

### 3.2.2.3.4.4 Manoeuvring and logistics

Kreutzian ideology is about an agenda of optimal sex, terminated by a comfortable death.

While optimal sex means optimal sexual function, it also includes the pursuit of sexual relationships with females of a high sexual market value, young, attractive, and healthy. I have never been interested in females of a low sexual market value, e.g. prostitutes, or women who have, or have had, numerous sexual relationships. There is often a reverse proportionality between the number of sexual contacts and health.

I have lived in Southeast Asia for many years, but I have never frequented brothels, bars, nightclubs, massage salons, barber shops, and if ever a prostitute has been among my girlfriends, than I definitely wasn't aware of her trade when we met, and definitely, the affair wasn't one of her normal business transactions.

I don't mind if a girl works in a factory, and I can take it if she works in a restaurant kitchen and smells of food. But I have no personal tolerance for women who work in sexual services.

Yes, my agenda may be in conflict with the agenda of some of my girlfriends who would prefer to have me all to themselves.

My agenda is male. It is a result of a male evolutionary history in which that set of genes is the most successful that takes procreative chances with the largest number of healthy women. As a result of male evolution, my typically male sexual desire is directed towards attractive and young-looking women because their procreative capacities are at a peak. (Fortunately, we are on the brink of a "mode of production" which in principle makes it possible for women to look as if they are in their thirties, even when they are chronologically much older.)

No, I do not have procreative intentions when I carry on with a new girl. But my typically male sexual desire is directed towards women in their procreative prime because of the evolutionary mechanism by which the genes of men who spread their sperm among the largest number of healthy women in their procreative prime are the most

likely to become dominant, and this includes the genetic trait of a preference for women in their procreative prime.

I consider it likely that not only the male preference for many women, and for young women, has a genetic basis, but also the preference for certain standards of beauty, as beauty is a general indicator of health, and men who spread their sperm among beautiful women were more likely to be successful in siring an optimal number of children than men who were drawn towards women without teeth, or those who are blind on one eye, or lame on both feet, or covered with skin lesions, or featuring a yellow, smelly discharge in places where I don't want this.

While my preference for young, beautiful, and healthy women is certainly genetic, the emphasis I put on women that are not promiscuous is probably only partially genetic, and partially cultural. Genetically, I must be against the promiscuity of my girlfriends because insemination by other men would threaten my reproductive success.

On the other hand, during pre-AIDS times, when every sexually transmitted disease was either easily treated or non-life threatening, the promiscuity of a man's sexual partners has probably been more acceptable than it is today.

My sexual agenda is in conflict with the sexual agendas of my girlfriends, because, in general, the procreative and sexual strategies of women are in conflict with the procreative and sexual strategies of men. Women don't produce trillions of gametes. During all of a woman's life, she generates just about 400 impregnable egg cells. And as opposed to the male minimum investment of 5 minutes of insemination, producing offspring for a woman means a burden of at least 9 months.

For women, procreative chances are a rather precious resource, and you try to avoid wastage with a precious resource. As a result, women are far more selective in their sexual strategies, and for good reason, it is in the best of their interests not to take risks with men.

For good reasons, the sexual agenda of women is directed towards men who are good providers, and who are around for the period of

pregnancy, and beyond. For men with an average or no accumulation of resources (of which the capability to do qualified work and earn a living is just one), the provider-oriented expectations of women mean that he should be willing to dedicate all his resources, and all his attention, just to her and the offspring sired together with her. For men who are either very rich, or very powerful, or outstanding for other reasons, women may be willing (and often have been willing throughout history) to compromise, though they may prefer not to have to.

That seeking material benefits is deeply ingrained in typically female mating strategies has been mentioned by David Buss in his book *The Evolution of Desire*, as well as in the work of other academic evolutionary psychologists. That a mating strategy of seeking material benefits and security for herself and her offspring in a lifetime relationship with a dedicated spouse is essentially based on the same paradigm (seeking material benefits) as the mating strategy of a street hooker is nevertheless violently challenged by well-reputed housewives.

My sexual agenda obviously also is in conflict with the agendas of other men. It is in conflict with the agenda of other alpha males, because we potentially compete for the same resources. It is even more though in conflict with the agendas of betas and gammas, because the whole system is unfair to them. There is always the potential risk that betas and gammas band together and apply the methods of the French Revolution. Fraternity, of course, is only transitory, as kings are replaced by emperors, and the nobility by politicians, bureaucrats, and capitalists who then appropriate the unfair share.

My sexual agenda is not condoned by the societies where I pursue it, and it wouldn't be in any other society. My agenda generates envy, and envy generates social friction, and that's not good for law and order, which is the responsibility of the politicians who govern societies. Politicians in power are against trouble. Even men who themselves pursue an agenda which is comparative to mine, will typically not endorse it, certainly not in public, and most likely not in private either. For what? Sharing information on the typical alpha lifestyle only attracts suspicion in one's immediate environment, and unwanted attention on the part of the authorities. A decrease in

opportunities would be a likely consequence of both suspicion and attention. You don't want to be known for your pursuits and your corresponding opinions, neither among your current or potential girlfriends, nor in the wider public. Known playboys are on a downward track, simply because they are known.