

3.2.2.3.5.3.5 Honesty

Some conflicts are biologically programmed, so that the human species achieves a competitive edge over other form of life. Most of these programs are in the realm of sexuality.

Each of us, whether male or female, has a pre-programmed preference to be loved by more than one partner of the opposite sex, while each of us also wants that our lovers love us exclusively, or at least consider us better than other loved persons. We can simplify the issue by stating: men want to possess more women than one, and women want to possess more men than one.

The form in which the possessive interest expresses itself may vary between males and females. The male possessive impulse in the current, and traditional sexual order, is more directed towards activities that potentially sire more offspring, and the female possessive impulse towards having more male backup options.

But these preferences are mere logical expressions of the modes of production. They result from the fact that for females, sexual conduct has, historically, always been more of a risk than for males, as pregnancies bring obligations for years, and have a great negative impact on the sexual market value of females.

But once the risk of pregnancies is eliminated, and the faster decline in the sexual market value of women is arrested and resolved, the pattern of possessive behavior of females changes dramatically.

What remains is that, in all sexual standard situations, heterosexual males and heterosexual females are opponents because they have opposing interests.

So, am I, in that I, apparently, in many articles express the interests of men, anti-women? Of course not. Women are the only true content of my life (not my work, not my wealth).

I love women. And yet, I am keenly aware that my interests and the interests of each woman I love are opposed to each other. A woman always wants that I love her exclusively, while other men also love her; she may swear lifelong loyalty to me, but when I am out of site, entice other men to have a sexual interest in her, and enjoy it when they do.

This pattern of infidelity, actually, is much more common among women than among men. This is why even married women spend much more time beautifying themselves when they go out, rather than when they just stay at home and are seen by no other men except their husbands.

I am a man, and a writer. Much of my writing reflects my interests as a man. What's more: most of my income as a writer, I generate by giving advice to men.

So, do you think I regard other men as my friends, while women are my opponents? You are wrong. Nothing would suit me better than if 90 percent of all other men would just drop dead. There would be much less competition for all the women of this world. If women are my opponents, then men are my enemies.

So why, for all reason, does a good part of my work address men?

Fact is that I do not write for men. I write for myself. My writing is nothing but my honest own reflection on me and my own position in the world. I am totally untalented to write lies.

This is because I only write when I have gained what I believe is some new insight on how I and the world around me functions, and what I should do to be competitive. The reason why my some of my work appeals more to men than to women is that, even though men are my natural enemies, their pattern of thought is much closer to my own pattern of thought.

That doesn't mean that I would not understand women. Actually, some of my female readers have expressed that I understand women better than most women do. As if all of the above would not be complex enough, men, not women, even though they (the men) essentially are my enemies, they (again: the men) are in a better

position to represent many of my political interests (such as opposing anti-male gender legislation).

And when I do touch male discrimination, other men, even though they are my enemies, see their interests covered in my writing.

In spite of all this, I cannot fraternize with other males in order to oppose females. It would put me in the entirely wrong camp. And I would be a fool if I were to sacrifice myself, becoming a hero of male interests. It would put me at a disadvantage at every front that counts for me.

Fewer women would consider me a worthwhile choice. Other men could easily gain a competitive edge by professing not to be as “anti-female” as I.

Other men would also profit from in whatever way I were to strengthen their position towards females. What fool would I be, doing the dirty political work for other men. And I am sure that other men feel as I do. And for this reason, there will never be a male gender movement on the scale of the feminist, or Feminazi movement.