

## *The Phenomenon of Infant*

The study of our psyche (i.e. psychology) is rooted in the fact that we, for whatever reason, are unable to remember the events that occurred when we were infants. Conversely, if we have the ability to remember our infant times there would be no psychological endeavors. As a result, two things rise as the absolute essence in psychology: 1) the investigation of the “phenomenon of infant” and 2) the investigation of our mimetic capacity to *re-cognize* such phenomenon.

Because we cannot remember our infant stages, we must lean on the “absolute fact” for the investigation of such. The absolute fact here is the fact that persists regardless of the prevailing discourses of gender, sex and sexuality. The absolute fact is that only what are biologically known to be the fetus bearers (in short, mothers) can give birth to a child. Such phenomenon is extremely important, for every child was once physically connected to its mother regardless of its sex and gender (I resort to calling an infant as *it* since the sex and gender of an infant at the time of its birth is not initially significant in the development of its psyche). A father is then a stranger to it who has a strong relationship with its mother for a yet unknown reason. An infant’s cognization of its relationship with the mother and the father and its subsequent wondering of such unknown reason that bounds its parents are together the “phenomenon of infant”. The “phenomenon of infant” is a conclusion drawn by logic based upon the absolute fact that does not incorporate abstract theoretical oppositions such as “conscious or unconscious,” “a boy or a girl,” “having penis or lacking penis,” etc. Note that “mother and father” are not oppositional terms.<sup>1</sup>

The constant frustration to an infant as it grows older and develops is then that the infant must get used to the presence of its father<sup>2</sup>, and this logically applies for all genders, sexes and sexualities. This “getting used to the father” is the *re-cognizing* the “phenomenon of Infant”. In other words, we are ceaselessly trying to unveil the relationship between our mothers and our fathers. And whilst we never truly understand their relationship, “mother and father” is the very first structural *division*<sup>3</sup> that appears in our minds. And because this structural division is forever incomprehensible we base our thoughts on producing and relying on a vast set of “comprehensible” structural *oppositions*. In other words, we voluntarily oppress our minds under the structural oppositions in order to make ourselves feel that the structural division such as the relationship between our mothers and our fathers is something that we can conquer with our minds.

Structural oppositions make up the artificial belief system designed to hide what is truly natural – structural divisions – separation – friendship – love – coexistence – visions – and all together art.

Alexander Kang  
2015/10/19  
Shanghai, China

---

<sup>1</sup> “Mother and father” is not necessarily formed between a female and a male couple.

<sup>2</sup> If the couple is composed of two females, then the infant will forever be *in search of its father*. If the couple is composed of two males, then the infant may be more likely to grow up with a lack of sense of belonging and may express more sexual desires towards females regardless of the infant’s sex and gender.

<sup>3</sup> Note the difference between seemingly similar structural opposition and structural division. Opposition suggests “this *or* that” whereas division suggests “this *and* that”.