

## The Nature of Sexuality

**Type:** Short Communication

**Received:** July 03, 2024

**Published:** October 30, 2024

**Citation:**

Vadim M Rozin. "The Nature of Sexuality". PriMera Scientific Surgical Research and Practice 4.5 (2024): 46-51.

**Copyright:**

© 2024 Vadim M Rozin. This is an open-access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

**Vadim M Rozin\***

*Doctor of Philosophy, Professor, Chief Researcher. Institute of Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 12, Goncharnaya st., bldg. 1, Moscow, 109240, Russian Federation*

**\*Corresponding Author:** Vadim M Rozin, Doctor of Philosophy, Professor, Chief Researcher.

Institute of Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 12, Goncharnaya st., bldg. 1, Moscow, 109240, Russian Federation.

### Abstract

The article "The Oddities and Origins of Human Sexuality" sets out the concept of sexuality, which is quite popular in our time, based on the ideas of the biological approach and psychoanalysis. The author analyzes these ideas in terms of grounds and consequences. The main provisions of the article are opposed to other provisions. Man is not only a biological being, but also a social, psychological, semiotic, spiritual, cultural, that is, a multidimensional centaur. In addition to the biological plane, evolution contains a socio-cultural plan. Love and sexuality are a cultural, historical and psychological phenomenon, in the formation and development of which such factors as the change of culture, types of individuality and personality, the nature of semiosis (sign systems, schemes, works of art) play an important role. However, criticism of the article "The Oddities and Origins of Human Sexuality" does not mean a desire to ban the ideas expressed in it. The presence in modern culture of different channels of socialization and ways of life, liberal democratic values and institutions presuppose, as Kant wrote, freedom in expressing one's opinions and beliefs.

**Keywords:** love; sexuality; person; personality; culture; semiosis; understanding; interpretation; approach; thinking

I was sent an interesting article "Oddities and Origins of Human Sexuality". The surname, name and patronymic of its author were not indicated, so we will call him simply "the author". The author refers to a large foreign literature, and in general his discourse on sexuality looks scientific and quite convincing, although, I think, only for a certain audience admiring the achievements of biological sciences and psychoanalysis. And the authority of biological disciplines, which is already quite high, is only growing in our age of the pandemic and the development of a vaccine against it. I am interested in the author's discourse of sexuality because it is currently quite popular in the scientific and near-scientific communities, and because, in my opinion, it is not universal, as the author of the article tries to present it, but also because I defend the discourse of love and sexuality, which is in opposition to the author's. The right of every humanitarian philosopher and scientist to carry out and argue his own concept, including the concept of sexuality, and no less the right to comprehend and criticize concepts with which he disagrees, since they are fraught with negative consequences for culture and man. As

I. Kant wrote: "In all its undertakings, reason must subject itself to criticism and cannot violate freedom by any prohibitions without harming itself and without incurring bad suspicions on itself... This freedom also includes the freedom to express one's thoughts and doubts, which one cannot resolve on one's own, for public discussion, and not to be accused for this as a restless and dangerous citizen. This freedom follows from the fundamental rights of human reason, which recognizes no judge but the universal human reason itself, in which everyone has a voice; and since every improvement that is possible in our state depends on this reason, this right is sacred and no one dares to limit it" (Kant, 1994, pp. 617, 626).

Already the author's formulation of the problem caused me a number of questions and doubts.

"Why," the author asks, "despite centuries of efforts by morality, religion, customary and public law systems, and despite great risks, adultery does not stop, not only on the part of men, but also on the part of women? • If the female orgasm is not a by-product of the evolution of the male one (which everyone has already agreed on), then for what function does it serve as a device, why does it not always happen and not for all women? • How to explain such a great difference between the usual integrity, syncretism of female feelings, sexual attraction and their frequent splitting, discontinuity in men?" [Rozov, 2021].

It is easy to see that all three questions suggest a seemingly innocent generalization - infidelity, orgasm, and the difference in the sexual behavior of women and men concern absolutely everyone, a person in general. But where do we see "man in general", isn't sexual behavior different in different cultures and in different individuals, and up to opposite models? I will be told that such generalizations at every step are a necessary condition for scientific analysis. Well, yes, I am guilty of this myself, but still not to such an extent. Should we not listen here to the opinion of the remarkable philosopher and methodologist Alexander Ogurtsov, who in the last years of his work constantly emphasized the danger of such hasty generalizations, to which he contrasted the analysis of specific cases (individuals, as humanitarians write), differences and distinctions that should precede cautious generalizations.

One of the author's arguments in favor of the proposed generalizations is the reliance on facts and historical material. For example, referring to four Western researchers, he writes the following: "Among the most diverse cultures of the savagery level (hunter-gatherers who have not switched to agriculture, as a rule, egalitarian), it is characteristic to believe that a pregnant woman should continue intercourse for the full development of the fetus, and preferably with different men" [ibid.]. But here is a well-known American anthropologist Margaret Mead, who has studied early forms of love and sexual relations, shows the exact opposite. "Since the Arapesh," she writes (a mountain tribe in New Guinea), "think that the child is obtained from the mother's blood and the father's seed, the father's function in fertilization does not end with conception, but requires intense sexual activity from him for several weeks. The more acts of coition the parents perform, the Arapesh think, the better and healthier their child will be. But as soon as "the mother's breasts show the swelling and discoloration of the nipples characteristic of pregnancy, it is considered that the creation of the child is complete. From now on, all sexual intercourse is prohibited." And then, until the child begins to walk, a strict taboo on sexual intercourse is imposed" [Mead, 1988, p. 253].

And almost all the examples given in the article can be countered. It is also surprising how the author uses these examples as evidence of his generalizations. Most often, he refers the reader to archaic culture, and sometimes even to the animal world, without posing the question, that sexual behavior and relationships in the modern world and in antiquity (especially among animals) are the same? Probably, he assumes that man has not changed much during social evolution (which, of course, is difficult to agree with), or another assumption, that man in his essence is primarily a biological creature (which, in my opinion, is also doubtful).

Modern research (anthropological, culturological, semiotic, psychological) shows that a person is a *multidimensional centaur*, in which it is necessary to distinguish not only a biological hypostasis (an organism), but also a social hypostasis (he is a social individual), and psychological, and semiotic, and spiritual (although not for everyone), and cultural, and there are complex relations between these hypostases.

Our author sees in man mainly a biological plane, sometimes, even he stipulates it, according to Fred, for example, not intimate relations, but "mating": for "unfaithful" women, he notes, "practicing the strategy of short-term mating, orgasm contributes to fertilization

and the perception of the best genes of the chosen one. For the “faithful”, deprived of the chance to reproduce reproductive benefits from extramarital sex, orgasm serves to strengthen the bond with a permanent partner (spouse) <... > loud, often uncontrollable female cries during orgasm; such sounds (moans, loud breathing, growls) excite men no less, and often more, than the sight of a naked female body; this indicates a well-coordinated “signal/response” pair, which has all the signs of innateness, universality, and therefore is a trace of a very ancient evolutionary adaptation; such sounds made by female primates during copulation serve to excite and attract other males; females primates practicing promiscuity make more complex, intricate sounds during intercourse than females of monogamy or harem species” [Rozov, 2021].

By the way, in the very concept of orgasm, two different meanings can be distinguished: biological and socio-psychological. The first is due to the biological interpretation of sexual relations - their ideal, desired result is constituted as orgasm. The second meaning is associated with the desire to present this result as a social relationship. In this case, orgasm is often understood as just a social concept, and not objective psycho-biological reality. It is not for nothing that we see in the literature such statements: “the female orgasm is a myth <... > men should focus on their pleasure, as the female orgasm and the G-spot are mythical animals, just like the unicorn. Women lie to their partners. Sexual dissatisfaction does not affect the quality of the relationship and the further decision to have children” [Scientists have proved, 2021].

In the justification of our author, one can notice how often the social concepts that appeal to them begin to constitute first the vision of a person (he finds himself in a new reality), then his behavior, and finally sensuality. Initially, the love described by Plato in *The Banquet* is simply, as I show, narrative schemes, then a new platonic love, which begins to be practiced by the emerging ancient personality, then social and psychic, including sensual, reality [Rozin, 2015]. For some, orgasm is just a concept, but for those who practice orgasm (specialize in it), so to speak, these ecstatic experiences can already be perceived as a bodily and mental fact of their private existence.

But this is our interpretation, the author’s discourse presupposes a consistent biological and partly psychoanalytic reduction. One of his main ideas is the explanation of female sexuality not as the behavior of an individual and a subject, but as an unconscious action of biological principles and reproductive organs - spermatozoa, vagina, penis. “Many researchers,” we read, “interpret unusual features in the structure of the human reproductive organs quite unambiguously, as anatomical traces of the former fierce competition of cavaliers for fertilization, and the main battlefield was not the fights of individuals before copulation, but large-scale “battles” between millions of spermatozoa of two or more cavaliers after copulation. multiple sexual acts with one woman <... > The human penis with a special thickness and additional thickening of the head in humans is designed to remove previous sperm <... > With vaginal contraction, the semen of one man may be expelled, while the semen of another will be drawn <... > For several decades now, the ‘sperm war’ has been one of the hottest topics in the study of human sexuality” [Rozov, 2021].

As we can see, this is a real apophysis (from the ancient Greek apotheosis - deification, deification) of biological explanation. It is also appropriate to note the influence of S. Freud: it turns out that a person is controlled not by consciousness, but by the unconscious in the person of the reproductive organs, which, by the way, justifies, according to the author, the tendency of women to frequent changes of partners. “Fred’s credo,” remark L. Kjell and D. Ziegler, “where the id used to be, there will be the ego, expresses his optimism that the forces of the mind will be able to tame primitive and irrational impulses. Despite the thesis that a high degree of rationality can be achieved through psychoanalysis, Freud’s theory is firmly cemented by the idea of the importance of irrational elements in human behavior. From the standpoint of this theory, the idea that a rational person controls the course of events in his life is nothing more than a myth” [Kjell and Ziegler, 1997, p.134]. It is quite possible to agree with this. Here, for example, is what Freud writes about love: “Love is fundamentally as animal as it has been from time immemorial. Love instincts are difficult to educate, their education gives too much, sometimes too little. What culture seeks to make of them is unattainable; those who remain without the use of arousal make themselves felt in active sexual manifestations in the form of dissatisfaction” [Freud, 1989, p. 73].

Perhaps the author’s concept was also influenced by Richard Dawkins, because according to his theory, people are just “survival machines” (tools) for genes. The combination of the ideas of Freud and Dawkins makes it possible to understand, for example, the author’s statement that “when the vagina is contracted, the semen of one man may be expelled, while the semen of another will be re-

tracted.” According to Freud, it is the vagina (unconscious) that controls a woman’s reactions during intimate relationships, according to Dawkins, this control is an evolutionary mechanism for genes to use the female survival machine.

In the age of the pandemic, philosophers and scientists who think like our author within the framework of the natural science approach would probably say that not only genes, but also the first order of viruses (coronaviruses) have managed to turn human bodies into survival machines or, perhaps, more accurately, “expansion machines”, machines for conquering the social world. But I proposed to understand the pandemic differently, in the opposite way [Rozin, 2020]. This is a natural response of nature (both the first and the second, biological) precisely to the development of planetary sociality. The density of contacts caused by business ties, tourism, megacities, technological experiments with biological materials, even modern forms of nutrition and treatment in the conditions of limitation of our planet (from the point of view of the scale of modern production and consumption, it turned out to be not so large) predetermined such a development of biological organisms, which allowed viruses to almost instantly overcome the border separating the biological world from the social world. Of course, man did not expect such a surprise from evolution.

It must be said that our author quite often appeals to evolution. For example, explaining the asymmetry of male and female behavior, he writes: “Metaphorically, the female orgasm is a bold and even quite humane attempt by evolution to somehow compensate, to overcome the forced and depressing dualism \u2012 splitting in the sexual life of men. Rejoicing and proud that he gave a woman such a strong and impressive pleasure, the partner receives at least part of the fullness and depth of love feelings that women are capable of” [Rozov, 2021].

But what does he mean by evolution? Mainly, biological evolution. But man was formed in the course of cultural and social evolution, which decisively transformed the biological plan. For example, the evolution of love and sexuality was greatly influenced by the concepts of love - platonic, courtly, romantic [Rozin, 2006, 2015]. In accordance with the Platonic concept, love and sexual relations, firstly, were transferred from the generic social model (love as an external action of the gods) to a personal one (love as the free choice of the individual), secondly, they were spiritualized and aestheticized (love as the desire for beauty and good), thirdly, sensual relations and women were belittled and pushed into the background by Plato. The courtly concept of love, based on the platonic concept, on the contrary, placed a woman in the center of love interest (the concept of the “beautiful lady”) and returned sensual relations to love.

“He,” we read in the anonymous courtly work “Donna, I Belong to You,” “who feels inclined towards a lady and often visits her, not daring, however, to convince her, is a timid ‘hidden’. But if the lady has shown him respect and encouraged him so much that he dares to make his request to her, he becomes a “supplicator.” If, by persuasion, he got her to give him a cord, a belt, or a glove, or some other possession, small or large, he rose to the level of an “admirer.” If she falls in love with her faithful ‘admirer’ and is pleased to kiss him with her love and put him under the blanket, he is elevated to the level of ‘friend’” [Friedman, 1965].

The romantic concept was formed both under the influence of the two previous concepts, and under the influence of modern European culture with its cult of a free, initiative and wanting person in the world. If we now consider that our sensuality is derived from cultural and social semiosis (schemas, concepts, works of art), then we should not be surprised by the fact that love and sexuality differ significantly in different cultures, as well as different cultural traditions.

In addition, in modern times, the spheres of love and sexuality begin to differentiate, they diverge and separate. As I show, sex is ambivalent in nature. “On the one hand, it is perceived as a mystery, pathology and intimate essence of a person, on the other hand, as an ordinary technique (“technology of love”), a norm and just one of the plans of a person’s life, where he can enjoy and maintain his physical and mental health. Love and sex are not only opposite (the first is focused on complex forms of life - spiritual, moral, communication and kinship, including, of course, intimate relationships, the second-- only for pleasure), but are also related to each other. Sex constantly “steals” love from it, uses its aura, exploits its various life forms. Love enjoys more modest fruits: it borrows, and then within its limits, the technology of sex and external forms associated with sexuality” [Rozin, 2006, pp. 153-166].

“How unfortunate is the phrase: ‘He needs a woman,’” reflects K. Lewis. \u2012 Strictly speaking, it is a woman that “he” does not need. He needs pleasure, which is hardly possible without a woman. How much he appreciates her can be judged by his behavior in

five minutes. A lover does not even need a woman in general, but this woman. He needs his beloved, and not the pleasure that she can give. I know only one person who made such a calculation, Lucretius, and he was not in love. And he answered as follows: falling in love interferes with pleasure, feelings distract, it is difficult to savor pleasure with knowledge (he is a good poet, but Lord, what kind of people were these Romans!)” [Lewis, 1991, p. 209].

Freud believes that sexuality is based on sexual desire (libido energy). I will not argue that the natural, biological substrate of sexuality is sexual desire, but cultural realities are different. Plato pointed to the work of the eye (contemplating a beautiful body, beautiful in general), the work of imagination, thought, education and communication (all this allows a person to become perfect). longing, waiting, wild imagination. Christian love introduced sinfulness and prohibition into sexuality. Romantic - strong passions, respect for the individual. Consequently, love, even bodily, is based not only on sexual desire.

But sexual attraction should also be understood differently than is usually accepted, it is also *centaurical*, that is, at the same time a biological and psycho-cultural phenomenon. This is my version. “The discrete, finite character of the sexual act can, of course, come into conflict with the complex psychic nature of love and the personality of man, but only if the love and relationship between man and woman are identified with the sexual act, and the sexual act itself is fetishized. Although the end of the sexual act leads to a sharp drop in mental and bodily energy, as well as the disappearance of sexual desire for a period of time (here Freud is right), other processes of love and communication (aesthetic, empathy, gratitude, kinship, etc.) do not end there, but, on the contrary, sometimes only gain strength. It is these processes that create the powerful pressure and flow of energy that carries lovers (lovers). And this is one of the problems of intimate life: how to achieve the merging of sexual desire with love, with the relationship of a man and a woman who love each other, how to make this relationship, which is not discrete, but rather continuous and often ideal, harmonize with the discrete and capricious, or, as Lewis said, “coarse” sexual desire.

And another problem is how to embody the complex mental process of love and relationships, to concentrate it in its culmination - the sexual act. “Even the highest form of love,” Berdyaev wrote, “is not sexless, bodiless love, it is not dried up duty and moral abstraction, it is based on mystical sensuality, the *immediate* joy of touch and connection” [Berdyaev, 1989, p. 47] (emphasis added. ). Purely bodily sexual desire and sexual act are unconscious, but they must merge in their process and culmination with conscious and different mental processes, such as the experience of feelings of kinship, gratitude, beauty, joy, communication, etc. rhythm and culmination, ideally to become unconscious, so to speak, to fly on the wave of libido. It is in this case that the realization of all desires will be synchronized, harmonized, and all processes will merge into one stream - the catharsis of love, which is both bodily and spiritual in nature. The *unconsciousness of conscious activity* is experienced as a sensation of the dissolution of the Self, as an immersion in the bodily element, in which it is almost impossible to distinguish between oneself and her.

And yet, let us emphasize once again, sexual attraction is only one of the forms of corporeality in love. Love as an ideal, love as a plan, should also illuminate, transform all other forms of corporeality that carry intellectual, spiritual love. In intellectual love, a person receives energy and spiritual strength not only from direct fusion with the beloved, but no less from his person (Berdyaev never ceased to emphasize that “at its peak, love is always a vision of the face of the beloved in God”), from his presence, from the very atmosphere, the aura that accompanies and surrounds him, in general, from the fact that he lives with the beloved” [Rozin, 2006, pp. 186-189].

The author titled his article “The Oddities and Origins of Human Sexuality.” Having thought through his approach and a priori notions, I realized that what is strange to him is what looks like a scientific explanation in another discourse. This other discourse is also based on a different culture of gender relations, on other ways of thinking. Is it not possible to suppose that our author, for example, believes that “men are men,” no matter to what time and culture they belong, and whether they are individuals or “average man,” as Aristotle wrote. That love is not very different from sexuality, and sexuality is entirely a biological phenomenon. That in fact everyone behaves and loves the same, about the same as the author of the article described.

But I am sure that there are at least two different cultures of love and sociality, and the author and I belong to different cultures. In mine there is no average man, and it is not good if empirical observations are generalized to man in general, and different paths of development to the only correct, law-conforming variant of evolution. There is no justification in it, or rather, no cultivation of the

priority of the unconscious and biological principles over consciousness and rational behavior, from which it does not at all follow that a person always does the right thing. We are imperfect and often weak, but it is important to strive to live rightly. When, for example, St. Augustine confessed his weakness on the path to God, he did not claim, like the Manichaeans, that he was the arena of the struggle between Christ and Satan, but called himself to unity and faith. "Let them perish at Thy presence," O Lord, as they perish, "superstitions and seducers," who, noticing the presence of two desires in man, declared that there are in us two souls of two natures: one good, and the other evil...

When I was thinking about serving the Lord my God (as I had long since determined), I wanted it and I didn't want it - and I was the same I. I didn't quite want it and I didn't quite want it. That is why I fought with myself and divided into myself, but this separation did not testify to the nature of another soul, but only to the fact that my own was punished" (Augustine, 1992, pp. 104, 107). Augustine does not renounce the priority of consciousness over his passions and desires, recognizing their importance, he gathers strength in order to put them in their place in the new reality of the Christian faith.

Do we always behave with dignity and in the right way in love and intimate relationships? Of course not. But it is more important what ideas about love we proceed from and whether we try to follow them. Our author generally professes different ideas. Following Kant's imperative, we recognize this right for him. Let him also recognize our right to think over and discuss his ideas.

## References

1. M Respublika. Augustine Aureli Confession (1992): 332.
2. Berdyaev NA. "Eros and Personality (Philosophy of Gender)". Moscow, Prometey Publ (1989): 156.
3. Kant I. "Critique of Pure Reason". Moscow: Mysl, (1994): 591.
4. Lewis K Hunt. "Peace and Eros". Mostov: Politizdat (1991).
5. Mead M. "Culture and the World of Childhood". Moscow: Nauka (1988): 430.
6. Rozin VM. "Plato's "Feast": A New Reconstruction and Some Reminiscences in Philosophy and Culture". V. M. Rozin; Russian Academician of Sciences, Institute of Philosophy. - Moscow: URSS (2015): 188.
7. Rozin VM. "Love in the Mirrors of Philosophy, Scene and Literature". Moscow, Moscow Psychological-Social-Social Institute Publ (2006): 464.
8. Rozin VM. "Pandemic as a "Pregnancy Test" and a Harbinger of Social Change?". Law and Politics 6 (2020): 15-24.
9. Rozov NS. "Oddities and Origins of Human Sexuality". Human (2021): 2.
10. Scientists have proven that the female orgasm is a myth (2021).
11. [https://pikabu.ru/story/uchyonyie\\_dokazali\\_zhenskiy\\_orgazm\\_yeto\\_mif\\_6809161](https://pikabu.ru/story/uchyonyie_dokazali_zhenskiy_orgazm_yeto_mif_6809161)
12. Freud Z. "Essays on the psychology of sexuality". Moscow (1989): 83.
13. Fridman RA. "Love Lyrics of Troubadours and Yts Interpretation". Scientific Notes of the Ryazan State Pedagogical Institute 34 (1965): 87-417.
14. Kjell L and Ziegler D. "Theories of Personality". M., - L., Kharkov: Petrit Press (1997): 606.