

1. Ideology

1.1 Kreutz Ideology

Ideologies are a replacement for religion for those who consider standard religions too unscientific.

Ideologies have the same function as religions, which is to convey an idea of sense to a meaningless life. Ideologies have formulated mantras against which even trivial day-to-day decisions can be checked for guidance.

Ideologies have explain modes. Among the explain modes of Kreutz Ideology is the concept of sexual motivation as the principle force in individual human life, and the concept of sexual interests as the principle force in human societies.

Ideologies are superstructures of modes of production. But what the modes of production refer to is not just how we bake our bread, and the means by which we get from point A to point B. The modes of production at their core are the modes of reproduction. Not just how self-replicating molecules manage to stay alive, which is a necessity for self-replication, but how they conduct self-replication.

That is why in human societies, medical discoveries, or events that interfere with reproductive biology, have always had so much impact.

The following interceptions with human modes of reproduction caused tidal changes in perception and opinion, and the superstructures of society.

- * The discovery of antibiotics in the far-reaching management of venereal diseases making promiscuity an attractive option.
- * The discovery and refinement of contraceptive technologies making sex for pleasure a viable choice, not only for males but also for females.
- * The occurrence of AIDS working in the opposite direction.

* Advances in cosmetic surgery and related procedures making it possible for people of advancing age to remain within the thresholds of sufficient sexual attractiveness.

* The discovery of phosphodiesterase inhibitors like Pfizer's Blue, and, on a smaller scale, the rediscovery of sexuality-enhancing ethnobotany (tongkat ali, butea superba) putting older men back into the sexual arena.

Modes of production in human reproductive biology had the strongest impact, but non-biological changes in the modes of production also affect the superstructures because of their relevance for reproductive behavior.

* Cheap air travel making it possible for people of a comparatively low sexual market value to pursue promiscuous goals in poorer parts of the world.

* The Internet facilitating partner search, however strange or rare one's sexual inclinations.

* The proliferation of pornography initiating young people at an earlier age and raising libido in those who benefit from this.

* Surveillance technologies restricting promiscuity.

Derived from the basic explain modes of ideologies are other explain modes, such as, in the case of Kreutz Ideology, the concepts of sexual economics and of sexual market value, which apply not only in free market economies or liberal democracies, but to all human societies of all sizes, even to stone-age villages.

The proclaimed adaptedness of humans to economies of need as found in the Third World, rather than economies of full supply, as found in the First World is yet another Kreutzian explain mode.

Ideologies don't only have mantras and explain modes, they typically also have agendas. The agenda of Kreutz Ideology is easily derived from its base, the interest in a comfortable death, precluded by optimal sex. But because Kreutz Ideology is individualistic, the agenda won't translate into much political activism. The primary interest is in our own comfortable death, precluded by our own optimal sex.

We won't die as martyrs of religions, and not as heroes for our fatherlands. We do not sacrifice ourselves for the progress of mankind, and not even so our children will have it better.

Under normal circumstances, we won't get involved much, and under unfavorable circumstances, we may just go somewhere else. Thus, our agenda is maybe just an opinion.

Our chances for a comfortable death are greatest in a kind, a gentle society. In an aggressive, brutal society, many people die a gruesome death, and this may include us. Because our interest in a comfortable death is vital, we have a good reason and strong incentive to act towards a harmonious society. Traditional drugs like marijuana and morphium make societies less aggressive, as they reduce sexual competition and offer an alternative to sexual success pressure.

Before a comfortable death, we pursue optimal sex. Each person's idea of optimal sex is different. Therefore, it is best to hold personal sexual freedom in high esteem.

We may see a need to regulate a transportation network, water supply, and garbage disposal. Violence obviously must be contained. Beyond that, the concepts of personal freedom, especially sexual freedom, deserve maximum respect, and interference is unwanted for anything that isn't physical violence.

Ideologies, as complete systems of how to perceive the world, offer an outlook on the time ahead. Unfortunately, a happy future for everybody is unlikely. Conflict will result in widespread destruction, but for those positioned well, this will entail many opportunities, including sexual.

On the other hand, we will not participate in destruction. It is not necessary for deriving benefit from it, as it will happen without us. To join destructive events also contradicts our interest in a comfortable death as our involvement plays back in our minds with mingled, even reverse roles.

The long-term assumption of Kreutz Ideology is that humanity will self-destruct. Not that it would matter.

Ideologies, just like religions, provide instrumentalizations by which to enhance a life in accordance to the tenets of an ideology.

For Kreutzian Ideology, the chemical interference with human physiology in order to optimize sexual experience is such an instrumentalization.

An ideology integrates many concerns, subordinated to its major principles. This is why many of my minor articles address a wide range of issues. Guidance on everyday conduct covers topics as diverse as geographical location, youth-preserving strategies, and educational recommendations.

1.2 Ideology is not science

Science is about determining definite facts in a wide field of interests. It is painstaking work, delving into ever more detail. No human can store all scientific knowledge.

Ideology doesn't compete with science when the task is to explain every aspect of the world. The purpose of ideology is to provide intellectual guidance on how to conduct one's life, and why to conduct it in a specific manner. In providing such a manual, ideologies are in one category with religions.

But modern ideologies draw on science. And Kreutz Ideology does. I have a keen interest in several scientific fields, ranging from biology to neuroscience to linguistics to philosophy. I am also interested in a wide range of practical solutions to all kinds of problems. .

No way can I be right in all my ideas on scientific findings. And apart from that, science evolves. Many scientific convictions of decades ago have been modified to a degree that they appear unrelated or contrary to previous beliefs.

But ideologies, in spite of being prone to error in every detail, are more enduring than the science of the day because ideologies provide an overriding principle only.

Furthermore, ideologies encompass more knowledge than just the scientific one. Knowledge is also a linguistic quality because most concepts are expressed in sentences. Knowledge for which a language has no terms would be hard to grasp. And then there is knowledge that is more beautiful to express in one language than another. The German "Das Sein bestimmt das Bewusstsein" would be an example. The standard English translation is "Existence determines consciousness" but this translation falls way short of the concise wisdom, and the poetic beauty, of the German original which has the syllable "sein" in the subject and the object of the phrase. Constructs of thought that deserve to be called Ideologies have to use language to create verbal art, apart from citing scientific fact. It is an inherent feature of any ideology that it doesn't just want to inform. It wants to convince.

Constructs of thought that deserve to be called Ideologies have to use language to create verbal art, apart from citing scientific fact. It is an inherent feature of any ideology that it doesn't just want to inform. It wants to convince.

1.3 What is truth?

Actually, it isn't much. Not the truth, anyway.

The emphasis is on "the". Not on "truth".

Because, as far as truth goes, it may be true. And the opposite of truth is what?

Of course, the opposite is also true.

It's a counter-intuitive idea that may need some time to get used to.

But the idea that the earth is a ball rotating around the sun and itself is also counter-intuitive, or at least it was when first presented.

But it could be measured. Galileo Galilei did.

Now scientist confront us with the theory that there is not just one universe, but an indefinite number of them, many of them even with their own laws of nature.

Difficult to imagine, but again, measurable. It's knowledge born out of an observation in quantum mechanics whereby, for an example, an atom's electrons, even though they have a mass, do not have a location that could precisely be determined (Heisenberg's uncertainty principle).

So, what is truth? If there is an indefinite number of universes, everything that can be imagined as false, is also true.

For another aspect of the topic, we have to go back to the German philosopher Immanuel Kant.

In his Critique of Pure Reason, he distinguished between things-in-itself as they exist independent from an observer, and the perceptions we have of them. These perceptions depend on the apparatus used in their observation (for humans their senses and brains).

To give a simple example. Feces itself does not stink. It just radiates gases. The idea that it stinks rests entirely with the observer. For flies, it just smells sweet.

But it's not just beauty in the eye, and bad smell in the nose of the observer.

Immanuel Kant recognized that even the ideas of space and time are categories of the observer, not the thing-in-itself.

Immanuel Kant's philosophy prepared the ground for Albert Einstein's theories in which he correlated the speed of light with time, reasoning that if we were to move faster than the speed of light, we would travel back in time.

We have learned time and again that intuitions and perceptions are a poor indicator of truth.

So, I guess the multiverse is just fine.

And truths are but (mostly useful) intuitions and perceptions of an observer.

The surest, an observer can feel about is himself. Therefore, Descartes famously stated: "I think, therefore I am."

And the philosophical school of solipsism is based on the recognition of the fact that the only thing a mind can truly be sure of is its own existence. Everything else which is experienced as reality may just as well be imagination.

In fact this may just be it. Anyway, if there is an indefinite number of universes, there are enough of them for each of us to occupy his or her own.

We can already recognize the pattern that the truest truths are those that are closest to the biological observer. This is why I don't doubt the reality of my sensations: pain, hunger, sexual desires, pleasure.

These observer-focused realities are so true that we do not even need language to be aware of them.

But the more complicated our perceptions become, the more difficult to think of them in categories other than language. Intuitions like “democracies are the political system best suited to safeguard human rights” could not be expressed, and would be hard to think of as true, in any way other than through the application of words.

Immanuel Kant propagated awareness for the fact that differentiation is needed between the thing-in-itself and its representation in the mind of an observer.

And thereafter, it 20th century philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein emphasized that the ideas we entertain, including those considered philosophical, are a function (in the mathematical sense) of the language used to express them. And that “whereof one cannot speak, thereof one must pass over in silence”. Knowledge on most everything depends on the absence of lexicographic voids.

Just a difference of language already can make for different truths, not even multiverse awareness is needed for that.

A lot of complex European philosophy is very hard to express in analytic (as opposed to inflectional) languages where more meaning is carried in single words, rather than deductive statements. That’s why the work of Martin Heidegger is so difficult to translate into Chinese where the concept of “being” often is included in nouns and adjectives, and verb forms do not differentiate tenses.

And that’s why it is so hard to be an atheist if one’s native language is Arabic.

For the co-existence of divergent truths, the preservation of the world’s linguistic diversity is important, indeed.

Because some truths can only enter and exit the human mind if there is a language adequate for it.

And because complex truths all so often are just a question of the language used, and because what is false in one language may just as well be true in another one, and because the potential number of languages is just as indefinite as the number of universes in the multiverse, the ideas of a German Marxist, an Arabic Islamist, and a Papuan Animist are equally acceptable to me. Even though they contradict each other, they may be true in themselves, in their own languages, in their own universes.

On the other hand, for me personally, and for other humans (if they exist outside of my imagination), concepts that express themselves only in languages are less relevant than primary realities that do not need languages, such as pain, hunger, sexual desires, pleasure.

1.4 The origin of motivation, and ideology

From the perspective of self-replicating molecules (RNA and DNA), a healthy, sexually motivated organism is an optimal EXTERNAL environment. An organism is NOT an internal system from the perspective of genes.

Life originated from accumulations of large molecules (ribonucleic acids) that reacted in chain processes to result in more of its kind. This self-replication of RNA, even of artificially created RNA, has been proven in laboratory experiments. However, basic self-organization and self-replication of ribonucleic acids is extremely time-consuming and does not reach far under lab conditions.

In the history of the earth, the chemical chain reaction of self-replication occurred at a higher frequency under favorable conditions. Favorable conditions initially were accidental.

Accidentally, too, but already along the principles of natural selection, some of these molecular accumulations not only thrived under favorable conditions, but influenced external conditions so that they would become more favorable for their self-replication. In practice, ribonucleic acid enzymes (ribozymes) catalyzed the self-replication of certain RNA molecules in favorable environments.

All forms of life, including our own, are just favorable EXTERNAL conditions for the self-replication of RNA and its slightly modified form, DNA.

Life didn't just happen out of nothing. It's a logical consequence of chemistry, under favorable conditions, but nevertheless just a result of chemical reactions.

It is a matter of subjective interpretation where in the course of ever more elaborately modified external conditions, one wants to set the origin of life, as anyway, the increasing complexity of these molecular accumulations is more or less linear on the time axis.

Favorable conditions, and the active interference of self-replicating molecules with their immediate surroundings to make these surroundings more favorable to their replication by enzymatic action, is very much at the bases of life. The strategy has been successful on earth, which is why we have a diverse biosphere all around the globe.

There are several terms to describe an optimal condition of this immediate external environment of self-replicating molecules which is organized as an organism. It can be called "health", or, more technically, "homeostasis".

Organisms display multiple functions to ensure that they are in an optimal condition for self-replicating molecules. At the root of all these functions is motivation. Without motivation, the function of an organism (the immediate external environment of self-replicating molecules) cannot be organized.

This is why even the most primitive organisms, for example *Caenorhabditis elegans*, have strong motivation. *Caenorhabditis elegans* is nematode, a roundworm, of just about 1000 cells, of which about 300 are a nervous system. *Caenorhabditis elegans* shows a strong sex drive and it even risks annihilation to pursue sexual reproduction. If females (which in the absence of males can be hermaphrodites) are at a food source, males stay there. If no females are at a food source, males crawl wandering around.

It is not that organisms have various drives such as seeking nutrition, avoiding danger and escaping negative stimuli, as well as seeking reproduction. Organisms really only have one purpose, only one drive, only one motivation: reproduction.

All other so-called drives are just logistical measures to make reproduction happen. Organisms avoid annihilation so that the one driving force behind any organism, self-replicating molecules, have an easier time to self-replicate.

The drive for favorable conditions for the self-replication of RNA and DNA is the most basic axiom of life. Everything else is just building on it.

Why do human beings, and other animals, have senses? To detect disturbances to the immediate environment of self-replicating molecules.

And why can animals move? To escape unfavorable conditions for the self-replication of RNA and DNA, and to go to more favorable ones.

And why do humans have feelings and emotions? For the same reason for which they have senses.

And the same goes for memory, language, and all cognitive functions. It even goes for ideologies, including the Kreutzian ideology you are reading about on this site. Its success rate depends on the extent to which it supports the self-replication of self-replicating molecules. And I guess it does a good job at that, which proves its biological truth.

The organizing principle of all nervous system functions, and their anatomies, is motivation to assure favorable conditions for the self-replication of RNA and DNA. With no motivation, all other brain functions are not just useless. With no motivation, other brain functions wouldn't be there in the first place.

Sex drive isn't a diffuse desire but rooted in mechanisms by which self-replicating molecules influence their surrounding to make conditions more suitable to self-replication. Thus, libido can be broken down into a multitude of influences of RNA, and its slight modification, DNA, on their environment to facilitate this self-replication. Evolution never functioned to achieve self-preservation, only self-replication. And this cause is evident in all forms of life, and its behavioral expression, up to the level of interaction in human society, and philosophy.

What appears to be a drive towards self-preservation and behavior directed to avoid annihilation is but a logistical organization for self-replication. That is why the males of black widow spiders risk ending up as meal, and why young men take the risk of death at a high probability for a chance to become sexually desirable heroes.

1.5 Motivation and spatial memory

Any nervous system starts with just two parameters:

1. Motivation

2. Spatial memory

Motivation sets out as motivation for self-replication. When motivation develops, it can take more complex forms. An early addition would be motivation to self-preserve. Obviously, self-preservation is often conducive to self-replication. But because self-replication reigns supreme, nature is full of examples of self-annihilation for the purpose of self-replication. Furthermore, nature cannot make exact copies. Some copies are improvements, and others are deformations. Self-destructive motivation without a benefit for self-replication or group selection are common short side branches in evolution.

Spatial memory is the second original component of any nervous system. Even primitive organisms like the roundworm *Caenorhabditis elegans* with a nervous system of just 303 cells exhibit it. The original capability embedded in spatial memory is the use of information on favorable conditions for self-replication, and, in extension to self-replication, self-preservation.

Spatial memory is biological fairly straightforward. Storage is in constructs of proteins or other molecules that are shaped as images of the outside world. Not photographic images of course, but representations of data, which can include all kind of sensory input, plus, by association, information that is derived from other data that is already stored.

Motivation and spatial memory interact, and in this process, images of the world that are stored in spatial memory are evaluated, first on a simple scale from worst to best. This evaluation is then translated into motoric impulses, which are the origin of behavior.

While the encoding of motivation itself has probably seen comparatively less development to optimize its functionality, the brain's spatial memory that represents the outside world (a map in a rather conventional sense) has an almost unlimited potential for improvement. The highly differentiated emotional tagging of the image of the outside world, for example, allows extreme differentiation in motoric response. This is why humans, with the most differentiated nervous system, rule the world. The more meaningful the spatial images of the world that are stored in a nervous system, the more benefit is derived from corresponding motoric responses.

Arthur Schopenhauer's main work had the title "The World as Will and Representation". And the first sentence states: "The world is my representation."

Reword this in more scientific terminology, and you get: The World is Motivation and Spatial Memory.

Motivation and spatial memory, and the manner in which the relationship between the two translates into action, are at the base of human existence and all intellectual capabilities we may possess. This is a central theme of Kreutz Ideology and is evident even in mundane topics, such as an evaluation in what part of the world we may expect the best sex.

1.6 A materialistic perspective

Kreutz Ideology advocates a materialistic approach to understanding of the world.

“Materialistic”, in this context, does not mean: driven by concerns for material benefit.

The materialism I refer to is a philosophical concept, built on the conviction that for everything that happens in the world, even in the realm of love and sex, there is a cause in the material world, and this cause can maybe be investigated and maybe be understood. This is what science is about.

If causes have been investigated and understood, such causes can be reenacted, or created. This is when we take the step from science to technology, and engineering.

Science and technology are applicable to the emotion of missing a loved person no less than they are to bridging the Mississippi. Which is why the first series of articles I ever wrote on love and sex was headlined “Engineering love”.

The opposite of philosophical materialism is philosophical idealism. Now, this idealism doesn't refer to us being idealistic in that we try to build a better world, or, on a lower scale, a working long-term love relationship. Philosophical idealism refers to the idea that there is something outside the material world, on which the material world depends.

“Idealism is the doctrine that ideas, or thought, make up either the whole or an indispensable aspect of any full reality, so that a world of material objects containing no thought either could not exist as it is experienced, or would not be fully “real.” Idealism is often contrasted with materialism, both belonging to the class of monist as opposed to dualist or pluralist ontologies. (Note that this contrast between idealism and materialism has to do with the question of the nature of reality as such. It has nothing to do with advocating high moral standards, or the like.)”

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

I am not a philosophical idealist. I am a philosophical materialist. I understand that humans, though not all of them, can understand, to a certain degree, what happens in the world.

As they say: the proof of the pudding is in eating it. Or, the proof of our understanding is that we can make it. This applies equally to constructing bridges and to constructing optimal relationships of love and sex.

However, there is an important twist to all of this. It is not just that, in as much as we understand the world, we can create it, but that, whether we understand the world or not, it always also creates us.

When Darwin summarized the emerging knowledge on the origin of species, and when, subsequently, humans developed the knowledge of genetic engineering, it wasn't just that we got better in shaping our world. Our new technologies also reflected back on us in no small dimension. Idealism took a major blow. And again, idealism will take another blow when medical science will have advanced to a stage, as it surely will, when in principle, it can afford humans an indefinite life span.

Alas, we are not quite there yet.

But regardless of when our technologies will have sufficiently evolved for this exciting prospect, the fact remains that it is our technologies, or (to use an older, and wider, designation) our modes of production that shape our opinions, and that only with sufficient cognition, we can see beyond this.

Just as our knowledge on the origin of species has important roots in 19th century philosophy, so does our understanding of the manner in which our modes of production reflect back on our minds.

The following is quoted from the preface of Karl Marx' "A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy", written in 1859:

“The general conclusion at which I arrived and which, once reached, became the guiding principle of my studies can be summarized as follows. In the social production of their existence, men inevitably enter into definite relations, which are independent of their will, namely relations of production appropriate to a given stage in the development of their material forces of production. The totality of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which arises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production of material life conditions the general process of social, political and intellectual life. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but their social existence that determines their consciousness.”

<http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1859/critique-pol-economy/preface.htm>

In the original German version, the above quote reads like this:
“Das allgemeine Resultat, das sich mir ergab und, einmal gewonnen, meinen Studien zum Leitfaden diente, kann kurz so formuliert werden: In der gesellschaftlichen Produktion ihres Lebens gehen die Menschen bestimmte, notwendige, von ihrem Willen unabhangige Verhaltnisse ein, Produktionsverhaltnisse, die einer bestimmten Entwicklungsstufe ihrer materiellen Produktivkrafte entsprechen. Die Gesamtheit dieser Produktionsverhaltnisse bildet die oekonomische Struktur der Gesellschaft, die reale Basis, worauf sich ein juristischer und politischer Ueberbau erhebt und welcher bestimmte gesellschaftliche Bewusstseinsformen entsprechen. Die Produktionsweise des materiellen Lebens bedingt den sozialen, politischen und geistigen Lebensprozess ueberhaupt. Es ist nicht das Bewusstsein der Menschen, das ihr Sein, sondern umgekehrt ihr gesellschaftliches Sein, das ihr Bewusstsein bestimmt.”

http://www.mlwerke.de/me/me13/me13_007.htm

You can read an explanation, written more than 70 years ago, through the following link:

Society and Mind in Marxian Philosophy

<http://www.marxists.org/archive/pannekoe/society-mind/ch01.htm>

To conclude that our minds mirror our modes of production is good science.

But there is an anachronism in Marx' thought. If anyway the modes of production determine ideologies, then the interference of Communist revolutionaries would be obsolete.

But Marx himself was a child of his times, when socialism among intellectuals was a fashionable idea.

Furthermore, his analysis of everybody belonging to a social class, the interests of which are reflected in his consciousness and ideologies, had more appeal in the 19th century but is less applicable to the more pluralistic and globalized present times.

Nevertheless, it remains true that while on a social level, everybody's consciousness and ideology is a representation of the modes of production, this consciousness and ideology is, on an individual level, a representation, or simply a rationalization, of a person's interests.

I myself, of course, cannot escape the fact that my own ideology, too, is a representation of both, current technologies and my individual interests. However, I have at least some awareness of this interdependence.

1.7 Ideology with contradictions

I live alone and work alone. I do not have an editor who would read and judge my articles. Unlike other authors, I also do not have a wife with whom I would discuss my work.

This has its advantages and disadvantages.

The primary benefit is that I can be totally honest. I do not have to be politically correct. I am not subject to any censorship.

So, in one way, I can consider myself lucky.

But to be outside of any control can also be a handicap. Nobody can tell me reliably, which of my articles are good, and which one are not.

Sometimes, I can put down an idea in a few paragraphs, and everything fits. And sometimes, what I produce is off the mark.

Some better pieces have been written in a single go, from start to finish, without second thoughts. And the same is true for some pieces that are over the top or below my standard of quality.

People who do not write have little awareness of how difficult it is to judge one's own work.

It's as if an author gets desensationalized to his or her own sentences, just as everybody gets desensationalized for one's own odors.

This is why in a professional setting, authors have editors.

I do not have an editor. The best I can do is to re-read an article after a few months, when my brain has sufficiently rewired itself. Only then can I recognize what is expressed well, and what is quatsch.

I do want to formulate a consistent ideology for a world in which optimal sexual experience, followed by a comfortable death, is recognized as guiding principle. I cannot do this in one sitting.

Kreutz Ideology is a collection of pieces that have been written during more than 30 years. My basic ideas haven't changed so it is befitting to publish them as one book. On the other hand, articles written more than 20 years ago represent not only my thought but also reflect on the modes by which I produced the economic frame of my existence. I re-read my work and eliminate strings to specific economic conditions of mine, as they are of no relevance to the Kreutz Ideology.

Kreutz Ideology of course does relate to modes of production. But not my modes of production of the day. Kreutz Ideology relates to the modes of production of a lot of people similar to me, and for those, including me, Kreutz Ideology is an adequate intellectual superstructure. It is in accordance to a current Zeitgeist.

Reviewing my work, I sometimes focus on one portion, and at other times on another portion of my ideology. As I go along, I often discover discrepancies that are due to the fact that the pieces assembled here have been pulled back from many editions, published during several decades. That some of the pieces pulled back were not even originally written by me, is further aggravating the situation. I try my best to sort them out, and to sort out discrepancies, as I work along. The final version will depend on when I die.

1.8 Ideology as a composition of articles

My work published on this site has been written during several decades. The texts on Kreutz Ideology were not conceptualized as chapters of a book. They are articles of the style columnists write their pieces. Each of the articles is structured as a piece in itself, and each article can be read as a stand-alone opinionated text.

My ideas have evolved, and certainly, there are logical and ideological discrepancies between what I have written just recently and what I have written much earlier.

However, on some important matters, I have never changed my mind since as a teenager, I formed my first own philosophical and political thoughts.

I have never been religious.

I have always considered sexual satisfaction the logical primary value in life: in my own life, the life of other men, and the life of women.

I have never had a high opinion of anti-sexual morals.

I have always considered philosophical materialism, rather than philosophical idealism as the correct view of the world. In this respect (but not in many others), I have always been a Marxist.

In spite of always having been a philosophical materialist, and in spite of having been captivated by Marx' analysis in the preface of his Critique of Political Economy, I am not, and never was, a socialist or communist. The fact is: I am not, and never was, an illusionist.

Now for those aspects on which I have changed my opinion, sometimes back and forth, over the past few years.

I previously considered myself a nihilist because I could not find any value in any of the standard moral theories (religions, political idealism) and have no interest in the world after my death.

<http://www.answers.com/topic/nihilism>

But I never really was a genuine nihilist because I always did believe in one value in life: optimal sexual experience, for me and whoever my female partner, and strictly during our lifetime. I do not care much for the optimal sexual experience of humans after my lifetime. They will have to tackle that problem themselves.

I had some phases in my life (actually not long ago) during which I concerned myself with ideas of how I could participate in a movement aimed at making the world a sexually better place.

But my involvement in attempts to create sexually better societies has ever only consisted of writing articles. I am not drawn towards doing political work because I have a hard time solidarizing with other men.

While I have the same interests as other men, I also perceive them as my competitors (or natural enemies). Thus, I do not have many personal male friends.

1.9 Ideology in the English language

English is not my native language, and up to the age of 20, I wasn't capable of writing a single paragraph in English without major errors in grammar and word choice.

Maybe, for matters of style only, my results would be better if I were to stick to German. But I like to write for an international audience.

At the beginning of the third millennium, whatever is written in German only, is unlikely to have much impact. In this respect, German, unfortunately, ranks on one level with Italian, or Dutch, or Swedish... and far below Arabic, Chinese, and even French and Spanish.

I don't care if my writing falls short of qualifying as literature. I do not writ to produce beautiful sentences. I write to communicate ideas.

My ideas evolve. I was not born with a fixed set of ideas, and I didn't receive a fixed set of ideas by divine inspiration, as founders of religions have claimed. While my ideas of a few years ago went into the same direction as the ideas I hold now, they are not identical.

Furthermore, my knowledge isn't universal. While my ideas on how we ought to view ourselves in this world are based on what I know about the world, errors in my perception of facts, and the way, these errors are reflected in my writing, all undermine not only my credibility but also the correctness of my opinions.

Nevertheless, I am confident that my current opinions on the world and the meaning of human life, by and large make better sense than what is or has been produced by other writers.

If I look at how off the mark other explanations of the world are (especially religious explanations), then I am very happy indeed, if I am more than 50 percent right.

On the other hand, I sometimes tone down my opinions, simply because I want to live in peace. For me personally, I see no benefit being in the public arena, and I have no intention whatsoever to be a hero, or a fighter for the truth.

Because my individual life will cease with my individual death, and I have, at the bottom of my heart, no interest in a world in which I do not exist, I would always do a Galileo when my writing starts to disturb the path I have chosen for my existence: a largely anonymous life of sexual pleasure, and after that, if possible, a comfortable death.

1.10 Spin doctors, copywriters. and spam

I am an independent writer in a modern world that is defined by the Internet. This is a world where practically everybody can publish his ideas. Not only his ideas but also his sales lines.

I don't think that the average reader is sufficiently aware of the degree to which information on the Internet is intertwined with economic interests. Information seldom is just an expression of ideas or news. It often also is a tool employed to guide readers to a certain consumer behavior. This has always been the case, but on the Internet, it has become much worse than it has ever been before.

The Internet grew by providing free information. To publish information takes time and costs money. To give away for free a product or a service, the compilation of which has taken time and has cost money, is a luxury few can afford for any length of time.

Political parties can. They have a far-reaching agenda.

And companies can, if the information they provide directs consumers towards buying their products.

I don't say that this wouldn't be legitimate. It's part of capitalism.

When politicians engage information professionals these information professionals operate as spin doctors. And when corporations employ authors to write texts to direct consumers to buy their products, these authors are categorized as copywriters.

And what spin doctors and copywriters produce on the Internet is called spam.

At least 90 percent of the information one finds on the Internet is spam, especially when it comes to sexual enhancement.

I have been a writer for all of my professional life. I started my professional life as a journalist, and I was a low-key journalist for many years. I have also written copy. And I honestly admit that a portion of my work that has been accessible on the Internet was copy.

But I have decided that copy isn't my line of business. I try to provide quality information because it is so much more satisfying to work on it. I try to offer honest information that is not designed to influence consumer behavior, even if my income in doing so is much less than what I could earn as a full-fledged copywriter.

Or as a professional spammer.

From a letter to a friend:

"I may be a writer, and writing may be a theoretical discipline, but I am also a very practical person. I do not live to be a writer. I am a writer because I have found it to be the most convenient way to earn money without being anybody's employee, and without being tied down at any specific place, and without needing bulky equipment.

"OK, I also am a writer because I believe that putting down one's ideas in writing is a great way to organize them. I even admit that I enjoy to communicate to others such ideas that present matters in a more truthful manner than commonly encountered.

"But I don't hold romantic views of my profession. Writing is less important than living. For me, the former is only a by-product of the latter. I regard many practical issues as more important than writing. Specifically, writing is no substitute for satisfying sexual relationships."