

3.2.2.3.4.3 Wrong priorities

Depression is a common condition among aging men and women. While, being a man myself, I have an easier time writing from the perspective of a man, I assume that the causes for depression are largely the same for women as they are for men.

Most depressed men are depressed for a good reason. Deep inside, they know that what they are lacking is a satisfying love life, or, in more direct terms, good sex. Better sex.

There possibly are many advantages to lifelong monogamous relationships: they are good for raising children, they likely are economically sound, and in a dangerous world, they can be protective capsules. But one thing they can not. They cannot make for a satisfying love life. Not for an extended period of time.

I realize that a good number of my readers are in longtime monogamous relationships, and I do not want to offend those who respect my writing; not individually, anyway. But I do believe that deep inside, every person wants to be free. And this means: free to have many sexual relationships.

I am not against longtime relationships. I have them, too. More than one, though this is sometimes difficult to manage in a world where US American standards of sexual morality encroach upon every part of the world. It is possible only if one enforces a certain level of secretiveness and mobility.

For successful Asian men, the import of US moral standards can feel like virtual castration. For men in many Asian cultures, to have parallel sexual relationships is a behavioral pattern to ease the unnatural restraints of monogamy. And Asian wives fear that by Americanized rules, they would have to separate from husbands who have parallel sexual relationships but nevertheless are good providers, family men, and fathers, thus ending up as losers anyway.

American ideology educates women that it breaks their heart if their men have sex with other females. Asian women also like men for themselves, and do not want to share them with other women. But Asian women are more willing to compromise. There are many other things one can get out of men, not just faked faithfulness.

Ethnically I am not Asian. Ethnically, I am a Westerner. But I have lived in Asia most of my adult life, and Asia is my home. Because I know both cultures equally well, I know what is wrong in the West, especially America, and what is right in Asia. For example: the awareness that women, even though they, too, have a natural polygamous impulse, have an easier time to adapt to monogamy than have men.

Mating strategies of men and women have been shaped through evolution and, in principle, by reproductive success. And reproductive success has formed the male and female sexual frame of mind.

No, we do not carry our genes to reproduce ourselves; rather, our genes have designed us to reproduce themselves. This includes mating strategies. They are their, not our choice.

Archetypal male mating strategies emphasize the aim to fertilize as many females as possible. By contrast, archetypal female mating strategies emphasize the aim to provide the best conditions for a much smaller number of offspring (which includes, for their sons, the best possible conditions to fertilize as many females as possible).

But we have to be aware of what the mating strategies of our genes are, and what humans who have reached sufficient self-cognition rightfully consider a sensible mating strategy.

Our genes only use our sexual desires as an instrument for their self-replication. But once we have achieved enough self-cognition, we will be aware of the fact that for each of us individually, the self-replication of our genes doesn't provide a sensible meaning for life. At that stage, the sexual desires themselves, and their fulfillment, separate themselves from their original purpose, which has been replication. And at that stage, when no longer reproductive success is the purpose of mating strategies, but to optimize the pleasure of

sexual conduct, the difference between male and female mating strategies diminishes. This is why I can rightfully postulate that optimal sexual experience is the only philosophically valid sense of life for both men and women.

The American feminist imperative that men not have more than one sexual relationship at a time isn't only aimed at men; it is also aimed at younger, more attractive women. That older and less attractive women resort to it as ideology to fight off competitors is itself a consequence of free-market democracy applied to sexual relationships.

In a society that considers "one at a time" as the ultimate standard of honesty, both men and women are restricted when it comes to opportunities to enjoy success by redeeming it in biological currency (nice attractive sex partners). A clear choice is presented to them: (1) either suppress your basic desire to have a variety of sexual contacts and keep your permanent partner (and social status), or (2) give way to your sexual inclinations and lose it all (family, social standing, career).

I cannot be blackmailed this way. I don't have to live in a society of such rules.

With most of my articles, I have addressed a primarily male audience. Even though I have started to edit my work to address more of a female audience, too, the tilt remains. Thus, while in the further paragraphs of this article, males are the addressed audience, many of the assessments also apply to women.

Western men who are in mid-life and depressed usually started out with the wrong priorities. Their priority for many years has been to advance their professional careers, or to run a business and to accumulate wealth. And because all of this requires a high level of social conformity, they have maneuvered their private lives into a cage, albeit a golden one. When you pursue a political career, you can't be a womanizer, or a bigamist. You can't even visit a prostitute, or watch pornography.

So you ask: and what about Mr. Bill Clinton? A womanizer. I have to laugh. A marriage, and a few affairs left and right (probably all

publicly known). Are these all his exploits? I match his lifetime achievements within a few weeks.

Social climbing? The only currency in which we can realistically measure male success is the number of lays, and the satisfaction we get out of them.

The dialectical nature of human biology (and sexuality) brings with it that traditionally, female success is measured with a different stick: her ability to bind an alpha male, and if it can't be an alpha, a beta version will do. However, for truly liberated women, not her capability to bind a male, but the degree to which she achieves optimal sexual experience is what determines her individual success.

Eastern societies, throughout history, have always been more sensible in that a successful man could have as many women, wives, or concubines as he could afford), while in Western (basically European) society, there has, for some 1500 years (of Christianity) always been a clear imperative for monogamous relationships.

And that's the model that sets modern moral standards.

In such a world, men have to make awkward choices. Social climbing, on certain routes, results in fewer, not in more rewards. Just look at the politicians of the Western, democratic world. Who, in his right mind, wants to be the president of a Western European country? Or a television personality? Or, for that matter, in any position which is subject to constant public scrutiny?

My biological parameters, philosophically emphasized, are that I strive to have optimal sexual experience with a considerable number of different partners. For the self-conscious individual of our species, all metaphysical projections beyond one's lifetime are plain nonsense. The only thing that counts is sexual satisfaction, an after that, a gentle death.

If, in the modern Western world, you place the need for optimal sexual experience behind your career, and behind your business, and behind accumulating riches, you stand a good chance to miss out on what really counts.

To be rich, of course, can come in handy. If you know how to exchange riches into sexual satisfaction. And no, I don't mean frequenting nightlife establishments. They'll exchange your riches alright, but not for a satisfying love life. What you'll get from them is just some outrageously overpriced champagne (or orange juice), and sex that probably is worse than masturbation.

I have been totally focused all my life on successful mating, and I am aware of the fact that my love life is better than what 99 percent of all men experience. I don't frequent prostitutes, but for many years have had at least one new love affair each month.

In my younger years, I primarily had to concern myself with supply questions. What to do to have at least one new sexual relationship per fortnight. I have solved this problem when I moved to Asia, and I believe that many men, whether young or advanced in age, could learn from my experience.

I am now well beyond 50, and over the past decade, I have increasingly faced restrictions to my love life that had nothing to do with supply problems, but with nature throwing other handicaps at me.

There is no question that at my age, one's physical and mental ability to experience full sexual satisfaction tends to decline. This has never been acceptable to me, and throughout years of experimenting, I have found ways to counteract this tendency. I can proudly announce that my physical capabilities of lovemaking are as good, or better, than they were 20 years ago.

I am also proud that my capability to satisfy my partners now is better than it ever was. Several of my girlfriends carry on with me simply because they are much more likely to achieve an orgasm with me than with anybody else.

I have to give credit where credit is due. Both the quality of my love life and my capabilities to satisfy my partners have a lot to do with how I consciously intervene with the physiology of sex. This includes, for example, the use of the Southeast Asian testosterone booster tongkat ali.

I am a writer by profession. But even more so, I am a writer by obsession. I write to drain my brain of the sentences that constantly form themselves, all by themselves. Thinking, for me, is formulating sentences. And to type them into a keyboard is my preferred method for making place for new sentences.

I am German by birth, and German is my native language. I was a journalist for newspapers and magazines, and I wrote a few books, all in German (under various aliases, as I am not interested in being personally known).

But I have been using English as my main tool of communication for more than 20 years, and I like the idea of writing for a worldwide audience. I can't afford a copy editor, so I apologize for errors of grammar and word choice.

On the other hand, I am confident that I do get my message across. It's a message of better sex, or, if you wish, of more satisfying sexual love.

My monthly statistics show that I have several thousand unique visitors per day. Unfortunately, this translates into less than three new members a week.

Never mind.

For a book, this would be a dismal performance. On the Internet, such a low performance is normal. The point is that too many people still believe that information on the Internet has to be free.

I care for my worldwide audience of less than three new members per week.

The others, those who only read the free articles, have the wrong priorities in life.

They may spend much more than what it costs to subscribe to my site on status symbols of questionable benefits, or they spend money indiscriminately, because they are not aware of where it really counts.

Stupid enough.

Many of their investments are a waste of money. Becoming a member of my site is not. To become a member of either “Sexual opportunities” or “Sexual function”, or, ideally, both, will have a major impact on any man's life. The promise is more sexual opportunities (more love relationships with more beautiful young women in Asia) and better sexual function (even at an advanced age).