

## **Sexual Captivity: The unnatural hyper-sexuality and infertility of humans.**

A friend sent me a brilliant article from the March edition of National Geographic “An Exclusive Look at Bonobos: The Left Bank Ape” by David Quammen, upon which this article is based.

Bonobos and Chimpanzees look very much the same; they are different cousins of common ancestry. However just looking at the heads of the two apes we clearly see that the more evenly proportioned Bonobo with its smaller head and less pronounced features than those of the Chimpanzee, which has a more pronounced and prominent jaw line, actually looks more like humans. There is constant discussion on this matter and others, particularly in relation to how it is assumed human behaviour “grew-up”, but it is visually clear that the Bonobo seems to link more closely. In the National Geographic article David Quammen writes about shadowing some primatologists who study Bonobos in their natural Congolese environment. Bonobos have gained claim to fame through studies in numerous settings, though more usually in captivity, where they express very socio-sexual activity. Scientists believe this is in order to create bonds between members of the tribe and also to release tensions in situations of conflict and to allow for a more peaceful existence. Very importantly the tribes are matrifocal, meaning that the female is the core of the tribe and she is the “directing” influence. This is very different from Chimpanzees who are male-focused and in a tribal setting conflict situations are directly male-male clashes. Overall what unifies the 2 types of apes is that they are protective of the female and the infant chimps/bonobos within their tribe, but conflict within the tribe seems to be dealt with in a masculine expressive explosion with Chimps and through female-based sexual tension release with Bonobos.

In the book “[Sex at Dawn: The prehistoric origins of Modern Sexuality](#)” by Christopher Ryan, and Cacilda Jethá, Bonobos are suggested to have sexuality much more akin to the human than to that of Chimps. This seems completely accurate in the way that Bonobo sexuality is described, even sexual positioning, kissing and caressing occurs in a very similar way to humans within Bonobo society while Chimpanzee sex is much less frequent or focused upon, it is less “playful” and less to do with pleasure, i.e. sex is less of a bonding process more of an actual mating. For the Chimpanzee there is less to sex than for a Bonobo, where sex is more about social connection and forming strong bonds.

One could make the mistake of thinking that Chimpanzees are about male-domination and Bonobos about the female, actually in both groups the female is still the focus of the society, or the core upon which the males are the exterior. One might say that the masculinated expression is stronger in Chimps than in Bonobos and so overall Chimps seem to be a more physically dominant presence, even the females. We can also see this in the human species where we all have different physical expressions, however the Bonobo still remains closer to the human proportion-wise and their sexual behaviour is closer to the human than is the Chimpanzee’s and this is the point described in “Sex at Dawn”.

As expressed in previous articles, it is clear from this that human sexuality is *not* monogamous, to claim that it is is ludicrous; monogamy is part of the warped masculinity of society and has nothing to do with wild-nature. However something

that was not explored in “Sex At Dawn” but which was pointed out in the National Geographic article was that Bonobo sexual activity is hugely affected by the environment they are in, i.e. whether they are observed in captivity, or in the wild, which would seem completely obvious when considering the nature of these very sensitive beings. In his article David Quammen quotes the eminent researcher Gottfried Hohmann who, after his 20 year study of Bonobos in the wild, says in response to one of the world’s key primatologists Frans de Waal’s focus on sexual behaviour of the Bonobo:

*“I could show Frans some of the behaviours that he would not think are possible in Bonobos,” Hohmann said..... “a captive setting really amplifies all these [sexual] behaviours. Bonobo behaviour in the wild is different - must be different - because Bonobos are very busy making their living, searching for food.” - Gottfried Hohmann, National Geographic , March 2013 edition.*

This is a key and brilliant point that we need to directly refer back to the human being. When we put animals in captivity they respond to their environment, they do not “like” being in captivity but are in acceptance of it and then adapt, often very badly. In the case of Chimpanzees, very often captivity can amplify their aggressive tendencies. This also happens with numerous other animals and why the hell not. It’s like assuming it’ll be okay to put lightning in a tin can, nature is wild and if you attempt to crush it, it will find a way out in one way or another or even through death. Nature will not be held down by Man’s ridiculous interventions.

This considered, if let’s say we take Bonobos and place them in confinement the way they deal with the excess tension and stress of being held in is through sexual amplification. The confinement amplifies the processes of stress and thereby the process of stress release via sexual activity which is their natural behaviour pattern/outlet. So by “fetishizing” and “collecting” the ape and putting them in our world we have created a hyper-sexual animal that is totally different from its natural-state expression.

While sexual connection is obviously key in Bonobo society and does totally blast through the idea of human monogamy, as does even Chimp behaviour or that of any of the primate family, this has nothing to do with how the human species has become so warped in their sexual desire and their focus on sex. It is a common statement that “a man thinks about sex every 7 seconds” but no-one asks why that would be? For many people this really is the case, and in fact it’s not just men, according to “Sex at Dawn” women feel this way too but societal norms have crushed the nature of the expression of this as being “proper” thus perpetuating the suppression of natural female sexuality. However, why society is so sex-driven is something that isn’t questioned very much, it’s either seen to be “natural” by some whereas by others it’s deemed as “disgusting” and should be somehow hidden or shackled or controlled. But the point is that it’s a phenomenon, it’s definitely happening, pervading everything from advertising to pornography, to what people wear, to perfumes and all kinds of hidden and warped expressions of our natural state of sex. Why?

If we are close to the Bonobos then it seems likely that we are suffering exactly the same fate as they do when in captivity. We are captivated by sex, but we are living the existence of sex in captivity. The nature of this and why we are hyper-sexual is due to

the constraints of society and its rules, processes of chastisement, focus on ownership and the breakdown of the family, tribe and community, which have meant that sexuality has been made nuclear. There is the nuclear family, nuclear power and nuclear weapons and they are all of the same ilk, none of them having anything to do with the nature of the human. Instead the human puts itself inside a box from within which its natural body cannot express itself, then they are surprised or confused with the conflict of being hyper-sexual or for the violence that breaks out.

Natural sexuality is only truly about bonding and connection and only real when it is in the context of a community in which sexuality is contextualized and is not the focus, but is part of life's energy expression. The only way for human sexuality to be calmed is actually for the fear that propels the population explosion and the tensions that create this to drop out - and that is the human condition of "self" or "me". The ideology that is central to the human society and the captivity applied to other animals, is the nature of there being a seeming solid core to "myself", a thing that is separate from everything else in the universe. This illusion creates the devastation of nature causing those bonobos in captivity to express the way they do and similarly for humans within their own box to express or repress in a process that is even more warped and internalized than that of the captive ape. The fetishism, violence and hugely destructive process of sexual internalizations and addictions are absolutely nothing to do with natural sexuality, they are energy that has internalized and created a dis-ease. Driven by the fear of being separate, humans have affected not only themselves but when they inflict captivity on other animals and plants so they see them break down too. The Bonobo is no different.

All of our observations of nature, looking into the "secret lives" of apes and so on, simply point out ever more clearly the human's own condition. We never get to know much about the nature of these animals who are simply an expression of nature and respond without a "me" or a sense of separation. It is not they who are behind bars at the zoo, it's us, they are in-acceptance even if their energy expresses itself in distorted ways because of their captivity. But for the human the biggest problem is that we don't even realize we are captives of our own imagination.

One can't change one part of human relationship without changing the whole lot. It's all tied together, every aspect of society keeps us in captivity and so every aspect has to break down in order for us to see the reality of what we are underneath that. The human body has no want to be hyper-sexual, it can't sustain this.

*"....[unnatural] sex is tremendously violent to the body. The body normally is a very peaceful organism, and then you subject it to this tremendous tension and release, which feels pleasurable to you. Actually it is painful to the body.*

*But through suppression or attempts at sublimation of sex you will never come to this [Natural] state." - U.G Krishnamurti*

Sex is simply energy expressing itself, it is neither right nor wrong. One thing for certain is that the orgasm releases energy and reduces tension, it is actually a way to exhaust the system of energy, in all cases it is a discharging of energy. So it is only when energy is there that it can be discharged and this has its own sexual cycle in accordance with everything in the universe. In Nature connection/bond is implicit, as it is all One, so sex is much more of a simple and natural expression of expansion

reaching its limit and then falling back around, much like the tides or the seasons. When the human being's "self" involves itself in these cycles it warps them and causes total disarray, either discharging their sexual energy when there is very little there and so forming dis-ease, or not being able to charge up the sexual energy as it has been used up by the mind, so there is no longer reproductive capacity. There is both a hyper-sexuality in society and also an infertility running as extreme poles to one another. The hyper-sexuality causes infertility (hypo-sexuality), the hyper-sexual being the yang and the infertility being its equal and opposite yin as extreme energetic poles.

If nature gets to a point where the "self" starts to significantly drop away from the human expression then sexuality will be put in context of the tribal community and of the land once again. As expressed in the Hohmann point, in the seeking for food either hunter-gather or agricultural based tribes need to be the focus of human process. We need to use our hands and bodies and not use our mechanical/ technological crutches, the energy of our natural expression simply needs to come through without the "me" coming in and controlling it. The "me" just puts the human into captivity and so forces a hyper-sexual/hypo-sexual extreme situation. The point is that condoning or condemning human sexuality is useless, the way to look at it is to find the root of the problem and at least to be able to see it from there, rather than from a subjective ideology that makes it "good" or "bad".

The nature of what the human has become is not of his or her making, it is natural in its origin and its dis-ease or dissonance with nature is also "natural". Death and the dying-away of a species is also natural, and is something that may well be the humans' fate considering its contraction into its captive state. Animals and plants that live with us in captivity get the same dis-eases we do, not because they suffer the "self" as the human does but because the energy of this suffering affects all that is around it. The human is a walking toxic wasteland for nature, and all that we attempt to "do for it" and attempt to "fix" always stem from our narrow-minded ignorance of the broader context of reality.

There is a helplessness that we as humans, we have to be able to at least see that. The Bonobo is not our inferior to be regarded as an observed ideology of some long-forgotten relic, it is the living reality of peace-on-earth and also the realization of how far the human has deviated from being natural. Can we see ourselves in the face of an ape? If so, how far will nature allow us to let go and return to our Natural state as another ape in the forest? If we cannot once again find our way to see Eden in our midst, is there any possibility that the human will survive?

David Nassim  
29/3/2013