An Existentialist Theory of the Human Spirit (Volume 1)

An Existentialist Theory of the Human Spirit (Volume 1):

To Love and Create... or Not

By

Shlomo Giora Shoham

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

An Existentialist Theory of the Human Spirit (Volume 1):
To Love and Create... or Not

By Shlomo Giora Shoham

This book first published 2020

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN (10): 1-5275-5517-8
ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-5517-4

The views, thoughts and opinions expressed in this book belong solely to the author and do not necessarily represent or reflect the policy or position of the publisher. These views, thoughts and opinions are not intended to malign any religion, nationality, ethnic group, organization, or individual.

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This book is dedicated to Prof. Ariel Porat, the president of Tel Aviv University, a beloved scholar, gentleman, and genuine friend.

I want to acknowledge, with thanks and appreciation, the editors of this 2-volume book, Shir Amir and Israel "Izzy" Cohen.

I also want to acknowledge the financial help of the Cegla Center for Interdisciplinary Research of the Law at Tel Aviv University's Buchmann Faculty of Law and the very helpful support of its director, my friend, Prof. Sharon Hannes.

CHAPTER 1: LOVE AS DIALOGUE

Agonies of Love

The conception of the dyad of love as an unattainable dialogue has been expressed by Georg Simmel as follows:

> "The fact that male and female strive after their mutual union is the foremost example of primordial image of a dualism which stamps our life-contents generally. It always presses toward reconciliation, and both success and failure of the reconciliation reveal this basic dualism only the more clearly. The union of man and woman is possible, precisely because they are opposites. As something essentially unattainable, it stands in the way of the most passionate craving for convergence and fusion. The fact that, in any real and absolute sense, the 'I' *cannot* seize the 'not I', is felt nowhere more deeply than here, where their mutual supplementation and fusion seem to be the very reason for the opposites to exist at all. Passion seeks to tear down the borders of the ego and to absorb 'I' and 'thou' in one another. But it is not they which become a unit: rather, a *new* unit emerges, the child."[1]

Simmel's ingenious observation, which is not very far removed from our own conception of the unachievable aims of core vectors, is that the impossibility of union between man and woman leads to the dialectical synthesis of the child. This seems to us as too mechanistic a concretization of dialectics. We envisage that man and woman are induced by shifty visions of participation emanating from sex and love to mate and breed, not unlike the way racing dogs are lured to win by an ever receding plastic rabbit running in front of their noses. Male and female do not directly intend to perpetuate the species by their sex and love. They are tricked into it by their programming. They are driven to mate by the quest of an orgasm which is meant to be a quick glimpse of participation, and by the Tantalic visions of eternal love which is a surrogate image of the unattainable aims of our *participant* core vectors (see Figure 1 on page 21 and Figure 3 on page 23).

The agonies of love, described by myriads of lovers from pulp magazines to the *Song of Songs*, stem from ego's feelings that he/she 'opened up' towards the beloved alter who did not respond as expected. This is the inevitable gap between ego's amorous expectations and alter's response. Ego many times experiences the chagrin of the disenchanted lover for having

invested so much emotion in such an unworthy person. Ego would rarely have the inclination or the ability to realize that he projected on alter his inner craving for participation and expected this core longing to be fulfilled by their love. As intersubjective communication is an ontological impossibility, alter cannot perceive ego's expectations and is even less able to fulfil them. "That love is suffering", says Capellanus, "is easy to see, for before love becomes equally balanced on both sides there is no torment greater, since the lover is always in fear that his love may not gain its desire and he is wasting his efforts."[2]

Love, however, cannot be "equally balanced on both sides" because ego's amorous expectations from alter and vice versa are determined by their differences in gender, neuroendocrinology, personality core vectors, and cultural imprints. Furthermore, ego's expectations are bound to change with time and place so that alter becomes even less able to meet these expectations.

What characterizes love at its peak is that the lover, spurred on by an intense longing for participation, claims the exclusive attention and time of his beloved. Ego desires (sometimes accompanied by overt demands) to share all the thoughts and experiences of alter. At that very time and place, alter may not be able or willing to be totally attuned to ego and match his staccato display of emotions. Alter may have reached an emotional crescendo at another time or place and cannot or will not match the emotional peaks of ego.

The pangs of love and the romantic agonies stem from the disparity of expectations between the lover and loved. We project on our beloved expectations that we ourselves are not aware of so the beloved certainly cannot be expected to be aware of them. If we aspire for our love to be what it cannot be, we make this love impossible. Consequently, the impossibility of love is related to ego's projection of his personality core longing for participation. As alter cannot fulfil this longing in the form, content and duration expected by ego, love is bound to be a temporary and often a lonely trip of ego occasionally and tangentially brushing the emotional orbits of alter.

Tantalic vs. Sisyphean Lovers

Love tends to be Sisyphean or Tantalic. We will deal extensively with the continuum ranging from the Sisyphean *separant* lover who aims to include, subjugate and 'swallow' his beloved, to the *participant* Tantalic

who longs to be immersed, included and consumed by his love (see Figure 8 on page 113 and Figure 9 on page 117). The Tantalic lover has been depicted in literature and art as *l'amour sacré*: the spiritual and sacred love for a person who stands for and symbolizes an archetype such as the Great Mother, the Virgin Mary, the Divine Presence, or even God Himself. This love of an ethereal purity is tailor-made as a surrogate participation dynamic.

By immersing oneself in the spiritual love of an unattainable woman, one enacts the longing of the core *participant* vector to partake of the absolute. The Tantalic nature of these sacred loves calls for their partial, at least, impossibility. The less attainable they are, the more pure, spiritual and sacred they become. Temporary blindness and selective perception is of great help in these cases. Without them a Don Quixote can hardly be expected to sing odes of love and worship to a Dulcinea the way she really is. The main function of the beloved in a Tantalic *participant* dyad is to trigger and reflect the lovers' own longing to partake in an omnipresent absolute and melt into an all engulfing wholeness.

The prototype for the Tantalic lover is Don Juan whereas the characteristic Sisyphean lover is Casanova. In a subsequent chapter we will analyze the poetry, drama and literature about Don Juan and the memoirs of Casanova as illustrative case studies.

Our main thesis on this topic can be stated as follows: both the form and content of the *participant* expectation of a lover are determined by biological parameters including gender, *participant* or *separant* personality structure, and socialization in a Sisyphean or Tantalic culture.[3] For the amorous expectations produced by ego's bio-psycho-cultural configuration to be met by alter, the expectations produced by alter's analogous configuration must substantially complement those of ego, a condition that is very unlikely to occur.

Secondly, meaningful communication is more feasible at shallow routine levels of encounter. At deeper levels of encounter, communication is barely possible.[4] The expectations of love are at the deepest level of encounter and for the most complete fusion of bodies and souls, yet communication between the lovers as to the intricate nuances of their mutual expectations are almost impossible. Consequently the more a couple are in love, the less able they are to convey to each other the depths, range and intensity of their emotions and their expectations from each other.

Thirdly, we know that an extreme need dulls all the other functions of the body and personality. It generates biased perceptions and even hallucinations. For example, hungry subjects perceive food-related stimuli and ignore a wide range of other stimuli.[5] In like manner, a sex hungry subject or one who is emotionally infatuated by love cannot evaluate the stimuli and expectations of his beloved except in the context of his own turbulent emotions. Ergo the lover is bound, therefore, to twist his perception and expectations of his beloved alter according to his emotionally biased perceptions which are twisted in turn by his own intensely motivated expectations *da capo*. The more intense the love becomes, the more impossible becomes meaningful communication between the lovers that would enable them to realize their *participant* aims. Love seems to be dominated by a self-defeating negative feedback cycle.

Finally, the investigators of the Least Interest Principle have shown that when ego is very high in his emotional involvement, alter seems to cool off and vice versa.[6] Although this phenomenon is well documented, as far as we know no one has yet offered an etiological explanation for the phenomenon. We, however, are able to do so. A *separant* ego who aims to gain and conquer alter will lose interest once he achieves his aim. This is especially so when ego's desire to overpower alter is dominated by his *separant* core personality vector which is not satisfied by an intermediate conquest but is ever craving to subjugate and 'swallow' more bodies. A *participant* ego with ever-ready submission will be taken and had by the *separant* alter, only to be rejected immediately afterwards as just another item in the conqueror's log book. If both ego and alter are *separants* (or *participants*) an amorous encounter between them would be quite unlikely from the outset. As their expectations are diametrically opposite, they are more likely to be repelled by each other than attracted to each other.

If sex is bait, and the exclusive communion through love cannot be attained, what reinforces the torrents of emotions invested by couples throughout the world trembling with desire for each other? What sustains the furtive longing glances of girls and boys in societies which forbid public manifestations of love? What makes a Tristan and Isolde so turbulently immortal, or the death for love of a Romeo and Juliet so intensely and continuously relevant? What makes Solomon's love song ever fresh and clichés of Segal's Love Story sell millions of copies? The answer is that the longing for the communion of love, and not its attainment, is the necessary and sufficient reinforcer.

Moreover, in many cases amorous longings should not be quenched in order to ensure their viability. After trying to fulfil his amorous longing with a thousand spouses, Solomon of the *Song of Songs* reached the abysmal despair of Ecclesiastes. Ephraim Kishon, the Israeli satirist, had the ingenuity to continue the story of Romeo and Juliet by having them saved, married and sunk into a nagging life of bourgeois boredom. Kierkegaard, on the other hand, renounced the realization of his love and freed it, thereby, from the bonds of its fulfilment. By making his love independent of its fulfilment, Kierkegaard assured its continuity.

The quests for *participant* union by sex and the grace of communion by love, as spurred by our core vectors, are unattainable. Yet the common longing for them by people in love creates a bond and a frame into which their different *participant* cravings might be expressed. Love encloses the lovers within a common boundary within which their separate and disparate visions of union seem to each of them as if flowing in unison.

CHAPTER 2: WHY SEX?

> What is the [sexual] instinct? On the one hand it is the ultimate expression of nature and, on the other, the blind force that demands the total subjection of human beings, even at the price of their destruction.
>
> – Albert Camus: The Rebel

The Violence of Sex

The long range advantage of sex is deemed to be a more effective distribution and transmission of favorable mutations. Its short-term advantage is related to the greater variability of the genotype and phenotype of sexually reproduced offspring and hence their greater adaptability to changing and adverse environmental conditions.[7] We are concerned with the translation of this evolutionary programming to the core dynamics of sexually interacting individuals.

The first premise in this context is that sexual reproduction is the most effective mechanism for creating individuals who have unique genotypes and phenotypes which, except for the anomaly of monozygotic twins, are as genetically unique as fingerprints. The enormity of the separating potential of sexual reproduction may be surmised from the fact that a single human couple is capable of producing 64,000,000,000,000 genetically different offspring.[8] Sex is the ideal means to realize the *separant* core dynamic aims of apartness, variability and discrepancy, which coincide with the biological aims of growth and evolutionary adaptation. For our present theoretical purposes, it is sufficient to point out the link between the variable aim of sexual reproduction inherent in evolutionary adaptiveness, and the separating core dynamic pushing towards maximum difference and plurality.

The sexual mechanisms, which may be related to the *participant* core dynamic that induces individuals to mate with other individuals of the same species, are a type of reproductive isolating mechanism (RIM). RIMs are the main ingredient of the definition of a species. "A species," says Ernst Mayr, "is a population of actually or potentially interbreeding individuals that is reproductively isolated from other populations under natural conditions."[9] RIMs operate on many levels. The well-known hybrid sterility of the mule is a physiological RIM, as is the gametic and zygotic mortality

following heterospecific mating. Incompatible sex organs are anatomical RIMs which prevent insemination. Differences in seasons and locations of breeding also prevent heterospecific mating.[10]

Finally, there are the most widespread behavioral RIMs of different courtship displays and mating calls attracting only species-specific mates. Jocelyn Crane has shown that the semaphore-like waving of the fiddler crab's large claw attracts females to their species-specific mates and chases away competing males from the courting pair.[11] In like manner, James Lloyd has demonstrated that the flash patterns of fireflies are different for each species and are meant to attract only species-specific mates.[12] Similar RIMs are effected by mating calls, and the chemical and tactile stimuli of a wide variety of fauna.[13]

We hold that with all his behavioral and cultural peculiarities, *Homo sapiens* is still on the same continuum with other fauna. Although all human beings belong to one species, there are many behavioral RIMs which are based on *participant* criteria of likeness and togetherness. Ethnicity, caste, religion, socioeconomic and political status have all been used as bases for inducing like to court and mate with like.

On the other hand, incest taboos and their widest possible manifestations of exogamy are *separant* mechanisms for enhancing variability of offspring by preventing inbreeding.[14] Here again we see the dialectical dynamics between the separating vectors of growth, variety, plurality and genetic uniqueness of the individuals, with the *participant* vectors of likeness and togetherness manifested by the reproductive isolating mechanisms.

The aim of growth and survival inherent in genetic variety is, no doubt, served by the *separant* diversity of sexual reproduction whereas the quest of participation and the attraction of like to like inherent in the RIMs seem to be *participant* 'baits' to induce mating and diversified reproduction, thereby ensuring better adaptation to changing and adverse conditions. Any particular species seems to comply with the motives of the core vectors of the individuals which comprise the species. Their quest for partaking in the togetherness of the group and the solidarity of likes triggers another cycle of *separant* reproduction.

The *participant* 'baiting' of sexual reproduction seems to hold true not only on the individual level but also for the species. We will later demonstrate that sexual reproduction (which is more violent than non-sexual reproduction) may have a collective motivational force, to use a

Jungian term, not unlike the separation of the distinct individual ego from the pantheistic togetherness of early orality.

Sex and Catastrophe

There is no clear evidence as to how and when sexual reproduction evolved with most of the higher organisms. We may infer, however, that organisms which developed genetic diversity through sexual reproduction survived adverse environmental changes, whereas those which continued their homogeneous asexual reproduction perished. There are, of course, many organisms which still engage in asexual reproduction by mitosis and parthenogenesis – the assumption being that they have not encountered environmental changes and adverse conditions which were fierce enough to induce them to evolve sexual reproduction. [Cells divide and reproduce in two ways: mitosis and meiosis. Mitosis results in two identical daughter cells, whereas meiosis results in four sex cells.]

Some organisms change from asexual to sexual reproduction due to environmental circumstances. Such occurrences are relevant to our present context. The Daphnia, for instance, reproduces parthenogenetically when food is plentiful, and the temperature is cozy. But when the temperature falls and food becomes scarce, the parthenogenetic profusion of female offspring crowds the pond. The water becomes polluted, males develop, and the Daphnia reproduces sexually. Of special interest is the fact that males may develop when only some of the environmental conditions become adverse, but if the situation is not really bad, the females will carry on reproducing parthenogenetically and the males will die out. Only when the climatic conditions become really tough and the pollution and overcrowding in the pond become unbearable does the reproduction of the Daphnia become fully sexual.[15] Sex for the Daphnia is a survival technique in the face of catastrophe.

The hydra reproduces asexually by budding, but when the concentration of carbon dioxide in the water rises above a certain level, the hydra starts reproducing sexually. The concentration of carbon dioxide in the water, which W. F. Loomis called the hydra 'sex gas', is an index of crowdedness and adverse conditions in the habitat of the hydra which induces it to shift from budding to sexual reproduction.[16] Here again sexual reproduction is linked with adverse conditions. Another example are the Aphids (greenfly) which multiply parthenogenetically in spring and summer but in the unstable weather of autumn begin reproducing sexually.[17]

There are many other instances of flora and fauna which reproduce asexually in times of stability and plenty, but shift to sexuality in times of turmoil and stress. Reproduction in itself is a *separant* dynamic of growth. Our programming to produce offspring seems to be the main *raison d'être* of our existence, but sexual reproduction seems to be an additional defense mechanism against the violence of the elements and other organisms.

Our hypothesis is that sexual reproduction evolved in catastrophic conditions so that the wider range of genotypes and phenotypes of the offspring enhanced survival. The earlier modes of non-sexual reproduction, which presumably occurred in times of relative stability, are registered by the collective memory of the species as Edenic bliss in comparison with the violent upheavals linked with sexual reproduction. The notion of a collective developmental memory is not a wild conjecture because the developing ovum and embryo pass through the evolutionary phases of its species in a very accelerated manner.[18]

The above examples of the adverse environmental conditions associated with the transition from asexual reproduction are just initial empirical anchors to illustrate our present premise. One important inference is that sexual reproduction with its greater variety of offspring is more violently *separant* than the homogeneous similarities and cloning of parthenogenesis, budding and mitosis. For conceptual clarification we may compare asexual reproduction to the pantheistic phase of the individual development *in utero* and in early orality. In contrast, the *separant* upheavals linked to sexual reproduction may likened to the violence of the separation of the developing individual from the togetherness of early orality and cushioning of the family fold.

Our analogy regarding these processes is not related to any similarity to their form or content but to their dynamics of participation and separation. Non-sexual reproduction is much more *participant* than sexual reproduction which is not only more violent in its dynamics but is also linked to adverse external conditions. The analogy here is between the *participant* motivation of the individual to revert to the tranquility of early orality and life *in utero*, and the 'bait' inherent in orgasm and love of *participant* bliss and togetherness.

The gist of our present premise is that there is an increasing level of separation from non-being through asexual to sexual reproduction. Because the developmental memory in the Jungian sense of the collective subconscious links sex to catastrophes and adverse environmental conditions,[19] the

organisms might not be willing to engage in reproduction unless lured by visions of orgasmic blissful union and by the desire for the communion of love.

The *participant* 'bait' of sex and love thus has a dual reinforcement function for reproduction. First, it provides the individual with an image of bliss and union as motivations for sex and love which lead presumably to reproduction. Second, the ecstatic peak experiences of sex and love may blunt the stressful developmental memories related to sexual reproduction so that the individual engages in it and reproduces as ordained by its programming.

Our theorizing is quite speculative in relation to non-sexual reproduction. Later, we will deal with the dynamics of sexual reproduction and the feelings of those who engage in sex and love, but we can only infer that asexual reproduction, although a *separant* mechanism of growth, is more peaceful and tranquil than the internal violence of meiosis and the adverse environmental conditions linked to the genesis of sexual reproduction. We do not know how a Daphnia feels when it multiplies parthenogenetically or how a hydra is 'baited' to clone and bud its young.

The mitotic divisions of cells as well as asexual reproduction by budding and parthenogenesis involve separation dynamics. By comparison, meiosis, which forms the haploid gametes required for sexual reproduction, is fiercely violent.[20] This increase in separateness with evolutionary development from asexual to sexual reproduction may be likened to the dynamics, but not to the form and content, of the developmental phases of the individual. The separation of birth, the crystallization of the separate self, and the social rites of passage from the cushioning family fold to the loneliness of adulthood are countered by the *participant* quest to revert back to the pantheistic grace of early orality and non-differentiated bliss *in utero*. In similar manner, evolutionary separation is also countered by a quest of participation. The more violent the separation, the more ardent is the *participant's* quest for *restitutio in integrum* (restoration to the original condition).

Indeed, the *participant* fusion of haploid gametes by sexual reproduction following violently *separant* meiosis is the only instance in nature of successful *participant* fusion. Lovers may long to melt into each other, Proust may dream of reverting to the protective grace of his mother in childhood, and an individual may be unconsciously motivated by his desire to regain the togetherness of early orality – but none can actually achieve

participation. However, diploid gametes do achieve actual *participant* fusion into a diploid embryo via sexual reproduction. This is the only instance where a *participant* quest is actually reinforced. The less violent forms of asexual reproduction would seem presumably to generate a lower quest of participation because their initial separation was not so fierce. The offspring are identical with their mothers. Buds and offshoots usually form rather close and tightly knit colonies.

Asexual reproduction is linked, as we have seen, with more tranquil and peaceful environmental conditions. It is, of course, a matter of wild conjecture as to where the evolutionary developmental memory of separation is stored so that the organism would be motivated to regain participation. One possible hypothesis is that in their own development, the gametes and embryo flash through the evolutionary phases of their species. The genetic code which stores the programming for the *separant* meiosis evidently stores also the *participant* quest of the haploid gametes to fuse into a diploid embryo. This very same quest manifests itself with the whole organism by courting, mating, love and sex. We risk a sweeping generalization by stating that the dialectics of the *participant* and *separant* core vectors, as manifest both in the evolutionary development of the species and the growth of individual organisms, seem to have as wide application in biological science as E=MC2 has in physics.

Our discussion centers on sexual and asexual reproduction, but there are intermediate cases such as the recombination of *escherichia coli* when two bacteria cells form a bridge of cytoplasm through which genetic material is exchanged. Also, there are many instances of hermaphrodites which have both male and female gonads and gametes. However, recombination has many elements of sexual reproduction and most plants and animal hermaphrodites fertilize not themselves but other plants and animals. Consequently, we did not err much in confining our theorizing to 'pure' sexual and asexual reproduction.

Sexual Aggression

The basic gender of most animals and especially of mammals is female. The spurting of androgen (male hormones) into the developing embryo 'masculinizes' it.[21] These very same male hormones (especially testosterone) which effect primary sexual differentiation are also responsible for the higher aggressiveness of males. The relevance of this to our wider theoretical context is that the primary differentiation of sex is effected by an aggression related hormone.

The more aggressive males can more effectively ward off other males which compete with them for females. The aggressive male is also better equipped to guard his territory, the females in it, and eventually his offspring. Aggression related hormones are not only the first differentiating correlate between male and female, but aggression itself is a favorable trait for male offspring to inherit because it enhances the likelihood of survival. The logic behind this is that if a male baboon has a higher level of testosterone, he would tend to be more dominantly aggressive and display more sexual prowess. Therefore, dominance and leadership are linked to prowess in sex not only among primates but also among humans. A traditional Judaic source states: "He is great whose (sexual) passion is great." The greatness of Solomon and contemporary Bedouin sheikhs can be measured by the number of their wives and their progeny.

The relationship between male aggressiveness and the better survival of progeny was noted by Darwin. [22]In practice, however, inter-male aggression is much more elaborate and has more of a display function in courtship than a serious fight leading to injury or death. The defeated wolf, for instance, shows its jugular vein to its opponent and then the fight ends.[23] Inter-male fighting is full of bluff and ritualistic threats to impress the females who watch the display of muscle so that they may choose a stronger and hence better father for their children.

This brings to mind the medieval knights fighting in front of the ladies who wait for the winner in order to accept his advances with proper coquetry. In like manner, girls at college football matches will date the football stars but only as an atavism because they usually prefer to marry boys with brains or money, the contemporary human equivalents to the coveted genetic trait of physical strength in medieval knights and male mammals. Evidence that inter-male aggression and violence is sex related has been demonstrated experimentally by the castration of male mammals from various species which were notorious for their fierce inter-male fighting. After castration these males rarely fought their male peers.[24]

The higher mobility and motile energy of the male is already apparent with the spermatozoa which have an energy generating system that propels them towards the ovum.[25] The initial structure of the sperm and ova, and the relationships between them, reveal a *participant* urge of the sperm to reach the ovum and be absorbed by it; whereas the ovum is *separantly* structured to 'swallow' the sperm and incorporate it within her. Right after ejaculation, a competitive race starts among the male sperms. The most energetic and fastest among them gets to the ovum, melts its surrounding membrane with

the enzymes on its head cover, and merges its haploid chromosomes with those of the ovum. After an ovum is fertilized, it is covered with a protective membrane to prevent other sperm from entering it.

The trophy of the 'best' and fastest sperm who won the race is the only successful *participant* union in the cycle of growth and development. In all other developmental phases, an individual may long for a *participant* union with objects and other people, but will never achieve it. Only the rush of the sperm towards an ovum is terminated by an actual *participant* union. Spermatozoa are living organisms carrying a genetic heritage, but our programming is wastefully cruel and violently ruthless towards all except the one that succeeds in fertilizing the ovum.

Males often display a *separant* tendency to possess a female and prevent other males from inseminating her. The techniques used by a male to assure his exclusive right to inseminate a female range from the bizarre to the macabre.[26] The Bruce effect makes pregnant female mice abort when they smell the odor of a new male, thus making themselves ready to be inseminated. A male lion that succeeds in competition for a female will kill the existing progeny of that female so that her surviving progeny will be only his.

The male *nitida* fly is eaten by the female but its genitals are left in the female genital tract as mating plugs. The *nitida* male achieves exclusiveness of mating at the price of his life. The male dragonfly attaches itself to the female's abdomen to prevent other males from copulating with her – not unlike a man constantly dancing with his date at a party so that no other man is able to court her.

Sex is also linked to aggression in mating. Many animals are quite violent in their sexual intercourse. In his classic essay on the origins of love, Robert Briffault states:

> The male animal captures, mauls and bites the female, who in turn uses her teeth and claws freely, and the 'lovers' issue from the sexual combat bleeding and mangled. Crustaceans usually lose a limb or two in the encounter. All mammals without exception use their teeth on these occasions. Pallas describes the mating of camels: as soon as impregnation has taken place, the female with a vicious snarl, turns around and attacks the male with her teeth, and the latter is driven away in terror. Robert Renegger remarks that the sexual union of a pair of jaguars must be a formidable conflict, for he found the forest devastated and strewn with broken branches over an area of a hundred feet where the fierce 'love-making' had taken place.[27]

Sex is not only violent but is also related to restlessness and increased nervous tension which is linked to courting, mating and copulation.[28] Mating is a tense, anxious and often disruptive and painful activity.

The male praying mantis is mortally afraid of the female when he approaches to copulate with her. His anxiety is apparent from his movements and general behavior. His dread is fully justified because many times the female starts munching his head and upper thorax immediately after the copulation has started. Kenneth D. Roeder explains that this cannibalism of the male's head is functional for reproduction. The decapitation removes the male's subesophageal ganglion which inhibited the male's copulatory movements. The headless male performs his mating more effectively with a higher probability of sperm transfer.[29] This highlights a theme which we shall elaborate further, namely the relative disregard of the welfare of the organism and its focusing on the process of reproduction.

It seems as if our programming has a desperate need to bring about the reproduction of flora and fauna for reasons known only to itself, with the process of reproduction being the aim of the exercise while the life forms seem to be tools or secondary instruments to the reproduction process. Moreover, sex is a very consuming activity both physically and mentally. It involves violent conflicts with other males and cramped, painful and sometimes dangerous positions during mating itself. No life form is likely to engage in reproduction which seems to be the target of our programming unless it has been 'baited', as indeed we are, by short-lived experiences of *participant* bliss in orgasm and non-realizable visions of the communion of love.

Our programming seems to be indifferent to the fact that the Tantalic *fata morgana* of love cannot be fulfilled even though it helps to blunt the violence and stress incidental to courting and mating and enables the life forms to reproduce successfully. We are anesthetized by sex and love to carry on reproducing in circumstances which are at best repetitive and at worst violent and painful. The name of the game is reproduction, but our Programmer did not divulge why it is so all important to Him or to us. Moreover, it offends our sense of fair play that the baits of sex and love, although effective, have not been construed with more sophistication so that they would seem, at least, more credible and viable.

Reproduction seems to be the *raison d'être* of life.[30] In most cultures, especially in *separant* ones, youth is worshipped as a corollary of fertility

whereas sterile old age is dreaded and considered non-aesthetic. Only in some *participant* cultures in the Far and Middle East, which anchor on transcendence and other worldliness, is old age revered as wise and sacred. In a similar vein, the infatuation of love seems to wane with marriage and childbirth as if the bait of love takes one up to reproduction but becomes superfluous after it.

After reproduction, the bait of sex and love has fulfilled its purpose.[31] The time for play is over and the nest should be prepared for the young. The centrality of reproduction to life is apparent in the devastating blow to a human being caused by the death of his offspring because it deprives him of his programmed *raison d'être* of reproduction.[32]

Sex and Hormones

In the beginning was the female.[33] The original hypothalamic disposition is towards the female sex. Only the increased spurting of androgens[34] in the male fetus around the 3rd or 4th months of pregnancy masculinize the gonads by developing the Wolffian duct[35] and regressing the female Mullerian duct.[36] The secretion of androgens also fixates the brain gender-wise and hence the masculine predisposition of behavior. Testosterone, the hormone which is primarily responsible for the change into masculinity from the basic feminine nature of the embryo and hence for sexual differentiation, is also related to aggression.[37] This relates sex, in a roundabout manner, to a violence-linked hormone.

The female's sexual behavior and much of her general behavior is influenced by her menstrual cycles effected by the secretion of female hormones.[38] This cyclicity of the female is so pronounced and pervasive that her whole biology and behavior is influenced by it from her moods to the operation of the neurotransmitters in her brain.[39] The female's hormonal cycles are related to ovulation, fertilization and reproduction, so that her whole being is related both directly and indirectly to her fertility cycles. Her pregnancies and births make her, and not the male, the prime agent of reproduction and growth.

The wife of former Israeli President Yitzhak Navon once said in an interview that during the time she could not become pregnant she was profoundly jealous of the pregnant alley cats she saw in the streets. This, more than anything else, expresses the essence of femininity, namely the core role of reproducing and rearing offspring. Woman is programmed to form, create and rear new essences and this dominates her being. All her

other roles seem secondary to her even if some feminist movements argue to the contrary.

Even the sexual baiting of women is cyclic. They seem to be more sexually aroused and receptive at ovulation, in the middle of their menstrual cycle, so that fertilization would be more likely. This might be one of the reasons for the many taboos against intercourse during the infertile days of menstruation as well as the traditional Judaic norm to have intercourse in the mid-cycle fertile days.[40] The sexuality of the female is therefore related to undulating cycles between the expectancy of ovulation and fertilization and the waste of menstruation. Finally, sexual puberty during and after adolescence is effected in males by spurts of testosterone and in females by corresponding spurts of estrogens. Sexual maturity is thus linked with the conflicts, physiological changes, and behavioral upheavals of adolescence. The endocrinological message here is clear: basic sexual differentiation is effected by an aggression linked hormone. Feminine sexuality is marked by cyclic agitations, and sexual maturity of both sexes is linked to the violent upheavals of adolescence.

To sum up this chapter we note that the female is the primary sex both developmentally and in its more prominent role in reproduction. The female is biologically the more *separant* sex insofar as she absorbs the fertilizing sperm. This is obvious in heterogamy where fertilization is effected by the fusion of gametes differing in size, but even in isogamy where fertilization is effected by the fusion of like-sized (yet physiologically different) gametes.

The female is instrumental for the growth and separation aspects of reproduction (i.e., pregnancy, laying eggs, initial care and rearing of offspring), whereas the male is usually more *participant* because he seeks union with the female via the absorption of his gametes by the female ova and their incorporation within them. Biologically there is a complementarity of roles between the separation of the female and the participation of the male. Without this complementarity, successful reproduction could not take place. In later chapters we will deal with the social roles of men and women and with the conflicts between their biological and social roles.

The creation of maleness and hence sexual dimorphism is fixated by the secretion of testosterone which is linked to male-aggressiveness. However, this outwardly exhibited tendency towards violence is less *separantly* domineering than it seems at first sight. We have seen that the inter-male aggression is more playful than serious. It has more of a display function so

that the winner is chosen as a mate by the watching females. The female seems to have the manipulative trump card because the more powerful and dominant males would presumably possess the more durable genes. For example, the female baboon with maximal perineal swelling, which signifies ovulation and prime fertility, will give in to the most aggressively dominant male in the troop so that she may absorb more powerful and viable genes.[41]

From a biological viewpoint, males are more expendable because one male can impregnate many females. This might be linked to the fact that males are more aggressive and therefore more engaged in defending territories, hunting, and fighting wars. Their higher mortality is not such a great loss to the biologically dominant females because only a few males are needed to impregnate them so that they can carry on their all-important task of reproducing and rearing their offspring.

CHAPTER 3: THE MODELS

> Rabbi Nachman Bar-Shmuel Bar-Nachman in the name of Rabbi Shmuel Bar-Nachman said: "…'and it was very good' refers to one's evil inclination. You mean that an evil inclination is very good? If it were not for the evil inclination one would not build a house, marry and have children."
>
> Genesis Rabbah 9:7 (Hebrew text, *Sefaria*)

For Freud, sex is one of three basic instincts, yet for the development of the personality the Freudian conception of the Libido is the juice of psychic energy, much more central to psycho-sexual development than Eros or Thanatos. Freud regarded sex as axiomatic, as something which cannot and need not be explained or interpreted other than by biological premises:

> "We are faced here" says Freud, "by the great enigma of the biological fact of the duality of the sexes. It is an ultimate fact of our knowledge, it defies every attempt to trace it back to something else. Psychoanalysis has contributed nothing to clearing up this problem which clearly falls wholly within the province of biology."[42]

We, however, envisage the core dynamics of separation and participation utilizing sex as a means to achieve their ends so that it can be 'interpreted' within the framework of the interplay of these core dynamics. We will, therefore, reexamine our three developmental phases of the individual within the framework of the core dynamics as related to sex.

The first ontological phase of separation is the 'thrownness' of birth. This transitional catastrophe, as registered by the neonate, is related by some myths and religions to the 'bad mother' who is instrumental in expelling her children from the cushioned bliss of the womb to the struggles and strife of life. Existentialist philosophy and psychology also expound their basic premises in terms of Man being 'thrown into this world unto death'. The *participant* counterpart to the *separant* 'bad mother' is the Judaic *Shekhinah* and the Gnostic *Sophia*, both of which are female and signify the perfection, wholeness and pre-being partaking in unity.

The second existential phase of development, which culminates in the coagulation of a separate self, differs distinctly between male and female. This phase, which is effected in early orality, is not only related to the child's basic developmental fixations but, according to our hypothesis, also to the