

3.2 Option 2: A comfortable death, and before that, optimal sex

3.2.0.1 Optimal sex and a comfortable death instead of God

I understand that some people are somehow religious, not because they would genuinely believe in the existence of a god, but rather because they feel that life is meaningless without something to believe in that transcends one's own life. Fear of dying and death plays a major role, too.

They have a vague idea of a god (just as the one propagated by Einstein) as an obscure entity beyond the scientific universe, or as a common soul, or as an indifferent common good.

All of that is of course nonsense, and the fact that Albert Einstein was a genius in the field of physics doesn't make him an authority on religion and philosophy, just as Sigmund Freud was no authority on engineering, and Pablo Picasso would never have been the right person to get advice from on dental surgery.

But I am aware that many people need something to hold on when their mind wanders to questions such as why do we exist, and what are we living for. Or when fear of dying and death creeps in.

Some of my articles are a sort-of catechism on the topic, but I also can summarize it as a mantra:

We live to have relationships of optimal love and sex, and, if possible, to have a comfortable death.

Good health and sufficient intelligence are prerequisites for optimal love and sex, so I have not included them as separate items.

A comfortable death is a widely underestimated philosophical or scientific concern, even though it is an essential aspect in piety and the propagation of religious beliefs.

Most non-religious people are so preoccupied with living optimally that their dying often is a terrible crash.

Or, if they realize their fear of dying and death, they suddenly turn to religions.

In order to de-substantiate religious nonsense, the philosophy and science of modern societies ought to deal with the topics of dying and death.

Dying can be a horrifying experience, full of panic and pain (see youtube [here](#)). But nobody lives through it to tell other people just how horrifying it can be.

Belief in a god, and praying, probably makes dying more bearable, but at the price of abandoning reason. And not everybody can lull himself in lies.

I advocate that modern, atheistic societies offer an attractive alternative to religious delusions when it comes to dying. There should be public education on how to best manage one's end of life. Sexual education and education on dying should go hand in hand, not least because proper awareness of the termination of all individual life is the strongest argument for optimal relationships of love and sex before one's life ends.

Yes, dying can be a horrifying experience, full of panic and pain. Therefore, I believe that morphine should be available for those who are dying consciously. Morphine, potentially the most valuable medication of a lifetime, can be the practical answer of science to all the religious blabla of priests at a person's deathbed.

As an alternative to religious beliefs, a modern society should also work to minimize the occurrence of potential death-in-panic situations. People should have the option to choose unconsciousness for air travel or other activities that are associated with an accident and death-in-panic risk. Providing such practical solutions to the fear of dying can go a long way in pulling the carpet from below the feet of the propagators of religions.

My mantra has two parts, optimal love and sex, and a comfortable death, but in most of my articles, I deal with optimal love and sex.

Christian fundamentalists stand in the way of a society in which optimal relationships of love and sex are rightfully recognized as every human's primary concern during life.

But Christian fundamentalists also are a political obstruction for the second concern, a comfortable death. They argue against humans taking their deaths into their own hands (not by committing suicide but by engineering its gentleness at the time death occurs), because it cuts into the domain they consider theirs (relief from the fear of dying).

3.2.0.2 Kreutz Ideology – earlier draft

PRINCIPLES

1. The human self is a product of the human brain. All expressions of the human self are functions of biochemistry.
2. It is a legitimate endeavor to interfere with brain biochemistry with drugs.
3. The interests of the human self may well be different from that of his or her genes.
4. The behaviour of humans, like that of all existing living organisms, is guided by reproductive desires more than desires to prolongue their existence.
5. The concept of sexual market value explains a wide range of human motivations and actions.
6. Humanity is better adapted to states of economic need, rather than oversupply. In more than one context, wealth is a trap. Destruction will ensue, whether we involve ourselves in it or not.

NO GOD

Scientific evidence supports the assessment that there is no god, and that therefore, all religions are illusions. Yes, neither the existence nor the non-existence of a god can be proven directly. However, the probability that a non-existent entity leaves no verifiable traces is much higher than that an existent entity leaves no verifiable traces.

Thus, as there are no verifiable traces of the existence of a god, we can conclude that there is no god.

The mathematical formula for the non-existence of a god is:

$$X (\text{sys}) \times Y (\text{time}) = Z (>0)$$

In any given system multiplied by any unit of time, the number of instances of verifiable evidence of the existence of deity cannot be zero.

In other words: we don't have to believe anything for which there is no positive verifiable proof.

The same reasoning can be applied to the question of whether there is a human afterlife, or whether, once we are dead, we are dead for good.

THE VALUE OF LIFE

As there is no god, no truth in religions, and no afterlife whatsoever, every possible human fulfillment can be redeemed only in this life.

Because nothing transcends from this life beyond it, there is no value in principle in life itself. It doesn't matter whether we die today or in 100 years. Measured by the infinity of time, our lifespan anyway is infinitively short.

Furthermore, it is obvious that every animal, including those of the species *Homo sapiens sapiens*, has much more capacity to suffer than to be happy. This is part of the genetic design of every animal, as it enhances its competitiveness.

Because our life-spans are infinitively short, and because nothing which could be of individual benefit to us transcends from our lives beyond our deaths, and because the likelihood that we suffer is much greater than the likelihood that we are happy, and because, furthermore, our suffering can be aggravated manifold, while all our happiness eventually ends in boredom, it makes sense to assume that it would be better to be dead than alive.

However, the genetic design of our emotional facilities effectively deters us from terminating our lives. Again, this is at the biological base of animal life itself, as it enhances the chances of a species' genes to propagate.

There is no point in lamenting our genetic make-up that prevents us from happily committing suicide because we have logically concluded that it would be better to be dead than alive. The immediate self-termination option is just not realistic as it contradicts our nature.

Instead, what we can realistically strive for, is, that when we die, we have a comfortable death. The ultimate comfortable death is, of course, to die unexpectedly in one's sleep.

Anything that enhances the likelihood for a considerable number of people to end their lives in such a manner shall be a concern on a political program in a more enlightened society.

Apart from experiencing a comfortable death, the only other definite biological value in life is optimal sexual experience. For only during the moments we experience orgasm, we can genuinely forget the elementary senselessness of our existence.

Again, anything that would allow a larger number of people to live a sexually more fulfilled life shall be a legitimate political concern in more enlightened societies.

SECONDARY, SOCIAL VALUES

From the primary biological interests of every person, which are (1) a peaceful, gentle passage into non-existence and (2) before that, optimal sexual experience, can be derived two secondary, social values.

The social values are secondary because their justification lies in the fact that for each individual member of a society, they facilitate the realization of the primary, biological values.

The two social values are safety and freedom. While each of these secondary values is cross-related to each of the primary values, safety relates more strongly to the comfortable death value than to the optimal sexual experience value, and freedom more strongly to the optimal sexual experience value than to the comfortable death value.

Furthermore, the two secondary, social values of safety and freedom are better suited than the principal philosophical values to form the ideological backbone of everyday political activism. Emphasizing social values instead of philosophical ones also is better suited for forming political united fronts. Everybody understands the values of safety and freedom, even those whose philosophical outlook is different from the one sketched above.

SAFETY

The principal purpose of governments is to provide safety.

The concept outlined above, of course, is not new. It can be traced back to Thomas Hobbes, and even ancient Greek philosophy.

FREEDOM

The limitations to human freedom which are effected by nature, are self-evident and do not need to be discussed here. Here we only focus on man-made restrictions of freedom (or liberty). And as Thomas Hobbes famously noted: “Liberty dependeth on the silence of the law.”

(Please note that below, the term “state” is used in its international meaning, referring to the administrations and governments of independent countries; not in its US meaning, referring to the federal divisions of that country.)

In the current world, and in most political systems since mankind organized itself in states, people usually experience(d) restriction of their freedom as arising from the presence of states, either their own states or states that conquered their own states.

This has, unfortunately, lead many people into believing that the presence of states per se is detrimental to personal freedom. Anarchists believed that people could live together in peace and harmony by just organizing themselves in communities. In practice, however, the abolition of states, or even just the their scaling down, gives rise to local tyrants which rule much more arbitrarily, and interfere much more strongly, with the personal freedom of those ruled than distant national governments would. Thus, the approach of anarchists has landed on the junkyard for ideologies a long time ago.

Others arrived at the conclusion, also erroneously, that states would all the more provide a frame for personal freedom the more they were constituted as direct democracies. The fallacy of this approach is less evident when just theoretically contemplated, but it has been tried time and again, and we can learn from history.

In direct democracies, governments typically do not get elected because they promise a large number of people more freedom (though occasionally, and only occasionally, they do). In established democracies, governments typically get elected because they address not the logical thinking of the populace, but their deeper emotions of hatred and envy. Psychologically, people are much more likely to vote for what is bad for their enemies than for what is good for themselves. Thus, in modern democracies, those candidates that promise to regulate something that affects a smaller number of people but does not affect the larger number will usually have an edge.

The result of continuing direct (especially US-style) democracy in a state is likely to be ever more regulations, rather than an attempt to preserve the personal freedom of the state's citizens.

This assessment is well backed by modern history. The US, with the lead culture of direct democracy, has the world's largest body of regulations, and correspondingly, the world's largest percentage of a prison population. Furthermore, prison terms for any kind of offence are constantly prolonged.

And in countries with a short history of democracy, such as Iran, direct democracy has by no means resulted in more personal freedom for the country's population.

Direct democracy as practiced in both the US and Iran, and in many other countries as well, is not at all conducive to personal freedom. And if we look back for some 200 years, we can see that when a higher degree of personal freedom was implemented, it usually happened by way of a grant, and thus was imposed, not by an elected body but an enlightened ruler or a conquering nation (such as, ironically, the US, or in Europe by Emperor Napoleon).

I have stated initially that the primary, philosophical values in life are a comfortable death (or, in more general terms, the absence of suffering) and optimal orgasms (or, in more general terms, sexual happiness). The second-tier values are safety and freedom.

That the institutions of a state or government have been established in a democratic fashion is neither a primary, nor a secondary value. It's a common fallacy to equate freedom with democracy. Democracy can often have profound anti-freedom consequences, as it did in Germany in 1933, when Hitler was elected in a democratic process, and on many other occasions in history.

I am concerned with personal safety and personal freedom. I don't care so much how a government is established: whether it has been elected in a democratic process, or whether it came into existence by taking power.

What I do care about, and wherein lies the ultimate legitimization of government, is whether it is good government, and yes, whether it provides safety and safeguards the personal freedom of the people which it rules.

On the other hand, I do have an opinion on what form of government is most likely to achieve both optimal safety and optimal personal freedom. Not a government elected in a US-style democratic process.

I would favor the rule by a single political party with a strong ideological base that includes a commitment to provide a country's citizens with the highest degree of personal freedom possible. For anyway we turn it, whether a country's citizens will enjoy a high degree of personal freedom depends largely on whether those in power favor such a setting.

Sure, such a political party can attain power either in a democratic process or through a revolution. In either way, if we assume that this political party is guided by an ideology that puts the greatest emphasis on realizing the highest possible degree of personal freedom for the people it rules, I am firmly against this party getting voted out of office, and, for example, being replaced by a party of religious lunatics.

For sometimes, if political leaders want to shape the world in accordance to an enlightened vision, they have to have the courage to do so even in opposition to a misguided majority.

While there is a potential danger that the above elaboration is used to exercise dictatorial power not for the benefit of those ruled but of those who rule, this threat could be minimized by making sure that (1) there is collective rule rather than rule by a single executive, and (2) through a system of indirect democracy.

CONTENTS OF PERSONAL FREEDOM: PRIVACY AND SECRECY

It is an illusion that a sexually better society would have to draw sexual conduct into the public arena. Humans have sexual conduct in privacy, and often in secrecy, for good reasons.

We are never emotionally indifferent towards the sexual conduct of other people. If confronted with the sexual conduct of others, we may react with jealousy, disgust, aggression, mental pain, hatred, or other strong, often negative, feelings. We are unlikely to be indifferent. The emotions we react with are not rational, and they may even be totally out of proportion. It is futile to attempt to change this pattern of reactions. We may be the masters of our intellect, but we are the slaves of our emotions.

We may discuss sexuality in public in general terms, and for the purpose of scientific or philosophical insight. Having sexual contact in public, or discussing the sexual conduct of certain people in public, or, even worse, reporting on the sex life of specific people in the media, all has adverse effects on the sexual experience of people. It promotes conflict over harmony, and tends to brutalize a society.

For this reason alone, a strong government ought to limit the right of the mass media to report on sex topics, and to exploit such topics solely for the purpose of generating sales, or publicity for advertisements.

Because having sexual contact in privacy and secrecy is a fundamental element of personal freedom, the extent to which governments police the sexual conduct of the members of a society, and to which governments try to impose certain moral standards, needs to be strongly limited indeed.

Because for each of us, whether male or female, the pursuit of optimal sexual experience is at the core of the only sensible personal value system, and because for each of us, optimal sexual experience can only be attained if we interact and experiment with different people, while at the same time, each of us easily reacts with negative emotions on the sexual conduct of others, especially those with whom we are in contact, the right to privacy and secrecy overrides the traditional moral imperative of honesty and faithfulness.

Just as media reporting on the sexual conduct of specific persons generates negative emotions in the public arena, honesty about multiple parallel sexual relationships, or multiple previous sexual relationships generates adverse emotions and easily leads to violent conflict.

For this reason, ethics in a sexually better society ought to emphasize that dishonesty about parallel or previous sexual contacts for the purpose of social harmony is a higher moral value than truthfulness.

Likewise, future ethics ought to educate that it is an element of the human nature to be sexually attracted to more than one person, and that the pursuit of sexual experience is at the core of the only sensible personal value system. A certain degree of secrecy in the pursuit of optimal sexual experience is necessary, and morally justified, as openness contradicts the high ethical value of tranquility in human societies.

Thus, a government dedicated to the personal freedom of a country's citizens ought not to interfere in the sexual conduct of the people for the purpose of imposing certain (out-dated) moral standards (such as faithfulness). Multiple sexual relationships, not even in the case of married people, ought not to be an excuse for public interference for as long as no violence is involved in these sexual relationships.

To keep sexual contacts private and secret, and to protect the privacy and secrecy of sexual contacts by not talking truthfully about them, and by willfully concealing them, are important elements of personal freedom, and apart of that conducive to the superior moral concern of social harmony.

THE BENEFITS OF RELATIVE POVERTY

A wise government, dedicated to providing people with a social environment in which they will achieve optimal sexual experience and after that, have a comfortable death, will have to engineer relative poverty.

Engineering poverty? For the benefit of the people? Isn't a good government one under which people prosper?

The point is that the benefits of wealth don't develop linearly. But even those with no background in dialectical materialism (or, for that matter, in Hegelian dialectical idealism) can, when confronted with some simple examples, grasp easily that more is not always better.

Take food. Everybody who lives in a rich society is aware of the fact that eating more food, even if we can afford it financially, isn't the path to better health, and not even to more happiness.

More food intake makes us fatter, and less healthy, and leads to “premature” death. To be mildly overweight may be manageable, and the impact may be limited, but if we are grossly overweight, our mobility will be severely restricted, and our self-esteem will be at the bottom of the scale. Because of being grossly overweight, we count little in our social environment. Not only is our sexual market value near nil; we are also considered to have a weak character. It is clear that more is not better. While less and less is also not the ideal (we should not be starving), the linearity from nothing to plenty is not matched by a linearity from worst to best. The ideal always involves moderation.

There is a parallelism to the manner in which societies develop. Oswald Spengler (*Der Untergang des Abendlandes*, *The Decline of the West*, published 1918), and later Arnold Toynbee (*A Study of History*) have reasoned that societies develop like organisms, from spring (the nascent period) through summer (when a society, or empire, is at its full power) to fall (a period of prolonged decline, marked by decadence) and winter (when an old empire is conquered by a new, nascent one).

Just as being overweight is not conducive to individual health, and just as reaching the height of power draws an empire to its decline, we should understand that linearly increasing the wealth of a society will not make life better for its citizens.

When people are relatively poor, they have a clear vision in life. To manage the material basis of their lives, or, ideally, to become richer. After all, they can see that in poor societies, their rich neighbors have a splendid life.

But when all people in a society become richer, then people lack orientation. They no longer have a clear vision of what they want to achieve, and for those who are richer than the average (who are poor), the benefits of being richer vanish.

There are many facets to the problem of societies becoming too rich, just as there are many facets to the problem of people being overweight.

One, conspicuous consumption (Veblen, *The Theory of the Leisure Class*), is just like cancer.

But I want to concentrate on discussing how societies being overly wealthy relates negatively to the quality of the sexual experience attainable by those who live in such societies.

In economies of need, not only do we have a vision of a better life (and display positive character attributes such as being industrious and interested in education); we are also much more inclined towards romantic love. For both, the vision of a better life and an inclination towards romantic love, thrive on hope.

I have never been an advocate of brainless promiscuity (quantity instead of quality), or sex without love. The point is: the sexual experience in a romantic relationship is so much better than the sexual experience in other settings. But romantic love needs to project into the future.

If we feel no necessity to hope for the future, because we don't really know what to hope for, then we become disoriented, and feel empty.

One can easily observe the negative influence that affluence has on the young generations in rich countries.

In poor countries, young people often strive hard to acquire an education, and to find work, for noble causes, such as helping their poor parents. In rich countries, in which children do not experience their parents as struggling to get them through to adulthood, children are seldom committed to such ethical goals.

Worries about the welfare of their aging parents, or younger siblings, are displaced by concerns about the latest fashions, or what strange trends to follow in order to be "in". Many of these trends (often associated with music genres) have a pronounced negative orientation, such as punk (no future), reggae (the music of Jamaican outcasts and Rastafariansim), or, lately, hip-hop (and rap, characterized by lyrics that worship violence).

Furthermore, during eons of our evolution, the females of the species have traded sexual gratification against protection and material benefits. This has left a mark on the way women function emotionally.

While for females who have achieved sufficient self-cognition, optimal sexual experience, followed by a comfortable death, is the only sensible personal value system (just as it is for males), many females feel that they need a second reason to enter sexual relationships. And the second reason with which many females feel most comfortable are material benefits.

In poor traditional societies, young females want to marry rich. This doesn't mean that they wouldn't enjoy sexual conduct once they are initiated. In societies of affluence, those young females who are not involved with destructive protest subcultures typically postpone their sexual initiation, simply because they lack a compelling second reason. This is statistically most evident in the fact that they marry later and later.

Not that this would be doing them a favor. They waste years during which they could experience the pleasure of sexual contact, simply because they do not have an excuse for getting into it.

Another positive effect of non-affluent societies is that in such societies, the sexual market value of people is determined more by economic factors than by factors such as looks and youth.

Humans will always compete for sexual relationships. It's part of seeking optimal sexual experience. However, the arena in which we compete may be more or less suitable for an optimal number of people achieving optimal sexual experience.

And, apostate and politically incorrect as it may sound, there are many good reasons why we may choose to engineer societies in which economic factors are a major aspect of sexual competition.

One is that when economic factors play a major role in competing for sexual relationships, then there will be less discrimination based on age. And this, again, is the same for men and women. Which is why not only rich men, but also rich women, have a much easier time achieving optimal sexual experience in poor societies, rather than in richer ones.

There is no way that weak governments in direct democracies could contemplate the issues raised above when deciding on the course, a country should take. Only a government formed by an intellectual elite (dedicated not just to let people become affluent, but to create suitable conditions for optimal sexual experience) could contemplate such issues, and come up with policies that circumvent the wealth trap.

3.2.0.3 The meaning of life

Humans desire for a simple meaning of life. The requirement for both, a “meaning of life” and the fact that it should be “simple”, are direct results of evolutionary pressure. Individuals who can, in a quick and straightforward manner, provide an answer to themselves on a question “for what they are on earth” are likely to function more efficiently than individuals who just don’t know.

Efficiency is what natural selection is all about, both in the realm of physiology and in the realm of psychology. There is no way that less efficient, less adapted behaviors will persist just because, for example, they would be philosophically more true. Rather will truth die, than stubborn but efficient ideology.

In order to function on an optimal level, humans need a sense of purpose, and it should be possible to condense this sense of purpose into simple statements that are easy to recall.

Sexual philosophy can offer such a mantra: the ultimate purpose of life, and the only one that is anchored in biology, is that we live to have optimal sex.

Everything else is subordinate. During an optimal orgasm, I don’t wonder why I am alive. I just know that it feels good.

It is a strength of Kreutzian ideology that it can be reduced to easy-to-remember catch phrases. Daily life constantly requires quick and determined decisions, and it is not feasible to ponder the universe every time one faces a minor practical challenge.

From the perspective of sexual philosophy, a quick and easy referral point for the value of any activity, whether simple or elaborate, is whether it is conducive or not conducive to optimal sex.

From this quick and easy referral point, guidelines can be developed which provide orientation for the way one conducts one's life.

While in current societies, especially in Asia, the Kreutzian ideology is easy to adopt for male readers, I do want to stress that it is equally applicable to women. However, women, especially in Asia, have been conditioned (manipulated) by their societies to not pursue sexual satisfaction, and those who do, typically face severe loss of face in their social environments.

But for women, more than for men, the Internet affords a unique opportunity to break free from social repression, as the Internet allows them to find open minded male sexual partners outside their neighborhoods, and to pursue sexual satisfaction without risking a loss of face in their immediate environments.

Kreutzian ideology makes it easy to spin off a political ideology, and it, too, can be summarized as mantra.

To allow each person, including women, the highest degree of sexual experience, it is essential to implement as much personal freedom as possible.

3.2.0.4 Sexual desires

Lean back. Close your eyes. Try to remember the best sexual fantasies you ever had. Voila, this is where you want to be.

Some things in life are absolute: one's sexual desires. To pursue them is the ultimate goal in his life. Whatever they are.

The stronger a man's or woman's sexual desires the luckier he or she is.

Leaning back, closing your eyes, and no pressing sexual desires appear? Something's wrong!

The first precondition for a satisfying lifestyle, as well as to avert depression and obesity, and actually, for overall health, and yes, for happiness per se, are strong sexual urges.

No sexual urges, and you are flat. No sexual urges, and you won't feel what you are living for.

Sexual desires are absolute. Their rightness cannot be questioned. Whatever form they take, for the person's in whose mind they appear, the satisfaction of precisely these desires is the closest he or she can get to having a purpose in life.

3.2.0.5 The pursuit of sexual joy

In our indefinitely short lives, I can see only one occupation, which is worthwhile to be pursued: optimal sexual joy. Every other endeavor really is but a ridiculous waste of time.

I hold that this philosophical position is valid for everybody, and for women as it is for men. Sexual satisfaction is the only purpose in life that makes biological sense.

I am aware of the dilemma this assertion poses for two groups of people:

1. those who have sexual desires that are unacceptable to the society a person lives in.
2. women in traditional societies, especially in Asia.

For the first group, people with sexual preferences that are not acceptable in societies where they live, the question arises whether they should pursue optimal sexual joy, even if it means to break the law?

Pondering this question, I feel fortunate that I am free of criminal inclinations as related to sexual conduct. I do not rape women. I prefer woman with own strong sexual desires, and I do not seek situations in which a woman would feel overpowered.

Of course, a sexual relationship outside wedlock, which is fully acceptable to me, would be considered criminal conduct in much of the Muslim world; but I avoid strictly Islamic countries.

Would I change my sexual inclinations if they were outlawed?

I am committed not to break any law, as I do not intend to waste my life in a prison. The preference therefore is to settle at a location where my sexual conduct is not in conflict with the law.

On the other hand, my sexual desires, and their optimal satisfaction is the only thing that is absolute in my life, and thus, they are not negotiable.

Ethics, after all, are arbitrary, and values are as variable as fashions. The solution is not to break the law, but to go somewhere, where the legal climate is milder.

3.2.0.6 The structure of human needs

Not the desire to survive, or to preserve one's existence, is the mechanism that drives life. Life is driven by mechanisms to replicate itself. This applies to the complex human existence just as it does to basic biochemistry. Human existence culminates in sexual motivation, sexual conduct, and sexual satisfaction, all of which are the behavioral representation of mechanisms of replication.

Humans also conduct non-sexual everyday lives. Humans also cope with many conditions that preempt reproductive behavior, or make it difficult. Impairments can be due to health issues, or economic restraints, or social conditions.

All of this is reflected in the structure of human needs.

Sexual needs (basic) – they are the essence of human existence, regardless of the degree, human individuals achieve sexual satisfaction.

Emotional needs (associated) – these are needs that are related to sexual needs, and encompass the need for love and self-esteem.

Social needs (logistical) – humans under normal conditions cannot live alone. Humans need societies for protection and comfort.

Economic needs (logistical) – humans need food, as without it, there isn't enough existence to pursue sexual needs. In modern societies, economic needs come in many different forms, which, however, are just interpretations of the most basic logistical need for food.

3.2.0.7 Planning your life, and your death

You want the best sexual satisfaction possible while you are alive, and you want to end life with a comfortable death.

During your life, you will have to spend more time on the logistics of sexual satisfaction possible than taking care of a comfortable death.

Taking care of a comfortable death involves avoiding situations in which there is a substantial risk for a non-comfortable death. You don't want to work in a coalmine (see youtube here), and you don't want to be a soldier. You avoid, as good as you can, boarding aircraft, and you don't entrust your body and mind to surgeons when you can avoid it. You don't want to be reanimated when you are in a coma.

When organizing your comfortable death, you don't need much advice. Common sense goes a long way.

It's a different story when organizing the best sexual satisfaction possible. On that topic, good advice makes a huge difference. This is the case because so much depends on where you live.

There also is a component of personal taste. For some men, to sleep with a different prostitute every day or night is their idea of a sexual paradise. For other men, it's to have a longer-term relationship (though not an indefinite one). And for others, again, the goal is several parallel love-based relationships .

Location and an understanding of sexual economics are crucial. Even for those frequenting prostitutes, there is a huge difference in the quality of service they can expect in different parts of the world. Generally speaking, South America and Southeast Asia provide much better value than North America or Europe.

Prostitutes are not my shoe, and beyond the above general assessments, I can provide no guidance for those who seek paradise in the arms, or other places, of prostitutes. My expertise is on genuine love relationships.

A considerable age difference often adds to the sexual excitement in a relationship. A teenager can have the most memorable sexual encounters with women more than twice of age, and being older, many prefer younger partners.

In the US, relationships with a considerable age difference appear immoral, and in some constellations are illegal, but in other parts of the world (Vive la France!), there is a better understanding of the charming aspects of such relationships. If you plan to pursue multiple parallel love-based relationships, you will likely have to relocate to where the dynamics of sexual economics are more in your favor.

3.2.0.8 Sexuality as principle force in life

I have a metaphysical opinion of sex. It is the essence of life, its only real value. Everything else is subordinate.

Sex is not just entertainment. It is on a level with what religious service was in times when religions were still plausible.

Which is why the topic is misplaced on the entertainment pages of newspapers and magazines.

It is sad that the entertainment industry has seized sex. Television game shows are entertainment. Movies are entertainment. Music is entertainment.

Entertainment as such lacks relevance. More often than not, entertainment is brainless. It's a waste of time.

All of these attributes do not fit sex. Sex is relevant, the source of genuine self-fulfillment.

Humans have developed a set of notions to express metaphysical ideas. Among them is the concept of a universal force to which one relates by means of one's religion, and from which one draws reassurance in a world that lacks in sense.

Traditional religions, primarily Christianity, have lost credibility among most of those who formally profess it. A large number of people now go without any metaphysical dimension to their lives. But they sure value their sexual experience.

An ideology can provide a metaphysical dimension of sex and orgasm. And as man's metaphysical concepts typically are carried in what we know as religion, it is but fitting that such an ideology should claim the status of a religion. Sex is sacred.

Sex, and not any other kind of god, is the source of all life. While this is clear from a purely biological, scientific perspective, this simple axiom still hasn't been established as the basis of a religion. It should have been.

It is obvious that all higher forms of life are created through the mechanisms not only of sexual selection but also based on sexual drive. And the sexual drive not only rules the rational dimension of species that are capable to think (primarily Homo sapiens, but, to a limited scale, also other primates and mammals).

The sexual drive also determines the existence of other life forms such as amphibians or reptiles... and even of lower animals such as worms.

Sex is the universal force that we ought to worship. Sex is the master of nature, it rules all life.

3.2.0.9 Consciousness and cognition

In order to function properly as sophisticated biological machines, we need motivation.

In as much as humans have developed consciousness, our motivational setting does not just depend on instincts but on cognition as well.

As far as motivation is concerned, lower animals get by just fine being driven by their instincts for survival and reproduction. The more humans, as higher animals, develop consciousness, the more we question “Why do we live?” and “What is death?”

Cognition is a philosophical and psychological category closely related to consciousness. While self-consciousness is just a state of having some ideas about oneself, self-cognition would be to have correct ideas about oneself.

Religious lunatics do have self-consciousness; they clearly have some reflective ideas about themselves, and their position in the universe. But from a scientific perspective, they are objectively wrong.

In as much as we now know that all religions are just inventions, and in as much as we are aware that we all are just the results of biological evolution, we actually have evolved enormously over the past few hundred years. Because of our cultural achievements in explaining the world and our origin, humans have evolved into a species with cognitive capacities way beyond of what our ancestors of just 20 generations ago possessed.

And our advanced cognitive capabilities teach us one thing (whether the individual members of a species understand this or not): anytime we are not preoccupied with tasks of survival, we pursue matters of reproduction, just as lower animals do.

Reproductive behavior (or, more clearly: having sex) is the only meaningful endeavor we can pursue, or the only thing that provides philosophical “meaning” in life. It is the only human activity that is synchronized with evolution. Religions, ethics, and morals are delusions.

Are you still with me?

We will live our lives because we have been born (certainly not by our own choosing). From both a logical and biological perspective, the only “philosophical meaning” that is available to us, is to pursue optimal sexual satisfaction, and to do so consciously (and cognitively), and to hope to end it all with a gentle, unconscious death. Nothing remains.