

### 3.2.2.3.2.67 Democracy not conducive to male sexual economics

Democracy is not a value per se. It doesn't matter whether a government was elected or came to power by other means.

What matters is to what degree a government interferes with personal freedom, and especially with sexual freedom.

A weak government is better than a strong government. A weak government is less likely to interfere with personal freedom.

People often think that democratically elected governments are weaker than dictatorial government, because in a democracy, so people assume, power is shared.

But in fact, dictatorial governments are often just occupied with stayinh in power, and do not interfere much with the lives of citizens.

On the other hand, many democratically elected governments are totalitarian. They assume total control over peoples lives.

Hitler was democratically elected, and his government was totalitarian to the extreme. Iran has democracy, and is totalitarian.

And the US is more totaliarian than Morocco.

To become totalitarian is an inherent tendency in Western democracies. Ever more things get regulated by law. And anything sexual is a prime target of the drive to regulate.

The mechanism is simple. People are interested in sex more than anything else. Anything sexual receives prime attention. Knowledge about anything sexual generates jealousy. Politicians playing sexual themes get most attention. It's their chance to get elected. In any population, people who are provided with information about sexuality of others, and who react with jealousy, will want this sexuality regulated out of existence.

Furthermore, any regulating of male sexuality will enhance the value of sexuality as a female resource.

From a perspective of sexual economics, men can gain more than women from weak government. But even if it results in weak government, men have little to expect from democracy.