

## **Fidelity to nature: freedom from the known**

Fidelity has several meanings that we constantly use:

*fi·del·i·ty*

1. loyalty to, an allegiance, promise, or vow
2. faithfulness to a sexual partner, especially a husband or wife
3. accuracy in describing or reporting facts or details
4. the extent to which an electronic device, for example, a stereo system or television, accurately reproduces sound or images

However it is the first two meanings we most often focus on, the third meaning about accuracy or fidelity to the facts, meaning a truthful ideology of what's going on, is often ignored and the last two are largely forgotten about. The fourth meaning relating to electronic equipment actually pertains to truth or authenticity, whether something expresses authentic sound reproduction and has not been distorted.

When considering the two more usual implications of fidelity, of loyalty to a cognitive “distortion” which we call a “promise” or “vow” and “faithfulness” to a sexual partner, we have to completely let go of definitions three and four. The process of creating a promise or vow is always associated with a future plan, something that can never be known, therefore cannot be promised or vowed, and this in itself is infidelity. Faithfulness to a sexual partner is another expression of a mentally pre-planned ideology which places a kind of mental-emotional restriction upon one's innate and instinctive nature in order that society runs smoothly.

As books such as *Sex at Dawn* by Christopher Ryan and Cacilda Jethá which expose the myth of so-called “natural monogamy” gain increasing prominence, society faces a huge dilemma. When we remove one of the three main expressions of natural infidelity - marriage - (money and legality being the other two) we note the cracks in society which begin to appear. So what does it mean to have natural fidelity? What does it mean for there to be a instinctive quality that rules, rather than our heads?

In the 1960's and 1970's the free-love movement, some associated with dictatorial Gurus like Osho and others, explored the possibility of so-called sexual freedom and ideologies like tantra and the focusing of the “spiritual” within sexuality. As time moved on and the 70's became the 80s the hippies' dream was largely forgotten and there was disillusion as to whether any of this was a reality. It seemed impossible to reconcile the notion of numerous partners with money or legality, so in a sense marriage was reinstated after the hippy revolution and still exists today, for many the recent royal wedding “proves” that monogamy and its ideology are still an expression of “true love”.

However as *Sex at Dawn* carefully evaluates, the nature of monogamy is not a natural truth or a natural option, it simply is an impossibility and only enforced by a mental “logic”. However, the vitally important point is that when a deep connection is felt between people there is a powerful recognition that “it's enough”, that the seeking is

over, and this feeling is often called “true love”, the point at which nothing else matters but the love, or as Rumi put it “the beloved”. However Rumi’s beloved is not exclusive. It is not owned or held-onto through a fear of not being able to be “okay” without connection to a specific him or her. This kind of process is a desperation and a part of the dis-ease of the separate-self which sets in usually quite early on in relations. For all of the seeming madness of the free-love movement, the idea was actually to break down the barriers of what is felt about the body and about the possibility of its feeling and connection...the fact that people can want to be deeply loving towards one person one day and then another person another day. It is actually possible for the heart to truly love unconditionally and also very freely, without ideology of what’s right or wrong, good or bad, without differentiation “me” from “you”. This often is denounced as being a way for men to “have their cake and eat it” by those often feminist-based legalists who wish to clamp down of the anarchic nature of society because it quite simply changes all parameters which can be very frightening. Yet it is true.

So what then of partners who wish to stay together longer? The point made here is not about what is right or wrong but what is natural. If it is such that partners constantly feel attracted to be together to the exclusion of all others, then this may possibly form a constancy of relationship to each other but as energy changes and fluxes so does the nature of relationship and it is exceeding rare for there to be a partnership of this nature that is actually natural. Most often it is enforced by a set of rules or ideas that are so deeply ingrained that for some people the idea of examining them to consider their validity and reality poses such a threatening risk to their moral high ground that they will not entertain the prospect.

The brilliant healer, Haruchika Noguchi, has expressed that relationships which have lasted for over ten years mainly consist of a pathological dependency which actually promotes dis-ease. If marriage licenses had to be renewed every year like an MOT it would be interesting how many would actually not choose to do so. Instead of using “the children” as the reason for staying within a pathological relationship, if it was a normalcy that relationships were seen as fluid phenomena children would not feel the torment of separation and the so-called tearing apart of relationships that may never have endured energetic longevity. The torment comes from an image of what should be, rather than what is. If changes of partner at the ripe time were recognised to be the social norm, so much fear and violence would drop out of society and it would be a safe place overall for children to actually be themselves. The exponents of the nuclear family are living in the Victorian past now.

Fidelity in its fundamental sense can only mean one thing and that is to the natural sense of what’s going on in reality, the raw clarity to go beyond what is taught and to see what *is*. The infidelity is actually to everything else, meaning that the idea of sex without total connection or involvement of feeling, simply an act for the camera, and equally the idea of marriage or state-of-partnership and its religious and arcane dictatorial anti-male and anti-female understandings of life. This brave new world needs to be able to understand love as an unconditional not conditional quality, which incorporates all people and all connections. In fact that all of life is intimate and yet impersonal, that “I” am completely

yours yet “I” am nobody’s and no-thing”. This is the paradox we face when fire and water are known to be in constant union, not separate forces.

So what this really means is that connection is always occurring, whether we know it or not. It means that energy is moving and if two people have one energetic connection that is lustful and energetic that is just as sacred as those who truly desire to be together, doing things with each other for long periods of time both as friends and lovers. The one is not better than the other. The brilliant film “The Unbearable Lightness of Being” fundamentally expresses the trap of illusion of what plagues the female mind, of jealousy and feelings of rejection, and at the same time highlights the male illusion that more is better and sex is thereby fetishized rather than fully connected to. Both are dis-eases, both have to find their route home. For the male this means understanding the meaning of intimacy, that which he most fears, to lose himself into the fire or passion and so lose his feeling of independent impartiality. For the female, while keeping her natural intimacy, it is to realise that the nature of connection is not about “me”, it is not personal, not owned and does not need to be. It is like fruit on the tree, eaten and drawn in when it is present and not when it isn’t, it is in fact always present and therefore it need not be mourned.

In today’s society the main issues of living in nuclear families are the ideology that women need to “pin-down” a “keeper” of a boyfriend, because he’s the one that will “stay and have children with me” and this is a contractual obligation that most men fear, and rightfully so because actually there is no intimacy in that at all. Contracts and conversing and manipulation through use of the legal system is far more threatening an idea than the intimacy of the female quality. The dis-ease of the female is far more aggressive than the nature of her nature. For the woman the situation of having children “on her own” and doing everything “by herself” is another travesty, a situation where there are no other women to connect with, to form bonds where children are not brought up together as in tribal families. Also the notion that a man needs to become “domesticated” in order to suit her needs, all of this is an ignorance and intolerance of the male nature and also of female nature. Of course some men will take to this naturally but this is not always the case and blanket ideas of what’s “right” and “wrong” are hugely judgmental and utterly manipulative.

In natural societies when children are conceived, this is an immediate accepted expansion of the tribe, it is not about “who did it with who” and “he’s mine” or “she’s mine” it is simply like cells multiplying. There is no question of loyalty or disloyalty, it is simply the expression of expansion of nature, and this is accepted for male and female. The nature of the male initiates the seed and the female grows this, that’s it, no madness, only One, Unconditional Love.

Humans can’t live in single units that come together to make nuclear families, it just doesn’t work on any level, especially if we want to come to terms with actual sexuality and the true meaning of the unconditional nature of love rather than a deeply conditioned and total infidelity to nature. The Tao Te Ching perfectly expresses the nature of intolerance to natural flow here:

## Chapter 38

*That which is an expression of Innate-perfection does not have a “self” image*

*Therefore this is called: Naturally virtuous*

*A person who “tries” to be “good” never strays from this path of “self”-image*

*Therefore this cannot be called Naturally virtuous.*

*The former expression cannot pre-intend action, and so leaves nothing left undone*

*The latter expression makes willful intention to act, yet leaves much undone.*

*That which is an expression of unconditional love acts spontaneously without motive,*

*A person who acts in accordance with the law acts with ulterior motive.*

*A person most knowledgeable in discipline acts, but when no one responds, he rolls up his sleeves and resorts to persuasion by force.*

*Therefore when Naturalness is not perceived, there is at least acknowledgement of Innate-perfection*

*When Innate-perfection is not acknowledged, there is at least a sense of unconditional-love.*

*When unconditional-love is not felt, there is legality*

*When legality is not perceived, there is disciplining.*

*Disciplining is the wearing thin of a sense of Oneness*

*It is the beginning of estrangement, suffering and confusion.*

*Divining or foresight of the future is an embellishment of the core expression of Naturalness*

*It is the beginning of illusion.*

*Hence wisdom is in that which is simple and real, less easily accessed by its refracted reflection on the surface.*

*Nourishment is in the fruit, not the flower*

*Therefore the Natural-human draws towards the one and lets go the other.*

This article and all the others are not “right”, they are trying to encourage you, the reader, to ask fundamental questions about how and why we live the way we do and to consider the totally unfounded and unrealistic image we carry. This is not a suggestion for anyone to *have* fidelity or to *be* an infidel, it is to question the whole notion of what it means to be faithful, and to be authentically real. Most of us have forgotten what our children and the animals and nature around us know innately, the Inner Child nature, Buddha nature or true essence is covered up by the lies, threats and anxiety of thousands of years of history all being constantly repeated as a mantra of bondage since time immemorial. It is time to let go these chains and in order to do so we need to see their origin in the nature of the ideology of the separate “self” and its ensuing dualism.

When relationships become as loving and as simple as a child playing albeit with an adult body, and when connection to each other has no fear of rejection or isolation, nor fear of intimacy because it is realized that there is no “self” to either be burned in flames or left out in the cold, then there is peace. In the disparagingly described “primitive” tribal cultures of our world exist people whose fidelity is to nature, for they know marriage, money and legality in fact to be a deep infidelity, the work of the “devil” or “divider”, the analytical nature of the “self”-orientated mind. They live in societies where there is free

sexuality, yet this not perverted, it is pure and natural and lovingly intimate in all cases. The male is understood and so is the female and their roles in the tribe suit these expressions and they are in accordance with nature not with ideology. There is nothing that is not shared, although this can't really be called "sharing" as it is One thing that's occurring, there is no division between people. This acts as our origin, our guide, our reminder of who we really are. For all those who will say "this is just not practical", suffering is far more impractical than the lives lived by those who have the sense to simply live naturally. This isn't about some detached, romantic ideal of what "you" or "I" want which is actually a perversion we are used to, it's simply about what incontrovertibly *is*.

The nature of the yang is the quality of the impersonal within a relationship, the yin quality is the intimate. Together they form the impersonal-intimate paradox of Oneness and the ending of "self". For the yang quality, the female is either like the fire that will burn him or the sea he will drown in, but either way it means the end of him-"self", yet still there is a draw towards the yin. For the intimacy of the yin, the yang is either a cold impersonalness or a power so tough and hard she cannot blend with it, when there is an acceptance that she doesn't need to grasp the yang, and when she lets go of "self", he comes to her. So there is a "self" within the fire of intimacy and a self within the coldness of the impersonal and both of these are vanquished by each other. Osho and others had the pretence of an understanding of sexuality, in that he would invite a freeness but this freeness was overseen and voyeuristically interacted with by him and others. The nature of this is the pure expression of the impersonal male expression, which is also why pornography is very much more masculine than feminine, very voyeuristic and detached, there is no intimacy just a need to interact, while being at a safe distance from it. The impersonal is what the yin fears most, being left out in the cold, yet she draws towards it because in a deeper way she knows it is the connection that ends her suffering the self of anxiety. The intimacy is what the yang fears most, being burned in the flames, yet in a deeper way he knows he is drawn towards it like a moth and it will end his suffering and thereby his isolation. In this way the relationship dissolves "self" into impersonal-intimacy, although of course these poles occur within as well as without.

Protection of children is a serious focus for many people in society yet it is interesting how those who are from a "broken home" almost never re-evaluate the nature of the so-called fidelity that is "broken". If we really want to "protect" our children it would be better to allow them to clearly differentiate between natural or instinctual fidelity, meaning being true to the flow of energy passing through "you", versus the human-adult's ideological picture of nuclear families "getting on with it". Of course as always the expression will be seen as anarchic and ridiculous but it is as anarchic as love itself, the true unconditional nature of it if we really want to change the world. It starts from a realization of letting go of the old dogma that and staring head-long into the truth. However, it is important to realize that many people can under no circumstance undertake a connection to truth, as their situation is not ripe for them to realize this. This does not make those "in the know" better, just different. In all cases the situation of "self" is dissolving and is essentially unknown by nature.

Modern society has perverted the ideology of what “love” is in every possible way and so few know its true meaning. There are many who continue to pay lip-service to the requirement for marriage and its so-called “sanctity” and who, despite being faced with daily evidence of the increasing occurrence of divorce and the resultant pain of children from “broken” homes, still “carry on” because there seems no other option. Buying-into and perpetuating this belief is a “self”-fulfilling prophecy doomed to suffering. Yet there are those who instinctually realise how fundamentally unnatural the cycles of marriage and divorce are, and their antipathy towards that situation may dissolve to break free of the confinements.

When we re-discover our tribal ancestors and reconnect to our roots in the earth, then there is no room for man-made formalities such as marriage, money and legality, in fact no room for anything but the intimate-impersonal connection of life as it is.

David Nassim  
20/1/2012