

3.2.2.3.1.17 US Congress regulating international dating

In 2005, the US Congress passed the International Marriage Broker Act. The declared intention of the law is to protect immigrant women who settle in the US as spouses of US men.

Congress sabotages international marriage

(http://www.times-news.com/opinion/local_story_171102856.html?keyword=secondarystory)

Marriage broker law seeks to protect readily exploited women

(http://www.times-news.com/marriage-broker-law-seeks-to-protect-readily-exploited-women/article_d3f1b613-d8cc-5a46-ae15-fab2afe9f51b.html?mode=jqm)

Apart from other aspects, the US International Marriage Broker Act also is a typical example of restrictive legislation, hypocritically imposed to allegedly protect those it effectively restricts.

Those who are restricted are women from Third World countries for which it would normally be a fortunate event to find a US husband, even if the US husband is not a prime marriage candidate. This is the net effect of the law.

Obviously, the law also restricts marriage brokers for whom it reduces business opportunities, and US men who either honestly seek spouses through an agency and have the intention to be good husbands, or search for female partners with less noble, more pronounced sexual motives.

But for both the marriage brokers and the men seeking female partners from abroad, the restrictive effect of the law is not as fundamental as it is for women from the Third World, seeking a US spouse.

The world is full of business opportunities which mainstream moralists consider seedy, and if indeed the International Marriage Broker Act puts some of the less serious brokers out of business, they will find other business opportunities that are on par. And men looking for women will find other avenues, and these may not be more moral than looking for a spouse via an agency.

The group of people one which the law will have the most decisive effect are women from Third World countries for whom immigrating into the US as a spouse of a US man (even a less than perfect one) would most probably be a fortunate event.

I believe that these implications have been clear to those who passed the law, and those who lobbied for it. This is why those who publicly support the idea of protecting women who immigrate to the US as spouses or candidate spouses are pretenders.

I do not generally believe in altruism. It's not a genuine biological concept. Scrutiny into the research into alleged altruism in the animal kingdom has usually yielded that the alleged altruism is but a sophisticated form of egoism.

Altruism

(<http://www.bookrags.com/sciences/biology/altruism-ansc-01.html>)

Study Exposes Craven Motive of the Brave Meerkat Sentry

(<http://www.nytimes.com/1999/06/08/science/study-exposes-craven-motive-of-the-brave-meerkat-sentry.html&>)

Full article here

(<http://select.nytimes.com/gst/abstract.html?res=F7091FFB385D0C7B8CDDAF0894D1494D81&n=Top%2fReference%2fTimes%20Topics%2fPeople%2fY%2fYoon%2c%20Carol%20Kaesuk>)

People normally do not take prolonged action for the benefit of others. In general, this would not be a viable biological concept. People take action if it is in their interest, though the way it is in their

interest, or the way they consider it in their interest, may be rather subtle. It may also be objectively wrong (in the Dark Ages, rich men would give fortunes to monasteries in exchange for absolution, or a reduction of the time they would have to spend in the purgatory... subjectively, these rich men acted out of their own interest, but objectively, they were wrong).

So, I want to examine in whose interest, subjectively or objectively, the International Marriage Broker Act actually is.

We can expect the law to have a negative impact on net migration rates, so anybody who is anti-immigration could be expected to be supportive of the law. To claim that immigrants are kept out for their own benefit is an old and common pattern. I remember that during the German "Wirtschaftswunder" years, those who didn't want "Gastarbeiter" from Italy argued that Germany wasn't suited for Italian workers and their families because the weather in Germany was too cold. Revealingly, they didn't campaign for a technical solution of the alleged problem (more jackets and blankets).

Whom else to expect in the coalition that lobbied for and/or passed, the International Marriage Broker law? You guessed it: feminazis, and even large segments of the US female population.

I define feminazis as women who hold gender-racist views ("men are evil") and are active in the public arena, where they typically lobby for anti-male legislation, or are active in the legal persecution of men who violate or violated sexual codes.

Typically, feminazis have a history of having been gravely disappointed by men. Either they were not courted by the men they desired, or they were abandoned, or both, and possibly more than once. If they were not out seeking revenge against men per se, I would feel pity for them.

Many of the women who become feminazis actually are excellent wife material. Loyal until death does them part. Alas, the times are not for such material to be in high demand, and the men they were with probably didn't value their extraordinary qualities.

Instead, the men in their lives likely preferred to have affairs, and to

later dumb them forever. So, understandably, the women were deeply hurt, which led them to become activists with an agenda of opposing male irresponsibility.

Now, don't blame the men!

Not for wanting to be with other women, in spite of having a loyal wife. Not for wanting to have another female partner altogether after a few years. Not for giving preference to younger women, who, if possible, have never given birth before.

Blaming them for these traits would be the same as blaming them for their baldness, or erectile dysfunction, or love handles.

No, I don't blame women either.

Not for being overly possessive. Not for integrating men into their fantasies of lifelong romantic partnership. Not for demanding that their men regard them as the only attractive women in the world, even when they long have passed the time of being sexually palatable.

I also don't blame them for sacking breasts, their buttocks circumference, or peach skin.

For all of us, whether male or female, have been shaped through hundreds of thousands of years of evolution, and this applies to our physiques, and the ways we deteriorate, as it does to how our minds function, and the ways our characters are less than perfect.

The keyword, whether for our bodies or our brains, is procreative success. For males, the greatest procreative success was achieved by impregnating as many women as possible, provided these women were still in a position to bring up the offspring until the offspring, too, could procreate.

In accordance to this formula, one of the greatest procreative success stories were some Chinese emperors who kept harems with thousands of girls and women.

1.5 million descendants

(<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/asia-pacific/4396246.stm>)

For women, comparative procreative success can only be attained if they give birth to an emperor ... not necessarily of China, but, for example, the Ottoman Empire.

But before she could reap in the potential procreative success, she would first have to see him through to adulthood, and the throne.

The sultanate of women

(https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sultanate_of_Women)

The minds of men and women, just as their bodies, have evolved as tools of our genes to procreate themselves, and for no other purpose. Certainly not to concur with Kant's categorical imperatives that we should not apply to others what we do not want applied to ourselves. Evolution is much more flexible.

It even has programmed for people to change their mind sometime during their lives, including on matters as complicated as social orders, depending on the procreative phase they are in.

Women who do not have grown up sons will typically favor social models that provide a fairly high degree of restriction as to how many sexual partners a man can have. After all, for women who raise children, it is an important aspect of procreative success that the father is present to share in the burden.

Women who have grown up sons are often more liberally minded.

Which doesn't mean that they would want to grant their male partners the same privileges they happily accept for their sons.

Towards their daughters, parents (and in this case, especially fathers), typically have different attitudes. Even fathers who themselves are philanderers wish "responsible" male partners for their daughters (men who dedicate themselves fully and exclusively to their daughters).

I personally have no problem at all with this kind of biological ambivalence. And I don't believe that state intervention is needed. For there are many other aspects that play a role. Anyway, it would be very difficult indeed to override psychological parameters that have evolved for hundreds of thousands of years.

I would define the following archetypal frames of mind for women and men.

For women, the idea of a life-long partnership with a single man has enormous appeal, no matter what the circumstances. Young girls dream about this long before they know about sexual excitement. And women who are rich in their own right, and certainly do not need men as supporters, still cannot resist the idea of the bliss, associated with lasting love and partnership.

All of this doesn't mean that they would not be tempted into sexual adventures on the side.

Sperm Wars: The Science of Sex

(<http://www.amazon.com/gp/product/0788160044/102-9502780-0044122?v=glance&n=283155>)

For men, whether they find fulfillment in a single, lasting, and exclusive relationship depends much more on the circumstances they are in.

In a poor society where everybody has to toil along just to meet the requirements of shelter and nutrition, men will be more inclined towards faithfulness than in a society where these requirements are easily met.

Likewise, in a society that provides a high degree of health for their members, men are much more likely to be unfaithful (as are women). Men who suffer from definite erectile dysfunction may not see much benefit in engaging in affairs, which works against the more female model of lifelong partnership. Pfizer's Blue, and possibly the herbal tongkat ali, puts them back into the game.

I have written on the wealth trap in another context. The increasing

affluence of a society works against male sexual interests because it removes support considerations from the mating equation.

The wealth trap

(<http://www.sergekreutz.com/wealth-is-a-golden-cage-trap.htm>)

The increasing affluence of a society also works against female mating interests because men are less likely to stay in a partnership, even if they do not have a replacement yet.

Furthermore, affluence works against male sexual interests because it gives disappointed women the economic independence to pursue a worldwide agenda of anti-male activism.

Scandinavian hypocrisy

(<http://www.sergekreutz.com/anti-child-prostitution-hypocrisy.htm>)

The natural antidote to the wealth trap would be population growth.

Population policies

(<http://www.sergekreutz.com/unwarranted-restrictions-to-population-growth.htm>)

Because sexual envy is easy to incite, and because anti-male feminists heavily utilize the media to stir anti-sexual emotions, the freedom of the press also works against male sexual freedom.

Banning sexual reporting

(<http://www.sergekreutz.com/generating-envy-of-sexual-posessions.htm>)

By and large, the pattern which we can apply to examine in whose interest the International Marriage Broker Act works, is similar to the pattern that applies to the pro and contra groups for sex tourism.

Why sex tourism

(<http://www.sergekreutz.com/Sex-tourism-and-sexual-economic.htm/>)

Apart from feminists who lobbied for passing the International Marriage Broker Act because it fits their agenda of restraining male sexuality, those in favor include a large part of the US female population, at least those females who are themselves on the mates market. They obviously do not want young, attractive competitors from abroad.

US men are likely split on whether they are in favor or against the Act. Those who are in a permanent relationship with a local woman in the US will likely be in favor. Their decision to stay with a current mate for an indefinite time may not be based entirely on prolonged attraction, but may involve a good degree of compromise: stay with the partner because doing otherwise would jeopardize their public career, or their business. Silently, they may envy the sexual freedom of those who could import a young beautiful bride from abroad (a privilege they don't want to grant others because it is not available for themselves).

Men in the countries of origin of the brides available through international marriage brokers definitely are in favor (unless they are the fathers of prospective brides who speculate on a material windfall and possibly a US visa). They don't want foreign men with a clear edge to compete for the most beautiful local girls in Third World countries.

Foreign men in Third World countries who are not themselves US citizens (like I myself) are mostly in a position to smile about the US legislative effort, at least as long as their own countries don't follow the US example. Though they do not suffer from US competition as badly as local men, their likely attitude is that the fewer sexual competitors they have, the better.

So, how about morals? Didn't everybody in favor of the act refer to the moral necessity to have it passed?

US politics (and politics most everywhere else, but maybe not as pronounced as in the US) have always been like that. Partisan interests are sold as moral concerns.

But aren't there actual cases of abuse of foreign brides. Haven't they be lied at, and even tricked? Of course they have. But this is in no way exclusive to international brokered marriages.