

Transition relationships: From monogamy to polygamy to polyamorous relations.

As expressed in a previous article, relationships are actually imaginary in that there is a belief/dis-ease happening between seemingly single or separate entities which we call “selves”. This is always the biggest problem because in actual fact, or in what Tony Parsons (<http://www.theopensecret.com>) calls the “natural reality”, there is no person involved in relating, because the “Self” is an hallucination of the senses.

While for many this reality is not immediately obvious within the fiction of the disease of “self”, there is always a deep feeling of yearning and seeking out something which feels more complete within the perception of the world as being full of separate objects and subjects. This generally takes the form of a kind of anarchic breakdown of many things within the world today. Governmental and economic breakdown are two such expressions which, as there are increasingly limited supplies of resources, will continue to have more difficulty holding the “power spot” and it will be more commonplace that governments give way with their economic backbones crumbling.

However this pans out, it may not be pleasant for millions, but it is also the nature of nature expressing itself through the human in its sufferance to want to seek for something more fulfilling and more complete than individualism and capitalistic economics, all based on “me”, the human condition of “self”. There is a natural breakdown that eventually reveals the true expression of human nature, which while constantly present is hidden within itself and therefore it is impossible to see out of that box.

One of the situations that is clearly crumbling and has done since its creation is the nature of the monogamous relationship. In the brilliant “Sex at Dawn” Christopher Ryan and Cacilda Jethá explore all the various permutations of how modern sexuality has been informed by a society constantly forming individualism and constantly moving away from its natural essence. The clear origin of humankind is tribal and as such the tribe is that which informs the nature of relationship. This is something that is long forgotten. The breakdown of monogamy starts with the idea of polygamy, which in many cultures was actually often the forebear of monogamy. Polygamy is about a man taking many wives. This ideology is based on patriarchal prowess and power rather than on natural connection. Women are very often objectified in this ideology and it is very much male-centered, or has come to be. This is actually not the origin of human civilization but something that came after patriarchal ideas overtook the natural expression of the bonding of a tribal community.

Polygamy is legally allowed by governments in several countries of the world, however its obverse, polyandry, where a woman will take many husbands is now illegal almost everywhere. This expression is often *not* about matriarchy but about a matrifocal society which is based on female sexuality not male. While this often functions better for everyone, the ideology of polyandry is something that is associated with a matriarchal system and so greatly rejected by the dominant patriarchy still currently within the world. Dominant female expression or dominated female expression is still to do with hierarchy and is something that nature has no time for, but polyandry is very often misperceived as being matriarchal when it’s actually closer to natural connection of the most ancient of human tribal forms.

Fundamentally these kinds of relationships are clearly about groups of people, not individuals. They break down the ideology of being in relationships where one is owned by another. “To have and to hold” is actually fundamentally unreal, as clearly it is never possible to have ownership of anything.

Interestingly where as polygamy is the stereotypical expression of patriarchy, so monogamy is the stereotypical expression of matriarchy. The counter reaction from “women as objects/ slaves” has turned to the feminist (yang-female) idealism of “women as equal/ same-as men”. Neither however are the expression of nature which is more “everything is energy”. The point is that the expression of the warped nature of the belief in the “self” has created polarization, it’s either a situation of legalized yang-masculine domination as in polygamy (still happening in some countries) or its about legalized yang-female idealism in monogamy. Neither of these consider the natural sense which is expressed through the innate quality of acceptance of the yin. The natural society is understanding of the yin quality and is not based on the polarization and ownership in the “many-women” or “one-man” based idealism. Both, because they are applied across the board, are actually ridiculously obsolete in natural-human connection.

In modern society with the increasing breakdown of marriages, there is a realization for most people of sexuality not being focused in one direction for a lifetime, but also and importantly that sexuality is about forming bonds, about *forming a lattice structure of bonds between members of a tribe* to form and re-form connections and cooperation. This is a truly wonderful expression but there seems a massive divide. Either it’s “relationship” or it’s “just sex”, the former is the angelic purity and the latter is the devil’s dungeon which is fetishised and very much to do with unexpressed and frustrated sexuality. This tension within people, most people, every moment of the day is what creates massive amounts of dis-ease processes. The ashamedness of being in a society where we are told that monogamy is the only “real” way to be, holds back a tide of sensation that eventually breaks through the cracks with hidden sexual activity, pornography and sexual addictions.

There can be the notion of friends that one can be sexual with, but this then questions what does “friend” mean here, in a way it is a process of not engaging beyond a certain internal parameter, almost having the connection but not letting go completely. This is still a confined relationship although it seems superficially not to be. None of this actually feels satisfying or connecting, it’s all awash with fear of rejection and not being connected to deeply and truly by many women and some men. For many men and some women it's the fear of being owned and not wanting to have their freedom to express restricted, rather than simply a requirement for various connections not the mono-diet of one.

The new wave of publications and understanding such as the bestselling book “[Sex at Dawn: the prehistoric origins of modern sexuality](#)” describe something deeply interesting. Firstly they show that human sexuality is a free expression and has no bounds. Secondly they express that if the female is the focus of society rather than its slave then she manages and heals masculine sexuality through her willingness to engage with men within the tribal setting where she is adored (not worshipped), and sexuality therefore bonds all people in this tribal setting together. Thirdly from this root the whole of society has to shift dramatically. The nature of relationship on this

basis is the most anarchic of expressions within society as it ends the conflict between individuals. “Make love not war” was the slogan of the free-love movement in the 60’s, but actually, all there is, is love, everything is love, so you can’t make it and the belief that you can is actually a kind of war. When nature is left to be exactly what it is, without addition, then there is a transition that occurs naturally and there is an unwinding of the mortal-coil of “self”.

So where does it leave us today? It seems there are many options: there are those within monogamous relationships who fantasise their way out of them or who actually “cheat” mentally or physically on their partner, although in the terms of the natural reality “cheating” simply means “energy moving”, there is no judgment. Then there are those who no longer want monogamous relationships, having been hurt and disappointed by them so many times, and they vow to either a life of celibacy or gravitate towards what is now termed “no-strings-attached” fun... a sexual connection without the commitments of relationship which is the opposite of monogamy. In monogamy it’s all idealized about “deep, true, only, and absolute love” however with free-sex it’s all about “fun in the moment”, so there is a kind of tacit superficiality. In monogamy there is the feeling of being “shackled” and in free-sex there is a feeling of an unfulfilled energy.

Out of this struggle forms the term polyamorous, meaning literally “many-loving”. The state of polyamory is actually as close as one can get to expression of the true nature of human-sexuality within the modern and dis-ease ridden world. It is an expression of both the intimacy of connection and also the impersonal freedom, which are representative of the female and the male expressions respectively. The understanding within the polyamorous expression is that it’s not only about sex and getting what the body needs mechanically, or about a bound intimacy with one individual, it’s about the realization that humans don’t function on either of these levels exclusively. The bonds of sexuality are passionate and powerful expressions but they are bonds, and they are energetically real, to try to cut them or mess about with them is to entangle oneself in oneself and to deny the nature of nature. Also the bonds are not exclusive, in fact when they become exclusive they become brittle.

In this are the issues of ownership, particularly of women, which are the key problem in the modern relationship in which jealousy and the power to control takes over the realization that forming sexual bonds within groups actually is beneficial to all seeming elements and is inclusive not exclusive. Aesop’s Fable of the bundle of sticks is a key issue here and is at the heart of the expression of the tribe and its sexuality, in that while one stick is easily broken a bundle of sticks bound together is immensely strong, not through the action of any individual stick or with the intention to be “strong” but simply by-nature it delivers strength. While we are not specifically looking to form “strength”, the image of unity here is a symbol of Oneness, which is lost from our perception. We are within this Oneness constantly and it is us, we don’t need to be bound together to be strong because we already are bound together within the matrix of nature. However the polyamorous suggestion and direction is an expression of this and its formation is a natural need to seek this in relationship.

Of course “many loving” is ridiculous, in that “love” is everything so you cannot really love many things or people as they already are “you”, **love is already everything - there is nothing you need “do” about it.** But even so this perspective

is more appropriate than the tightness of monogamy or the dis-connection of free-sex. Of course polyamorists it is clear, will have the difficulty of having been brought up to be monogamous and so will find some difficulties, jealousies and complexes. Those who go into it purely with the idea of sexual connection will also find there are difficulties but the nature of its expression has the possibility of a transition to the true nature of human connection which is both deeply intimate and bonding and deeply impersonal and freeing at the same time.

Fundamentally if we look at the nature of a flower, it can be seen and sensed by anyone and anything, no one or few consider the flower to be “owned”, however humans really desire to own their partners like another object and own “each other”. So as polyamorous relationships express themselves there is an interesting tendency for people to try to seek out “the one” within the several people that are engaged with the new “tribe”. This however is simply the politics of monogamy invading natural connection. Natural connection is not about comparative judgment and trying to find “the ultimate” it is actually about realizing that everything is energy and some energy is more compatible in one way than another way, all flowers are different, all have their expression in the whole. It is the realization and acceptance that one person can’t fill the job of all tribe members within that body. It is realization that we can be open-hearted and not close down to other people when there is no ownership or comparison/ judgment involved. The seeking for “the one” is a primary ideology of monogamy and is also something that exaggerates the idea of “my soul” an owned and certain expression of “I am”. When relationship is all about a hidden agreement of mutual ego-stroking, as Tony Parsons suggests, then it is simply conditional-love. This becomes about trying to find “the one” to fix the sense of separation between “me and “you”, which so has no realization that it is all within Unconditional-love and so has never needed to find anything. From here relationship is as free as every other expression of nature.

The above is not a prescription it is a description of how society is moving and why this is happening at a deep level. This is also not to say that polyamory works in practice, but the keenness to move towards it for a larger and larger group of people shows a new revolution of the human towards their natural tribal origins.

For more information please see:

[Sex at Dawn: the prehistoric origins of modern sexuality.](#)

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Polyamory>

<http://www.polyamory.org/>

<http://www.thedailybeast.com/newsweek/2009/07/28/only-you-and-you-and-you.html>

<http://www.polyamory.org.uk/>

David Nassim

5/8/12