

Of a category of childlessness, of the infertile and bereaved of egotistic¹ and/or disturbing persuasion

This submission regarding part (b) of the terms of reference, concerning the role of the Government in creating a framework to assist victims of ‘forced adoption’, may be published.

As an outcome of this Inquiry, I would like to recommend an educational campaign to address the facts surrounding ‘forced adoption’, including, as here addressed, the nature of ‘the beast’ of egotistic adoptive parenting. We must learn from the lessons of history if we are not to repeat them.

Presently there is a continuing trend not only in Australia, to empathize with infertile or otherwise childless couples as those deprived of a need. This trend encourages those couples to feel entitled to have that ‘need’ met. Their qualification to access “the pool of available children” is based on the promotion of adoptive parenting as superior because ‘proven’ by longing for a child through the disappointment of infertility or childlessness. This continuing trend, which is based on the assumption that an unplanned child is an unwanted child, pits infertile or otherwise childless couples against unsupported mothers, in a spirit of competition for their young. The child must be presented as unwanted or in need of being rescued, in order for his or her adoption to be seen as justified and in order for such adoption to succeed in the long term.

For example, a reader disgruntled over the lack of Australian children available for domestic adoption, recently stated: ‘One needs a licence to have a dog or cat and to drive a car – yet anyone with the equipment can produce a child/children irrespective of temperament, affordability, mental capacity, fiscal capacity, etc.’²

¹Oxford American Dictionaries, ‘Egotism’, ‘Egotism is a negative term that combines extreme self-preoccupation with a tendency to show off or attract attention. There is nothing neutral about conceit, which carries strong connotations of superiority and a failure to see oneself realistically. Vanity, on the other hand, is not so much based on feelings of superiority as it is on a love for oneself and a craving for the admiration of others.’

²Deborra-lee Furness claims a win over a public service ad with Elmo, Herald Sun, Retrieved February 27, 2001, from

It is important to help the infertile come to terms with the fact that they suffer the privation of fertility rather than a child, and to help those bereaved of a child understand that a child in general cannot replace their lost child; 'a child' is a concept rather than a being, while children come in concrete particular form, as they are individuals. And yet advertisements in promotion of adoption continue to brand them as general beings, as if one could replace the other, as this common online advertisement exemplifies: 'Adopt a beautiful newborn.' To the ignorant the latter sounds reasonable enough. To those who know the sinister implications of such a command, it is shocking in the extreme of its commodification of children.

The egotistic infertile couple has no appreciation for the suffering of a mother and child separated through adoption and, evidentially, of the latter's innate bond. The ground of entitlement to aid and abet such separation rests only on the dubious legal right to possess a child as a thing may be possessed. While those seeking to adopt subsequent to the loss of a baby of their own, are more than aware of the pain of separation. There is a disturbing callousness in the latter scenario, while an abysmal ignorance pervades the former.

The principle of the best interests of the child is now generally acknowledged by Australian adoption agencies as best served not by an egotistical sense of entitlement to the child of another but, rather, by the altruism that acknowledges the need of the truly orphaned child to:

- grieve over the loss of its parents and kin; or to
- live in the hope of reunion with them.

In contrast, egotistic adoption (which Dr G Rickarby has coined 'exclusive) can provide no justification for the separation of a mother and child, such as latterday policies have allowed in their denial of common law and basic human rights and entitlements.

There is nothing more of an affront to nature than to rob a child of its own mother, nor a mother of her child, yet that is precisely what the adoption industry promoted and continues to promote, surviving in Australia only in a parasitical capacity because on

past victims as unwilling hosts of its dying industry. Surely it is time funding was withdrawn from past providers of babies through ‘forced adoption’. Surely it is time that funding was allocated to those trained in reality-based counseling, as well as directly to the mothers and children themselves.

Of reunion with the child of an egotistic adopter

As secretary of Origins SPSA Inc, I have been asked to notify the committee of this Inquiry that Origins committee, when called to give evidence, wishes to raise the issue of the low success rate of the reunion of mothers and their children taken by ‘forced adoption’ policies.

When a ‘happy’ reunion is heard of it is because the mother has been fully deprogrammed, or is in a high state of denial (still subservient not only to the adoptee but to the adoptive family, as per the latter’s expectations), at the time of first making contact with her child.

It is indeed a great struggle, as well as a testimony to undying maternal love, when a mother seeks to bring about her child’s emancipation under such extenuating circumstances. She has such a struggle, typically, despite incontrovertible evidence of ‘forced adoption’, typifying the hold that adopters continue to have over children taken in secretive, forced adoption arrangements.

The Adoption Privacy Protection group, whose members petitioned governments for the continued secrecy of adoption information, is one example of the extreme measures that adopters will go to in order to maintain control over children removed, without justification, from their mothers at birth. They must keep up the falsehoods that the mothers were either deviant or disintitiled, interpreting the stories of those mothers without ever having met them, for the success of ‘forced adoption’ depends on such falsehoods.

The child must be grown up and de-babied from the adoptive status if reunion has a hope of being successful, as adoptive children have never really been permitted to grow up. Even when adopters pass away their adoptive children remain loyal,

typically searching for natural parents only then to find they have been cheated in discovering the latter have passed away.

Children of ‘forced adoption’ have been raised from birth to believe they were either unwanted or rescued from a life of poverty and debauchery, when in fact their human entitlement to food and shelter was exchanged for a slave-like existence. Furthermore, no facts can justify unlawfully depriving a child access to its parents and kin. There is no justification for crime, yet the myths continue unabated.

One can only hope that the threat of ‘forced adoption’ to future generations will be averted in a factual recount of this tragic episode of Australian history.