

Controlling passion: the contraceptive dilemma

Today's use of contraception is two-fold, in the prevention of sexually-transmitted infection and the prevention of pregnancy. There is a fear associated with the risk with sexually-transmitted infection as it a constant problem. Its origins stem from a loss of contact with the senses and a splitting-off from original cultural roots/tribes. In the so-called "civilized" world this eventually formed sexual tension/repression due to various societal moral taboos around sexual energy, resulting in the propensity to form delusions and sexual psychoses which can be part of the process which leads to infections. This is prevalent in the modern world due to humans' movement into the head and away from nature. However this article is essentially concerned with contraception as it relates to the prevention of pregnancy, humans taking control of the process of conception, or abortion.

There is a huge amount of religious doctrine and other moralistic ideas associated with this, such as in the Pro-Life Movement, but if we set that aside and look at what's going on energetically the prevention of pregnancy is fundamentally a psychological issue. If conception and pregnancy occurs, what's going on is simply that nature wants to create or expand in the form of a child. Nature wants to expand and be creative, whether that occurs through violence such as rape or through a strong connection between people, whether inside or outside of "wedlock". Essentially when there is conception it's an expression of the passion of nature.

Humans live in a world of seeming "individuals" who believe they have a choice in all these processes, whether it's to conceive or to prevent a pregnancy. But "choice" is actually impossible as there is no such thing as the "individual-self", hence "choice" energetically means psychological-intervention added onto the natural process. This is where the difficulty lies, the notion that having a child is individualistic, which stems from the base premise of the nuclear-family delusion forming ideas of what's "right and wrong". This has no sense of the nature of masculine or feminine sexuality, it is essentially to do with social structures, economics and power associations, and has nothing to do with the nature of nature. So within this society people suggest that a "committed" relationship is the ideal prerequisite for pregnancy. In this case "commitment" is generally focused on the masculine because the female is the one who is becoming pregnant, so hers is the passive and his is the active role stereotypically. As far as the nuclear-based family, individualism and society goes, the masculine here is seen to be the dangerous component, therefore there are attempts to control him in order that "commitment" is equaled with exclusivity, meaning that when conception occurs it should be aligned with exclusive commitment to that particular person. So the male supposedly has to carefully make the "choice" as to which person they want to have children with, out of all those people with whom he has relationships. The fact that they are having sexual relationships with many women throughout their lives is seen as having nothing to do with commitment, but simply to do with sexuality, so sexuality and commitment are completely separated.

In fact in nature within connection there is constantly an implied commitment, but the commitment is non-exclusive so interestingly there is total intimacy but at the same time

it's impersonal. This is very difficult for society to comprehend and is completely rejected by many female "rights" protestors. The wild nature of the masculine's energetic and potential to breed is seen to be dangerous because it is anarchic. There is therefore an attempt to control that, which exacerbates the stagnation of this energy and tension leading to an explosion, that creates perversion which in turn moves to create sexually-transmitted disease. It also forms myriad ideologies and causes a lack of clarity about the nature of sexuality.

Therefore the major problem is that the masculine is being told to be something it isn't, which causes societal problems and resultant psychoses. The feminist power attempts to control and dominate the nature of masculine sexuality and when you try to control something that is naturally functioning it causes major difficulties. Contraception becomes the champion of masculine freedom in a certain way, as it confirms and perpetuates the idea that you can have a sexual connection without there being an implicit commitment or intimacy. Even the prophylactic itself is a metaphor of separation, it's representative in many ways of the whole of the society being separate, it is the representation of infertility, so "self" of individualism IS infertility. The female encourages this because she has seeming "power" in "her own decision-making" relating to her "own" body, thereby she prevents masculine control which would be gained by "making her" pregnant and therefore possibly dependent upon him financially.

There are huge problems around dependency associated with the violent male. Women throughout millennia have been affected by a violent masculine expression which is dominating and controlling her simply by conceiving a pregnancy and therefore keeping her in a particular state which he can manipulate or control. This is obviously why the feminist movement created legal systems to control the male and form female-rights as a form of protection, but the origin of the masculine violence is often due to millennia of enforced sexual repression or misunderstanding of creative energy. This culminates in problems we see in society today associated with the me-against-you attitude and the nuclear family principle. Because everyone is split away from each other there is no community, nothing outside of "my" family versus "your" family, it's all exclusive. This is "your" child, or "my" child, it isn't associated with a universal picture and as a result there's no tribal connection and problems ensue.

There are of course situations within tribal communities where natural fertility-reducing substances are taken by women, especially where the size of the population means there's not enough food or other resources and an increase in the population will cause problems. But usually there is a natural limiting within tribal societies, i.e. when there isn't enough food inevitably there is infertility, so there is a process of nature controlling that and also when a woman produces many children quite a few of those will inevitably die. These processes are seen to be completely natural within these societies and in nature overall. In our society today high infant mortality is viewed as terrible, but what's actually far more warped is the intervention in a natural process. If the natural masculine energy is essentially allowed to be what it is, which is both intimate and committed but also non-exclusive, then that frees up masculine sexuality. If there is understanding by the female that that is simply what the masculine expression is, there will be more clarity and less of

a desire to attempt to control this. There is also the idea that women have the “right” to have an abortion, which in theory is the case though it is also strongly lobbied against. However the important point is that it’s an interventional process, a doctor is doing something aggressively opposite to the physiology which wants to go in a particular direction in order to deal with a mental-associated idea of “my choice”. Also the suggestion that “it’s not the right time or situation for this pregnancy”, simply originates in the notion of a separated society.

We are taught that teenage pregnancy is something to be ashamed of, yet in fact very often the body is well-suited to pregnancy in late teens and early twenties and recovers from pregnancy easily. It is far healthier for the mother to have children at this time, but in today’s world there is a fear that “babies are having babies”, that he or she isn’t “grown up enough” or “doesn’t understand the world enough” to have children, all this is total nonsense. Neither nature nor animals have the human notion of “intelligence” which is in fact a warped separatism, they have the same sense as a baby or infant between about 1 and 3 years old, this quality is having children or reproducing all the time. When engaged in sex or birth there is no adult involved, it’s all the human-animal expression. So reproduction and sexuality have nothing to do with so-called adult “responsibility”, they are simply a natural process.

In the brilliant 2006 film Idiocracy a world is depicted where the “white-trash” average American has taken over the world, simply because they reproduce more easily than the highly intellectual American who simply “died-out” due to the fact that they simply thought about things too much! A world made out of Homer Simpsons may not be the approach that is actually the resultant expression of the human being, but it is very interesting how people who are considered to have “got it all wrong” or who are “stupid” very often actually have a far higher sensory connection and sexual fertility than those who would like to scientifically analyze everything down to the last strand who are society’s focus rather than society’s “trash”.

So contraception is the end of the line, in a certain sense it is the literal expression of the nature of separation between human beings and the literal control and crushing of the nature of intimacy. However, many of the expressions of the true nature of intimacy are not going to be accepted at present by society. We see this naturally when the male enters into a physical relationship with the sense of wanting to engage deeply, intimately with, and there’s a realisation that the intimacy is completely unconditional and impersonal and then connection is a committed one. This means that the “other” person is not broken off from because she is pregnant, but this doesn’t make this situation exclusive. This father quality here expresses the nature of the tribal father and what it means to be a male within a tribe, and has nothing to do with the so-called “fatherly” roles which society deems a man *should* take on in relation to a nuclear family. For women to be truly female and for men to be truly male, society has to see itself as one entity, like an ant-colony or a beehive, but fingers of the same hand, not globally, but locally to begin with. When it is seen as a blessing that an 18 year-old is pregnant and that the parents don’t consider their daughter is awful for “keeping” the baby or berate the father for being irresponsible, but instead there is a joyfulness that this is a celebration of life, an expression of intimacy,

commitment and impersonal non-exclusivity, when the paradox is met head-on rather than shied away from, then there is a totally different community of humans and this is about Oneness. All children are children of humanity, all women are mothers and daughters, all men are fathers and sons. This is the expression of nature.

Most people would suggest that this is all an idealistic dream but this article is purely looking at the nature of contraception and what we're doing as an extension of this. Many contraceptives, for example the Pill, are very clearly damaging to women's health and to the whole eco-system, as is hormonal therapy of any kind, they all damage the natural cycles that are already present. The process of controlling female fertility is to do with the warped-masculine's advance, not to do with female freedom. Female freedom is the situation of being able to feel comfortable with being pregnant, no matter what the situation, being able to feel the body can become pregnant and to have children without fear. This situation rarely exists within society today, other than perhaps in tribal communities or extended communities. Controlling female sexuality has a domino-effect, the already warped-masculine then feels there is justification in not fully engaging within the intimate connection, his mind is warped by a situation based in aggressive masculine domination of the female resulting from a sense of "self", a separation of masculine from feminine and from nature. When that ideology is passed on to the woman, her perception is then altered causing her to also see herself as separate from everything.

This is clearly explained in the metaphorical story of the Garden of Eden where the snake, which is representative of the masculine and of sexuality, in a certain sense is seen to be what passes on the message of contraception, of sexuality without intimacy (intimacy meaning implicit commitment/faithfulness to nature). This causes a ricochet of problems, it makes the woman anxious that she needs to find the "right" man or situation, before she can be pregnant. Whereas within a more understanding tribal society this notion would be completely absurd, "right" would be seen as having to do with a simplicity of natural connection of male and female without expectations or idealism, deeply intimate and deeply impersonal.

The power of yielding and the nature of nature is expressed in the amazing 2010 film "Incendies" which expresses how a woman's rape and grief in the midst of war creates what seems like hell on the side of society, yet a celebration of life as the vigorous expression of nature no matter what the situation. A friend also told me that the roofs of some of the tallest buildings in central London need constantly to be weeded, nature will always return because the "self" is such a small resistance in relation to "Her".

This article is simply noticing what happens in the process of using the contraceptive, why the psychology is as it is, why there is so much fear associated with it, where does that come from and how society has become like this. Essentially the fundamental basis is the sense of separation which is endlessly passed on from generation to generation, the prevention of cycles of nature, be they the period cycle, the masculine sexuality, the process of abortion, are all interventions which humans are fundamentally making because they see themselves as separate from each other.

David Nassim
04/03/2012