

ON SELF ROBUST TO FLEETING LOVES OF WOMEN

ZULFIKAR MOINUDDIN AHMED

Today, November 10 2021, I have a new insight, an insight from my own self-development, of the fundamental need for self-esteem that is not grounded on the fleeting loves of women for men.

I did see the tremendous negative effects of Avoidant Relationship measures against Marriage Satisfaction. This has led some relationship psychologists to consider Avoidant as a sort of intrinsic flaw of character. This is deeply wrong. I think relationship psychologists are not being refined enough in their concepts here. Human nature is quite complex and I have other difficulties with extant established theories of romantic relationships.

Today's great insight is for a slight fine-tuning of concepts rather than lumping together all the good and bad into "Avoidant". It is clear to me from life that Self-Esteem that is overly dependent on the love of a woman is immature and robustness to the fleeting nature of women's love is a necessity for a man's Self-development. When psychologists are not measuring separation of what is necessary for psychic health and marking them as pathologies it is too disturbing for me.

There are several issues here. One is a robust self that is autonomous and resilient and robust to the various ebbs and flows of women's loves. That is not pathological but the essence of a mature psyche of a man. A different thing is inability to allow a woman to enter the inner world of a man when in a relationship. That inability and discomfort with allowing a woman to get close is problematic. We see here the Ludus Love style that is 'game-playing'. It is folly of relationship psychology not to measure these always separately.

My hypothesis right away is that there are two dimensions at work. Lack of robustness of self will lead to lower marriage satisfaction and that is *not pathological* and so will *inability to feel comfortable allowing a woman to get close*. That is definitely a weakness as well.

I would like some further empirical work on the distinction here. I think they are both quite crucial, but the first is lumped with the second in psychological theories I have examined as "Avoidant".

1. MY DOCTRINE

Psychology can be unwieldy and vast. I have some constraints based on the following position. I believe that all human beings, men and women, are born with genetic inheritance of human nature the potential for maximal *Life Satisfaction*. My task, then is to elucidate the Virtues developed by habituation primarily of all Virtues including those associated to Romantic Love. In particular, both of the dimensions I mention I believe are *necessary* for fulfilling the hidden potential for Life Satisfaction and they both will include Virtues associated with Romantic Love.

Date: November 10, 2021.

I am not seeking infinite number of dimensions. I am attempting to understand some significant universal dimension.

From this point of view, it is a *major failing* of scientific theories of Romantic Love to collapse a major positive dimension to "Avoidant". I would expect a satisfactory theory of Romantic Love that is universally valid to contain this dimension that I am elucidating.