where people complain that becoming a parent robs them of their identity and leaves nothing for themselves.

I find this bizarre on many levels.

I have never felt I sacrificed anything by becoming a parent. For about ten years when my daughter was young, I stopped writing books, but so what? I have been happily married for over twenty years and stopped dating others, but so what?

Have I sacrificed by studying philosophy and striving to live morally? Occasionally, but overall, it has been an enormous positive.

I have also pursued a rigorous exercise regime for forty years. Has that been a tragic sacrifice? Compared to being overweight, low on energy, unattractive to my wife and myself, and losing years of life? Please!

If you only do what you want and view obligations as intrusions, you are living lower than an animal. Birds fetch food for their babies, whales breast-feed underwater, lions bring meat, and gorillas carry water. Your parents deferred their gratifications to serve you. Living only for your pleasure is theft of life – vampiric, predatory, and exploitive.

It's like benefiting from your parents' investment in your education but refusing to invest in your own children because you want to buy a boat. Or enjoying a big inheritance and leaving nothing for your offspring.

The great chain of life that stretches back over 4 billion years has led to you. Never wanting to sacrifice for others is consuming all prior sacrifices for your own selfish pleasure.

Your ancestors fought, hid, reproduced, and died to give you life. Parents have children hoping their children will also have children. You are alive to continue their continuity.



Human life is the greatest gift because we have abstract thought and morality. Other life forms merely *exist*; we can be *good*! We carry the divine whispers of conscience – other creatures are driven by lust and hunger to eat, sleep, and reproduce. We are like angels; other creatures are mere machines of consumption and reproduction.

You don't *have* to reproduce – and 10% of married couples struggle with fertility, which is a great tragedy. But...

We exist due to the struggle of millions of generations. Breaking this chain for self-indulgence would leave your ancestors dumbfounded.

Your ancestors survived plagues, famines, wars, ice ages, endless predation, and childbirth in order to give you life and a mind. They wouldn't have made those sacrifices if they knew you'd throw it all away for trivial pursuits like travel, video games, or fleeting pleasures.

## Peaceful Parenting and Ego Part 2

If you enjoy your life but don't strive to pay it forward, you are staggeringly selfish.

If you don't enjoy your life, it may be because you are too selfish to have children.

Your life isn't just for you; you didn't create it. Your life continues because previous generations kept it going.

Your ancestors sacrificed their egos for a larger purpose – the purpose of having and raising all those who eventually led to you.

The height of selfishness is consuming others' sacrifices for your own vanity.

You may have pretty eyes, intelligence, or athleticism – do you realize how many billions of years of evolution were required to give birth to these traits?

Countless prior generations sacrificed their lives for you. Would they approve of you wasting the existence they provided?

It's incomprehensible to waste life - especially by avoiding parenting.

Parenting doesn't sacrifice your ego; it *fulfills your potential*!

Creating future generations enriches your legacy, not diminishes it.

Would you feel ripped off if I took a dollar and gave you a million in the future?

That would be madness!

The joy of raising a child is beyond compare.

Turning a child from infancy to rational adulthood is like building a thriving city from an empty desert.

We can't be truly happy by selfishly exploiting the endless sacrifices of millions of people.

Squandering hard-won gifts on selfish pleasures is shallow and predatory.

Sexual desires aren't for satisfying your ego but for bringing new life into the world.

Women's youthful beauty should attract a man willing to support a family, not for casual flings and luxury indulgences.

Your beauty is a down payment on motherhood, not a lure for material indulgences.

Everything you think is free will eventually be paid for.

Men, when you give money to women who won't be the mother of your children, you corrupt both yourself and them.

Women, if you take money from men you'd never have children with, you become opportunistic and exploitative.

As you know, your youthful beauty will fade, leading to isolation and regret.

Men's sexual market value improves with age; they have many more years to choose to have children.

For women, the reproductive door closes halfway through life and never reopens.

Sex is for creating children, for pair-bonding, and for families, not for vanity, easy cash, and provoking envy.

Women should gain resources for their children, not for another bikini and a trip to Bali.

Hijacking nature's purpose for satisfying vanity will lead to misery!

Everything you take must be paid for, and it costs you part of your soul.

It's not a sacrifice to tame your ego in pursuit of a moral goal.

Indulgence is the real sacrifice, pleasing your ego at the expense of happiness.

Ultimately, you don't give up pleasures by having children – they are one of life's greatest pleasures!

## Peaceful Parenting and Ego Part 3

Life becomes simple and pleasurable when you operate by easy, universal principles. In marriage, you become one flesh, a unified team like horses pulling a carriage. Imagine driving a car where one wheel suddenly decides to go its own way; you would crash. While a husband and wife are two different people with individual preferences, the idea that one can win at the expense of the other is madness.

Consider an exercise regime that strengthens one arm but destroys the other, or a diet that causes one leg to lose weight while the other gets fat. Such imbalances are absurd. You don't lose by contributing to a team that serves everyone's common goal.

The alternative is to live hedonistically, chasing momentary pleasures that everyone knows diminish over time. Think about the excitement of receiving your first paycheck versus the feeling of getting your most recent one. Chasing pleasure alone destroys the ability to defer gratification, essential for both physical health and spiritual love. Without this ability, emotions can't be controlled, making love and trust impossible.

Hedonism leads to diminishing returns and eventual pain. By the time pleasures fade, you've often lost virtues like integrity, love, and trust. Those advising against hedonism are trying to *increase* your happiness, much like a dietitian aims to prevent diabetes. Immediate pleasures often turn into long-term regrets.

Acting sensibly to secure future happiness is not a sacrifice. In marriage, you ensure your partner's happiness by living with integrity, negotiating for mutual benefit, and maintaining health and attractiveness. When you have children, their happiness ensures your future happiness. Serving children isn't a sacrifice, similar to how exercise and a good diet benefit health.

Prioritizing work over children might earn money, but that diminishes over time, whereas the lost love of your children is significant. Dumping kids in daycare to pursue a job shows them you chose money over them. Later, when you're old and lonely, they'll likely prioritize their lives over visiting you, resulting in a solitary old age.

Imagine being eighty, ill, and alone, with nothing left but memories of old paychecks and accomplishments that no longer matter. Love, companionship, and family cannot be bought. You'll remember missed moments like your child's school play. Your long-dead boss won't remember your sacrifices, but your children will never forget your absence.

Choosing work over family inflicts long-lasting regrets. The devil of temptation only reveals his price when it's too late. Vanity's costs appear when restitution is impossible. The symptoms emerge when death is inevitable. Nothing escapes this punishment—whether it be from God or your conscience.

Live for your children, maintaining independence and integrity, and you'll never die alone. Live solely for yourself, and you'll live and die alone.

## Peaceful Parenting and the Voluntary Family

If you are born into a crime family, do you have to stay a criminal?

In "The Godfather," the main character is drawn back into crime due to family ties.

Our lives are defined by this question: *Am I loyal to virtue, or to others?*

We were born into families with specific moral qualities and commandments.

Modern family history often goes like this:

A baby is born to busy parents. The mother cares for him while handling work, then leaves him with someone else to return to her job.

The baby panics as his emotional needs are ignored. He is often raised by people with different accents, different cultures, and no family bond.

Is it moral to give birth and then hand your baby over to others to raise? No.

Is it moral to marry and have affairs? No.

A husband who has affairs cheats on his wife. A mother who works cheats on her baby.

We get upset at the former but applaud the latter. This is corrupt.

Cheating on your baby is worse than cheating on your husband. The husband chooses his wife; a baby never chooses his mother.

A husband can leave; a baby cannot. A husband has options; a baby has none.

A husband has rights and income; a baby has none.

A baby and mother are one unit. The mother's milk is the healthiest nutrition.

A mother has a monopoly on what's best for her child – nothing can substitute her.

Cheating on your baby is worse than cheating on your husband.

What lesson does this teach your baby?

Family matters less than money.

Serving strangers is better than parenting your baby.

Instincts mean nothing; strangers, ambition, and money mean everything – and the weak must suffer so the selfish feel valuable.

Why do new mothers go back to work quickly?

If they stay home for a year or two, it's a stronger bond to break when the toddler is left with strangers.

A child's personality is largely formed by age six.

Babies in daycare for twenty hours a week show the same psychological trauma as those abandoned.

In "adult time," it's 8-10 hours a day – in "baby time," it's an eternity.

Working mothers with little children have the highest stress levels.

A baby whose needs are denied sees the environment as dangerous – it must be war, plague, or famine keeping his mother away.

Why do new mothers go back to work quickly?

Peer pressure and propaganda.

They're told being a mother is boring and unimportant, but a boring job is essential!

They're told they are replaceable to their baby but irreplaceable to their boss.

They're bribed with spare change after childcare, transportation, clothing costs, taxes, and deductions.

They do what they're told, not what's right.

They value others' opinions more than what's best for their babies.

Their choice: loyalty to others, not their babies – not virtue.

But later in life, a reversal occurs.

When young and ambitious, these mothers prioritize loyalty to others over their babies.

When old, they demand loyalty from their adult children.

“While I chose loyalty to others over you as a baby, now you must choose loyalty to me over others!”

This wild reversal is covered by massive propaganda.

The song "The Cat's in the Cradle" traces this journey but doesn't explore the moral principles of this betrayal.

## Loyalty to Virtue?

Are we loyal to virtue, or to others?

Is “family” a substitute for virtue?

Does “family” mean mere genetics or true loyalty?

Does “parent” mean biology or parenting actions?

Are you a parent if you don't parent?

Are you a family if no one is loyal?

Does “father” mean “sperm donor,” or decades of investment?

Are you a mother if you don’t breast-feed and instead leave your baby with strangers?

Are you a parent if daycare workers mostly raise your children?

Is an open marriage monogamous?

Of course not.

Women complain about double standards but could avoid them by prioritizing children.

In a sitcom, a mother said: “At home, I want to be at work – at work, I want to be with my baby!”

This was seen as a crisis due to the “women are wonderful” phenomenon.

Imagine a husband saying to his mistress: “With my wife, I want to be with you – with you, I want to be with my wife!”

Would we sympathize with him?

## Blank Slate

I want you to think about something – it's very important.

Imagine you do not know your mother.

You go to a dinner party and meet an older woman you’ve never met before.

As you converse, you notice if she asks questions or mostly talks about herself.

Does she complain or inspire? Do you admire her or inwardly roll your eyes, wishing you were seated elsewhere?

At evening's end, would you look forward to seeing her again? Would you exchange contact information?

Would your mother be a valuable addition to your life without your shared history?

Now, think about your father.

Imagine you go on a hike with him but don't know him. What does he talk about? Is he funny, engaging, and curious? Does he ask about you or just talk about himself? Is he warm and authentic, or does he brag and status-signal?

After the hike, would you exchange phone numbers and hope to meet again? Without history, would he be in your life?

Do adults believe they can stop providing value and coast on historical momentum?

Parents who don't do much parenting, or who are violent, often claim the category "parent" deserves unending love, loyalty, and devotion.

If adult children resist, parents say: "But – I'm your *mother!*" or "I'm your *parent!*"

But - did they actually parent?

Did they wander off for money, hit, yell, ignore, and call you names? Did they dump you in terrible schools and let you be bullied?

Did they follow peer pressure while telling you not to? Did they help you find good friends and partners? Monitor your social circle for safety?

Did they teach you the skills to succeed? Teach you to live morally, or just share a roof?

Were they parents, landlords, or roommates?

Did they let dysfunctional relatives influence your moral development?

Did they say that being good was more important than obeying blood relatives?

Did they advise serving virtue, not others, yet avoid parenting to serve others?

Parents owe their children *everything* – this is the inevitable contract of reproduction.

Children owe parents *justice*, which means repaying honourable investment.

If parents invested honorably, children enjoy their company as they age, naturally.

Those who gave little end up trying to take by bullying. Those who didn't invest bully their adult children for support.



Parents fail to parent because they expect time, love, and resources from their adult children no matter what.

If you and your parents had no history, would they be in your life?

Remember – we serve either virtue, or others.

In moral relationships, serving virtue and others align. The virtuous never counsel us to do evil; the corrupt advise evil under the guise of good.

Treat people well initially – thereafter, treat them as they treat you.

Babies, toddlers, and children lack the first option - but have the second as adults.

We can't complain about the world's immorality if we reward immoral people.

Commit to virtue, and life becomes enormously simplified.

## Preferences and Identity Part 1

Many believe that denying immediate preferences makes them less themselves.

If you are defined by your preferences, denying them seems like denying yourself. Sacrificing yourself means having less of yourself, right?

This stems from modern secularism.

Religion sees your essence as a soul, not a body. Secularism denies the soul, reducing us to mere flesh.

Are you your body, brain – or mind?

If you are your body, deferring gratification is pointless – the body works short-term. The brain plans longer-term - but still remains mortal.

The body wants immediate satisfaction – the brain plans for a lifetime.

What about the *mind*?

If you're reading this in fifty years, I am long dead, but my words live on in your inner voice.  
My brain is dust, my words are alive.

Your body is now – your brain is for life – but your mind is for eternity!

The body demands immediate satisfaction. The brain denies the body for future happiness. The mind denies both for eternal truth.

So I ask again: are you your body, brain, or mind?

What makes you human?

It must differentiate you from animals.

Animals live for the body – many plan for the future.

Squirrels store nuts; beavers build dams; birds do mating dances.

We alone have the capacity for universal thought.

The equation two plus two equals four is as true now as it was thousands of years ago.

Universal concepts unite us in eternity.

A dog catching a ball cannot calculate its trajectory.

Equations, scientific principles, universal moral truths – these make us human.

Secularists can see "God" as the abstraction for the immaterial mind.

"God" is immortal – truth lives forever.

"God" is all-knowing – truth defines reality eternally.

"God" is all-ethical – universal moral truths define virtue.

The soul is an abstraction for what makes us human.

What makes us all-knowing, immortal, and virtuous?

What differentiates us from animals?

Without eternity, infinity, omniscience – we live only for our bodies and brains. We live for the pleasures of our brief lifespan.

We don't partake in eternity.

We are never larger than our short lives.

A primitive chieftain once responded to Christian missionaries: "We think life is like a bird flying through a room, in one window, and out the other. We never think of where it came from or where it goes – but you've told us what lies outside the room..."

This is the evolution from cunning ape to divine human.

If you are only mortal, self-sacrifice beyond oneself makes no sense. It's like denying cheesecake on your execution day because you want to watch your weight.

Humans can work with universals in three ways:

1. *Create them* – identify new ideas, truths, and concepts.
2. *Manifest them* – embody virtue and truth by living morally.
3. *Reproduce them* – teach and inspire others.

Few are privileged to create universals, as few make new arguments, theories, movies or songs. We can all manifest universals by living truthfully. Some can reproduce universals by explaining and inspiring truth and virtue.

Most can only truly participate in universals by having and raising children.

Think of nutrition. Few make advances in nutrition science or inspire others to eat well. Every parent can teach their children how to eat well.

Think of exercise. Few advance exercise science or become effective trainers. Many parents play sports with their children.

Without children, humanity loses its immortality, its essence.

By encouraging children, we encourage what is greatest and deepest in the human mind.

Few will write enduring poems or songs. Shakespeare is immortal; most writers are forgotten. Our minds' contents, taught to others and our children, make us immortal.

Failing to have children destroys the ultimate art of your ancestors – yourself and your eternal offspring, breaking the great chain of life.

Another brutal fact: Can you have a relationship without communication? Language, codified concepts, allows us to communicate. Disagreements on words disrupt communication. Universal concepts enable relationships.

Language evolved over tens of thousands of years. Without children, there would be no language, no relationships. The childless strip-mine history's sacrifices for present relationships, giving nothing in return. They are vampires of eternal history.

Modern science and medicine relies on thousands of years of knowledge passed down *because people had children*. No kids, no progress. You take the benefits without contributing.

Monstrous. Absolutely monstrous.

How dare you take others' sacrifices for your own selfish pleasures? Like showing up to a potluck empty-handed and expecting to be fed forever.

Once you make a genuine commitment to virtue, your life becomes enormously simplified.

## Preferences and Identity Part 2

Do you want healthcare when you're old?

Who will be the doctors if no one has children?

Do you want running water, heat, and cooling?

Who will maintain that infrastructure if no one has children?

Expecting a government pension?

There's no money; it's all spent.

Who will support you if no one has children?

Your behavior is selfish and greedy.

You rely on others' sacrifices for everything.

If everyone lived like you, your life would be hell.

You consume what others' sacrifices built.

It's not immoral to avoid having children – many great thinkers did.

Jane Austen didn't have children, but she lives on.

But you?

Everything you value exists because others had children.

If you don't want children – fine.

Just don't make a *virtue* of it!

Don't scorn parents whose children give you life and comfort.

Don't call mothers “broodmares,” or claim to be good by not having children.

Don't boast about “saving the environment” by not having kids.

Be selfish. Own it. Don't excuse it.

If you keep showing up to potlucks empty-handed and eat everyone else's food – don't sneer at them for cooking.

Don't talk about how virtuous you are for not bringing food.

Don't lecture those who feed you that preparing food is dull and worthless.

It's vile.

If you don't want to contribute to the human story – but rely on others' sacrifices – be honest.

Say: “I'm too selfish to make sacrifices – but I appreciate you having kids to care for me as I age!”

It's too much to expect selfish people to show gratitude – but a man can dream.

That is the stick – here is the carrot.

## The Benefits of Having Children

Most misery in the world is petty and self-inflicted.

When you have children, self-destructive thoughts mostly evaporate.

You have so much fun with your children that vain thoughts vanish.

Try worrying about work conflicts while playing a board game or being stressed when your toddler falls asleep in your arm.

Parenting is a series of little joys that erase pettiness with true perspective.

Without children, death is more frightening.

Which do you fear more – death, or being put under for an operation?

Death, of course. It's forever.

As a parent, your body and mind live on in your children.

Your genes and thoughts are passed on.

Your existence alters the future because you had and raised children.

We live on in our thoughts, ideas, virtues, and children.

You are a vehicle for eternity. You exist because your parents had children.

Your complexity exists due to stars burning and exploding for billions of years.

You are composed of star matter. You are universal and eternal.

Life is fleeting – human thoughts are eternal.

Our brain is mortal – our minds are gods.

God created life, as can we.

As the birth rate has declined, depression, anxiety, and mental illness have all skyrocketed.

Avoiding responsibility doesn't bring happiness. Our ancestors found happiness because they didn't avoid responsibility.

Frauds, thieves, and pickpockets aren't happy.

Those who pillage the general good and scorn the fertile are miserable.

It doesn't have to be this way.

Just be honest.

You're scared that no good soul wants a baby with you. Scorn is a mask for insecurity.

You scorn families because no one wants to make a family with you.

You scorn parenthood because you fear a child will never love you.

You scorn eternity because you've been tricked into living for the moment, abandoning your humanity.

Change – turn back. Rejoin us.

You can be loved.

But you must first stop fearing and hating.

## Discipline Without Violence Part 1

There is a vast difference between Peaceful Parenting and Unparenting.

Unparenting assumes children don't need to be raised, trained, or guided in any way.

Unparents let children stay up late, eat whatever they want, and watch anything – without any guidance.

Unparents treat children like brain-damaged adults.

If children generally made reasonable decisions, they'd be functioning adults.

To Unparents, children are tiny adults with undeveloped brains, living in a lazy socialist paradise, with no responsibilities, ethics, growth, or accountability.

Parenting aims to prepare children for successful adulthood – morally, and often materially.

It's better to be good and poor than wealthy and corrupt.

Wealth is morally neutral, like sex – fine if obtained voluntarily, not through force, fraud, or corruption.

Moral people are great in business – they don't cheat, making contracts unnecessary and lawyers redundant.

Moral people bring trust, making business cheaper and expanding trustworthy networks.

Why is Unparenting bad?

Adult life is full of obligations, restrictions, laws, rules, and temptations.

As an adult, choices have vast consequences.

The government doesn't force you to choose a profession, but your choices matter immensely.

Raising children without rules or consequences doesn't prepare them for adulthood.

As adults, bills aren't paid automatically; chores and expenses need attention.

Many young adults lack basic life skills today. Cooking, cleaning, and budgeting are often forgotten.

Doing everything for children without expectations raises selfish, entitled narcissists, crippling them as adults.

Babies and toddlers need full care, but older children need *expectations*.

If they take out toys, they should put them away – like adults do.

Parenting transfers adult skills to children.

Parents not teaching language would cripple their children.

Teaching reading transfers essential skills.

Passing cultural and moral values is key to human parenting – especially Western values like free markets, free speech, and political liberties.

Failing to transfer these values disrespects ancestors and leaves children without higher values.



Animals are programmed by nature; they don't compare actions to ideal standards.

A monkey doesn't lecture her baby on morals.

Moral standards differentiate humans from animals.

Animals don't understand "honesty" or punish moral crimes.

Lying is a survival strategy for many species.

Denying children abstract standards denies their humanity.

If you don't teach right and wrong, others will teach them to lie.

Teach children to love virtue.

Punishing children for moral failings teaches them to fear virtue.

This associates moral judgments with pain.

Virtue thus equals torture – not encouraging goodness.

Morality and consequences are complex.

We can't judge morality by consequences – it's like trying to disprove math with a Ouija board!

Consequences lie in the realm of mysticism; moral arguments lie in reason and evidence.

Judging morality by consequences is like calling arguments against religion "heresy."

Predicting the future is fantastical mysticism.

The more central the moral argument, the less predictable its consequences.

Additionally, children must understand the relationship between effort and reward. They should learn that good behavior and hard work lead to positive outcomes, while poor behavior and laziness result in negative consequences. This prepares them for adult life.

Finally, you must foster critical thinking in your children. Encourage them to ask questions, seek evidence, and think independently. This empowers them to make informed decisions and stand by their beliefs, navigating the complexities of the world.

## Discipline Without Violence Part 2

Many opposed ending slavery, fearing it would make food and clothing production impossible. They couldn't predict the labor-saving devices that inevitably emerged post-slavery.

People oppose moral arguments by projecting their anxieties into lurid tales of endless suffering.

“If you privatize healthcare, sick people will die in the streets!”

This predictable argument is anti-human. Animals decide based on predicted consequences; humans decide based on moral principles. Imagining we can predict consequences makes us think we are omniscient – a vanity even the most narcissistic would avoid.

Rejecting a moral argument by claiming to know future outcomes asserts an impossible ability to foresee the future, which will differ from the present.

Ending slavery or alimony means the future will differ from the past and present, fundamentally changing societal pillars.

Someone may claim: “I know *exactly* how the future will play out based on incomplete present information!”

While I think this is impossible, as an empiricist, I'd happily test this hypothesis.

“You can predict the future? Amazing! Can you tell me your stock portfolio will be worth next month?”

“If you know the future, you know which stocks will rise or fall – so you must have made a fortune!”

They'll claim it doesn't work that way, or they don't use their powers for material gain, or other such nonsense.

Those rejecting moral arguments by predicting societal outcomes never prove their amazing powers. They can't tell you what you'll say next, gold's price in five minutes, or next month's unemployment rate. They never show empirical predictions.

That which is asserted without evidence can be dismissed without evidence.

You might think: “You say no one can predict the future, but also that hitting children has negative outcomes!”

True – I claim hitting children has generally negative outcomes. However, we don't judge the morality of hitting children based on outcomes.

State control of the economy leads to inefficiencies, but we don't judge its morality by outcomes. Some prefer state control for power and prestige, benefitting them but harming others long-term.

The question of state control is *moral*, not consequentialist. If everyone has the right to property, using force to control others' property is immoral. The consequences of controlling property are negative for many, positive for some, and generally destructive in the long-term.

The question of hitting children can't be resolved by consequences – hitting children is beneficial to many in society! Billions of parents prefer hitting their children – they benefit from it, and the consequences of not hitting them would be negative for those parents!

Saying “hitting children leads to bad outcomes” is testable, as we show in the longer version of this book – available at [www.peacefulparenting.com](http://www.peacefulparenting.com).

However, “bad outcomes” isn't a magical phrase answering deep moral questions with certainty.

Some benefited from ending slavery; others were harmed emotionally, morally, and economically.

Children and society benefit from peaceful upbringing, but this doesn't answer *why* people hit their children.

The answer is: because they want to, and because they can.

Addiction has negative consequences, but not for everyone, not all the time – otherwise, addiction wouldn't exist.

## Discipline Without Violence Part 3

The consequences of *not* hitting children will be extraordinarily negative for billions of people worldwide.

When people claim that a moral argument's consequence will be negative, they are lying. If you prefer hitting your children, stopping because it is immoral will be very negative for you. If you need costly medical interventions due to poor health, privatizing government-run healthcare will be negative for you.

When people say, "The outcome of this moral argument will be disastrous," they mean it will be disastrous *for them*. Those benefiting from slavery argued that ending it would be disastrous, hiding their self-interest. Maybe they profited from it or enjoyed victimizing others. Opponents of moral arguments don't want to be defined as evil.

No one doing evil wants to be revealed. People who justify hitting their children don't want to be convinced it's evil. Expecting otherwise is madness.

Would the Coca-Cola Company pour resources into banning Coca-Cola? Would an ambitious politician support his opponent? People respond to incentives, especially moral ones. Moral arguments shape the world; changing moral definitions changes the world. Most people like the status quo. Most parents prefer hitting their children and will oppose anything that stops them.

Drug addicts get quite unhappy when their drug is unavailable—shocking!

Evildoers always distort morality to justify their immorality. They claim moral clarity will be disastrous for the world. They promote fear to deter respect for morality and align with those profiting from evil to discredit the truth. But it doesn't matter what happens to the world when we do good.

We cannot judge the morality of hitting children by imaginary disasters designed to scare us. If evildoers scare you away from virtue by citing consequences, you join their ranks, worsening the world.

Primarily, I'm not asking you to be good – just honest. If you don't want to stop hitting your children, admit it to yourself. Don't hide behind claims of universal disaster. Be honest: you hit your children because it gives you pleasure, relieves stress, or because you can get away with it.

A soldier once admitted he liked killing people: "I can't believe I get paid to do this. If I wasn't wearing this uniform, I'd be put to death!" You can't be moral without being honest first. Asking for morality without honesty is like asking for muscles without lifting weights. Honesty is necessary - but not sufficient - for morality.

If you don't want to teach or discipline your children, don't hide behind "Unparenting." Admit you don't want to confront them or set standards. Acknowledge preferring other activities over parenting. Issues can be solved if admitted.

Shielding children from standards and consequences is very cruel. When they grow into adulthood, these will be imposed externally. If your child needs to pass an essential test, help them study; don't let them fail. Indifference is cruelty.

Life daily imposes standards, requirements, and consequences. Failing to prepare children for this is preparing them for failure as adults. But how do you impose standards without being aggressive?

## Imposing Standards

If you lie, honest people avoid you.

You can't expect honesty from others if you lie.

Aggressive parents punish lying; peaceful parentings model adult scenarios calmly.

If your son lies, express your disapproval.

If he repeatedly cheats at a game, stop playing it with him.

In real life, cheating makes people avoid you.

Remind your son that lying will make you avoid conversations with him, and you won't feel bound to be honest with him in the future.

Honest people avoid liars, while dishonest ones exploit them.

Childhood is a rehearsal for adulthood. Mistakes are preparation.

Peaceful parents prepare children for adulthood, showing that bad behavior drives away good people and attracts bad ones.

Natural behaviors like lying, cheating, and stealing are experiments.

If a daughter sneaks candy after promising not to, peaceful parents explain the real-world consequences, asking if it's okay to steal her belongings in return.

"You took our candy without permission. It's experimenting, but would it be okay if I took your stuff?"

"No!"

"Exactly. Just as you wouldn't like us taking your things, we don't like you taking ours. Fair rules apply to everyone; they connect us."

Moral rules are universal, hence enforceable.

Over-punishing suggests that there is no self-interest in virtue; its only value is the avoidance of punishment.

We pursue goodness because that leads to happiness through reason - not because of fear.

Exercise should be driven by enjoyment, not fear of obesity.

Thinking clearly and being free from physical weakness requires strength.

Negative consequences imply no positive outcomes for preferred behaviors.

When you stop eating junk food, you end up enjoying healthy food even more.

When you start exercising, you'll enjoy exercise more than being inactive.

If you are virtuous, you end up enjoying virtue far more than vice.

Punishing people for non-virtuous actions compels them to avoid badness, rather than pursue virtue.

A poor person can get your money by appealing to your charity, or by robbing you with a gun.

If he robs you with a gun, he is explicitly stating that he is undeserving of charity – that you would never *choose* to give him your money based on his virtuous need.

If you hit and punish children for being “bad,” you are expressly telling them they have *no good reasons to choose virtue*.

Additionally, they will never internalize rules that are painfully inflicted by you, from the outside.

We cannot be loved without being virtuous – and love is the greatest thing in life!

Love is our involuntary response to virtue, if we are virtuous.

Not only can we never be loved without being virtuous – we can never fall in love either!

Falling in love, and being in love – are these not the greatest things in the universe?

And they are only achievable through virtue.

Disapproving of your children when they act badly is important - but always be honest with them, and don't fake positive emotions you don't feel.

Loving them – and being loved by them – is the greatest glory in life.

Who would trade all that for a few pieces of candy?

When we nurture virtue in our children, we prepare them for a life filled with genuine relationships and lasting happiness.

By emphasizing positive reasons for virtuous behavior, we instill a deep-seated love for goodness in our children.

This approach fosters a society where integrity and happiness flourish, and where relationships are built on mutual respect and trust.

Ultimately, peaceful parenting not only shapes better individuals but also creates a better world.

## Peaceful Parenting and Timeouts

Jailing people was an improvement over violent retribution for assaults and murders.

Defamation laws are better than duels –wrangling in court beats pistols at dawn.

We should never stop improving.

Are you ever fully satisfied?

Do you have enough money?

Time?

Love?

Prestige?

Did you upgrade your first phone or computer?

Do you like newer car features?

We always seek better.

Horses beat walking – cars beat horses – planes beat cars – and the next thing will beat planes.

A breeze beats still air – fanning yourself beats a breeze – an electric fan beats that – and air conditioning is best – so far!

A dishwasher beats washing by hand – a robot will be even better.

Moral progress is hard-won – but once achieved, few seek further improvements.

Serfdom was better than slavery – income tax is better than both – but then we stop, thinking no further improvements are needed.

Timeouts are better than beatings – but so what?

The iPhone 6 was better than the iPhone 5 – but we still upgrade past that!

Continuous improvement – that's humanity!

## What is a Timeout?

A timeout is a form of parental discipline involving giving one or two warnings to a child, then placing the child in a corner or on stairs for a duration based on their age, typically one minute per year.

How does it work?

If a child disobeys or engages in harmful behavior, the parent gives warnings. If the behavior persists, the parent places the child on a naughty chair or stair for the number of minutes corresponding to their age—a three-year-old for three minutes, a six-year-old for six minutes, etc. If the child tries to leave, the parent returns them to the spot without interacting. After the timeout, the parent explains the reason, asks for an apology, and continues the day as usual if the child apologizes.

This technique avoids physical and verbal abuse, which is an improvement. However, we must strive for perfect consistency with principles, even if it's impossible.



The fundamental moral principle of peaceful parenting is the nonaggression principle—never initiate force against others. This principle includes respecting property rights, as we own ourselves and should not be subjected to violence.

Morality in parenting requires aligning actions with the nonaggression principle and respecting property rights. Striking a child and exercising coercive control violate this principle.

For example, if a taxi driver locks you in and drives off, it's kidnapping. If you prevent someone from leaving your apartment, it's unlawful confinement. Similarly, verbal abusers invade their child's mind, inflicting negative language that harms the child's self-interest.

Defamation laws protect against false negative language causing harm. For instance, falsely claiming a restaurant served a live rat can result in financial loss, and a student can sue a professor for false negative recommendations that harm career prospects.

Verbal abuse is harmful when it falsely accuses a child of being mean, selfish, or ungrateful, affecting the child's self-esteem. This abuse impacts future economic interests, as verbally abused children often earn less due to diminished self-worth and negotiation skills.

Even adult workplace bullying has economic repercussions, and abusive employers are often sued for these costs. The defamation inflicted by verbally abusive parents can cost their children hundreds of thousands or millions of dollars over their lifetimes.

Verbally abused children also struggle to form loving relationships, losing out on the social, emotional, health, and economic benefits of a stable partnership. This loneliness or lack of connection has worse health effects than smoking.

Verbally abusive parents steal their children's self-respect, crippling them socially, emotionally, and economically—often for life. This is a violation of the nonaggression principle.

So.

Timeouts.

When you put your child in a timeout, are you exercising coercive control over that child's body?

Of course you are.

You are physically picking up the child, placing them where they don't want to be, and then returning them when they try to escape. You are overriding your child's self-ownership with coercive control.

One key test of peaceful parenting is: Would this be acceptable or legal with adults?

If a boss physically forces an employee to sit in a corner, it would be considered physical aggression punishable by prison time. Even off-color jokes can create a “toxic work environment” leading to lawsuits.

Does verbally abusing children create a “toxic environment”? Of course it does, but children can't quit and sue.

Not convinced?

Imagine trying this with your wife. If she disagrees with you, can you pick her up and force her into a chair? Don't even try it! If she dings the car, can you confine her to the backseat for forty-five minutes and only let her back in after she apologizes – not only for dinging the car but for being disobedient? Absolutely not.

You wouldn't do this to a spouse, a boss, a policeman, a teacher, a priest, an employee, or a retail worker. Why not?

Because it would be illegal, weird, wrong, aggressive, and coercive!

If you try to wrestle someone into a sitting position in public, they could use significant force to defend themselves. They could punch you, pepper spray you, or even taser you.

So – why allow this aggression against children?

It can't be because children don't respond to reason. If that were the case, we'd change laws to allow manhandling *anyone* who doesn't listen to reason. But that's not allowed.

If someone has an anxiety attack, can we wrestle them to the ground? No.

If someone doesn't speak our language, can we force them into a sitting position? No.

If your child can understand instructions, they can be reasoned with.

What can you do if adults disagree with you? You can disapprove of them.

If someone makes an offensive argument, you can't legally beat them up, but you can walk away, express upset, be angry, inform others, and make counter-arguments.

It's pretty universal – and exactly what we teach our children!

You use your *words*, not your *fists*!

## Sibling Aggression Part 1

If your daughter is stacking blocks and your son knocks them over, does he deserve a timeout?

No!

Creating imaginary solutions to real problems is irrational.

We look at primitive tribes attributing volcano eruptions to an angry Fire God with bemusement. Similarly, parents often fabricate a "badness" devil in the child and try to drive it out with punishment. It's akin to believing in demonic possession that needs a witch doctor.

Pretending that children are possessed by "badness," that is banished by punishment is primitive superstition. Imaginary answers stop us from asking real questions. Believing that a Fire God causes eruptions halts geological understanding and breeds priestly cults that end up punishing skeptics.

False answers lead to violence and hinder moral and intellectual progress.

So, why did your son knock over the blocks?

Without believing in "badness," you can investigate true causes. Rejecting the Fire God belief lets you understand volcanic eruptions. Similarly, abandoning "badness" helps understand children's actions constructively.

Believing that rituals control rain instead of building tangible irrigation means continued starvation. Questioning a witch doctor's authority results in accusations, torture, or death - reinforcing harmful beliefs.

Skepticism towards imaginary devils like "badness," challenges the violent mysticism ingrained in society. This mysticism feeds on violence against children and will label skeptics as heretics and evildoers, provoking familial or societal backlash.

By challenging these irrational beliefs, you aim to overthrow antirational mysticism. This is dangerous, as those perpetuating child violence may attack, including your family. However, rejecting these harmful myths is crucial for genuine understanding and progress.

## Sibling Aggression Part 2

As always, the only demon is the belief in the demon. The real badness is punishing children for their imaginary “badness.”

If you take away the devils, the pretend exorcists are revealed as abusers. They invented the devils to punish children. They are the real devils.

Why does your son knock over what your daughter built? It has nothing to do with his mythical “badness.” The real answer is: *you don't know*.

The beginning of wisdom is to call things by their proper names. The honest answer is: *we don't know*.

You don't know *why* your son knocked over what your daughter built. If you punish him, you will never know. By *pretending* to know, you prevent everyone from knowing the truth.

You punish your son because you don't *want* to know the truth.

The honest answer is: it's *your* fault.

You get angry at him, so you punish him. Your son is angry at your daughter, so he punishes her. Your son is just like you.

There could be many reasons why your son knocked over his sister's blocks. Perhaps she is new to the family, and he gets little attention. Should he be punished for that?

Perhaps your son has seen other children acting aggressively and is repeating that behaviour. That is still your responsibility. You control who your children spend time with. If you put your son in situations where aggression is modeled, that is on you.

Perhaps your son knocked over your daughter's tower because she tore a page out of his favourite book. Perhaps *she* was the aggressor, and he is responding. Perhaps he is in discomfort. Perhaps he misses his father. Perhaps he learned about death and is having a crisis. Perhaps he spent time with a family member who is secretly aggressive. Perhaps his teacher is aggressive.

If you pretend to drive out a devil through punishment, you will never learn the truth! You don't *want* to learn the truth because *you are responsible for everything that is happening*.

You don't want to take responsibility for your children's environment or the negative behaviours you modeled. You don't want to confront aggressive people in your son's environment. You don't want to homeschool him, find a different church, or confront your mean father.

You don't want responsibility. You don't want confrontations. You don't want to look in the mirror. You just want to blame and attack *him*.

I understand. We all have these impulses. It's easier to blame your own bad behaviour on an imaginary demon called "badness" in your children.

Either he is bad, or you are bad. You're bigger, right? You can manhandle him – he can't manhandle you! If you punish him, you don't have to change anything else.

The terrible thing is that you punish him for failing virtue – but your punishment is *you* failing virtue! You punish him for being irresponsible – to avoid your own irresponsibility. You claim that *he* is the wrongdoer – but *you* are the real wrongdoer!

You know this. Everybody knows this. You punish him rather than asking questions because you know the answers don't look good on you.

You know this.

And your son knows this, too.

You remember your own anger and frustration because you were constantly punished by people who never asked you questions. You were told to use your words, not force – but you were forcefully punished and never allowed to speak!

We punish our children so they will not speak. Our children know *exactly* how messed up our societies, schools, families, and parents are.

A man who criticizes a dictator is punished because the dictator cannot handle criticism. The man is punished for his strength – and the dictator's weakness.

Your son knocks over blocks – he is trying to tell you something – to save himself, you, your family – and, in the long run, your entire *society*!

Your son opens up a life-changing conversation – but you fear what he has to say. You can't punish him without justification, so you pretend he is bad – and that badness must be punished – and you are just helping him!

And so the cycle continues, and the world continues its path into hell.

## Compliance and the Teenage Years Part 1

Most modern parents go through four distinct phases with their children.

The first is infancy, where parents submit to their newborns' needs, not expecting compliance.

Next comes toddlerhood – the “terrible twos” – marked by a battle of wills. Parents impose discipline and expectations, working to control the child's rebellious spirit. Toddlers frequently defy their parents. Unlike babies, toddlers can embarrass their parents, are expected to share, and are seen as needing “taming.”

This “domestication” involves much wailing, crying, yelling, spanking, and punishing - lasting 2 to 3 years until the latency period from ages 5 to 11 or 12. During latency, the modern school system further destroys the child's willpower with rigid routines. The child's will goes underground, waiting for the reinforcement of puberty. Parents mistakenly believe they have “civilized” their children.

When puberty hits, the buried rebellion resurfaces with sarcasm, anger, and disobedience. Teenagers engage in acting out, drinking, drugs, and sexual activity, disrupting the household. Children grow stronger, making compliance through overpowering force impractical.

During teenage years, children shift focus from adult authorities – teachers, priests, parents – to peers, for the sake of future mating. Teenagers seek peer approval over adult guidance, knowing their future mate will come from peers. Hence, they prefer spending time with peers rather than parents, which is natural.

This peer focus is problematic because most parents avoided reasoning with their children or used “reasoning” backed by threats. Children learn compliance through threats, not genuine moral standards. External threats don't instill virtue; they only teach avoidance of punishment. Compliance with a mugger doesn't teach the virtue of charity.

Threats and punishment are negative economics, not positive morality. Children do homework to avoid punishment, not out of love for learning. Parents and teachers pressure children to conform to them, then complain about teenagers' susceptibility to “peer pressure.”

If you break a horse with violence, you can pass it to someone else who rides it easily. Similarly, breaking children with threats leads them to yield to peer pressure. Peers simply unlock the behaviors instilled by the parents.

Parents blindly apply the same aggression used during toddler years to teenagers, finding it ineffective, since teenagers are no longer toddlers. Sending children to school out of societal conformity exemplifies parental submission to peer pressure.

## Compliance and the Teenage Years Part 2

Parents who hit their children comply with harmful social norms - then complain when their children do the same!

Did you circumcise your son? It's not medically necessary, traumatically harms the baby, and reduces lifelong sexual pleasure. "Well, that's just what you do!" You imprinted peer pressure through bodily mutilation, yet you complain that he succumbs to peer pressure?

By bullying your children, you teach them to obey those with the most power. As teenagers, it's their *peers* who hold that power. Our genes prioritize peer acceptance for the sake of reproductive success.

Aggressive parents instill one lesson in their children: "Obey whoever has the most power over you" – that's parents when they're little, peers when they're teenagers. Violence against toddlers drives teenagers toward their peers.

Peaceful parents guide through reason and empathy. Power is superstition; reason is science. Superstition gives blind external forces control over beliefs; reason studies these forces, learns their nature, and commands them with knowledge. Commanding nature requires obeying it; commanding oneself requires obeying reason.

Punishment replaces reason and empathy with rebellion and conformity. Children learn fear, not justice; pain and obedience, not empathy. They link morality with punishment and develop an unhealthy relationship with both.

Can you love someone who hurts you? Teaching morality through pain makes children fear morality. Teaching them to obey bullies perpetuates aggression or victimhood.

Why do we do this to our children?

It's obvious, right?

When I clarify these basic truths, isn't it embarrassing that no one has said it before?

What on earth have philosophers been *doing* for the last 3,000 years?

Society is full of moralists discussing tolerance, empathy, diversity, sensitivity, and openness - yet ignoring childhood in such a clear and obvious manner. Philosophers focus on abstract problems instead of fundamental childhood protections.

Our society *relies* on child abuse. Change childhood, and you change everything, which those in power resist. But progress often angers the evil. Ending the slave trade, liberating women, and freeing concentration camp prisoners all upset those in control.

Progress means defying evil. The alternative is to remain evil.

## Peaceful Parenting: Clean Your Room!

Peaceful parents ask: how do I get my kids to clean their room?

I dislike messes too, so what's the answer?

Peaceful parenting handles all conflicts similarly.

First, ask: *why is it important?*

Kind of an important question, don't you think?

*Why* do you want your child's room clean?

Parents often set rules and demand obedience, leading to endless battles – for *what?*

Parents need to teach responsibility and tidiness, but how essential is the rule?

Let's take a typical example.

Mom wants her son's room clean.

Initially, she cleans it herself. As her son grows, he wants privacy, and demands she not enter his room. She agrees, but insists that he keeps it clean, or she'll tidy it herself. He doesn't keep it tidy, so she cleans – he feels violated, and the conflict escalates. Neither gets what they want, leading to endless, pointless fights.



The mother fears losing authority if she gives up her demand, while her son fights against perceived bullying. Both harden their positions, setting the stage for ongoing escalations.

Sound familiar?

It's a common pattern in many families.

What's the solution?

The mother wants a clean room; the son wants privacy and no orders.

Here's the essential message: *Don't lie to your children!*

What do I mean?

Well, in most cases, the mother is *lying* about why she wants a clean room!

She feels anxious and unhappy if the room is messy; she likes exercising power, has unresolved conflicts, fears judgment from others, and feels powerless in life.

It's not about the room, tidiness, privacy, or intrusion!

If the mother feels anxious, helpless, frustrated, and angry about the messy room, she should tell her son the truth about her thoughts and feelings. But she doesn't. Why not?

Two main reasons:

1. She prefers aggression over asking for favors from a state of vulnerability. Asking doesn't allow bullying - and her son can say no, revealing how little they care about her feelings.
2. It's indefensible to ask her son to clean his room because she feels bad when he doesn't.

Why?

Because we are untrained in philosophy!

The principle extracted is that we should change our behavior to make *others* feel better!

However, it's a universal principle, so it applies both ways. If the mother says, "I need you to keep your room clean because I feel bad when you don't," the son can then reply, "I need you to stop asking because I feel bad when you do."

Do you see?

It's hard to ask someone to change their behavior to help *you* feel better.

In the short run, it's easier to make up moral reasons about “respecting the shared environment,” *self-care, honoring your mother, doing the right thing* – easier to use the moral club and beat your child's will into submission, rather than ask for a favor that can be easily reversed.

Thus, the ongoing conflict isn't about cleanliness, but unresolved feelings and the misuse of power. Honest communication about underlying emotions will prevent these endless battles. The goal should be mutual respect and understanding, rather than exerting control through deceit.

## Why Is It Important? Part 2

Children are incredibly good at sensing hypocrisy in their parents.

If a mother imposes a moral narrative on her son about keeping his room tidy, rather than being honest about her own anxieties, her son will resist.

She lacks credibility because she is dishonest about her demand.

If she expects her son to manage her emotions by obeying, he will lose respect for her – particularly as a male who doesn't naturally operate that way.

Her daughter might mirror her habits in relationships, demanding others change behaviors to manage her emotions.

If the son has to change behavior for his mother's emotions – and she lies about it – he sets himself up for a life enslaved to women if he submits.

Women generally aren't attracted to submissive males, so this harms his future romantic prospects.

Would you rather your son tidy his room as a teen, or have a great wife and a happy family?

A boy who submits to emotional manipulations cannot be a great husband or father.

A woman who reproduces emotional manipulations cannot be a great wife or mother.

A teenage boy who submits to his mother lowers the quality of women he can attract. He becomes submissive, an appeaser - which is unattractive to confident women.

A mother demanding submission from her son undermines his chances of attracting and keeping a quality mate.

The son fights his mother to fight for his future happiness and survival.

In the past, sons who submitted to their mothers either didn't reproduce or reproduced with dominant, low-quality women – a disaster.

That's why the son fights hard.

What about the mother?

Why does she fight hard to control her son?

A middle-aged woman bullying others to appease her emotions doesn't confine that habit to her son.

Oh no!

If she is still married, her *husband* likely succumbs to her emotional manipulations and bullying.

What happens if her son successfully resists her bullying?

By forty or fifty, a woman's emotional habits form the foundation of her relationships, except possibly with her parents.

Her relationships rely on others managing *her* negative emotions. If she's upset, others have failed her, justifying her aggression.

If she *feels* bad, others must *be* bad!

If someone refuses to make her feel better, they're mean and selfish, and she must punish them to ensure compliance with her emotional demands.

If a mother is like this and her son successfully resists her bullying, that resistance might spread to her other children, her husband, and even her friends' families.

It ain't so much fun when the rabbit gets the gun, is it?

The son avoids submitting to prevent ending up alone or in a bad marriage, while the mother fears his rebellion will expose her weakness and aggression.

Imagine if the son successfully resists his mother's will – he might date and marry a healthy, assertive woman who won't tolerate his manipulative mother.

Ouch!

How does peaceful parenting resolve this?

As Socrates said, know thyself.

As a mother, deeply understand *why* you want your son to keep his room clean.

Is it fair or just to make this demand?

Parents often assume their demands are legitimate and children's resistance is not.

*How do you know?*

The question of what is good and just and right is complex and ancient.

We treasure the principle that the accused are innocent until proven guilty.

If your child disagrees, assume they are right and just.

Ask *why* they disagree - and genuinely listen to their answer.

Maybe they have a good point.

Listening without prejudice, tension, or anger is a gift to your child – to anyone!

Children should be listened to – we all should be!

Don't assume you are right – have the humility to accept you might be wrong – for two reasons: you might be wrong, and you want to model humility for your children.

Don't expect your children to be humble if you only model arrogance!

Which brings me to...

## Have I Modelled the Behaviour I Want in My Children?

This can be tough!

Decades ago, a friend of mine lived with a woman who constantly nagged him to keep their place spotless. After they broke up, he found out she had let it become a pigsty. He realized she never valued cleanliness; she just liked bossing him around.

Want an organized environment for your children? Is your *own* environment organized?

Want your son's room tidy? Is *your* car tidy?

Want him to listen to you? Do you listen to him?

You want him to manage his emotions? Do you manage yours?

If you expect obedience because you're his mother, does he see you disrespecting your own mother? Do you model the behavior you want in him? It's not enough to just be okay at it – you have to be nearly perfect. You wouldn't take diet and fitness advice from an overweight smoker, right? You want advice from someone super healthy.

If you claim it's efficient for him to keep his room tidy, can you find things easily in your environment? Can you counter his argument that searching for fifteen minutes is better than two hours of tidying each week?

If you want *him* to admit fault, do *you* admit fault?

Are you flexible with his rational objections? If not, he'll see your reasons as hypocritical nonsense. If you say he'll be happier in a tidy room and he disagrees, what do you say? If you brush past his objection, he'll know you're lying - and won't want to obey a liar.

If *you* keep an organized environment, and involve him in keeping it neat, and remind him over the years how easy it is to find things, and ask for his help rather than yelling hypocritical moral commandments, you practice peaceful parenting.

Demanding obedience without reason and evidence only trains him to be a slave.

You want your children to follow good reasoning, good morals, and their own conscience, not hypocritical commandments.

Don't break your children! Forcing submission destroys their spirit, cripples their free will, and undermines their future integrity and relationships.

Thank him for fighting you. Remember when your baby fought for a dry diaper instead of a nap? Often, your children fight to *help* you, not just *oppose* you.

You want your son to attract a high-quality woman and have a balanced marriage, right? Breaking his will now undermines his future relationships. A controlled boy becomes an unappealing man, who struggles to stand firm in his convictions.

You're not attracted to weak, broken men, right? You prefer men of integrity.

It might be annoying at the moment, but it's much better in the long run.

Can we agree on that? I'm sure we can!

Don't make him unappealing by breaking his will. Keep him strong and able to assert his identity. He'll have a happy marriage with an equally strong woman, giving you a good daughter-in-law, wonderful grandchildren, and stable support in your old age. That's worth infinitely more than a tidy room when he's thirteen. Am I right?

Of course I am!

## Peaceful Parenting and Peer Pressure Part 1

Now that you understand Peaceful Parenting, you can answer this: How do you ensure your children won't be bullied?

First, don't bully them.

Second, don't let *yourself* be bullied.

The antidote to bullying is open communication. Bullies target children who lack psychological and emotional support from their parents. Without parental protection, children are vulnerable.

Bullies fear humiliation. A protected child won't be targeted, and this protection comes from open communication with strong parents.

If children can't come to you with problems, their issues will escalate. Parental anger or panic discourages children from sharing problems. Dysfunctional fathers get angry; weak mothers feel overwhelmed.

Society makes it easy for bullies. Teachers avoid dealing with bullying to prevent conflicts. If Bobby is bullied by Joe, the teacher will just tell Bobby to avoid Joe. Confronting Joe risks backlash from Joe's parents.

Bobby is alone unless protected by his parents. This teaches children that authority only punishes, never protects, undermining civic ethics. Authority's credibility lies in serving and protecting children. If teachers, principals, and parents can't stop bullying, they lack moral strength and credibility.

Government schools facilitate bullying because no one wants to confront bullies or their parents. Expelling bullies is nearly impossible. Parents, taxed for government schools, often can't afford private ones. Homeschooling is viable if legal, but requires one parent - usually the mother - to stay home.

Mothers working since their children were young lack strong bonds, and recoil from homeschooling. Parents must accept the consequences if they choose work over homeschooling.

If a child is lonely, bullied, or alienated at school and mommy prefers to work, the child knows mommy's work is more important than his own safety and happiness.

Women who use daycare make little money after expenses. Children grow up realizing mommy preferred earning a few dollars over spending time with them.

I worked in a daycare for years, I know what I am talking about.

Parents must accept the consequences of daycare:

1. Your children are less important to you than a commute, job, and a few dollars an hour.
2. You prefer under-qualified strangers to raise your children.
3. You chose to have children, but don't want to raise them.
4. Endless stress from juggling traffic, childcare, dinner, and bedtime routines.
5. Weekends are also stressful with chores, groceries, bills, taxes, and social events.
6. Mornings are rushed and stressful as parents hurry to get children to daycare on time.
7. Children's feelings and preferences are irrelevant; they'd rather stay home with a happy mother.
8. Parents impose daycare on children without economic benefit or pleasure.
9. Children don't bond or trust daycare workers who frequently change.
10. If children complain or want something different, they are ignored, lectured, scolded, and sent back to daycare.

## Peaceful Parenting and Peer Pressure Part 2

It's bizarre to think that a stranger - often from another country, and with limited English - is equal to a birthmother in raising a child.

Imagine it's your tenth wedding anniversary. Your wife spends all day getting ready and shows up at the restaurant. Instead, you call her: "I have to work late, but I called a temp agency. They're sending a guy named Manuel. He speaks some English and is hungry. He might be lactose intolerant, so check with him. He has a gardening job and hasn't showered, but I'm sure it's fine!"

Your wife would be outraged: "What do you mean, you're sending a stranger to have our anniversary dinner with me? I want my *husband*, not some stranger named Manuel!"

"But you sent our kids to daycare, saying strangers are just as good as family. Don't be selfish, have a great evening with Manuel!"

Your wife would never accept a stranger instead of your company on your anniversary - but she substitutes a stranger for herself by dropping the kids off at daycare. Strangers are just as good as family, apparently, unless that interferes with her preferences. It's incomprehensible.

Children with working mothers see their moms submitting to their bosses, but fighting with their husbands. She yells at her husband, then the boss calls, and she submits. She speaks to her boss with more respect than to her husband. She's pleasant to the stranger but difficult with her husband.

If her husband asks her to submit to male authority, she rebels - but she submits to her male boss. Children think, those outside the family have all the power. The man in the family has none.

Good luck getting your sons to look forward to marriage or your daughters to respect their boyfriends and husbands.

If you sacrifice your children's well-being for your own habits and ego, be prepared to live with the consequences.

Good people respond to sacrifices with reciprocity. If you lend money to a good friend when you are wealthy, he will lend you money if the situation reverses. If you do favors for others, they will do favors for you.

If your children know they come first, they will respect, love, and admire your integrity. Parents *claim* they'd do anything for their children - but drop them at daycare, ignore their needs, and sacrifice their happiness for a few dollars and social approval.



"Don't succumb to peer pressure!" say mothers who dump their children with strangers to avoid the stigma of being a stay-at-home mom.

A father tells his children to respect authority - while ignoring their emotional needs so he can brag about his working wife.

If you want your children not to be bullied, don't be bullied yourself - especially at their expense.

## Family and Bullying Part 1

Parents want their children's respect because it ensures efficient and productive negotiations. Without respect, negotiations are worse than useless.

For example, there's no point in negotiating a payback plan with a deadbeat brother-in-law who won't repay. Similarly, if you know your doctor is merely a pharmaceutical shill, he loses credibility, and negotiating payment plans becomes irrelevant.

Negotiations fail when there's no mutual respect or valued exchange.

If you allow yourself to be bullied - especially in front of your children - you'll lose credibility with them, leading them to potentially become victims or bullies themselves. If your mother-in-law bullies you, and your children see it, they'll struggle to respect your teachings about integrity and pride.

Children are highly sensitive to their parents' moods, an essential survival strategy. Even if you handle a tough call with your difficult parent in another room, your children will notice your changed mood when you return.

Allowing difficult people into your life makes your life difficult. Deferring to them depletes your children's respect. Many parents resort to hitting their children because they've acted hypocritically and lost respect.

Imagine a fat man promoting a diet book or a chain-smoker holding a quit-smoking seminar; it's laughable. They lack credibility regardless of the quality of their advice. Would *you* pay for their seminars or books?

To sell something, you must first embody it. To sell fitness, be fit. To advocate for financial success, don't be broke. Parenting often ignores this principle, as children lack the choice to leave.

Socialist leaders controlling economies show hypocrisy without consequence, similar to monopolistic government agencies that claim to satisfy customers without needing efficiency. As a parent, integrity isn't mandatory, because children can't escape your influence.

However, society indoctrinates children to believe they owe lifelong obligations to their parents, regardless of how they were treated. This need for indoctrination reveals the prevalence of hypocritical and bullying parents.

People don't need propaganda to desire inherently appealing things like sugar, money, or vacations. The complexity of life often stems from the hypocrisy and hardship encountered in childhood.

## Family and Bullying Part 2

Society tells wives - even mothers - to leave their husbands if bored or dissatisfied. Yet, if you abuse your children for years, those kids owe you everything for life. Why?

If society wants consistency, make divorce illegal and forbid quitting jobs. But no, we can't do that – what if the husband is abusive, the company is corrupt, or the job unsatisfying?

So, people can un-choose what they chose, but never un-choose what they *never* chose?

Immigration is positive, people say. People don't choose their birth country, so it's fine to leave it. Yet escaping an abusive family you never chose to be a part of is wrong. It's nonsense!

We lack virtue, consistency, and moral rules – all we have is power, exploitation, and shifting justifications to defend the powerful and abuse the weak. We defend parents, attack children.

No more!

To have credibility with your children, have integrity as an adult. Avoid peer pressure if you want your children to. Make good choices if you want your children to. Care for them if you want them to care for you when you age. Respect their needs if you want them to respect your wishes. Don't leave them with strangers for years if you want them to look up to you. Reason and negotiate instead of using manipulation, threats, and force.

It's so *simple*!

I'm not teaching new values or a radical philosophy. Live your values consistently – the values you proclaim and inflict on your children. Your children will absorb your hypocrisy if you don't.

They will learn that words don't match actions, integrity is a lie, and moralists punish others while excusing themselves.

Life is simpler when we live our values consistently.

Einstein's  $E=MC^2$  gave us great power over matter and energy. Understanding gravity helped us comprehend the structure of the universe. Consistency is virtue and safety.

Imagine having to learn the danger of fire every single time. Believing every lion is friendly. Trusting a communist girlfriend to be wonderful. Thinking hunger will resolve itself.

We wouldn't survive!

Live your values consistently – without changing them, or reversing them for convenience.

As a moral philosopher, I have some radical arguments.

Peaceful Parenting isn't one.

Reasoning with children is better than hitting them. You can't teach a language you don't speak. Children learn empirically. We must model virtues. Leaving abusive relationships is good. We reap what we sow. Peace is superior to force. Hitting weak, defenseless people is cowardly and pathetic.

We claim to want the best for our children, but live the opposite.

Not anymore.

What if tomorrow, you apologized to your children, made restitution, and committed to never hurt them again? Do it in *all* your relationships - but especially with children, who have no choice but to be there. Apologize first to those you've hurt most and who have the least choice.

## Siblings

Siblings are either our greatest allies, or our greatest enemies.

They compete for parental time and resources, viewing each other as rivals in scarcity.

Allied siblings, however, excel in adulthood. Loyal brothers are unbeatable in hunting or war, while affectionate sisters provide safety and security for their children.

Those in power prefer loyalty to them alone, turning siblings against each other from day one.

## Brothers

Modern society turns brothers against each other by rigidly age-segregating children in schools, promoting peer-bonding over family bonding.

The older brother gains status from his peers, leading to the “tagalong” scenario. The younger brother wants to spend time with him but is rejected and called a “tagalong” by the older brother’s peers. This also happens with his sister.

The older brother is compelled to reject his sibling for peer approval, losing both his younger brother’s bond and his peers’ approval. The younger brother resents being rejected for transitory classmates, while classmates move on.

Lonely, the older brother tries to reconnect, but power dynamics prevent an honest apology. The younger brother, having learned that status means rejecting a brother, rejects his older brother when he needs him, mirroring his own rejection.

“Bound together in discontent” describes most modern relationships, including between brothers.

## Sisters

Sisterhood functions similarly to parent-child dynamics. Parents asserting authority based on age create power imbalances among siblings, with older siblings feeling superior and younger ones inferior. This dynamic fosters an artificial sense of superiority in older siblings and a corresponding sense of inferiority in younger siblings.

Older siblings become addicted to their sense of superiority, developing unstable egos reliant on the younger siblings’ perceived inferiority. Younger siblings eventually realize they must detach from this dynamic to find their own power, often facing hostility from the older sibling when they attempt to break free. This dependency on unearned superiority leads to violence and tyranny.

Placing one’s value on accidental traits - such as birth order - is the root of many issues. The older sibling’s addiction to superiority involves subjugating the younger sibling, creating dependency and instability when this dynamic is challenged. When their sense of superiority is threatened, older siblings often respond with escalation and hostility, either directly or indirectly.

Unstable escalation and tyranny can eventually lead to healing as the withdrawal from this addiction dissipates, and more authentic sources of happiness are found.

These issues worsen if the older sibling is taller, more attractive, or more intelligent, reinforcing their addiction to superiority. Among sisters, older siblings may use verbal abuse to instill feelings of inferiority and unlovability in younger siblings. This abuse can make the older sister appear more attractive to men due to a false confidence derived from the younger sibling's suffering. The high of verbal abuse often implants a dangerous charisma into the older sister's personality.

However, this dynamic hollows out the older sister's personality, leaving her prone to ideology as a substitute for genuine value. She may attract romantic attention, but cannot settle down due to her hollow personality. Unable to form genuine relationships, she externalizes her frustrations, blaming societal structures like "the patriarchy" or "capitalism" for her unhappiness. Empathy - essential for love - is sacrificed for vanity.

Older siblings must develop empathy by imagining themselves in their younger siblings' shoes. Recognizing that much of their perceived value is accidental is essential for developing the capacity to love and be loved. Genuine value comes from earned virtue, not from unearned traits like inheritance, beauty, birth order, or genetic intelligence.

While it's common to feel superior due to accidents like physical traits or natural talents, these unearned gifts should not foster feelings of superiority. Instead, we should strive for earned virtue. Older siblings, tempted to value themselves based on birth order, must seek true value through earned virtue. This involves recognizing the superficiality of accidental superiority and striving to manifest and spread genuine virtue.

True value comes from what we *earn*, not from what we receive by chance. Embracing this understanding fosters humility and empathy, essential for forming genuine, loving relationships. The pursuit of virtue in a challenging world is the highest calling, requiring resistance and opposition to build true moral strength. If you're not facing resistance, you're not building muscle. If you're not being opposed, you're not doing good. Evil doers silently applaud you for pretending to have value for that which you did not earn – that is the surest path to joining their ranks!

To manifest and spread virtue in the world is the most extreme sport known to man and God. This commitment to earned virtue over accidental value is essential for true personal development and meaningful connections.

## Sibling Potential Part 1

Siblings who become allies are a powerful force for good.

They accompany you through your entire life journey.

When parents die, only siblings remember your childhood and its shaping forces.

Siblings hold deep, detailed knowledge about you, crucial for your future.

True bonding is trusting someone with your deepest thoughts and fears.

As adults, we choose to reveal ourselves; as children, siblings see everything.

Adults expect privacy; siblings have little to none.

Siblings hold inherent power from witnessing your childhood.

Do parents teach siblings to use their power for good or ill?

It depends on how parents use their own power over their children.

Anonymous opinions matter little; close opinions do.

People who know you well hold great power; siblings inherit this power and often misuse it.

If parents model dominance and aggression, older siblings will inflict this on younger ones.

Siblings speak the language taught by their parents.

Aggressive parenting destroys sibling bonds.

Abusive parents turn siblings against each other, creating not just distant siblings but often mortal enemies.

## Sibling Potential Part 2

I have seen this play out countless times over my life and given this speech to many battling siblings:

*You **must** treat each other well, for many reasons. First, your parents will age and die, leaving only each other as witnesses to your childhood. Your sibling is the only person who can share your entire life journey. They saw you grow, learn to walk, go through puberty, get educated, find a job, get married, and have children. This deep knowledge allows you to help each other like no one else can. Siblings are like expert mechanics who can fix or break anything. Living closely with people who know everything about you can be challenging, especially if they don't have your best interests at heart, as they can do much damage. It's like a doctor who can either heal you or torture you with his knowledge.*

*You will never meet anyone who knows you as well as your siblings. Even a spouse of fifty years won't have witnessed your entire childhood. Siblings can elevate each other to great heights or drag each other down to hell. If you turn on each other, using your deep knowledge to harm, you'll never stop paying the price. You won't fully trust anyone else because you couldn't trust yourself to handle your power over another human soul. You'll be repeating the mistakes your parents made.*

*Harming each other falls into a parental trap. Siblings who suffered alongside you should be your natural allies. Dividing and conquering only benefits those who wish to control us - whether in the family, society, country, or the world.*

*Older siblings: being born first doesn't make you better. You didn't earn that. Those "best friends" you abandoned your sibling for, where are they now? Are they here to help with your kids, nurse you when sick, or support you through tough decisions? Will they assist with aging parents? Probably not. You likely don't even know where they are - and if you called, they'd laugh. You gave up your blood kin for strangers living separate lives. Isn't that pathetic? How can you trust your judgment when you made such poor decisions against nature, history, and family?*

*Now, you seek authority over your younger siblings, asking for favors and trying to be in charge. They'll say, "Talk to the precious friends you preferred over **us**!"*

*Younger siblings, playing the victim: **would you have done differently if you were older?** You criticize your older siblings for lacking empathy, but have you tried to understand **their** perspective? They took the brunt of parental misdeeds and societal pressure to prefer peers over kin. If you've never held such power, it's easy to judge those who misuse it. Anger at older siblings is part of abusive parents' plan: "You fight among yourselves while we avoid judgment."*

*You complain that your older siblings' negativity affected you, but how much more did your parents affect **them**? By attacking each other, you excuse your parents, who remain in control. **All** the children made mistakes; forgive each other as children and place the blame on the adults.*

*Your parents are part of your past; they no longer parent you. But your siblings are your present and future. Sacrificing a functional future for a dysfunctional past is a terrible idea that will cost you all for the rest of your lives if you don't change.*

## Extended Family and Peaceful Parenting Part 1

If we accept that rape is evil, does it make any sense to punish women for defending themselves against it?

Would we argue that murder is evil, but self-defense against murder is *more* evil?

Would we claim theft is wrong - but that preventing theft or punishing thieves is also evil?

Of course not!

If an action is defined as evil, preventing or punishing it cannot also be considered evil.

Defining an action as evil inherently praises and defends those who oppose it.

Is hitting children evil?

Yes, for two main reasons.

First, children are defenseless and trapped with their abusers for years.

Second, hitting children breeds adult evils, legitimizes violence, encourages the strong to terrorize the weak, and destroys empathy and bonding.

Hitting children creates criminals.

Is verbal abuse of children evil?

It can be even worse than hitting them.

A child's self-image is shaped by parental language.

We start moldable and harden over time; changing as adults is difficult.

Is neglecting children evil?



Neglect can be worse than verbal or physical abuse.

Children experience neglect as an existential death threat.

Neglect produces socially anxious adults with poor relationship skills.

Committing crimes is immoral.

But it's also immoral to be an *accessory* to the crime.

Facilitating a crime makes you equally criminal.

If you allow child abusers to harm your children, you are as guilty as the abuser.

Parents are fully responsible if they allow their children to be abused.

Family relationships don't exempt you from the law.

If your father drives the getaway car, he still gets charged if you rob a bank.

Cover for a sibling's murder and you're complicit, family or not.

Morality supersedes family ties, and prevents criminals from exploiting familial immunity.

Do you follow?

Of *course* you do, brilliant reader!

Criminals like pickpockets work in pairs. One bumps into you, the other steals your wallet.

Both commit the crime, regardless of familial ties.

The moral law serves *morality*, not *family*.

Consider your extended family's responsibility if you were abused as a child.

Aunts, uncles, grandparents – did they act against your abuse?

If they had confronted your parents and demanded help, could your parents have continued the abuse?

Likely not.

Extended family members claiming ignorance of abuse often lack credibility.

Grandparents in particular - having raised the abusive parents - cannot claim they had no suspicion.

When abusive parents go unchallenged by relatives, those relatives share responsibility.

If your extended family had acted to stop the abuse – confronting your parents, demanding help – the abuse could not have continued.

## Extended Family and Peaceful Parenting Part 2

Imagine if grandparents gave their grandchildren a violent dog they had raised for a decade. When the dog inevitably bit one of the children, would anyone believe the grandparents when they claimed they had no idea the dog was capable of aggression?

A child experiencing abuse displays signs like depression, anxiety, introversion, and avoidance. Can the entire extended family honestly claim they noticed no changes in the child's behavior?

If your girlfriend was brutally raped at a party, wouldn't you detect changes in her personality the next day? Even if she had just been beaten up or robbed, would she be exactly the same the next day, showing no difference in her personality or interactions whatsoever?

If your extended family claims ignorance of any abuse you endured, they can't claim to be close to you, love you, or care about you. They are ignoring your personality, history, and experiences, and how you were parented.

Every adult knows that child abuse is a significant risk. It is their moral duty to inquire about the well-being of children in their vicinity - especially within their own families. Ignorance is no excuse, legally or morally.

As a child, were you forgiven if you forgot the date of a school test and failed? Of course not! It was your job to know and prepare for tests. Similarly, it's your extended family's job to ensure you're safe and not harmed.

Extended family members who avoid asking about child abuse do so expecting that their claims of ignorance will be accepted later. They are explicitly avoiding crucial knowledge, and so cannot claim a lack of it as an excuse.

It's twisted that society punishes children for avoiding required knowledge but forgives adults who ignore infinitely more important knowledge, like whether children in their family are being harmed or abused. Grandparents who raised abusive parents avoid confronting their faults and harm, continuing the cycle of abuse.

As a parent, you are *entirely* responsible for ensuring that your children aren't abused. If strangers verbally attack them in public, you must charge to the rescue. If a crazy person pushes them to the ground, you must defend them. If bullied, you must get them to safety and ensure their continued security. If they are verbally threatened, you must protect them from both the physical and verbal threats. If they're subjected to ideological abuse at school, you need to address it and ensure they are not indoctrinated.

Protecting your children is a universal principle. If your child is bored at school, you must protect their enthusiasm for learning by fixing or changing their environment. If threatened with drugs due to restlessness, you must defend them. If born into economic slavery due to national debts and unfunded liabilities, you must relentlessly advocate for a more sustainable political and economic system.

If divorce will harm your children, as it often does, you need to find a way to work it out with your spouse to keep your kids safe and happy.

Imagine a world operating on the simple, universal principle: Protect our children! We wouldn't force them into terrible schools, sell their future to bribe voters, fill their heads with doomsday scenarios, or let ideologues program them to bow before political power.

The world could be paradise, but we need to be good.

## Extended Family

If your father is harsh with your children, *you* are abusing them.

Your father is only in their lives because *you* allow it.

If you keep an aggressive dog that bites your children, *you* are responsible.

If your father humiliates you in front of your children, you harm them. Even out of sight, it affects them because you become tense and upset.

When your father humiliates you, what do your kids see?

They see him exercising power over you, and you bowing down. They see who has real authority. They see your lack of integrity and lose respect for you. They view you as weak and the bully as strong.

Children are drawn to strength and repelled by weakness. By watching you submit, they learn that virtue loses to aggression, and bad people run the world.

Once they see who is strong and who is weak, they will obey your father and disobey you. Your father ends up bullying your children through the example of bullying you.

As teenagers, will they listen when you tell them to put virtue above peer pressure? Will they accept doing the right thing, even when it upsets others? Will they surrender to the most aggressive person, or want to become him? Almost certainly.

If you submit to bullying, you cripple your children's moral integrity. If your deeds don't match your words, your words are worse than useless. If you claim to know virtue but don't act on it, your claims damn you. Your children will learn that "virtue" is just words to distract from your cowardly surrender.

People pretending to be good talk about integrity, then do what bad people tell them.

Life becomes simple when you follow universal principles. Do what is best for your children! Is it good for them to watch you being bullied and humiliated? Will they respect your moral authority, or be ashamed to be ruled by a weakling?

What will you see in their eyes when you bow before a bully? The fires of respect, extinguished by your cowardly surrender.

Don't do it. Or – if you're going to surrender to bullies, don't have children.

## Dealing with Family Bullies

What do you do?

Simple! You already know the answer!

How do you deal with bullies you don't need in your life?

It's a two-step process:

1. Have reasonable standards
2. Enforce them

If your mother calls you names, tell her to stop. If she doesn't, stop seeing her.

People often try to control aggressive people with complaints and negotiations, but this is pointless.

Tell your mother: "Mom, you call me names, and I don't like it. I'm going to have children and I don't want them to see me humiliated. This isn't a negotiation. If you want to be around me and your grandchildren, I need an apology, restitution, and proof it won't happen again. Anger management or therapy might help, but it's up to you."

If she denies it, stand firm: "Sorry, mom – this isn't a negotiation. Fix it, or you won't be invited over."

Have this conversation somewhere you can leave easily because boundaries aren't enforced through negotiation. Negotiations work when there's a middle ground, but not for abuse.

You wouldn't be happy giving half your money to a mugger or negotiating down from murder to cutting off your hands.

Morality doesn't negotiate. It defines and enforces. There's no middle ground between good and evil, or rape and lovemaking.

Immoral people will try to negotiate ethics, pretending good and evil are subjective. Don't do it!

As a peaceful parent, ensure everyone in your children's lives treats them peacefully.

Abuse is mind-poison. You wouldn't let anyone serve poisoned food to your children, so don't allow anyone to abuse them.

There's no negotiation here – no one is excluded from this requirement. You wouldn't allow half-kidnappers around your children, right?

No one aggresses against my children – period!

Why should they learn to deal with abuse?

Trust me, there are enough reasonable people in the world that your children don't need to handle bullies.

Bullying weakens children, making future conflicts worse.

Aggressing against your children to prepare them for bullying lets bullies dictate your parenting.

If you bully your children because bullies exist, those bullies are actually parenting your children.

You're still letting bullies into your children's lives.

## Family Loyalties

I understand family loyalties are ingrained – but so what?

Morality opposes our instincts – that's why we *need* virtue!

Being tempted by family loyalties is like craving sugary foods.

Adult children want to conform to their parents, but so what?

Every moral advancement opposed instincts.

Slavery was universal – until it wasn't.

Torturing children for the gods was common – until it wasn't.

Moral progress is difficult – but so what?

You tell your children to go against *their* instincts, right?

You have to do the right thing.

Saying something is difficult is an excuse.

“Oh, it's difficult to exercise and lose weight!”

So what? Do it anyway.

Difficulty should spur you on – not be an excuse.

Do what's best for your children!

Having abusive people around is destructive.

Set and enforce reasonable standards.

If abusive parents claim that family is *everything* – they’re lying!

If they say you shouldn’t make family feel bad – then why did they make *you* feel bad?

If they say your words are cruel – why did they say cruel words to you?

If they say standards are wrong – why did they inflict unreasonable standards?

If your mother says you make her feel terrible – why did she yell at and hit you?

If it’s bad to enforce rules, why did *they* enforce rules?

Every argument against you enforcing rules is a lie proven by their actions!

If your mother demands that you change because she’s crying – why didn’t *she* change when she made *you* cry?

If your father demands that you consider his feelings – why didn’t he consider yours?

If the category “parent” deserves love and respect, why not the category “child”?

Both are family!

If you have to treat *them* well, why didn’t they treat *you* well?

Every argument they make condemns them more.

If it’s cruel to make them feel bad, why was it good for them to make you feel bad?

If they say they don’t remember abusing you, why didn’t they forgive you for “forgetting things” as a child?

Why is their fake “forgetfulness” forgivable, but your genuine forgetfulness punished?

Why do they claim excuses that they never accepted from you?

Why do they claim stress made them act badly, but stress was never an excuse for you?

When abusive parents had power, they made you feel bad.

Now that you have power, it's wrong to make *them* feel bad?

It was good for them to initiate aggression.

It is bad for you to defend against aggression.

It was good for them to yell at and hit you.

It is bad for you to enforce reasonable standards.

Sometimes, moral clarity is all you need.

## Blowback from Boundaries

Abusive parents will badmouth you to the family if you enforce boundaries, trying to ostracize you to cover their own moral crimes.

This actually benefits you.

By bullying others into rejecting you, they reveal that they are moral weaklings who will betray you in a crisis – it's like identifying mines in a minefield.

Though painful, this "cleaning house" saves time in identifying who has integrity and moral courage.

You owe your parents *justice* – holding them to objective moral standards, ideally truly objective, but at least to the standards they claim.

If your parents punished you for forgetting or lying as a child, they can't complain if punished for the same as adults. If they enforced standards by making you feel bad, they can't complain if they feel bad when you enforce your standards.

The saying goes: *Don't dish it out if you can't take it!*

If your parents refuse to own up to their hypocrisy, holding children to higher standards than themselves, they'll continue to abuse you and your children.

If they think that harming innocent children was *good*, but harming guilty adults is *bad*, they plan to keep abusing under the guise of morality. They twist universal moral standards into a power-play to control helpless children.



Kidnappers don't love their victims; they just exploit the love of others to get paid. Similarly, abusive parents use fake morality to control others - the greatest possible corruption.

Telling children that they are punished for their own good is the greatest moral evil, and there's no recovery from that. You might get a fake apology and some moves towards restitution, but once children are harmed with fake morality, restitution is impossible.

Protect your children – relentlessly abusive parents are beyond salvation.

## How to Apologize Part 1

When I was a boy in England, I found a stack of Readers Digest magazines. Reading them voraciously, they profoundly impacted me—"Laughter, the Best Medicine" taught me humor; "Drama in Real Life" instilled courage. I vividly recall articles about the "Scared Straight" program.

This program involved young at-risk youths receiving terrifying lectures from hardened criminals. One man warned them they wouldn't be tough in prison and wished someone had warned him earlier about the perils of a life of crime.

Does *this* book aim to reform aggressive parents or prevent future aggression? Is it punishment or reward?

Parents who have been aggressive will feel punished by this book. Future parents inspired by it will gain the rewards of virtue. Abusive parents use blows, yelling, and punishments to instill corrupted virtue in their children. Aggression breaks children in order to become a delivery mechanism for corrupted morality.

Physical injuries are not eternally traumatic. The real trauma is the corrupted morality that infects the child's soul and programs it for life.

When I was a child, a friend and I were captured by two teenage boys in the woods. They forced us to stay, build a fire, and threatened us. I was small, and my friend, who had asthma, was even smaller. The taller boy called him a "sucky fag," and my friend cried. I said, "Why don't you pick on someone your own size?" and got punched in the stomach.

Eventually, they let us go, reminding us not to tell anyone or they would kill us. I felt helpless as we walked home. Society seemed unable to protect us. These teens had become violent bullies preying on children, and no one stopped them.

They risked beating up little children but knew they could get away with it. They were teaching us an essential lesson: society couldn't protect us. "Children, teachers, priests, and police are helpless. The worst we'll get is a lecture or short punishment."

I couldn't defend myself, and society couldn't either. Their death threats showed they had nothing to lose—no fear of prison, no concern for consequences.

I didn't think they'd murder us, but I feared being stalked and beaten. These bullies had operated without fear or consequences for years. The school allowed them to continue attending, giving them access to countless victims. The police either didn't know or chose to do nothing.

These experiences highlighted society's inability to protect children and its tolerance of bullying and violence. The lesson was clear: without consequences, aggressors thrive, leaving the vulnerable unprotected.

Let me tell you what was so utterly strange about all of this.

My school – like all schools – claimed to be a moral and educational institution.

My teachers constantly lectured me about morals, virtue, and responsibility.

However, significant evil was in their midst.

Isn't this a strange thing?

Even at the age of eleven, I felt how strange it was.

It was like a famous doctor, skilled at spotting subtle signs of illness, ignoring a giant tumor on his wife's neck.

Wouldn't this be a surreal pantomime?

Either the doctor didn't see it or had no interest in fixing it.

See the parallels?

Significant evil roamed my high school, preying on helpless children.

My teachers lectured about morals and warned against tiny bad habits like laziness and tardiness.

I had to do my homework - but they didn't have to protect me.

Our elders gave endless sermons on subtle signs of future immorality. I remember the vice principal lecturing us for an hour on the virtues of vocabulary, gifting us a thesaurus.

Our gym teacher lectured us when boys mocked a basketball video.

We received lectures about the tiny negative habits that could lead to moral disasters.

These elders were experts in all the tiny signs of potential evil!

Yet great evil walked their halls, and no one did anything about it.

They were like bloodhounds unable to sniff out the rotting bodies at their feet.

I began to realize that society was a madhouse, where elders lectured about virtue while letting evildoers prey on children.

When I was about the same age, a boy unplugged a video game I was playing, and I called him a jerk.

His older brother then chased me around the school, threatening to kill me.

He punched me on the shoulder one morning.

I told him I didn't hit his brother, but it didn't matter.

I remember sitting in my apartment, playing Taps on the harmonica, remembering the eighteen-year-old man saying, "You're *dead!*"

I never dreamt of going to a teacher or adult for help.

All the adults knew about these brutal young men, yet did nothing.

They either didn't know, didn't care, or knew and couldn't fix it.

Morally sensitive children were lectured and punished – immoral children were enabled and ignored.

Punishments were only for the good – evil was allowed to grow without repercussions.

Diet books were given to slender people – the obese got endless buffets.

I stopped believing in the virtue of society.

I didn't mind that society wasn't virtuous – I minded its hypocrisy.

I viewed a mugger as more honest than my teachers.

A mugger doesn't lecture – he just takes your money.

There is violence, but no hypocrisy.

Teachers and parents endlessly lecture about virtue, but only if you are morally sensitive.

Brutal, aggressive young people are ignored, allowed to prey on smaller children – and then those victims are lectured about being *strong*.

I thought this was a smaller problem – but as I got older, I realized no one could talk about it in society.

If no one talks about a problem, it must be either nonexistent or all-pervasive.

People rarely discuss alien abduction, but they don't tense up if the topic comes up.

But moral hypocrisy is different.

No one talks about it, and everyone gets tense when it's mentioned.

It's the biggest secret we have.

I don't know what would have happened if I'd gone to an adult for help.

Maybe the violent young men would have been dealt with, but it's unlikely.

Evildoers educate the innocent on the true nature of society.

The young men who brutalized me did so because they had learned they faced zero repercussions.

They had been bullies for at least a decade.

They knew society was impotent to deal with them.

I was being bullied for the first time, but they had ten years of experience!

They bullied because they knew society wouldn't stop them.

We work the odds, right?

I had no experience with bullies – they had ten years.

Who knew more about how society dealt with bullies?

Who had explored – tentatively at first, then with increasing confidence – how easy it was to prey on little children that society so loudly proclaims it lives to protect?

Funny story – turns out, society is lying. Children are unprotected, forced into the same buildings as their bullies, year after year, like innocent men tossed into prison!

This exact same society praises brave soldiers and courageous superheroes for standing tall and fighting evil – but then cowers before teenage bullies, feeding them their endless victims in cowardice and appeasement.

Society lectures the good and colludes with bullies.

Teachers bully with moral lectures; bullies attack with fists.

The moral lectures last a lifetime; punches hurt only briefly.

Teachers, elders, parents, and priests did more damage than punches.

I thought teachers failed to protect me from bullies; then I realized that the *bullies were trying to protect me from teachers*.

This wasn't conscious, but it was the effect.

Immediate pain protects from future pain.

Putting your hand in fire teaches you to avoid greater harm.

Bullies show that *society* is the real bully, exposing the elders' moral hypocrisy.

Bullies' attacks inoculate against hypocritical moral attacks.

Bullies say: “Those claiming to protect you serve *me*, your bully! I'm waking you up to reality; it hurts now - but would hurt more if you believed the lies of your 'superiors.'”

Physical bullies counter hypocritical moral bullying.

They try to help us, and certainly they helped *me*!

I knew a boy who bullied his single mother and got into fights.

He died in a motorcycle crash at the age of nineteen.

He went unnoticed despite his self-destruction.

Nobody noticed, cared, or believed it could be fixed.

If his immorality couldn't be fixed, why does society pretend to fix immorality?

This is like society shaming you for aging, which it cannot stop.

There are books on losing weight, not reversing time because time can't be controlled.

If society recoils from evil because it can't be fixed, why lecture about fixing it?

People talk about virtue to feel good, but *being* good doesn't feel good.

Like “champagne socialists” who claim to love the poor but avoid them, society pretends virtue.

Society is addicted to feelings of virtue but avoids actual virtue.

Feeling virtuous feels good; being virtuous often feels bad, at least short term.

Preferring to *feel* good over *being* good empowers evildoers, as threats make you back off.

Hedonism drives you to give up virtue in discomfort.

Virtue is required because it often feels bad, like dieting or exercise.

We need discipline for things we don't want to do.

I was lectured about discipline, homework, hard work, being on time, and doing the right thing—things I didn't want to do as a child.

I was lectured about virtues of difficult or unpleasant tasks, like practicing violin or memorizing times tables, by a society that enables bullies because dealing with them is difficult.

It's the darkest comedy.

Once you realize society is largely a rundown neighborhood of junkies addicted to self-righteousness, everything becomes clear and bitterly illuminated.

You see, but it burns.

You predict outcomes you don't want to come true.

You're right, and you're depressed.

You're accurate, and hate it.

As the Good Book says: "He who increases in wisdom, also increases in sorrow."

Drug addicts lie and are emotional terrorists.

If you don't comply, they increase aggression until you do.

They deny their addiction and rage at those who point out facts.

Drug addicts fear withdrawal and continue their destructive behavior.

We are surrounded by moral hypocrites, dopamine addicts who loudly proclaim virtue while betraying their values.

It's a scam, con, and a rank betrayal of the young.

## Apologizing to Children Part 1

A fork in the road exists for every soul that encounters a credible new moral argument:

Improve my life, or attack the messenger?

If I found out tomorrow that cows were highly intelligent, I would be appalled at eating them. I wouldn't condemn myself for past actions without evidence. Otherwise, I'd be paranoid about my assumptions, unable to trust my judgments.

Philosophy provides certainty through reason and evidence, not omniscience. An omniscient mind wouldn't need a methodology to distinguish truth from falsehood.

If I had publicly proclaimed cows were intelligent and deserving of rights but secretly ate them, I'd attack the messenger if exposed. Lack of knowledge is forgivable; rank hypocrisy is not.

An 18th-century doctor not prescribing antibiotics is excusable. A 21st-century doctor failing to prescribe them while claiming dedication to patients is not. Those dedicated to virtue improve with new knowledge; hypocrites attack it.

If you want to visit a friend, you're happy when he's home. If you want to rob his house, you're unhappy when he's home.

What will the world do with the moral knowledge in this book?

Many will appreciate it, avoiding the evil of terrorizing children. Others will rage against it for obvious reasons. Some will want to change, ashamed of past actions but unsure where to start.

If you believe you've wronged someone, the first step is to apologize.

If you publicly accuse an employee of stealing and video evidence proves him innocent, you should apologize.

But what does an apology mean?

The purpose of an apology is to restore trust.

If you break your arm, a doctor restores functionality. If you break trust, an apology restores it. Trust is empirical, not merely verbal.

Credibility is empirical, not only verbal.

If you want people to lose weight, don't be fat. If you want others to grow a six-pack, have a six-pack. If you want better skin, don't have a face full of pimples. If you want to promote happiness, don't be miserable.

A sophist instructs without empirical evidence of his success. It's easier to say, "Trust me, bro," than to earn trust through consistent positive behavior and measurable achievement.

In "America's Got Talent," mediocre singers would get angry at Simon Cowell, a judge, claiming they sang better than he does. Cowell never claimed to be a singer but a good judge of talent, proven by his mentoring of successful acts.

It's tragic how many successful people are lectured on success by unsuccessful people. Vanity, one of the greatest sins...

If you accuse an employee of a crime and she is innocent, you've done great harm – how do you fix that?



Apologies – actions to restore trust – require three components:

1. The apology itself, admitting fault in the same scope and context as the accusation. If the wrong was public, the apology must be public.
2. Restitution for the wrongdoing. If your employee suffers due to your accusation, offer a bonus as restitution. Restitution must be empirical, as the wrongdoing's effects were empirical. Your employee lost sleep and peace of mind, experiencing great upset.
3. A measurable commitment to prevent recurrence. If you wrong someone through excessive anger, seek therapy or anger management. If you steal due to a gambling addiction, work with a professional program.

These actions are necessary – but not sufficient – for the restoration of trust.

## Apologizing to Children Part 2

Your employee might quit after a false accusation, even if you follow all steps. That's her right. Trust is restored only after significant honourable behaviour.

There's a 7 to 1 ratio of good to bad in relationships. One bad day needs seven good days to balance it. Understanding this prevents the accumulation of bad days, which can doom the relationship.

A bad week needs 2 months of great behaviour to repair; a bad year takes seven years. A bad hour can be fixed the same day, but a bad decade is irreparable.

The 7 to 1 ratio balances extremes. Mild grumpiness differs from vicious betrayal; inattentiveness differs from verbal assault. Severity determines the time needed to restore trust.

How long does it take for a wife to trust her husband after an affair? A brief emotional affair differs from a decade-long double life. This is why people say not to go to bed angry - thus accumulating more deficits.

People end relationships when restitution becomes impossible due to severity or longevity of wrongdoing.

What does an apology look like if you've wronged your children? Apologize without excuses. An apology with "but" nullifies itself. "I'm sorry, but you provoked me!" means: "You provoked me!" Excuses are promises of repetition.

Parental excuses perpetuate inter-generationally. Saying, “I’m sorry I hit you, but I was hit as a child,” justifies the cycle of abuse. Children then excuse hitting their own kids, perpetuating the cycle due to your pride and need for an excuse.

You can't claim an excuse you formerly denied your child. If your boy hits a girl and says, “I hit her because I was hit,” would you accept that? No. You can't claim an excuse you'd deny your child. If your boy says, “But she made me angry!” would you accept that? No. Therefore, you cannot use excuses when apologizing to your children—or anyone else.

Apologies must come without footnotes or asterisks. Excuses abdicate responsibility. “I was angry because I was provoked” promises repetition. If there are no excuses for your children, there are none for you.

## Apologizing to Children Part 3

You can't expect more moral responsibility from your children than you take for yourself.

You can't suddenly condemn behaviors you've modeled for years.

If you apologize for hitting your son at the age of eight, it's irrational to tell him he must never hit anyone else and that he's fully responsible if he does.

If you hit your children when you are forty, how can you condemn them for hitting others when they are much younger?

Blaming them for youthful mistakes *when you made the same mistakes for decades* is unfair.

If you hit your children for years, they'll likely continue their aggression for some time after you reform and apologize – the blame lies with you, not them.

The captain of a supertanker must cut engines six hours before stopping – the momentum is enormous. It takes even longer to turn the ship around.

Parenting is momentum – for good or ill.

When you apologize for hitting your children, you must also apologize for lying to them.

You lied about *why* you hit them – claiming they were bad and deserved it, and that you were being a good parent.

But you were wrong. They didn't deserve it, and you were being a bad parent.

Apologizing for actions is easier than admitting motivations – but without admitting motivations, apologies mean nothing.

You might say:

“I'm sorry for hitting you, that was wrong, but it's how I was raised, and how everyone I know deals with their children. I got angry when you didn't listen. Parenting was harder than I thought. Work was crazy, your mom was sick, we were tight on money, my car broke down – it was a bad time! I'm not saying I handled it well, but there was a lot going on. I wasn't just a mean ogre. I'm telling you so you don't take it personally.”

That is crap!

Saying you didn't want to hit your children but circumstances made you do it, tells them they can expect to be hit again.

Children trapped at home with parents who hit them also experience stress, fear, and anger. Did you ever excuse their “bad” behavior because they were stressed?

No – that's why you hit them.

You're saying stress justifies bad behavior – but only for adults.

After you ‘apologize,’ you'll ask them to be good while showing them they can justify bad behavior.

You're saying they can behave badly until they're forty – as long as they find excuses.

So – *why* did you hit your children?

It's a tough question, and you might feel shame. Maybe a lot.

It's hard, but necessary.

You must accept the shame to change for the better.

## Apologizing to Children Part 4

If you tell your children that you hit them because you were hit as a child, you teach them that humans have no free will, that we are just dominoes knocked over from the beginning of time, and that you hit them for acting badly – while *knowing that children who are hit act badly!*

This is like spiking their hot chocolate with alcohol, then punishing them for being drunk.

So...

*Why did you hit your children?*

You didn't hit them in public, in front of a policeman, at parent/teacher conferences, church, or the mall. You refrained from hitting them, so external circumstances didn't cause it. Stress at work doesn't vanish in public, yet you didn't hit your children there.

Stress doesn't cause you to hit your children. Your bad childhood doesn't cause it. You didn't have a bad childhood at home but a good one at the mall. You weren't beaten as a child in the backyard but reasoned with at church.

If you ever hissed, "Just wait till we get home!" you didn't hit your children for external reasons. You hit them because you could get away with it, because you were bigger, and they were smaller and dependent.

*Why did you hit your children?*

Because you wanted to - and you could.

People who do wrong create endless complicated excuses to live with their actions. Seeing bad childhoods behind adult immorality is a logical error – "Post hoc ergo propter hoc" – "After this, therefore because of this!"

Sometimes it makes sense – people open umbrellas after it rains. But not always. People get cancer diagnoses after tests; it doesn't mean that tests cause cancer.

Bad childhoods don't justify adult immorality. Many people become *better* because of their bad childhoods. Saying that Bob became an alcoholic because his father drank doesn't explain why his brother never touched alcohol.

Saying you hit your children because your father hit you is an excuse. In fact, you have *less excuse* if you were hit because you know how much it hurts. It's like saying you don't know how painful sunburns are after experiencing them.

Those who experienced abuse have the least justification for inflicting it. It's like a torturer claiming ignorance of pain while targeting sensitive areas.

Why did you hit your children?

Because you *wanted* to – and you *could*.

The causality of a bad childhood, neglect, or the cycle of abuse is total crap. If you say being hit as a child produces evil outcomes, why did you hit your children?

If you claim you thought hitting was right, who can disprove you? If an adult hits a child for carelessness, and the child hits another for the same, the adult punishes the child again. It's the same moral rule.

You must be *honest* about why you hit your children if you want to regain their trust.

You should say: "I'm incredibly sorry I hit you. It was wrong, and I have no excuse. I did it because I was bigger and knew I could get away with it. Hitting you made me feel stronger. It was pathetic. I taught you wrong things, like using violence against smaller, helpless people. I lied about why I hit you. You weren't bad – I was. The worst was not just hitting you but saying I did it because you were bad. I put thoughts in your head that are hard to get rid of. It's all on me."

Do you have the strength for that kind of speech?

Because that is what's needed.

You only get one shot. If you violate the moral standards you inflicted on your children while apologizing, they will never trust you again. They may pretend, laugh, and joke, but they won't *trust* you.

If you punished your children for dishonesty - and are then dishonest in your apology, you'll never escape your corruption. Honesty requires rejecting manipulation.

If you falsely employees of a crime and then "apologize" while asserting they *were* acting suspiciously, they will quit if they have any integrity.

If you punished your children, denying excuses for their actions, and then claim excuses for your punitive immorality, you are lost.

Sometimes life comes down to one shot, one moment, one speech.

Don't screw it up.

## Restitution

Assuming you are honest in your apology, the next step is restitution.

Remember the 7 to 1 rule. Maybe, given the strength of the child/parent bond, we can reduce this to a 3 to 1 rule. If you hit your children for a year, it will take three years to repair the damage. Ten years of abuse requires thirty years of positive interactions to overcome.

Restitution is the act of making whole the injuries you have inflicted. It is defined by the victim, not the perpetrator. If you ding someone's car, pay for repairs, and give them free dinner, they are not happy it happened, but not unhappy either.

What does it take to achieve restitution with your children? What would it take for your children to be okay with being hit, yelled at, and insulted for years? Child abuse shapes the personality and brain. How much money would you take to give up twenty years of your lifespan? Child abuse can take twenty years away from people's lives, producing addiction, criminality, ill health, and an early death.

It destroys what you *could* have been...

If you hurt your children, they deserve an apology. Maybe this will fix the relationship, maybe it won't. But we don't judge the morality of an action by its consequences. We don't say we can't end slavery because society will have no way to produce food and cotton. Do the right thing, though the skies fall!

After you apologize, you make restitution, as best you can. Then you do everything – absolutely *everything* – in your power to show you will never do evil again. Go to therapy, study moral philosophy, take anger management courses, reject and abandon evil people in your life. Do everything necessary to prevent the return of evil into your heart and hands.

Use workbooks by psychologists to get to the root of your motivations. Talk to your parents, examine your childhood, trace the growth of your immorality, confront yourself, challenging the devils that live in each of us. Weep, wail, gnash your teeth, confront the heart you blackened with badness, overthrow the devil you grew, and throw your broken soul into the arms of the angels.

Surrender your twisted will, excuses, manipulations, and hypocrisies to the shining standards of universal virtue. Obey what is good and right, not your base animal hedonism. Serve

righteousness, morality, virtue – God. Stop making excuses, and start making progress. Stop lying for immediate benefit, and start telling the truth for long-term happiness. Give your children freedom by taking responsibility for everything you have done – and everything you failed to do. Find your soul – and save it. Graduate from self-righteousness to righteousness, the service of virtue, rather than your own ego and vanity. Drop the need to feel right, and pursue the glory of being good.

Perhaps you make it, perhaps you don't. Perhaps it's too late – perhaps it isn't. But if you finally and honorably live the values you have always claimed – that you would do anything for your children – the world will become inestimably better.

Think of all the great souls who have dragged humanity up the thorny cliff-sides of virtue. Think of all the freedoms and opportunities you possess because of their sacrifices. It is better to add to the honor of the species than to exploit the sacrifices of your ancestors. We will all be gone soon enough – the purpose is to be good before we go! Add to the truth of the world, not the hypocrisy that serves only your vanity. Talk to your children – apologize, make restitution – and be better. Morality is empirical, not verbal. Virtue is for living, not talking. If you are not doing good, you are not good.

Stop reading, go act.

## Child Abuse and Power Part 1

The purpose of moral education is to make people want to be good. But why should we be good? Fear and desire are powerful motivators. A young man wants to ask out girls but fears rejection. Fear of failure shadows the drive to succeed.

Philosophers rarely discuss the ethics of child abuse and peaceful parenting. A few advocate reasoning with children and non-coercive punishment, but this hasn't solved aggressive parenting. Why not?

If actions are judged by outcomes, that's utilitarianism. What's wrong with that? Everything. A theft is positive for the thief. A rapist sees assault as positive. Regret and remorse don't undo crimes. Even if a murderous wife confesses, her husband remains dead.

Saying we should be nice to children for positive outcomes ignores the fact that many people are nasty to children for their *own* benefits. Thieves take more from the economy than they gain. Property owners spend more to protect goods than the value stolen.

If stealing and violence were purely negative, they wouldn't happen. Bad things happen because they feel good to bad people. "You'll feel better if you don't hit your children, and your relationship will improve." Nonsense. Does that work?

You're asking cruel people to empathize with their children – and their future selves. But - if they could empathize, they wouldn't be cruel!

Modern calls for better parenting appeal to the conscience of those without a conscience. It's like saying only Japan has bad parenting, then not publishing parenting books in Japanese. Madness, right? Diet books for thin people. "How to Quit Smoking!" for non-smokers.

How do you get people without a conscience to act better? If you don't have a conscience, you only fear *consequences*. If you have a conscience, you fear having a bad conscience. Without a conscience, you don't feel bad about any crime you can get away with. Jails exist for people without a conscience.

If you could steal a million dollars without getting caught, would you? Would you murder someone you hated if you knew you'd get off scot-free? Would you cheat on your spouse if you knew you wouldn't get caught?

Do you refrain from crime out of love for virtue, fear of your conscience, or fear of consequences?

Clearly, abusive parents don't love virtue or fear their conscience. They may have moments of unease – even regret – but these flash by like trees past a midnight train window.

Do child abusers fear consequences? It doesn't seem so – certainly not enough to change their course.

Do you understand why child abuse hasn't stopped?

There are no *consequences*.

## Child Abuse and Power Part 2

Parents who read parenting books want to improve.

How do we stop bad parents from abusing their children?



They abuse because they can't defer gratification – they get angry, lash out, and feel better. There are no negative consequences.

You likely collude with abusers. You are an abuse excuser.

Do you doubt me?

Have you ever advised an adult survivor of child abuse to forgive, reconcile, be the bigger person?

Have you made excuses for abusive parents? “They did their best, meant well, were raised that way...”

Imagine a friend confiding about childhood abuse and wanting to take a break from unrepentant parents.

What would you say? More importantly, how would you *feel*?

You'd probably feel anxious, tense – and ease your anxiety by telling your friend to forgive, not be judgmental, be the bigger person, and avoid endless regret.

Sadly, most of us are foot soldiers in the war against children. We collude with brutalizers.

It's like inviting an unjustly persecuted man in, giving him coffee, then calling the secret police.

We send adults escaping abuse back to their abusers and curse them if they refuse to return. We perpetuate the cycle.

We betray principles, children, virtue – and ourselves.

We complain the world is immoral, while colluding with evildoers.

What will you do when a friend reveals abuse?

Will you stand up for what is right, have sympathy, or send them back?

The future depends on your decision.

So...

How do we stop people from abusing their children?

*Consequences.*

If society promotes escaping abusive relationships, abusers will restrain their abuses out of fear of losing touch with their victims.

Society runs on virtue, violence, or ostracism.

Ostracism – shunning evildoers who refuse to apologize and make restitution – is the only consequence that can reform them, or at least protect their victims.

Ads once warned against drunk driving and smoking, showing horrible consequences...

Frighten people with the consequences of their actions, and you will change minds.

Children are threatened with losing a year of their lives if they fail school. People are fined for speeding. If you don't pay taxes, you go to jail.

Unpopular or offensive arguments on social media lead to bans, doxxing, firing – losing access to bank accounts, the right to fly or rent a car. Reputations and incomes are lost – vicious punishments for *words*, not *deeds*!

We don't avoid judging abusive parents because we hate being judgmental. The mob eagerly destroys lives over words and ideas.

Yet abusive parents somehow escape this mob.

The mob sees itself as a moral force, destroying lives for wrong words and ideas.

A parent viciously beats a helpless boy? Say nothing! The mob is silent.

Moralists who attack evildoers ignore abusive parents, instead raging at those with unpopular arguments.

The “moral mob” can't be taken seriously. They are attack dogs for rulers, with no more morality than a pack of jackals.

Do you see the hypocrisy?

In modern “morality,” abusing a child is excused and forgiven – but quoting inconvenient facts or making unpopular arguments is unforgivable and must be punished.

This is the world we live in, created by abusers, supported by betraying child abuse victims.

We won't survive much longer if we don't *stop*.

## Child Abuse and Power Part 3

If evil people should never face consequences, let's make that a principle for society.

No punishments, no attacks, no consequences – no police, courts, jails – no enforcement of laws – no failing children in school – no cancel culture.

Oh wait, you don't want *that* world?

You think bad people *should* face consequences? Evildoers *should* be punished?

Then why excuse abusive parents?

If your friend's husband beat her for a decade, would you tell her to forgive, go back, and love him?

Of course not.

But if her parents beat her as a child for ten years, you'd tell her to forgive, forget, and move on.

You see the hypocrisy?

The abusive husband she chose is *evil*, and she must escape him!

The abusive parents she never chose – who abused her when she was helpless – well, she's bad for even bringing it up! She must *never* escape – that would be wrong and selfish!

And you'll curse her if she thinks of escaping – “You must forgive and reconcile, or you'll *regret it!*”

It's unthinkable for a wife to stay with an abusive husband – it's unthinkable for an adult child to escape abusive parents!

It's good to escape the abuser you chose – it's evil to escape the abuser inflicted by nature.

It's all too revolting for words.

## Peaceful Parenting and Reconciliation Part 1

Those society deems immoral are attacked and ostracized. If you're labeled a “racist,” “misogynist,” or have a “something-phobia,” almost no one engages with you reasonably. Instead, you are destroyed and cast out.

There's significant anger towards unjust authority, which channels this anger against anyone who questions it. People, angry from childhood abuses but too frightened to confront their abusers, are easily manipulated against dissenters.

This cycle repeats; my book is a plea to break it. You know evildoers in your life. Are they to be cured or cast out? The stakes are incredibly high.

Evildoers gain power by provoking needs in others and then denying them. A kidnapper denies freedom; a rapist exploits his victim's revulsion; abusive parents neglect their children's need for love to feel powerful.

How does it work out for people to *need* things from evildoers?

Badly.

Provoke a need, refuse to satisfy it – that's immorality's *modus operandi*.

If you need evildoers to give up their immorality, they gain power by refusing.

Should we appeal to their conscience? If they had one, they'd already be horrified, already be seeking improvement. How often do abusive spouses reform without external pressure like a court order or their partner leaving?

How many abusive parents would read a book titled “Peaceful Parenting”? Few. How many feminists would read “You Too Can Learn to Love the Patriarchy!”? How many socialists read Ludwig von Mises? Such reforms rarely happen.

95% of people trying to lose weight fail to keep it off, often gaining more. The diet industry thrives on the myth of permanent weight loss. Despite immediate benefits like better health and praise, only one in twenty succeed long-term, often aided by surgery or health scares.

Is losing weight easier than confronting your own evil actions? Is it easier to keep weight off than shift from a life of harm to virtue? We all know the answer.

I've exercised regularly for over forty years. Every New Year, gyms fill with people making resolutions. Within weeks, the crowd thins. Home exercise equipment, bought in fits of panic, ends up gathering dust.

Few keep their New Year's resolutions or avoid dysfunctional relationships despite knowing the red flags. Most fail to reform bad habits, even when only suffering themselves, encouraged to change, and enjoying quick benefits.

Dieting is simple: eat less and exercise more. Quitting drinking: don't pick up alcohol. The emotions are difficult because people aren't addicted to substances but to relationships.

## Peaceful Parenting and Reconciliation Part 2

An obese person is not primarily addicted to food but to the family and social circles that enabled her obesity. Losing weight becomes a massive criticism of every one of those relationships. Most people became overweight as children, under their parents' control of diet and exercise. Can you lose weight without criticizing your parents? Of course not. Obesity signifies compliance to dysfunctional relationships. Fat children are sabotaged by their parents—losing weight uncovers that sabotage.

Everyone has seen a fat family in a restaurant encouraging overweight children to eat more. Eating less offends your dysfunctional parents. If a teenage girl with unattractive friends loses weight, exercises, and gets a great haircut, her friends react negatively, calling her vain and shallow. It's a psychological force of nature.

If you improve your parenting around those who don't, what happens? You face inevitable attacks—direct or indirect—from aggressive parents.

You seek parental approval, while your abusive parents need you to stop your peaceful parenting.

Have your parents generally gotten their way throughout your life? Most likely, since compliance ensures survival. Decades of compliance don't just *end*.

Consider language fluency: if you're fluent in Japanese, you won't suddenly stop understanding it. Similarly, decades of parental compliance persist, even after their death—their voices and arguments linger in your mind, commanding your obedience. A famous psychiatrist reported that all his suicidal patients heard their parents' voices urging them to die.

Can decades of evil against the innocent be cured? Can criminals grow a conscience? Studies show high recidivism rates: thieves steal again, pedophiles reoffend, and rapists leave prison still thirsting to rape. Empathy requires early brain wiring, and if missed, it's irreparable. Early language deficiencies lead to lifelong deficits. Extreme trauma or repeated evil actions erode the "observing ego," the mind's moral compass. Evil justifies itself and cannot be reformed.

How often do abusive parents apologize to their grown children? Rarely, if ever.

If a disease is incurable, we have to focus on prevention. Ignoring prevention to attempt curing the incurable signals a preference for the disease—you become part of the problem. I urge future parents to reject violent parenting and create peaceful homes. Past abusers are irrelevant; prevention is crucial as cure is impossible.

When I was a child, I constantly heard that men are chauvinistic pigs and oppressive. Did that make boys feel good? No. Should society hide the link between smoking and lung cancer to spare smokers' feelings?

I'm not calling all parents evil. I'm a stay-at-home parent for 15 years. My focus is on specific immoral actions detailed in this book.

## Peaceful Parenting and Reconciliation Part 3

So – if your parents were abusive for decades, can they reform?

I don't know, and I wouldn't bet on it, but so what?

I recommend seeing a therapist before talking to parents about past abuses, as it's grueling. If physically safe, confront those who wronged you.

Tell your parents what happened, how it affected you, and what you want next. This is like an intervention for addictive behavior – informing the addict of the harm caused, demanding help, and warning of ostracism if they continue.

If your parents are addicted to power and abuse – stage an intervention! A one-time event, often managed by a therapist. Bring your parents into a counseling session: "Here's how you hurt me; do better, or I'm ending the relationship – decide now, I'm only doing this once!"

Sensible, natural, and accepted in addiction practices.

Doctor Phil has this to say on the subject:

The emotional wounds caused by parental abuse can last long beyond childhood. If you want to rebuild a relationship with your parent now that you are both adults, Dr. Phil has some advice.

### **Be heard**

You won't be able to repair the relationship until your parent fully understands how the abuse has affected you. He or she may feel guilty, but you're the one who needs to be helped.

### **Redefine the relationship**

It's up to you to express yourself. Tell your parent what you need now that you're not getting. Be honest and clear; this is your chance to say exactly what you need emotionally.

Nothing can change the past, but you can create a new history with your parent. Treat each other as the people you are now.

### **Do what is best for you**

Consider the possibility that it may not be healthy to have any sort of relationship with your parent. It's a difficult pill to swallow, and it should be used as the last option. However, it may be the option that helps you the most.

Being honest – talk to them about what happened, how it affected you, and what you need going forward. Have a conversation, then end it. See what they do.

Personally, I have a twenty-four hour rule for apologies – if I don't get one within twenty-four hours, I know it will never come.

When people feel wrong, they either admit fault or redefine the issue in order to feel right, making you seem wrong and unjustly critical.

Without philosophy, people can convince themselves of anything. If twenty-four hours pass without an apology, they've convinced themselves they're right and you're wrong. It's simple - and accurate.

Certainty saves time. Fishing in a lake and catching nothing is frustrating, but being warned there are no fish saves a whole day. Facts conserve resources and time.

Talk to your parents – that's my advice. If they listen and reform, fantastic – they're rare! If not, they'll continue to abuse you, and you can make a sensible choice with that knowledge.

## Defining the Cycle of Abuse Part 1

To build a new house, you need to clear what came before.

To reshape your choices in the image of virtue, you need moral clarity.

Why does the cycle of abuse repeat?

Avoid inevitability when asking why something happens in the human mind.

Why do victims of child abuse become more aggressive, promiscuous?

Human behavior evolves.

Life, especially human life, is shaped by survival and reproduction.

Women raised by violent men choose violent husbands.

Animals can't evolve in a single generation – humans can.

Some tribes in high altitudes have adapted to lower oxygen. Caucasians developed lighter skin to better absorb vitamin D. All blue-eyed people share one ancestor with a mutant gene.

People who hit their children justify it as moral – necessary, virtuous.

For them, hitting children is *good* – refraining is *bad*.

Can you perform an action you define as immoral? Yes – but you don't brag about it.



A man who cheats knows it's wrong – but does it anyway. Thieves rarely defend their actions – but do it anyway.

A murderer doesn't define killing as good – he might claim morality doesn't apply to him but won't defend his actions.

The cycle of violence is the cycle of justification.

If your parents hit you because they say you are bad – and you believe them – then you believe children who act badly must be hit. It's good because it trains them out of their “badness.”

Children are believed to be born selfish and irresponsible – and the only way to save them is through strict discipline.

It is not a cycle of *abuse*. It is a cycle of *justification*.

Why do many women abandon their children in order to go to work? Because they don't define it as “abandoning their children.”

They say they are strong, independent women, modeling workplace empowerment – becoming better mothers by not feeling bored and isolated.

It's *good* for the children, don't you see?

If anyone talks about privatizing education – making it responsive – he is accused of not wanting children educated!

Apparently only the *government* can educate children – so if it doesn't, children grow up illiterate.

“Government education” is reframed as “education” – so if you don't want the government to educate children, you don't want them educated *at all*!

It's amazing.

The same arguments were used to oppose ending slavery – if you wanted to end slavery, you wanted crops to rot in the field!

The more things change, the more they remain the same.

Humanity is still short of learning a few basic principles.

Do you see the pattern?

## Defining the Cycle of Abuse Part 2

If I say: “Don’t discipline your children by hitting them!” – what do people hear?

They hear: “Don’t discipline your children!”

When I say: “Don’t try to improve your children by yelling at them!”

They hear: “Don’t try to improve your children.”

When I say: “Your children are not born bad...”

They hear: “Your children are not born bad.”

Because they weren’t.

I wasn’t.

You weren’t.

If your parents hit you, *they* were bad – not you.

How do you feel about that?

Anxious, I bet!

Understandable.

I sympathize.

If one man shoots another, it’s either murder or self-defense.

*Someone* is wrong.

It was either you or your parents.

We feel uncomfortable doing that.

But – so what?

It feels weird to fly.

It feels odd to see someone far away.

But we've adapted.

It is strange to get ice in the summer.

Don't tell me we can't adapt!

Justification occurs when you internalize your parent's perspective.

In their view, your badness comes first – their punishment came afterwards.

A policeman who locks up a thief is not an abuser – and your parents who punish you are not abusive.

They are *good* – because you were bad, and punishment was moral!

A doctor who performs an emergency tracheotomy is not randomly stabbing someone – he is saving a life!

The woman is choking – cutting her neck open is the only way to save her!

It is easy to believe this causality because cause and effect are lost in early memories – and because we are constantly told we are punished because we are bad.

You get humiliated by a teacher because you did not do your homework.

You stay for detention because you were talking in class.

You fail a class because you did not pass the exam.

You did something wrong, and then you were punished.

This is how we were raised.

It's incontrovertible.

Also – it is utterly false.

It is a lie destroying the world.

You were *not* punished because you were “bad.”

You were called “bad” so you could be punished.

## Defining the Cycle of Abuse Part 3

You weren’t humiliated for not doing homework.

Homework is assigned to humiliate students.

Don’t believe me?

It’s easy to prove.

Homework provides little educational benefit.

So, what’s it for?

To humiliate students who refuse to do it.

This teaches the class to obey authority without question.

Homework punishes disobedience.

It teaches fear, subjugation, and compliance.

That’s its purpose.

If education aimed to improve knowledge, it would test the value of homework and drop it when it failed.

But it’s even *more* sinister!

Homework punishes those *most likely to change the system*.

Who *doesn’t* do homework?

Victims of abuse and chaos.

Who *does*?

Comfortable middle-class kids with involved parents.

Who else doesn't?

Kids needing jobs to survive.

Who else?

Kids who find it useless and boring.

Kids with an accurate view of homework.

Children who see homework as useless busywork.

How do those in power view these rebels?

As enemies to destroy.

And destroy them they do.

Or at least try.

You weren't punished for failing homework.

Homework exists so kids can be punished.

This is *everywhere* in childhood...

You weren't hit for being bad.

Your "badness" was invented so you could be hit.

The evidence was planted, witnesses paid off, the judge bribed – the fix was in, the verdict preordained, the kangaroo court eternally in session.

## Defining the Cycle of Abuse Part 4

How do I know you were not hit because you were bad?

Brace yourself.

I can prove it easily.

You were hit to prevent becoming *more* bad, right? To stop you from becoming a *really bad person*?

But - if hitting children prevented badness, *why do they grow up to hit their children?*

Violence is among the worst immoralities, and children are hit to stop them from becoming violent. Yet, parents who hit their children are perpetuating violence.

Syllogistically:

1. Violence is the worst immorality.
2. Children must be hit to avoid immorality.
3. Hitting children is the most prevalent violence.
4. Therefore, hitting children doesn't prevent violence.

Some argue hitting prevents children from becoming rapists and murderers.

Let's examine the childhoods of violent criminals. Almost all were hit as children.

The argument then shifts: criminals were hit too much or too often, in the wrong way or with the wrong motives. Hitting must be just right, like eating. Too little or too much is dangerous.

Thus, hitting children is very complicated! Parents must have studied corporal punishment in great depth to hit just right.

But if they researched properly, they'd find arguments *against* hitting children.

Parents say that *instinct* guides them - but this doesn't solve the problem.

The theory says hitting must be just right to avoid disaster, not just a matter of instinct.

Parents who hit children claim to administer a dangerous medicine at *just the right dose!*

Do they read the directions, like with real medicine? Of course, because hitting children requires delicate balance to avoid disaster.

Parents who say they hit correctly because *they* were hit correctly are like those who give their children outdated medicines.

How do you know the right dose? Times have changed. Medicines used to contain opiates, cocaine, marijuana. Would responsible parents give these to their children now?

Of course not! We must update our research.

Research shows spanking has negative effects. It harms children and is unnecessary.

Parents hit to teach consequences - but hitting children is itself *not considering consequences!*

Parents who spank fail to research the consequences of hitting while demanding that their children *always consider consequences*.

The parent hits the child not to improve them because it didn't improve the parent.

Hitting is not about teaching consequences, because parents haven't considered the consequences of spanking.

The mother hits because she was hit, claiming to know the right dose from her childhood experiences, not from adult research. She uses her childhood instincts to punish her children's instincts.

Childhood instincts are both good and bad, supposedly...

If she claims adult responsibility for spanking, she must research it – thus encountering arguments against spanking.

She uses her childhood instincts to punish her children's instincts.

Every hit child knows sometimes parents hit, and sometimes they don't – even under the same circumstances.

If a parent's mood determines punishment, it's corrupt.

If a judge freed criminals when happy but jailed them when upset, we'd jail the judge!

If you escape punishment when "bad" because the parent is in a good mood, you're not punished for being bad.

You're punished because your parent is in a bad mood.

Your "badness" is invented so your parents can punish you, in order to feel better.

Moreover, the inconsistency of punishment based on a parent's mood teaches children that their behavior isn't the real issue—it's the parent's emotional state. This arbitrary and unfair system only fosters resentment and confusion, undermining any moral lessons intended by the punishment.

In summary, the practice of hitting children is fraught with logical and ethical contradictions. It fails to achieve its stated goals and instead perpetuates harm and hypocrisy. The solution lies not in physically punishing children but in understanding and guiding them with empathy and reason.

## Defining the Cycle of Abuse Part 5

Let me ask you something.

If you sympathize with a homeless man, do you wait until no one is around to give him money?

Of course not.

Does a woman with a perfect figure wear baggy clothing to hide it?

Not often!

Hitting children is a good deed, apparently—so why do parents hide it?

Yelling insults at children is the best way to teach them—so why do parents wait until they are home to do it in secret?

Why *hide* their good deeds?

That would be like me yelling at my daughter in public and negotiating peacefully at home.

I advocate for peaceful parenting—so I parent peacefully in public too!

When people say how fun and charming my daughter is, I explain our no-punishment policy.

I spread the message of peaceful parenting publicly.

I don't do the opposite in private, because I am proud of my parenting!



My daughter has to live in the future world, so the more children who are parented peacefully, the better her world will be.

It would be cruel to my daughter to be aggressive in public and peaceful in private!

Imagine if I wrote a book advocating spanking and yelling while parenting peacefully at home!

Wouldn't that be insane?

How can something be good in one place but bad in another?

That is moral relativism - formalized hypocrisy.

I am a peaceful parent everywhere I go—proudly, loudly!

So—why are aggressive parents peaceful in public but violent in private?

It doesn't make sense!

Why hide their virtues from the world?

They say hitting children is essential for a moral world—but don't hit their own children in public!

It's incomprehensible!

Children know this, deep down.

Their parents say spanking is good but almost never spank in public.

Imagine a lifeguard who stood by and watched a child die.

“Why didn't you do anything?” you demand.

“Oh,” the lifeguard smiles. “I decided not to rescue him because people were *watching!*”

Would that make sense?

Saving a child from drowning is *good*, right?

Why wouldn't the lifeguard do a good deed because people are around?

More importantly—why take money for a job you don't plan to do?

Would you fire that lifeguard if he worked for you?

It's interesting, right?

If aggressing against children is moral and good, why don't you see it in public?

I can count on one hand the times I've seen a parent aggress against their child in public.

If you were hit because you were bad, why weren't you hit in public?

This question breaks the equation.

If you were hit because you were bad, you'd be hit in public.

So—why *weren't* you hit in public?

Ah—because hitting you in public would make your *parent* feel bad!

There would be negative consequences!

Someone might intervene, she'd get dirty looks, she'd feel humiliated, embarrassed, judged.

Interesting, right?

## Defining the Cycle of Abuse Part 6

Your parents didn't hit you in public because it didn't serve their immediate self-interest.

They refused to do the right thing because they don't feel like it.

But - isn't that what you were hit for?

You were hit for putting immediate self-interest above moral principles and long-term positive consequences.

But your parents did the same by *not* hitting you in public!

Punishment should happen close to the misdeed – waiting until later is punishing badly, which is *wrong*.

Punishing a three-year-old days later is wrong because he can't associate the action with the punishment.

But your parents deferred punishment *all the time!*

They might say they punish privately to avoid public humiliation, but why humiliate at home?

You were not punished because you were bad.

You were punished to make your parents feel better.

They invent your “badness” to justify hurting you.

This way they hurt you twice – by punishing you and implanting the permanent ghost of your “badness.”

It’s a terrible lie – and if you continue to believe it, the cycle of violence will continue.

## Breaking the Cycle of Abuse

So - how do we break the cycle of abuse?

Moral clarity is all we need.

The cycle of abuse:

- A child is told he is bad.
- The child is hit for being “bad.”
- The child internalizes this “badness” to preserve the parental bond and his own survival.
- “Badness” means “disobeying.”
- Disobeying parents is bad and must be punished.
- The child grows up, and his own children disobey him.
- Disobeying parents is bad and must be punished.
- The next generation is hit.

To break the cycle, violent parents must be judged as bad. There is no other option.

We either judge our parents justly, or punish our children unjustly. Without moral clarity, we repeat historical evils.

If you refuse to judge your parents, you will become them. Whatever we justify, we repeat.

Condemn child abuse, and you will never abuse a child. Justify abuse, and you will become an abuser.

It's uncomfortable, but so what?

When low on cash, did you ever seriously consider robbing a bank or a stranger?

No, because stealing wasn't an option!

It's the same with parenting. Hitting and yelling is not an option – so you will find another way!

Put “hitting your child” on the same moral level as “robbing a gas station.” With evil on the table, you get a bitter meal. Take evil off the table, and you get an infinite buffet.

Possibility.

Choice.

Virtue.

Heroes overcome obstacles to do the right thing. You don't need to fight a super villain – just apply universal moral judgments to your own parents.

You won't die or get hurt. You might be attacked emotionally or ostracized. So what?

Everything we have is the result of past sacrifices. Stop taking – and join us!

This is the ultimate heroism. Stop reading about heroes. Stop living courage vicariously.

Step into the suit.

March with us.

Save the world.

## The Effects of Child Abuse over the Lifespan

In this book, I have discussed the physical and psychological effects of child abuse.

I stated that if the world is hell, it is because of childhood.

I write for my own child – to help her grow up in a more sane, peaceful world.

Families are traditionally insular, making it rude to criticize parents.

However, children are raised to be released into the world.

If you mistreat your dog, it can threaten my family.

We all have a stake in peaceful parenting.

We all live among the products of parenting.

Abused children are often divisive, manipulative, violent, and disruptive.

They are more likely to commit crimes, get addicted, ruin their health, or withhold societal contributions.

Even if they become basement ghosts addicted to digital distractions, it's our collective loss.

Child abuse has cost us brilliant art and inventions.

Abusive parents destroy love and connection.

We must be cautious in cities because abused children often become predators.

Morally, no parent has the right to be abusive.

Practically, we must oppose child abuse because we live among those raised by parents.

Humanity thrives with strength, empathy, and moral clarity.

Strength promotes virtue and opposes evil – empathy identifies who can be saved and who must be ostracized – moral clarity ensures we understand virtue and how to oppose evil.

## Neglect

The severity of child abuse can be ranked from most to least serious:

1. Sexual abuse
2. Neglect
3. Verbal abuse
4. Physical abuse

The effects of sexual abuse are so egregious that sympathy for murdered pedophiles is rare.

Verbal abuse twists children's personalities. It labels them lazy, stupid, clumsy, useless, ugly, hateful, bad – labels that do not heal without intervention. An adult who heals can never return to their original self.

Accidental injury doesn't harm a child's soul or mind. Physical injury, like falling off a bike, is essential for development, teaching risk management. Movement risks injury; inactivity guarantees degeneration.

If we move, we could get hurt; if we don't, we will for sure.

Imagine a father who beats his daughter but says she's done nothing wrong – he's just angry from work. She's hurt but doesn't internalize self-blame. Usually, parents hit children after verbal abuse, whipping themselves into a frenzy first.

It's essential to separate emotional damage from physical injury. The body heals on its own; the mind does not. A broken mind is like a poorly set broken bone.

If your arm doesn't set properly, it needs re-breaking and fixing. The goal is to return it to 100% functionality.

Emotional abuse reshapes the brain, changing neural pathways and affecting the hippocampus and amygdala. This requires significant intervention – a re-traumatization – to repair.

The body heals on its own; physical trauma is essential to growing up. The brain internalizes abusive judgments, replacing the child's authentic identity.

Verbal abuse is worse than physical abuse.

Now – why is neglect worse than verbal abuse?

A great question...

## The Effects of Neglect Part 1

Which is more traumatic – verbal and physical abuse, or neglect?

We can answer this question philosophically, empirically, or morally. The result is the same.

Children often "act out" – behaving in ways that elicit an abusive response from their parents. A teenage boy might provoke an aggressive father, anticipating a blowup. Similarly, a child commanded not to push over a plant might deviously do it, knowing it will provoke a reaction.

Why do children act in ways that invite hostility? Evolution offers an answer. For children, the greatest danger is being ignored by their parents. Without parental attention and care, a child is almost certain to die. To secure protection, a child must feel they provide value to their parents.

If parents love their child and show it, the child can rest easy. But how does a child provide value to parents who dislike them? Think about someone helping build a house without construction skills; they can help by taking away the trash. Similarly, a child can provide value to aggressive parents by being a punching bag. Reducing a negative is the only value they can offer.

Imagine trying to sell a car that no one wants to buy. When someone offers to tow it away for free, they provide value by reducing your disposal costs. Similarly, a child enduring abuse provides value by absorbing their parents' aggression, making the parents feel better.

Genes prioritize survival over happiness. If survival means enduring beatings, the child will do it, in order to reach adulthood, and reproduce. Children who didn't provoke and endure beatings didn't survive.

Sometimes, a doctor can't cure you but can significantly reduce your pain. Anesthesiologists earn high salaries because they prevent agony, adding great value. Similarly, children provoking abuse can provide value to their parents, ensuring their survival.

Broken and bruised, these children rest in the twisted security that their abusive parents need them. Shattered in mind, soul, and spirit – but still intact in body – they likely reach adulthood and reproduce. Evolution wins, at a grim cost.

Neglect is worse than emotional and physical abuse because children frequently provoke abuse to maintain parental attention. Empirically, children show neglect is more harmful than abuse. Why? Because negative attention ensures survival, while no attention leads to death.

Neglect is more traumatic than abuse. Children, driven by evolutionary imperatives, prefer the trauma of abuse to the fatal threat of neglect, securing any parental attention necessary for survival.

## The Effects of Neglect Part 2

If parents find no value in us, we won't reach adulthood. Even if we do, lacking essential social skills makes finding a mate and reproducing unlikely.

Consider your old car for sale. People look it over, deem it worthless, and leave. Do you stop them? No.

Now, if someone offers to tow it free, saving you \$500, and starts to walk away, you call them back. You value them for reducing your towing costs.

You care about those who provide value—either by paying for the car or saving money on towing. Those who offer neither, you let wander off.

Neglect happens when parents let you wander off because they don't care. Abuse happens when they call you back in order to hit you.

If neglected, you will likely die. If abused, you will likely live. Choose abuse over neglect. Emotions program you to risk abuse over certain death from neglect. This pattern persists into adulthood.

Animals stick together, even under abuse. Ducks stay in flocks despite assaults. Abuse is better than neglect. A bad crowd is better than being alone and vulnerable. Ducklings follow their mother, staying with the flock.

Isolation is death—abuse is life.

## The Effects of Neglect

In the past, neglected children generally died – now, they seek social skills online.

Neglected children rarely form in-person social groups. Online, they gather and reinforce their worst habits.

Neglect causes constant stress in children, making them hypervigilant. The humiliation of neglect leads to isolation or extreme extroversion to hide their lack of self-worth.



Loneliness from neglect is a severe health hazard, comparable to smoking half a pack of cigarettes a day.

Recent studies found:

- Social isolation increases the risk of premature death similar to smoking, obesity, and physical inactivity.
- Social isolation raises dementia risk by 50%.
- Isolation increases heart disease risk by 29% and stroke risk by 32%.
- Loneliness correlates with higher rates of depression, anxiety, and suicide.
- Heart failure patients facing loneliness have 4-times higher death risk, 68% higher hospitalization risk, and 57% higher emergency visits.

We are wired to be social. Aristotle said only beasts or gods can live alone.

Our bodies are part of a larger whole – a village raises children; a tribe protects individuals.

Neglecting children is like poisoning them. The stress of neglect is worse than abuse since abusers often protect their children to continue their harmful behavior.

How would we feel about a parent forcing a child to smoke half a pack of cigarettes daily?

Neglect is just as appalling.

We crave social contact more than anything except food and drink. More than sex, as social contact is a prerequisite for that!

Trapping and neglecting a child is like a kidnapping followed by a poisoning.

Our thirst for social contact is immense. Teenagers join bad crowds to belong. Women risk dangers for company. Billions drink and do drugs for social lives. Elderly women invent ailments to talk to doctors.

As isolation rises, mental illness soars.

Sanity requires community.

Veterans nostalgically recall the companionship of their combat years. Fraternity pledges endure tough initiations for tribal approval.

A friend of mine endured vomiting and humiliation just to join a fraternity and gain friends.

This isn't a moral review, just empirical facts.

Long-married couples often die close together. Without companions, life loses meaning.

Hysterical pet ownership, like older single women with many cats, shows our need for contact.

We cannot survive solitude.

Children cannot find their own companions. Isolation cripples social skills and creates hostile home environments.

Seal them in their rooms and watch them rot!

## Sadism and Neglect Part 1

There is significant cruelty in neglect.

In most countries, it's legal to give up your children if you don't want them. You can drop them off at a police station, fire station, or hospital, and they will be taken care of.

If you get a dog and hate having it, why keep it? It doesn't make sense – unless you are a sadist.

We all want to feel needed and loved. How do you feel needed if you refuse to provide value? Movie stars and beautiful people are in high demand because they provide value.

But how do you feel needed if you don't provide value?

You trap someone, and withhold what she needs. An ugly man can kidnap a beautiful woman, making her need him for safety, freedom, food, water, or medical care.

Why do parents have children and then neglect them?

To feel needed. It's a sadistic pleasure. If you feel powerless at work, you can dangle a leash in front of your dog but refuse to take him for a walk. You have power over him by withholding what he needs. When you take your dog for a walk, he now has power over *you* because you're doing what *he* wants.

Neglectful parents occasionally have fun with their children, in order to keep their hunger for them alive - and also to blame the subsequent lack of interaction on the children being 'difficult.'

Neglect is about feeling needed while only occasionally satisfying that want in order to keep the need alive.

Bullying toddlers because they desperately need interaction – how brave and noble!

Some people provoke others to craziness while remaining calm. That's called *passive aggression*.

Parents provoke and ignore their toddlers, then get calm when the toddlers have tantrums.

These parents complain about their children's emotions and irrationality, like arsonists complaining about smoke. They teach their children to equate need with pain, crippling their ability to love and be loved.

By stealing their children's childhoods, these parents erase their grandchildren. They cripple their children through neglect - and then scorn them for social awkwardness and inability to form relationships.

They wound others, put them in wheelchairs, then mock them for not standing up. They fail to teach their children German, move them to Germany, and mock them for their language difficulties.

Monstrous.

## Sadism and Neglect Part 2

As adults, neglected children try to solve emotional problems alone – but problems *caused* by isolation can't be resolved *in* isolation.

Victims of neglect provoke false superiority in others, who then scorn their awkwardness. Breaking this cycle is tough.

The solution starts with anger.

Neglected children have to quickly shed the capacity for anger – parents avoid them more if they show anger, making the neglect even worse.

Cold, distant parents recoil from genuine emotions, making it hard for neglected children to express feelings.

What is the solution?

Well...

This is for the victims of severe neglect.

Recognize that you were cruelly treated – ignored and abandoned.

Imagine a man who, after researching dog ownership, ignores his dog, tying it up in the basement and driving it mad.

That was your parents.

If you don't want to spend time with kids, don't have kids. If you don't like spending time with your kids, seek therapy and fix your heart. If you can't, give up your kids – ignoring them isn't moral.

Neglectful parents are vicious and cruel, committing an irredeemable sin. However, your family dynamics are unique.

You were treated more cruelly than children beaten with belts or screamed at.

I'm sorry.

You can fix it, but anger is necessary.

Talk therapy is essential, so you can connect with someone who listens to and supports you.

## Empathy Part 1

The first – and most essential – ingredient in improving the world is *empathy*.

Empathy occurs when we truly understand and feel the deep emotions of another person.

For me, empathy is distinct from sympathy – sympathy is when we understand and *approve* of the emotions of another person.

If a child is sad because her pet died, we agree with her emotion and feel compassion for her grief.

If a man is happy because he is getting married to a wonderful woman, we approve of his emotion and share in his joy.

If a belligerent man is angrily trying to start a fight with us, we feel his anger but do not approve of it and work to resist or avoid it.

If a woman fakes crying in order to gain our pity, empathy helps us understand and resist her shallow pretense.

Empathy is *feeling* the emotions of another person; sympathy involves *agreeing* with those emotions.

A woman walking alone at night hears a man sneaking up and feels his aggression but opposes it, possibly reaching for her gun.

Think of coming across a child trying to catch a frog. How would you feel if the child gently lifts the frog, laughing in happiness? Pretty good, right?

How would you feel if the child laughed after pulling a leg off the frog? Pretty horrified, right?

Feeling good about the gentle child is sympathizing with the child's positive delight in nature. Feeling horrified about the abusive child is empathizing with the child's positive delight in torturing animals.

As a lion creeps up on a zebra, the zebra edges away, understanding the lion's hunger but emphatically *not* agreeing to satisfy it!

Without moral strength, empathy seeks endless sympathy, twisting into excusing child abuse: "Your mother had a bad childhood... Your father means well... Approach them with love and empathy... Forgive them, or you'll regret it... Don't hold onto resentments... Be the bigger person..."

This vile nonsense is easily disproved logically.

If you were abused by your parents and are angry at them, being told to forgive them—whether or not they apologize—means you are *judged negatively* for *judging your parents negatively*.

This marks deep corruption, and collusion with evil.

There are evildoers and evil-enablers—those who commit crimes and those who facilitate them. They are two sides of the same coin.

Child abusers rely on abuse excusers.

These apologists condemn anyone who opposes abuse.

Consider the common clichés about failing to forgive parents: “Your parents made mistakes but did their best... Holding resentment will poison your life... Let go of your anger or regret it forever...”

These apologists use verbal abuse to defend parental abuse.

They curse those who stand against evil, poisoning those clearing their minds.

They define standing up to evil as immoral and self-destructive - *but only against abusive parents*.

Imagine telling a woman in an abusive relationship: “Stop judging your boyfriend... Accept him, don’t confront him... Let go of fear and bitterness, never move out - or be miserable forever.”

No, that speech never happens.

In the old Soviet Union, the secret police relied on citizens to spy and report each other. In Communist East Germany, a third of citizens betrayed friends, colleagues, and family.

Without spying and reporting, secret police couldn’t terrorize.

Child abusers and abuse excusers are the same.

Abuse victims are susceptible to being judged negatively.

Excusers exploit these wounds to enforce compliance with abusive parents.

It’s revolting.

## Empathy Part 2

The abuse excusers understand the vulnerabilities and sensitivities of child abuse victims and exploit these wounds to compel compliance.

They see an abuser and a victim - but only criticize the victim, never the perpetrator.

These excusers are skilled at verbal abuse and often come from elder siblings who had to placate parents and defuse younger siblings' anger to reduce future parental abuse.

Elder siblings who haven't processed their victimhood continue to victimize others. They feel anxiety when a younger sibling gets angry at an abusive parent and try to control the only variable – the younger sibling's willpower.

They focus on stopping the defiance, knowing it may escalate parental abuse to grievous injury or death. This is how abusive parents manipulate elder siblings into becoming co-abusers. To protect younger siblings from abuse, they bully them into silence and often blame the younger siblings for parental abuse.

When unprocessed trauma resurfaces in adulthood, these elder siblings oppose confronting abusive parents by using emotional and psychological tactics. This behavior is driven by anxiety management, not morality or maturity. Aggressive parents are managed by controlling the youngest children. Elder siblings are often included in punishment meted out to the youngest.

Unable to control abusive parents, elder siblings control the younger children's resistance, opposing any challenge to abusive parents at any stage of life. "We can't control evildoers, so we MUST control those who identify evil!"

This is similar to the tyranny in North Korea, where parents control children to avoid punishment for skepticism of the Supreme Leader. In a famous TV show, an American doctor hisses at a woman to quiet her crying baby during a war, leading the mother to smother her baby to avoid enemy soldiers. The cruelty of soldiers cannot be controlled, but the baby's crying can.

This dynamic also extends to parents and children, such as a mother who snarls at children to be quiet because her violent husband is in a bad mood. The abusive husband's aggression cannot be changed; the children's behavior can.

This is why it is difficult to be rational in society. Most avoid confronting the immature and aggressive, trying to alter the behavior of the reasonable and mature. This leads to reasonable people being bullied, and unreasonable people being rewarded, making the world more and more irrational.

People cannot admit they avoid conflicts with aggressive individuals due to fear and lack of a moral compass. They pressure reasonable people to appease the aggressive, demanding they keep the peace and be "reasonable" by surrendering their self-interest.

Abuse excusers act similarly. They lecture victims on virtue, tolerance, forgiveness, and kindness – and never confront the abusive parents.

If forgiveness is such a virtue, and child abuse results from a failure to forgive, then abusive parents should be condemned. We all know why this does not happen.

## Empathy Part 3

We all know why “moralists” who condemn a lack of forgiveness never condemn parents who didn’t forgive their children.

If failing to forgive leads to misery, what about parents who don’t forgive their children?

Abusive parents are angry, bitter, and miserable.

Every curse on children for not forgiving their parents applies *even more* to parents who don’t forgive their children.

Jesus said: “Why do you look at the speck of sawdust in your brother’s eye and pay no attention to the plank in your own eye? How can you say to your brother, ‘Let me take the speck out of your eye,’ when all the time there is a plank in your own eye? You hypocrite, first take the plank out of your own eye, and then you will see clearly to remove the speck from your brother’s eye.

If forgiveness is a virtue, the unforgiveness that leads to child abuse is the *worst*.

Parents who forgive have no excuse for abuse.

Victims are angry because parents didn't forgive them and used violence.

Victims should forgive the abusers who used *unforgiveness* as an excuse to abuse?

As children, we practiced fire drills for evacuations.

What’s worse: setting fire to a school or escaping it?

If an arsonist ignited a school, would you yell at the fleeing children?

Would you cover up for the arsonist?

Would you demand that the burn victims *forgive* the arsonist?

Adult children of abusive parents may escape.

Children didn’t start the abuse; they stand up to aggression and defend themselves.



Parents set the fire; children escape the flames.

You protect abusers and verbally abuse victims.

Adults escaping abuse are condemned, but abusive parents are “forgiven.”

It isn’t abusive to beat children; it’s abusive to protect yourself from parents.

Abused children aren't the problem—the real victims are the abusive parents judged by their children.

The real criminal isn’t the rapist but his escaping victim.

Appalling...

But it gets worse.

## Empathy Part 4

Unrepentant child abusers *continue to abuse their adult children*.

Abuse excusers verbally abuse adult children for setting boundaries with abusive parents.

But the real hell is still ahead of us.

Let’s discuss grandparents, parents, and children.

If abusive grandparents are involved, they may abuse their grandchildren—or they may not. Either way, it's still abuse.

If abuse excusers convince parents to keep abusive grandparents in their children's lives, the children face direct and indirect abuse.

If grandparents screamed at the parents, they’ll likely scream at the children.

If grandparents hit the parents, they’ll likely hit the children.

If grandparents molested the parents, they’ll likely molest the children.

Abuser excusers advocate for *continued child abuse*.

They give access to children to unrepentant abusers - and so become abusers themselves.

If abusive grandparents are violent to children, that's monstrous.

If abusive grandparents are peaceful to children, that's also abusive!

The narrative is that abusive grandparents did their best with the knowledge they had. If they treat grandchildren well, this claim is *now revealed as false*.

If grandparents treat children well, they knew about peaceful parenting and can't claim ignorance.

Logical objections are easily dealt with.

If grandparents had a change of heart, why wouldn't they tell their own children?

If you realize you were an abusive parent, you'd apologize and prove the behavior won't recur.

(By the way, this almost *never* happens.)

If I speak fluent Japanese at seventy, I either knew it when I was young or learned it when I got older.

If a grandparent treats children well, they either knew how when younger or learned how when older.

Abusive grandparents who treat children well continue their abuse, implying to their own adult children: "We always knew how to be nice. You were a terrible child to provoke us because our grandkids don't..."

It's revolting.

Without genuine apologies and restitution, all evil remains manipulation.

Abusers aren't bad for not forgiving repenting victims; only victims are bad for not forgiving unrepentant abusers.

## Strength

Strength is required to pass moral judgment against the preferences of evildoers.

Would you set up a literacy project for fluent readers? A weight loss clinic for the slender? Or a hair transplant clinic for men with full heads of hair?

Yet, this is the state of modern “morality.” Modern moralists are merely diet experts for lean people. Sociopaths don’t care about morality – ethically sensitive people do. So, who do these “moralists” target?

The cold, cruel, abusive, or manipulative?

Nope!

They target the morally sensitive and collude with the abusers to cover up their crimes.

Historically, “morality” was not invented for goodness, but for abuse and control.

If you think forgiveness is the ultimate virtue, you must identify those doing the most damage by refusing to forgive. Abusive parents do lifelong harm by refusing to forgive their children. If forgiveness is the ultimate virtue, shouldn’t you confront abusive parents for their *failure to forgive*?

You’re lecturing child abuse victims on forgiving lifelong and unrepentant abusers? This perpetuates abuse, making it likely that their children will be abused too, either by themselves or the unrepentant grandparents.

Libertarians promoted the nonaggression principle – that initiating force is the greatest evil. If you care about this principle, you should identify the most common and greatest violations, like spanking and child abuse. Yet, many focus on issues like taxation, central banking, and foreign aid, which they can’t change.

Imagine an ER doctor ignoring a roomful of dying patients in order to yell at the TV. Isn’t that a sign of insanity?

Moral insanity is the norm. A doctor prescribing useless pills instead of exercise, making you sicker, is akin to a sadistic killer. Excusing unrepentant evil makes it worse. Pretending to do good while forgiving the unrepentant lets abusers continue harming children.

Empathy without strength turns into pathological altruism and the pretense of sympathy. Strength without empathy becomes cold-hearted dominance, subjugating others and stealing their resources.

## Moral Clarity

Moral clarity defends against those who abuse you through false morality—the greatest enemies of mankind.

If someone says to forgive your abusive parents, counter with: “They didn’t forgive me as a child – talk to them!” If they don’t immediately apologize and address your parents, they're delivering you unto evil.

That is simple moral clarity.

Anyone who equates escaping evil with abusing the innocent is deeply immoral and should be avoided.

If someone praises forgiveness, say:

“Then forgive *me* for not forgiving my abusive parents!”

“Of course, but you’ll regret not forgiving them.”

“No, that can’t be true!”

“Why not?”

“If forgiveness is virtuous and you forgive me, then I can forgive *myself* for not forgiving my parents!”

“What?”

“If a lack of forgiveness can be forgiven, I *won’t* regret it!”

“Maybe I *can’t* forgive you then...”

“Ah then forgiveness isn’t a high value! You ask me to forgive unrepentant abusers but won’t forgive their victims. That’s utterly corrupt!”

This will cause confusion because the moralistic manipulation has failed.

That is moral clarity.

We don’t have to prove objective moral standards - we can judge pretend moralists by their *own standards!*

This protects against moral manipulation of the innocent for the sake of the guilty.

Strength, empathy, and moral clarity free you from malevolence.

Fail in these, and you stay a slave, leaving a legacy of enslavement.

Break this chain, or enslave your children.

There is no other choice.

## Education

All decent parents want their children to be moral and happy – the real question is: how is this achieved?

Historically – evolutionarily, really – the answer has been to train children with punishments and rewards until they comply. If a child behaves in a way the parents approve of, affection and praise shower down. If a child “misbehaves,” affection is withdrawn and punishments are applied. Carrots and sticks, sticks and carrots...

It is the same way in school – gold stars and detentions, praise and harsh criticism. It does not trouble people that this is *exactly* how we train animals – encouragement and harsh words, treats and punishment.

Moral happiness is a uniquely human attribute, yet we train our children as if they were dumb animals. We rob them of their greatest possible joys - ethical excellence, integrity, moral courage, and love.

Love is our involuntary response to virtue, if we are virtuous. We cannot aim directly at love any more than we can aim directly at health. We can control actions that *encourage* health, such as eating well and exercising. We can control actions that will *encourage* love – honesty, moral courage, and integrity.

Friedrich Nietzsche described Socrates’ goal as *reason = virtue = happiness*. If we are rational, we can be virtuous – if virtuous, we can be happy. Aristotle saw the best life as pursuing moral excellence. So the question isn’t new, but peaceful parenting offers a radical answer.

How do we encourage morality in our children? Do we punish them? Hit them? Snarl at them? Call them names, threaten, withdraw affection, abuse, beat them? Lock them in rooms, withhold

food, abandon, neglect, shake them, call them evil for disobeying - humiliate, threaten with eternal hellfire – and more?

Punishing children suggests they are born evil but can become good. This method implies the highest purpose of morality is using violence, abuse, and manipulation against helpless and dependent children. Would you respect dietary advice from a fat man who forces you to follow his habits? The marital advice of a woman on her fourth divorce? The career advice of a homeless man?

Children can't hear our words over the din of what we *do*. The twisted spectacle of a woman hitting her child while screaming "Don't hit people!" is insane. Parents who regularly insult their children pretend to be shocked when insulted back. "How *dare* you talk to me that way?" they cry.

No.

No to all that.

How should we teach our children? We teach children to be good not through punishments and rewards, but by *being good ourselves*. That's a whole lot more difficult, isn't it? It's harder – at least in the short run – to lead by virtuous example rather than inflict self-righteous aggression.

If you want children to be peaceful, you must be peaceful *yourself*. If you want them to use words, not fists – then *you* must use words, not fists. If you want them to reason with others, *you* must model reasoning with others – and with them. If you want them to be pleasant, *you* must be pleasant.

People use violence and intimidation with children because they want to teach a language they don't speak themselves. Hypocrisy leads to violence. Using violence on children destroys all moral credibility.

We know this. You never see a fat man on the cover of a diet book, or someone with bad skin on a makeup ad.

Instruction starts with: "*be like me*." Do your children want to be like you? If you use violence, do they want to grow up to be like you? Of course not. They fear you, and will grow to hate you.

We treat children often worse than animals. Few people confess to regularly beating a dog or a cat, but many parents take pride in assaulting their own children. If your children don't want to be like you, what can you teach them?

Peaceful parenting is all about credibility. If you live a life your children admire, they will copy you. You don't yell at them to exercise – show them. Do you snarl at them to get off their tablets while staring at a TV? Tell them to eat better while snacking on junk food?

Children want to emulate you; instruction happens naturally. Violence makes them resist you, warring against their deepest instincts, their perception of your hypocrisy. This is why violence towards children does not work. A screaming mother loses the respect of her kids. Children disregard the advice of divorced parents: “Who are you to tell me how to live, when you couldn't even stay married?”

Parents must be honest about their imperfections; admit fault, apologize, and make restitution. It's tragic for parents to demand that children admit wrongdoing while never admitting wrong themselves. Parents use punishment to cover up their own hypocrisy. Attacking children reflects their own failures.

A man who beats his dog hates seeing it shy away, reminding him of his violence. Aggression makes children fear you and resist you, continuing the battle even after death, until we change...

## Conclusion

The greatest intellectual advancement in the history of our species has been the introduction of the scientific method.

In science, a theory has to first be logically consistent, and then tested against the empirical evidence.

This approach has given us unprecedented control and power over nature, paving the way to just this kind of book, which can be distributed around the world through the miracles of science and engineering at a moment's notice.

Engineering takes scientific theories and puts them into practical practice.

In the science of morality, an ethical theory has to first be logically consistent, and then tested against the empirical evidence.

## The Syllogisms

The syllogisms of peaceful parenting are remarkably simple.

1. Children should not hit each other, because hitting is wrong.

2. Since hitting is wrong, we should not hit children.

1. Those with the most power over others have the highest moral obligations.
2. Parents have the most power over their children.
3. Therefore, parents have the highest moral obligations regarding their children.
4. It is more moral to use reason than to use force.
5. Therefore, since it is more moral to reason, and parents have the highest moral obligations towards their children, parents must reason with their children.

1. Adults are more responsible for their actions than children are.
2. Therefore, adults cannot claim excuses that they do not accept from their children.

1. Violence is only morally acceptable in an extremity of self-defence.
2. Therefore, parents are not justified in using violence against their children.

1. It is immoral to use violence to settle disputes.
2. Therefore, it is immoral for parents to use violence against their children to settle disputes.

1. It is wrong for children to call each other hurtful and harmful names, because verbal abuse is immoral.
2. Therefore, it is immoral for parents to call their children hurtful and harmful names.

1. It is abusive to terrify children by repeatedly inflicting horrifying scenarios upon them, which they have no capacity to control, affect or change.
2. Therefore, it is abusive to frighten children by telling them that environmental disasters – which they can have no control over – will cause the end of the world in their lifetimes.

1. It is hypocritical and abusive to punish others for moral standards you refuse to uphold yourself.
2. It is also hypocritical and abusive to punish children for behaviour you have modelled for them.
3. Therefore, it is hypocritical and abusive for parents to verbally abuse children who verbally abuse others.
4. It is also hypocritical and abusive for parents to physically hurt children who physically hurt others.



We could go on and on, but you get the general idea.

## The Empirical Evidence

Practical morality is taking ethical theories and putting them into actionable practice.

In this book, I have made the case for the morality of peaceful parenting, and then shown you how to put this moral case into practice over the middle portion of my writing.

Following the general principles of the scientific method is never a bad idea, since it has been the most productive approach to the world.

In this spirit, the final section of this book turns to the empirical evidence that supports the ethics of peaceful parenting.

Now, if I make the scientific claim that cholera is transmitted through contaminated water, and tell people to boil their water before drinking it, then I should check to see if those people who boil their water are in fact less likely to contract cholera.

One way we know that an action is evil is that it has harmful effects on the innocent.

Since I have provided both the moral theory of peaceful parenting – and how to be a peaceful parent in your life – it is now incumbent upon me to also provide the empirical evidence for the virtues of peaceful parenting.

If, for some bizarre reason, peaceful parenting was both moral and practical, but it ended up making your children sick and neurotic, then the theory would have, to put it mildly, a significant problem.

If, on the other hand, the moral is the practical, then we should be able to find significant evidence for the physical and mental health benefits of peaceful parenting – and, in contrast, aggressive parenting – abusive parenting – should be harmful to the bodies and minds and spirits of innocent children.

Do you think that spanking is good or bad for children?

I don't mean just morally, but rather practically, physically, mentally and psychologically?

Human beings have been spanking their children for tens of thousands of years – do you think that anyone has studied the phenomenon, to find out if it actually works?

What about other forms of abuse, such as verbal aggression and neglect?

Do you think that experts have studied the effects of such aggressive parenting choices?

If so, do you think that there is significant debate among these experts as to whether aggressive parenting is good or bad?

If experts have studied aggressive parenting for many decades, and are unanimous in their conclusions as to whether it works, whether it is beneficial to children - especially in the long run - then only one question really remains.

Why don't you know what these experts have found?

Well, we are about to answer that question.

Neither the questions, nor the conclusions – or why you don't know either – are very pretty at all.

But we need to know.

And then we need to know why we didn't know already.

Let's begin.

*For more information on the empirical evidence for the value of peaceful parenting, please consult Part 3 of the full-length book, available at <https://www.peacefulparenting.com>*

This is the end of the condensed version of the book – for the free full version, please visit <https://www.peacefulparenting.com>

This book is FREE – and I hope that you will share it as widely as possible.

If you would like to help out the show, you can visit <https://www.freedomain.com/donate>