

Sexuality

By Jeff Graubart

A discussion of AFFEERCE sexuality fits-in with neither a discussion of reproduction nor of family. One can have sex without reproduction and reproduction without sex. One can have sex without a family and a family without sex. Sexuality certainly has a role to play in both reproduction and family. But it also has a role to play in health, entertainment, spirituality, relationships, learning, ritual, and for some, as a career.

To be sexual or to be abstinent are natural rights. However, engaging sexually with another person, without their consent, is assault.

Polygamy versus Pansexuality

What is the purpose of sex other than procreation? Is it anything more than sport, the experience of a high, the search for self-worth, a way to honor others, the exercise of power, or a way to combat loneliness? As if that weren't enough. On an objective level, these are all great reasons why sexuality is a powerful force in our lives absent procreation. But there is much more, if you are willing to look at the mystical, subjective level.

In the chapter on enlightenment, it is argued that consciousness is built into the fabric of the universe. Everything has both an intrinsic and extrinsic state. According to this panpsychist thought, consciousness of individual entities, cells for instance, collect to become the consciousness of a higher level individual, an organ for instance, such as the heart. But what of the intrinsic nature of this combined consciousness? How do cells that are part of a heart feel differently than those that are not part of a heart? We call the intrinsic nature of this combination of consciousness, intimacy.

The sensation during sex that two become one is not an illusion, as the objectivists might contend. I argue that it is the very real creation of a higher level individual; a collective consciousness that is the couple. Sexuality is certainly not a requirement for collective consciousness, intimacy and love. However, sexuality can create collective consciousness, intimacy and love where it does not already exist. On the other hand, sex can destroy a friendship, or as panpsychist researchers might put it: creation of a new entanglement implies decoherence of the old.

The influence of this new consciousness on the individuals in the relationship can be profound. There is often the sudden appearance of extreme maturity, a significant change in relationships with others, increased empathy and altruism, the ready willingness to sacrifice one's life for one's partner.

In fact, no growth can occur at all outside of a relationship. Whenever we have a relationship with anyone, sexual or not, we create a collective consciousness from the intimacy that serves as a teacher, mentor, and guide.

Polygamy can be considered serial monogamy. The only thing that differentiates monogamy from polygamy is the time element. Sexual orientation is no barrier to this modern definition of polygamy. For instance, there are four kinds of polygamous triads: a heterosexual man and two heterosexual women; a heterosexual woman and two heterosexual men; a homosexual man, a bisexual man and a heterosexual woman; a heterosexual man, a bisexual woman, and a homosexual woman. At any given time, these relationships are monogamous, involving sex between two people. They also involve an inherent inequality that can be absent in strictly monogamous relationships. In each case, there is a person who has sex with two different parties, and two people who have sex only with one other person. If polygamy grows beyond three, the power relationship becomes even more unequal.

This is not to cast judgment on any family. The Biblical Family of Kings (discussed later), designed around the most extreme form of polygamous inequality, is a highly successful generator of progeny, embodies extreme wealth and security, provides all the perks of royalty and is probably a lot of fun. Ironically, no family does more to reduce income inequality and end wealthy dynasties. There are probably many other sexual liaisons within the BFOK independent of the king and his queens.

Many people seem hard-wired for coupledness, so monogamy and serial monogamy (polygamy) will tend to be the norm, at least in the first few generations, within alternative families. This is also due to the heterosexual tradition. A heterosexual sexual encounter cannot involve more than two people without physical boundaries imposed on the love bed itself. For instance, when a man is in bed with two women, should the two women engage in lovemaking between them, the encounter ceases to be strictly heterosexual.

Homosexuality and bisexuality bring with them the concept of a sexual encounter, without boundaries, that involves more than two people. For instance, three men in bed together could have a sexually egalitarian relationship. We call this, for lack of a better word, pansexuality. Strictly speaking, pansexuality is an unreachable concept where sexual encounters are entered with the same level of discrimination one might reserve for conversational encounters. Such pansexuality would only apply to bisexuals, more specifically, those who are polymorphously sexual, that is those who enjoy sexual contact, regardless of gender, ethnicity, looks, body type, or age.

Many people rightly eschew labels, and AFFEERCE gives each individual complete sexual freedom, as long as reproduction is avoided. The reason for this discussion on pansexuality is not a prescription for what people must or even should do, but rather what I speculate is apt to happen naturally over centuries of AFFEERCE. In a proto-pansexual society, pansexuality is defined as any sexually egalitarian relationship between two or more people. I suspect early pansexual relationships will be highly homoerotic, and anything but polymorphously sexual. People will come together because of their similarities. Having sex with one person will feel the same as having sex with another in the relationship because they are so similar.

It is worth noting that in a homoerotic pansexual relationship there will be members with green eyes, blue eyes, brown eyes, and hazel eyes. There will be some variance in finger size and leg length. That is because our culture does not place a strong weight on these attributes in determining the sexual worth

of a partner. Over generations in a free society, the isms, sexism, racism, ageism, looksism, and so on, will tend to disappear. Thus pansexual relationships will remain homoerotic and built around similarities, but sex, race, age, and looks will matter less and less in those relationships. This is the homosexual dialectic that Nancy Davis and I developed in our 1975 book, *Heterosexual*. It states that “homosexuality grows out of the contradictions between heterosexuality and sexism, is qualitatively superior to heterosexuality, and will destroy heterosexuality to become pansexuality and communism. “

Although it mentions communism, I now believe that an AFFEERCE society is our economic future. The severity of the dialectic grew from our then Marxist orientation and the severe discrimination against homosexuals in the 1970s United States.

Today, I would phrase the dialectic quite differently.

People have come to more and more accept the part of them that is homosexual, owing in part to the increasing contradictions in society (women choosing between family and career, increased passivity in men, etc.). They are realizing that their homosexuality gives them far more family options, and over time these family options will become prevalent in society, leading to more satisfying human bonding, economic justice, and compared with today, a utopia.

This is a long way in the future, and AFFEERCE will precede any resolution of the homosexual dialectic. I would guess that most early alternative families will consist of monogamous couples and serially monogamous relationships. What AFFEERCE society will be called when pansexuality evolves into polymorphous sexuality with the destruction of the isms is, many years in the future and anybody's guess. Call it pure communism, call it pure capitalism, or just call it utopia.

Bisexual Triads

A bisexual triad is a three way sexual relationship between a gay man, a heterosexual woman, and a bisexual man. Alternatively, it is a three way sexual relationship between a gay woman, a heterosexual man and a bisexual woman.

These triads can constitute a family, or they can constitute a sexual unit within a family.

Different than heterosexual polygamy, one person with two spouses and four lines of attraction (2 for the man's attraction to each woman, and one each for the woman's attraction to the man), the bisexual triad is unique in that it has five lines of attraction out of a pansexual maximum of six lines of attraction for a 3-personed sexual relationship. The maximum lines of attraction in any sexual relationship is $N * (N-1)$ where N is the number of persons in the relationship and $N = 3$ in the case of a triad.

There is no guarantee that pansexual relationships or even triads will exist beyond rare instances. The development of these relationships in AFFEERCE, as some kind of norm, is only speculative. In a free society, nobody can dictate the nature of a relationship outside of those involved.