

ZULF IS TOTALLY UNCONVINCED BY RAJA HALWANI'S JUSTIFICATION OF PROMISCUITY AND OPEN MARRIAGES

ZULFIKAR MOINUDDIN AHMED

In the third chapter of *Virtuous Liaisons*, Raja Halwani says he will stand on a neo-Aristotelian position to justify flourishing potential of several lifestyles. One is sex-workers; second is promiscuity; third are open marriages. Zulf will seriously attack Raja Halwani's positions on these, and totally annihilate it. I respect the intellect and rigour of Professor Halwani, so I will not use the rhetorical techniques that employ with enemies of mine, such as Bill Gates, such as mocking and laughter, and other sorts of rhetorical methods. Instead I will engage with his positions seriously.

I will tell you my major strategy. It will be based on quantitative metrics, especially life satisfaction. That's the first approach. If I am able to show that life satisfaction of actually promiscuous and open marriage participants is lower than those in ordinary committed relationships and marriages, then he has not established his thesis. Similarly if I show life satisfaction of sex workers is lower than other people then I will claim to have established that he has not established his thesis.

At the moment I am marking this as a task and want the world to know my intention here. I believe that this riffraff of sexual liberality leading to flourishing is total nonsense.

1. RHONDA BALZARINI AND AMY MUISE 2020 FINDINGS

Around 4-6% of Americans and Canadians engage in Consensual non-monogamous relationships. Rhonda Balazarini and Amy Muise tell us that the general issue is that the primary partner fulfills some emotional needs and is considered the primary long term partner and the secondary partner fulfills sexual needs. I am not particularly impressed by this because I don't understand why they couldn't have chosen better the primary mates so they would not need the secondary mate for sexual fulfillment in the first place. To me this smacks – I am a man so I have heterosexual male prejudices – of a man who shaked with some woman who was not the right choice, is then too fearful of losing her but wants to fuck some hot secondary woman.

Now Raja Halwani can say what he wants about the moral justification for this situation, but this is not a great gentleman who would live his life like this. He is using the first woman, and using the second woman too. If you don't want the first woman let her go and find someone good for you. Don't be a fearful little dependent son of a bitch who is without any substance at all who then gets around cheating by a emotional fears of abandonment by one woman to fuck another one without

wanting to respect her as a full human being. Raja Halwani, are you serious? You spent you time and effort to justify this sort of nonsense?

2. MONOGAMY WITH GOOD SEXUAL AND ROMANTIC SATISFACTION IS HEALTHY EVERYTHING ELSE IS DEGENERATE

I won't speak of non-heterosexual relationships but human beings have been loving and making pair-bonds and raising children for 4.5 million years. The idea that there are novel exciting advances over human nature that is healthy, the nuclear monogamous relationship capable of raising little humans, in the past 50 years that is not a disaster is absurd, so absurd that I consider all the propagandists of these phenomena to be *enemies of mankind*. What they whitewash with morally justified will destroy the entire human race in the end with crippled broken human beings lost and confused resulting from these sorts of unions. I am just amazed that a neo-Aristotelian would get involved in this sort of insurrection against civilisation.

3. ZULF'S SPEECH TO SOPHISTS POST-NIETZSCHE

Look, all people, we are the Human Race. We're not young. We're also not old. But we are at least four million years old. Nietzsche was a devious but quite brilliant man. He is the main rebel against all values with a failed project to produce a new religion all by himself, the adherent of a new god of love, Dionysus. Quite an ambitious man, but he was very bad. He made the absurd idea fashionable that we *create our own values* if we are strong enough and so on. Jean-Paul Sartre took this to the edge. And because of this strain, more than any other people Western intellectuals are the stupidest people in the world when it comes to understanding the nature of moral values at all. I have shown empirically the invariance of moral values distributions globally, and this means that there is a strong historical component to human morals. All sorts of rhetoric and Jedi mind tricks to delude ourselves and go off the rails with speculation and creative thinking on intellectual concepts will not lead to anything but deranged human beings whose psyche have been abused in inhuman ways. Human nature is in the genetic code in common G_c , and it is not rational but aggregation of natural evolution that had been guiding us for millions of years. Rationality is not part of human nature but an interesting discovery, a specialised useful talent for some. So mythologies and religions have contained our wisdom in the past regarding human nature too. Artificial speculative ideas that seem particularly pleasing to ivory tower intellects are weapons of mass psychic destruction when they become popular. They are trusted not on their certainty of knowledge or accountability for the ravages of their fads on human race but are rather irresponsible in the end. We don't like to hang and torture the intellectual rebels but we idolise them for a long time. I am not seeking a change for this, but I am firmly ensuring that this outrageous intellectual parlour game industry be stopped on issues as important as human moral nature. We are not elastic bands; we are delicate exquisitely complex beings whose nature is shrouded in mystery. None of our genetic adaptations were designed by followers of Socratic Reason or neo-Kantians. Our ancestors survived all manner of saber-tooth tigers eating them to give us our genetic endowment. We ought to respect our human nature and not leave it up to irresponsible intellectual speculators to ruin the civilisations that were there long before their outrageous arrogance and hubris disrupted the entire world with all manner of things for people to do to ruin their lives.

4. THE ABOVE IS NOT FOR PROFESSOR RAJA EL HALWANI

The above rhetoric is broad and based on a significant strong feeling that I had developed over the past decades that everything in Western ideas of morals and values has been totally decimated in the past several centuries so they are worthless. I have a revival of Virtue Ethics of Aristotle extended via Avicenna to my Virtue-Eudaimonia Theory. It has been Martin Seligman and Christopher Peterson who had given a good sharpening for list of virtues and their work was sharp enough to detect the four virtues dominating Romantic Love, i.e. Hope, Gratitude, Zest, and Love. These are canonical values, and exceed all confusions of Nietzsche, Sartre and other subjective-value-creation theorists. And that is the final correct direction. And that is what all of humanity must accept for this is truth.