



Gender and Attraction: What Men vs Women REALLY want

Description



I once attended a marriage breakfast at my local church

where the leaders posed this question (*based on the hit song*): “What’s love got to do with it?” As it turns out, when men and women pick spouses for themselves the answer is “not much”.

We’ll get to the reasons men and women pick each other in a minute, but first a disclaimer is necessary: **These reasons will seem shallow at first glance; but they’re not.** (*which we’ll see*). These criteria are vital to the survival of the human species... even if they seem shallow at first.

This is the 7th article in our marriage series, the first article is entitled “[How Getting Marriage ‘Wrong’ Destroyed Every Great Civilization in World History](#)”. If you haven’t read that article, I would highly recommend you do so before proceeding.

Without further adieu, we’ll get started:

What Men vs. Women Really Want:

According to a study entitled: “[Rational Choice and Evolutionary Psychology as Explanations for Mate Selectivity](#)” which was published in the [Journal of Social, Evolutionary, and Cultural Psychology](#), here are the top things men and women look for in potential mates. (*Excluding shared preferences like intelligence, kindness, etc.*)

)

What women want:

1. Economic resources (*he's rich*)
2. Good financial prospects (*likely to get richer*)
3. High social status
4. Older age
5. Ambition and industriousness
6. Dependability and stability
7. Athletic prowess
8. Good health
9. Love
10. Willingness to invest in children

What men want:

1. Youth
2. Physical attractiveness
3. Particular body shape (*low waist-to-hip ratio*)

There's an old cliché that goes like this: "*feminine beauty + masculine money = love*". From a purely data-driven standpoint, it's 100% true.

Yes this seems shallow at a glance, but we'll prove that it's not.

That's not the only study to confirm these preferences either.

The new research also confirms that, while humans may pride themselves on being highly evolved, **men really do go for an attractive mate** – though will make do with someone who falls somewhat short of this ideal – while **women – apparently understanding this – adjust their desire for a "high-quality" mate according to how attractive they perceive themselves to be.**

In other words, beautiful women want rich men.

That is the conclusion of research published in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences by Peter Todd of Indiana University, Lars Penke of Berlin's Humboldt University, Barbara Fasolo of the London School of Economics, and Alison Lenton of the University of Edinburgh.

[Source.](#)

From the study itself.

"We found that **what men and women say they want is not the same as what they actually choose**

. And that the actual choices made by men and women accord with a rough evolutionary-predicted trade-off. In this case between men's overall mate value (*combining their wealth and status, family commitment and health*) and women's self-perceived attractiveness,"

[Source](#).

And again.

Todd said, participants stated they wanted to find someone who was like themselves — a socially acceptable answer. But once the sessions began, **the men sought the more attractive women and the women were drawn to material wealth and security**, setting their standards according to how attractive they viewed themselves.

[Source](#)

Again, this seems incredibly shallow but I can prove it's not.

Let's dive in.

Context: It's All About Kids

From a survival perspective, the purpose of all life is to reproduce so the species doesn't die out. From a Biblical perspective, the same is true but with the added force of a command from God Himself.

Genesis 1 27-28

27 God created man in His own image, in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them.

28 God blessed them; and God said to them, "**Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth, and subdue it**; and rule over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the sky and over every living thing that moves on the earth."

God repeated that command after the Flood.

Genesis 9:1

1 And God blessed Noah and his sons and said to them, "**Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth.**"

It's the same commandment a second time.

What if the reason men and women choose what they choose is for the well-being of their children, *even if that choice is subconscious?*

Could it be?

Let's look.

The "Social Contract" of Marriage

For most of human history, marriage was a mutually beneficial arrangement for both men and women. Men brought something to the table; women brought something to the table. In a broad sense, here's what each got out of marriage.

What women got:

#1 Protection. Since men are physically larger and stronger than women, the job of protecting the family has historically fallen on men. This includes protection from the elements and animals, but also from other men. Pit the average woman against the average man and the woman is in trouble. Therefore, women have historically relied on their husband and/or male relatives to keep them safe.

This is especially important when a woman is pregnant or has an infant because they are even more vulnerable then. Pregnant mothers and infants are both incredibly fragile (*where the life of the baby is concerned*). If they aren't both protected, the infant will die.

Women also need protection from themselves. As we saw in the article on [Gender Differences and the Biology of Leadership](#), women have less serotonin. This makes them far less able to defer pleasure, resist making impulse decisions, and make good choices. (*And in [the first article of this series](#), we saw that equal rights for women destroyed every great civilization in world history*)

#2 Provision. Pregnancy and infants take an exorbitant amount of time and resources for a mother. Therefore, women have historically needed basic necessities like food and shelter provided for them. Further, men are far more capable of doing the work to provide these necessities because of their greater physical strength. Roughly half of single mothers these days live below the poverty line, probably because of this. (see *the [first article](#) for stats/proof*)

#3 Children. Psychologically healthy women love kids. [One study](#) says: “Moms of four or more showed an outsized proclivity to be “very” or “extremely” happy.”

What men got:

#1 Legacy through Children. Men have a natural desire to make their mark on the world and leave a legacy; children – especially sons – are essential to that. Further, children have taken care of the the parents in old age for most of human history. Children were the original “retirement plan”.

#2 Exclusive sexual access to the woman. The “exclusive” part is important because men want their children to be their own; not “*the pool boy’s*”. If his access to her sexuality isn’t exclusive, then the paternity of the child will be unsure. Adoption aside, men want to know their kids are actually their kids. Plus, men love and want sex; typically lots of sex.

#3 A homemaker. She takes care of his home and does a large part of the child rearing while he is out providing for them.

The agreement between the sexes, as exemplified by marriage:

- **What women say:** “***if*** you will protect and provide for me my *entire life*, ***then*** I will give you exclusive sexual access to my body, bear your children, and keep your home .”
- **What Men say:** “***if*** you give me exclusive sexual access to your body, bear my children, and keep my home, ***then*** I will protect and provide for you your entire life.”

Men want sex, children, and a homemaker. Women need provision and especially protection. That fact alone explains nearly all of a woman’s choices when it comes to getting a husband.

The “Selfish” Gene – Why a Woman’s #1 and #2 Priority is a Wealthy Man

As we saw above, a woman’s #1 and #2 priority for a man are:

1. Economic resources (*he’s rich*)
2. Good financial prospects (*likely to get richer*)

The opening of the arguably the most famous woman’s book ever written – and it was written by a woman – goes like this:

“It is a truth universally acknowledged, that **a single man in possession of a good fortune , must be in want of a wife**. However little known the feelings or views of such a man on his first entering a neighborhood, this truth is so well fixed in the minds of the surrounding families, that he is considered as the rightful property of some one or other of their daughters.”

“Pride and Prejudice” by Jane Austen

Jane Austen understood that women want rich men. Even Elizabeth Bennet – the heroine of the story who wants to marry for love – cannot escape her feminine nature/desires. When her sister asks Elizabeth when she fell in love with the incredibly wealthy Mr. Darcy, she replies:

“It has been coming on so gradually, that I hardly know when it began. But I believe **I must date it from my first seeing his beautiful grounds at Pemberley.**”

Notice that Mr. Darcy didn't even need to be present for her to start falling in love with him. (*In the book, she was surprised to encounter him.*) No, it was after seeing Mr. Darcy's **mansion** that Elizabeth started to “fall in love” with him. The version with Keira Knightly does this scene wonderful justice and serves to drive the point home: (3:36 long, please watch at least the first ~15 seconds.)

(*One of the best things about this scene – in the context of the movie – is the first time Elizabeth says something nice about Mr. Darcy is while she's staring at a marble statue of of him inside his mansion . She agrees he's handsome... after seeing his mansion.)*

Have you ever noticed that “chick flicks” are always about exactly one thing, and one thing only? And I don't mean movies that both men and women typically like, I'm talking about the ones aimed specifically at women. They are all about the girl getting the (*often wealthy, definitely masculine*) man.

That's it.

There's a million variations on this theme, but romantic comedies are the bread and butter of the female audience. Romantic comedies are always about the girl **getting** something (*a guy*). I'm not disparaging women here though.

Not at all.

I believe this is **on purpose** by God for the good of the human race.

For most of human history, a woman sought to “get” a man who could protect/provide for her because she would probably die if she didn’t have one. Probably because of this, God wired women to find an “alpha male” (*wealthy, high status*) so they can **get** provision and protection. It’s for the provision/protection of her and her children.

Look at the list of things women want again; **it’s all about provision, protection, and children...** which as we’ve already covered are the three things women have historically gotten out of marriage.

What women want:

1. **Economic resources** (*he’s rich, and therefore can provide for her*)
2. **Good financial prospects** (*he’s likely to get richer, and thus be able to provide a better quality of life.*)
3. **High social status** (*powerful/influential enough to provide protection and provision; more on this priority later.*)
4. **Older age** (*young bucks tend to be less secure financially and lower status than established older men.*)
5. **Ambition and industriousness** (*likely to get richer again, and less likely to lose the wealth/provision he has accumulated*)
6. **Dependability and stability** (*won’t suddenly go broke or stop protecting her*)
7. **Athletic prowess** (*good genes so her kids will be healthy. Also, it means he has the ability to protect her physically*)
8. **Good health** (*good genes for the children and he won’t die unexpectedly, robbing her of provision and protection. Also, a sickly man can’t protect her.*)
9. **Love** (*if he feels affection for her, he’s less likely to abandon her*)
10. **Willingness to invest in children** (*children; enough said*)

It doesn’t seem so shallow now, does it?

Women “selfishly” realize they need a man to protect and provide for them and their children, so they look for a man who will do both.

Is it selfish for a woman to seek a man who can provide for and protect her (*and her children*) so she doesn’t die?

I don’t think so.

Sidebar: As evidenced by movies, men want something different.

The typical “chick flick” is about the woman getting something: typically a man. However, the typically guy movie is about a (*sometimes reluctant*) hero who sacrifices a whole lot – sometimes everything – to defeat an implacable foe. Think of Braveheart, The Magnificent Seven, Die Hard, The Outlaw Josey Wales, The Matrix, Star Wars, and **every Superhero or War movie ever**. There are a zillion examples, but they all boil down to this basic theme: self-sacrifice for the good of others.

So:

- Women like movies where they **get** something (*a guy*)
- Men like movies where they **give** something – sometimes everything – for a good cause.

This is good for women, because if men didn't want to provide, mankind would've died out long ago. Women should want to be provided for, and men should want to provide.

It's how God designed it.

A Woman's #3 Priority – High Social Status

This one bears looking at in great detail.

In his book "12 Rules for Life: An Antidote to Chaos", Jordan Peterson uses the biology of lobsters as a simplified example to show how the exact same chemical triggers work in humans.

And yes, they work the same way.

They work so similarly that antidepressants designed for humans will cheer up lobsters. Remember, he's talking about lobsters but the exact same biology is also at work in humans.

(He's in the middle of explaining is how serotonin is the chemical that regulates hierarchy in all animals, including humans. You might remember this from the second article in this marriage series entitled: [Gender Differences and the Biology of Leadership](#).)

The female lobsters (who also fight hard for territory during the explicitly maternal stages of their existence) **identify the top guy quickly, and become irresistibly attracted to him.** This is brilliant strategy, in my estimation. **It's also one used by females of many different species, including humans.** Instead of undertaking the computationally difficult task of identifying the best man, **the females outsource the problem to the machine-like calculations of the dominance hierarchy. They let the males fight it out and peel their paramours from the top.**

Source: "12 Rules for Life: an Antidote to Chaos" by Jordan Peterson.

The "dominance hierarchy" he's referring to is the serotonin system which regulates hierarchy in all higher order animals, including humans. *(again, see the second article in this marriage series entitled: [Gender Differences and the Biology of Leadership](#) for more details.)*

God wired women to be attracted to "dominant" aka "Alpha" type men. (high serotonin)

This is because men with high serotonin (*high social status*) are more likely be able to protect and

provide for them. However, **this choice is almost entirely subconscious**. This is why women prefer “bad boys”. It’s also why “*nice guys finish last*” ...and they do finish last according to several studies.

“Bad boys” win, good guys finish last

The study below focused on how “responsiveness” affected attraction between men and women. They defined responsiveness as how much focused attention a person paid to another.

Scientifically, nice (heterosexual) guys might actually finish last. A study published in Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin recently found that while **men were attracted to nice-seeming women upon meeting them, women did not feel the same way about men.**

...

The researchers found that men who perceived possible female partners as responsive found them to be “more feminine and more attractive.”

On the other hand, **women** didn’t necessarily perceive a responsive man as less masculine, but **they also did not find a responsive man more attractive. What’s more, when women perceived their male partner to be responsive, they were less attracted to the man.**

In other words, it appeared that in an initial encounter men liked nice ladies; **women thought nice guys were kind of lame.**

...

The second study required participants to engage with either a responsive or unresponsive person of the opposite sex, then interact with them online while detailing a current problem in their life. The goal here was to remove the potentially confounding elements of live social interaction (smiling, physical attractiveness) to see if they could isolate how much responsiveness—or niceness—played into attraction.

Again, the men in the study thought **responsive and attentive** women were more attractive as potential partners, while **women found men with those same traits to be less desirable.**

...

The third and final study presented in the paper sought to test specifically whether the mechanism by which “responsiveness” motivated individuals to pursue relationships was, in fact, sexual arousal. To do so, they replicated the second study, but added a specific measure of sexual attraction.

While the studies shed some light on why men find responsive women more sexually desirable, Birnbaum explains that **researchers are still unsure why women are less sexually attracted to responsive strangers**

than men [are].

“Women may perceive a responsive stranger as less desirable for different reasons,” said Birnbaum in a press release. “**Women may perceive this person as** inappropriately nice and manipulative (i.e., trying to obtain sexual favors) or **eager to please, perhaps even as desperate, and therefore less sexually appealing. Alternatively, women may perceive a responsive man as vulnerable and less dominant.”**

[Source.](#)

Why do women want a man who ignores them a little? Because if he is paying attention to her all the time, they are of equal status. If he’s of equal status, she thinks she’s aiming too low because women want men of higher status.

Again:

Instead of undertaking the computationally difficult task of identifying the best man, the **females outsource the problem to the machine-like calculations of the dominance hierarchy. They let the males fight it out and peel their paramours from the top.**

Source: “12 Rules for Life: an Antidote to Chaos” by Jordan Peterson.

I cannot overstate the importance of this enough. In fact, there’s an interesting article entitled: [Science Proves That Even Feminists Prefer “Sexist” Men Over “Woke” Male Feminists](#). The study the article cites proves exactly what the title suggests.

Interesting no?

Even rabid feminist can’t overcome the biological imperative to seek out a dominant, “alpha” man. (*high serotonin*)

“Nice guys” tend to lavish affection on their women. However, if a man makes his life revolve around a woman, that means – to the woman – she is at least equal status with him. Since women always want higher status, higher serotonin men, giving a woman all your attention is a sure-fire way to make her lose interest. (*She says she wants all your attention, but doesn’t realize that’s the exact opposite of what she wants.*)

Here’s the “Ah-ha” moment.

Women are wired to seek out men who are higher status than they are. Status is determined by serotonin, and a low serotonin person (*the woman*) is likely to follow/obey/submit to a high serotonin person (*the man*), as we covered in [the second article in this series](#).

Women literally – though subconsciously – crave a higher serotonin man, who they will be more likely to follow/obey/submit to.

It's just how women are wired.

Women seek out the highest serotonin man they think they can get. This in turn makes it more likely they will follow his lead. Further, when he's no longer more dominant (*higher serotonin*) than she is, she loses interest fairly quickly.

Notice: the #3 requirement for a woman (*high social status*) is a requirement for a man who's more dominant than she is. After the basic necessities for life (*food, shelter, clothing*), a woman's next requirement is "*someone more dominant than I am*". You could read that: "*someone who I will follow/obey/listen to*".

No, this isn't Politically Correct, but that's how women are wired.

As the article linked to above covered, even modern rebellious/feminist women who fight this with everything they have, can't overcome the desire for a "sexist" alpha man vs a "woke" one.

The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly; how this works itself out

Depending on the society, this tendency of women to always fall for higher serotonin men can be good, bad, or downright ugly. Let's start with the ugly first.

The Ugly – The Dark Triad in an egalitarian society

There's a cluster of three personality traits that are almost irresistibly attractive to women. They are called "The Dark Triad" and we'll see proof in just a moment. But first, here are the three traits that comprise "The Dark Triad".

What is the Dark Triad?

First off, Narcissism: essentially an excessive sense of self-love and self-admiration, **this is someone who sees themselves as better, more attractive and more intelligent, than other people.** They like to compete with others, and, they like to win. They are the center of attention, they like to be admired.

Then, Machiavellianism, this is a trait which depends on interpersonal manipulation. Essentially **a Machiavellian tells people what they want to hear to maximize their own potential benefits.**

And, then, there's psychopathy, this is basically an empathy deficit – **a lack of concern about the feelings of others**

. Often drinking drug taking, no seatbelt wearing and unprotected sex are involved.

[Source](#). (*emphasis added*)

A narcissistic individual has an inflated opinion of them self. Thus their serotonin system responds to their own perceived high status, opening the floodgates and bathes their system with serotonin. They tend to get ahead (*at least in the short term*) because of their Machiavellian tactics, so they often reach high status. Plus, they don't care much about other people (*psychopathy*), so they appear more attractive to women. (*who don't like when men pay too much attention... remember?*)

Make sense?

Those three form a powerful aphrodisiac cocktail for women, and many find it nearly impossible to resist. From a study titled: [The-Dark-Triad-Personality Attractiveness to Women](#). (*Note: "DT" is short for "Dark Triad" in this study*).

A t-test showed **the high DT character was rated as significantly more attractive than the control character**.

And the difference wasn't small either. Women found men with The Dark Triad traits to be a third (33%) more attractive! (*3.34 vs 4.44 out of 5*). Again, women are irresistibly attracted to dominant "alpha" men (*high serotonin*).

But it gets worse.

No previous studies, to our knowledge, have considered the attractiveness of the Dark Triad personality constellation to the other sex. Past research has demonstrated that the **DT is associated with self-reported mating success and increased number of sexual partners**.

...

However, our findings do indicate that the DT personality is attractive to our participants. **This in turn supports previous work that has suggested DT men are more sexually successful**.

Another study found this:

We found that **the number of offspring born to women given for their age was associated with women's preference for narcissistic and Machiavellian male faces**, but not with

preference for psychopathic male faces,' the study explained.

[Source.](#)

Did you catch that? **Women who are attracted to The Dark Triad actually have more children.** That further reinforces the data saying that Dark Triad men are “more reproductively successful”.

Many people personally know a woman who – despite saying she wants a “nice guy” – actually picks horrible men. If you don't know one personally, I'm sure you've heard of them. The trouble is, she doesn't have a choice about her attraction. And worse, she has lower serotonin which limits her ability to make a good decisions or defer pleasure.

This is why women stay with horrible men.

Remember, women are attracted to higher serotonin men. When the serotonin gap is high enough, the man can treat her terribly and she'll still want to be with him. I'm sure you've heard the stories of a man who abuses his wife/girlfriend, but when the cops try to intervene, the woman attacks the cops, not the man who abuses her.

(Talk to a cop or someone who works in the domestic violence field; it happens all the time.)

Counter-intuitively, the woman isn't attracted to the man **in spite of** him treating her horribly, she's attracted **because** he treats her horribly.

It's a serotonin thing.

You don't treat those of equal status badly (*and obviously, a real man shouldn't treat anyone badly*). But because he treats her terribly, he's sending a clear message that – in his eyes – he's of higher status than she is, which makes her attracted. And because being treated poorly reduces a person's serotonin levels even further, that makes it **even harder** for the woman to make good decisions. That's why they often (*sadly*) stay until they get themselves killed.

Yet more proof: convicts have more sex **and** more children

From a research paper entitled: “[Criminal offending as part of an alternative reproductive strategy: investigating evolutionary hypotheses using Swedish total population data](#)” (*yeah, quite a mouthful, but descriptive*)

First, using criminal conviction data for all 4.8 million men and women in the total Swedish population born in 1958–1995, **we showed that criminal offending is indeed associated with increased reproductive success compared to a non-criminal lifestyle.**

From the same study:

Third and finally, our findings showed that **the increased reproductive success among criminal offenders compared to non-offenders is explained by more reproductive partners.** Hence, on average, offenders have fewer children with each partner than non-offenders **but raise their fertility beyond the general population average by having children with multiple partners.**

These children of course grow up without a good father, and thus have a tendency to become criminal themselves. (As we saw in [the first article](#).) Nice guys really do finish last... but only in a society where women have equal rights.

The Bad – Deadbeats, duds, and divorce in an egalitarian society

This is merely a less severe form of “the ugly” like The Dark Triad above. High-school is a nearly perfect microcosm for this. The prettiest girls always attach themselves to the popular men, usually the Jocks. The Jocks might have several girls fawning all over them, while Joe Schmo who works hard to learn (*and would be a better provider/husband*) often gets nothing.

When women pick their own spouses, they tend to go for “jocks” and “bad boys”. (*high serotonin men, regardless of their ability to provide.*)

This is partially why women throw themselves at rock stars, movie stars, professional athletes, billionaires, etc. Any high-status, high serotonin man – especially if he’s masculine/attractive and/or rich – will “*get their motor going*” because they have high serotonin.

That’s why “nice girls” always seem to fall for “bad boys”.

It’s written into female biology. Unfortunately, it also means women have a tendency to make poor choices when it comes to husbands. In turn, that bodes ill for the health of the society as a whole.

Further, I’d wager it’s the reason for the divorce epidemic in this country.

Why?

Because the “nice guy” is attentive. That should be an attractive quality, but to women – who are wired to find higher serotonin (*and less attentive*) guys attractive – it quickly becomes a turn off. As we saw in the first article, women are the primary drivers of divorce.

The pattern is predictable, again as we covered part of it in the first article in this series. The initial rush of attraction lasts for a while and they get married, or just start living together. Eventually, the woman gets bored of the “nice guy” or more attracted to someone else, and they divorce/leave the nice guy, taking the kids with them. This cycle often repeats a few times.

This is called “serial monogamy”, and it leaves behind a wake of destruction in the form of broken homes and fatherless children. (*That in turn leads to a great civilization destroying itself.*)

So a woman's attraction to higher serotonin men can be a huge liability in an egalitarian society. However, it's a major asset for women in a patriarchal society like the Bible espouses.

The Good – Guaranteed Marital Love in a Patriarchal Society?

In a truly patriarchal society – like the Bible espouses – women don't get to pick their husbands; their fathers do. It might seem cruel to stick the woman with a man she may not "love", but the opposite is actually true. **It's far more likely to guarantee a woman's happiness.**

In a previous article in this marriage series – [Does God View Women as the \(Social/Political\) Equals of Men](#) – we talked about this. We saw how God gave a never-married girl's father absolute say over who she can marry. Even if the girl got married in secret or got pregnant out of wedlock, God gave the father the power to prevent or annul the marriage if he didn't like the guy. (*see the article for details.*)

Now, think about the serotonin system.

In a patriarchal society like that, women would have very little serotonin because they would have very little authority. Conversely, men would have much more serotonin. Therefore, the husband that her father picks for her will have far more serotonin than she will.

This is excellent for the woman.

Let's go back to serotonin for a moment.

Remember, in the quote below the author is using lobsters as a simplified example of what humans do. The same biology is at work in humans and the same results ensue (*as we've already seen*).

The female lobsters (who also fight hard for territory during the explicitly maternal stages of their existence) **identify the top guy quickly, and become irresistibly attracted to him**. This is brilliant strategy, in my estimation. **It's also one used by females of many different species, including humans**. Instead of undertaking the computationally difficult task of identifying the best man, the females outsource the problem to the machine-like calculations of the dominance hierarchy. They let the males fight it out and peel their paramours from the top.

Source: "12 Rules for Life: an Antidote to Chaos" by Jordan Peterson.

The girl is **nearly guaranteed** to be married to a much higher serotonin man. It's almost a given. And once that happens, her biological imperative to be attracted to a high serotonin man will kick in. She **almost** won't have a choice about being attracted to him... almost.

She might find it hard to love if she married a cruel husband. (*Though maybe not as we've already seen*.)

So it's a good thing that's a LOT less likely in a Patriarchal society!

Think about it.

Women are almost wired to seek out men who will make poor husbands. However, a woman doesn't choose her husband in a patriarchal society; her father does. Now, who do you think is more likely to pick a good husband:

1. A teenage girl with a biological imperative to find The Dark Triad more attractive?
 - o **OR**
2. A seasoned, 40-50 year old man who's been around the block a few times and who can see through younger men's crap because he was one.

See my point?

A woman who marries a higher serotonin man (*probably much higher*) will find herself "irresistibly attracted" to him. If he's a good man, he'll treat her right. So she'll be well treated by a man who she can't help but fall in love with.

That's as close to a guarantee of happiness in marriage (*for women*) as you're likely to find.

It's certainly better than today's divorce rate.

Further, it forces society to become better.

Think about it.

Fathers are very protective of their daughters. They typically won't let her marry anyone but a good man. Thus you can't get married and can't reproduce unless you're a good man,. **In just a generation or two, the men who make poor husbands die out because they don't reproduce, and nearly all the children would be brought up by good men.** Being brought up by a good man makes it far more likely you'll turn out to be a good man yourself.

Thus, fathers having the ultimate say about who their daughters marry will actually force all men in a society to be better.

It's true.

Why women vote more left than men

As we covered in the first article of this series, women vote significantly more "left" politically than men do. By and large, that's because of biology.

- Women are wired to find someone who will protect them, provide for them, and who will tell them what to do. Thus, they favor big governments who promise to protect them, provide for them (*via welfare and social programs*) and who will tell them what to do. (*Lot's of intrusive laws, bureaucrats, and regulations.*)
- By contrast, men are wired to provide for themselves, protect themselves/their family, and don't like being told what to do. Thus, they prefer smaller governments who aren't intrusive.

However, women outnumber men.

The most conservative group of female voters is married white women... and even then, only about half vote conservative. They cannot resist the biological impulse to vote for greater government control over their lives, more "government" (*i.e. taxpayer*) money being given to them, and the "protection" they think will come by surrendering their liberty for security.

Now, let's talk about what men want.

Eye of the Beholder – Why Men Want Beautiful Women

While women look for wealth, status, and high serotonin, men have a completely different set of qualities they look for in a spouse. Remember, men provided for and protected their wives for nearly all of human history. They didn't need someone to protect or provide for them, they wanted sex, homemakers, and legacy through children. More importantly, they want healthy children who aren't likely to die.

In a nutshell, men seek beautiful women because literally everything about a woman's body is an advertisement for health and/or fertility.

Again, here is what men want:

1. Youth
2. Physical attractiveness
3. Particular body shape (*low waist-to-hip ratio*)

Let's look at each in turn.

Why Youth?

Young women are incredibly fertile.

If you could only pick one predictor of fertility, youth would be a smart choice. Despite what the media and feminists have been saying for decades, the age of the woman for childbearing does matter; a lot.

Younger is better (*to a point obviously*) and a woman's reproductive system doesn't agree very well with feminism.

Because **age is the most important factor affecting fertility**, understanding how exactly it affects a woman's chances of conceiving is important to make the most out of her reproductive years.

A woman's fertility mainly depends on her ovarian reserve, which is the capacity of her ovaries to provide viable eggs that can be released on ovulation, fertilized by sperm, and develop into a healthy pregnancy.

[Source](#). (*emphasis added*)

The "ovarian reserve" refers to the number of egg cell a woman has which can be turned into viable eggs. However, the egg cell count decreases rapidly with age.

However, like all other cells in the body, women's eggs age, resulting in a natural decline in their count and quality.

...



[Image Source](#)

At **birth**, ovaries contain between **1-2 million** egg cells, which will degrade until puberty.

At **puberty**, girls have about **350,000-500,000** eggs in the ovaries.

Mensuration. From puberty until menopause, up to about **1,000 eggs** will be recruited to be matured during each menstrual cycle, in which one egg will be released on ovulation

[Source.](#) (*emphasis original*)

But not only does the egg count go down, so does the egg quality.



[Image Source.](#)

Over time, there are chromosomal (DNA) changes in the eggs due to sicknesses, fevers, toxins, and other factors. An egg with such abnormalities is not viable and will cause a **series of complications** if it is released on ovulation day, including not being fertilized, failing to implant in the uterine wall, or leading to a miscarriage or birth defects in the fetus.

Because **egg quality cannot be improved**, abnormal eggs accumulate over time, resulting in a **higher percentage of abnormal eggs** among older women, as shown in this egg quality-age chart:

[Source.](#)

At ~30 years old, a woman's fertility starts to take a serious hit. Not only is she less likely to conceive, but she's more likely to miscarry too. The odds against conception and risk of complications rise quickly until menopause.

When it comes to fertility, younger is better. (To a point.) So that begs the obvious question:

When is that point?

How young is too young?

We'll look at that next.

However, a disclaimer first: Romans 13 makes it clear that Christians should obey the government, excepting only when the government requires us to disobey God. The age of marriage is *definitely not* a "disobey God" level issue. **Thus, if the government says that a certain age is the minimum age to get married, do not get married before that age, and do not marry someone younger than that age.**

Period.

That's a commandment from God and breaking it will not only incur His wrath, but it will also bring law enforcement down on your head. Do **NOT** disobey the government in this area.

That said, we'll begin.

Let's look at the Biblical Minimum "age" First

It's not quite an "age" in the Bible. Instead of a minimum age, God gave a minimum standard based on biological maturity.

1 Corinthians 7:36 (*KJV, because it's more literal here than my usual NASB*)

36 But if any man thinks he is behaving improperly toward his virgin, if she is **past the flower of youth**, and thus it must be, let him do what he wishes. He does not sin; let them marry.

The underlined and bold text there is a single word in Greek, which is "?????????" ([huperakmos](#)). It literally means:

Definition: past the bloom of youth

Usage: past the bloom of youth, of full age.

The "Flower/bloom of her youth" should be obvious in its meaning. According to God (*writing through Paul*), a woman must have her period before she can be married... but I think more is intended here.

Notice, the definition is: "**past the bloom of youth, of full age**".

For those who don't know (*many men*), a girl doesn't typically just "get her period" and then it comes like clockwork right away. Often, it's irregular for a while before stabilizing. A girl's first period is called "menarche" and her cycle usually a couple of years to become regular.

One study that reviewed menstrual records of 250 girls, 100 of whom were studied longitudinally for up to 6 yr (3140 menstrual intervals), indicated that **menstrual regularity was established within 2 yr after menarche in the majority**.

(note: Some studies with other, less reliable methodologies mentioned in the study push the time down to a year, and sometimes less)

[Source.](#)

So it would be about two years until a woman's period became regular. That's the point at which she's "past the bloom" because she's no longer blooming; she's bloomed (*has regular periods*).

So, about 2 years after first period is "fully bloomed" (*regular period*) and thus Biblically eligible for marriage... sort of.

There's a minimum age component because of modern conditions as well, which we'll look at in a minute.

(Note: I know some women's periods never fully stabilize. I don't mean to suggest they can't ever get married. Once a woman has hit the "minimum age" – discussed soon – I'd say she's "fully bloomed" regardless of how regular her period is. I suspect that chronically irregular periods are more a result of modern lifestyles, nutrition, and artificial hormones, and weren't much of a problem pre-200 years ago. I have no evidence of this though.)

Okay.

So when do girls get their first period? (*called "menarche"*)

In modern America it's quite young. Historically though, it's been significantly older. I found [an article that talks about the average age of menarche](#) (*first period*) throughout history. Here's what they said:

- 13 – The Roman Empire (*lots of fatherless homes; more details in a moment*)
- 14 – Up to the 12th century
- 16 – in The Renaissance, 1300s – 1600s. (*They theorize that this later age was likely caused by widespread malnutrition*)
- 14 – in The Victorian Era (1800s)
- 13.9 – in a 1928 study.
- 13.5 – in the 1950s and 1960s, according surveys of British teens.
- 12.8 – in 2012, according to a New York Times article.

You can see the average age of first period has gone down quite a bit in the last ~100 years. **However, under normal conditions it seems to be about 14. Now, add 2 years for a period to stabilize and you end up with a minimum age for women to marry of about 16.** If you go purely by the biological signs, it could *technically* be younger, but as we'll see in a minute, **younger than 16 is an extremely bad idea** for multiple reasons, including legal ones.

Interesting side note:

One of the causes of women getting their period earlier is – drum roll please – fatherless homes.

It has long been a puzzle that **girls who grow up without their fathers at home reach sexual maturity earlier than girls whose fathers live with them**

.
...

Or it could be a complicated physiological response to stress, in which girls adapt their reproductive strategy to their circumstances. If life is harsh, the theory goes, maybe they need to get their babies into the world as quickly as possible.

The animal world suggests that the effect is not restricted to humans. Young mice, pigs, goats and even a few primates get signals from their kin which inhibit sexual development; a strange male in their midst, by contrast, really speeds things up. Research in humans has shown that girls growing up with stepfathers mature even more quickly than fatherless girls and that stepbrothers have a measurable effect too.

[Source.](#)

If you want a woman to sexually mature later, make sure her biological father is around. This partially explains why women get their periods younger these days.

Anyway...

It seems for most of human history, 14 was the average age a woman got her period.

Now, add ~2 years for her to hit "full bloom" (*regular period*) and you end up with a woman being Biblically ready for marriage at about 16 years old (*on average*).

At this point, they've reached sexual maturity and are ready to bear children. Interestingly, the minimum age of marriage around the world tends to right in that neighborhood. In fact, it's exactly in that neighborhood:

Globally, the average legal age of marriage for boys is 17 and 16 for girls but many countries permit them, particularly girls, to marry much younger.

[Source.](#)

In the United States, you can get married at 16 in ~2/3 of the States with parental consent.

Now, in the modern world we have all kinds of pollutants, chemicals, and especially artificial hormones, so the biological indicators are not reliable. No non-wicked man would think that a girl who got her period at age 9 (*yes it happens*) would be ready to marry at age 11. That's pedophilia and utterly abhorrent.

We've managed to mess up the biological indicators God gave us, so we are left with looking at what the marriageable age would be without our "fussing" and using that. Based on the data in this article (*and more that I didn't include because of space*), it seems like age 16 would be when women would've hit the indicators that God gave.

Thus, since women would meet the biological indicators for marriage at 16 without our "fussing", 16 years old seems like a good marker for the minimum marriage age of women.

Notice, this aligns well with the global average for legal age of marriage.

And again, as Christians we are required to obey our local laws, including on this. So if it's higher, like 18, wait until then. (*And if you are inclined to seek a bride who's younger than 16, I personally find that disturbing.*)

"But Wait! Won't women die in childbirth having children that young!?"


That occurred to me too before researching this article, but it turns out: not so much. The real risks start when a woman is pregnant before the age of 15... which wouldn't happen if we obey God's command (*through Paul*) in 1 Corinthians.

For confirmation, let's look at age vs mother death rate due to birth in a worst-case scenario: third world countries.

The follow is the [Maternal Mortality Ratio](#) (*number of mother deaths per 100,000 live births*) vs. the age of mother. It's from [this study](#) and is the aggregated results for 38 developing countries. They include "*sub-Saharan Africa, and selected countries in Asia, and Latin America*".


This file was auto-generated; some formatting errors might occur. (example: non-English letters become question marks)

Notice,



Notice, even in developing countries *like Africa* with 3rd world medicine, the 15-19 age group is **statistically identical to** – or lower than – the 25-29 age group.

And that's in developing countries. In the United states, the picture looks even better for young mothers.



[Image Source](#). (Please note that this also includes **all** pregnancies under the age of 20, including those under 15 which have a much higher rate of complications. Without include those, the numbers would look even better.)

I have much more data, but there's just one more quote that's really relevant. From a study entitled: "[Labor and delivery complications among teenage mothers](#)". (Admittedly a slight older study. However, the facts haven't changed much.)

Findings show that compared to mothers aged 25 to 29 having their first child, **teenager mothers appear to have superior health in most—but not all—labor and delivery outcomes.**

If you are interested in more data on this topic, I have more research below. However, the above pretty much covers it.

[Click here to expand additional research/quotations](#)

The trouble is, many studies lump all teen pregnancies together, from 12-19. However, there is a **vast** difference morally, Biblically, and biologically between getting pregnant at 12 and getting pregnant at 16. And yes, earlier than God prescribed can cause severe complications.

Though women are able to give birth as soon as they begin menstruating, there are some possible risks when you have a child **early on** in your teen years... Here are a few risks that are greater if you are pregnant **before the age of 15** or you do not seek prenatal care:

- low birth weight/premature birth
- anemia (low iron levels)
- high blood pressure/pregnancy-induced hypertension, PIH (can lead to preeclampsia)
- a higher rate of infant mortality (death)
- possible greater risk of **cephalopelvic disproportion*** (*the baby's head is wider than the pelvic opening*)

[Source](#).

Again, that's pregnant before 15, which wouldn't happen in you listened to God's directive (*though Paul*) in 1 Corinthians.

Pregnant teenagers face many of the same obstetrics issues as women in their 20s and 30s. However, there are additional medical concerns for younger mother, **particularly those under fifteen** and those living in developing countries. **For mothers between 15 and 19, age itself is not a risk factor**, but additional risks **may** be associated with **socioeconomic factors**.

[Source.](#)

Again, we seen the following God's prescription **completely avoids all** the serious heath risks. Further, any risks to mother and child are **not** related to age, but to "socioeconomic factors".

Adolescent pregnancy (i.e., in females 13 to 19 years of age) is associated with an increased risk of maternal complications during pregnancy and delivery, as well as increased risk to the fetus and neonate. Complications associated with adolescent pregnancy include preterm delivery, low birth weight, and infant mortality. However, **age-related biologic factors alone are not associated** with an increased risk of fetal death. In infants of teenage mothers, much of the risk of low birth weight **is related to behavioral and psychosocial factors**. Thus, psychosocial risk factors should be a major focus of care.

[Source.](#)

These "socioeconomic factors" and "behavioral and psychosocial factors" typically boil down to nutrition and living situation. In our culture, teenage mother tend to be poor and come from fatherless homes. (See [the first article in this marriage series](#) for stats/proof.) The family situation and stress obviously cause issues.

Further, adequate nutrition is important, and low-income families rarely can afford decent quality food. The issue isn't a health or age one; it's a **nutritional** one.

If a 16 year old gets pregnant, is healthy **and** eats a good diet, there aren't any problems. But poorer women/families tend to skimp on food first in tough times. This in turn can make it difficult for the mother to grow a healthy baby. This is hardly unique to teen mothers though. They are just affected more because they are finishing building their own bodies. (*again, not a problem with a good, nutritious diet.*)

The Other Reason Men Like Young Women

First, let's talk about the age at which a human brain matures.

Have you ever wondered why car insurance companies have much higher rates for men under 25 than men over 25? (*obviously, it's because they get into more accidents, but why?*) The answer is because a man's brain hasn't fully matured until at least 25.

Yes. The car rental companies got to it first, but neuroscientists have caught up and brain scans show clearly that the brain is not fully finished developing until about age 25.

...

So the changes that happen between 18 and 25 are a continuation of the process that starts around puberty, and 18 year olds are about halfway through that process. Their prefrontal cortex is not yet fully developed. That's the part of the brain that helps you to **inhibit impulses and to plan and organize your behavior to reach a goal**.

[Source](#).

Now, in a patriarchal society a man must provide for and lead his family. It's hard for a younger man to be well-established enough to provide for his family, even if he is mature for his age. Wouldn't it make sense for the head of the household to be fully mature before having a household?

Those are (some of) the reasons it's a bad idea for a man to get married before at least 25.

Now, back to men liking young women.

There's an interesting thing that happens to the brain during the teens and early twenties. This thing makes it **far** more likely that girl married in her mid-to-late teens will be a better wife. That thing is she has become more "moldable".

And the other part of the brain that is different in adolescence is that the brain's reward system becomes highly active right around the time of puberty and then gradually goes back to an adult level, which it reaches around age 25 and that makes adolescents and young adults more interested in entering uncertain situations to seek out and try to find whether there might be a possibility of gaining something from those situations.

...

Well, actually, one of the side effects of these changes in the reward system is that **adolescents** and young adults become much **more sensitive to peer pressure** than they were earlier or will be as adults. So, for instance, a 20 year old is 50 percent more likely to do something risky if two friends are watching than if he's alone.

[Source](#). (*same interview as the quote above*)

This applies to both men and women.

However, we've already said men should wait until they're fully mature before getting married (*age 25+*). However, if the girl gets married in her mid-late teens, she will still be in this state of increased susceptibility to peer pressure... including her husband's "peer pressure". By that, I mean she's more likely to adopt his opinion, worldview, and practices.

Imagine a girl in her mid-late teens (*already a time of uncertainty and angst*) is married to a man in his mid-late 20s. The 10+ year age difference means he's mature and fully a man, while she's still trying to figure out the world. He will have 10+ years of life experience on her. This life experience translates to better solutions to problems and stronger reasons for what he believes.

Naturally, she'll lean toward adopting her husband's views.

That's a good thing.

Over time, she's likely to absorb his views and make them hers. Not everything of course, but enough to improve compatibility. This is doubly true when you consider he'll likely have for more serotonin than she will, making this even more likely. Therefore, he's far more likely to be happily married to this young, beautiful wife who's "molded" to him, his ideas, and his worldview.

They are both more likely to be happy.

- Women marrying a (*much*) higher serotonin man will be "irresistibly attracted" to him, especially if he has good moral character. (*Which is far more likely if her father has a say.*)
- Men marrying a young woman in her mid-late teens gain a beautiful, fertile wife who's likely to "mold" to his unique way of living life.

The result is a much higher chance for marital bliss than rolling the dice in the dating world.

I understand many will hate this – feminists and egalitarians foremost among them – but "*dems da facts, ma'am*".

Further, it would make sense that God would arrange it so that a married couple's best chance at marital happiness comes when you follow His plan. Sure, it doesn't look like what we'd expect, but since when does God do things the way we expect Him to?

Why "Physical Attractiveness"?

The answer is very simple. Men want beautiful women because they are more likely to be healthy and fertile, though this is likely subconscious and not conscious.

The female sex hormone estrogen was thought to be the mediator of beauty, which

advertises health and fecundity. Now researchers at the University of St Andrews have shown for the first time that women with higher levels of estrogen do indeed have more attractive faces.

The study, published today in the Proceedings of the Royal Society: Biological Sciences is the first to demonstrate that women's facial appearance is linked to their well-being because estrogen impacts women's reproductive health and fertility.

...

The female sex hormone estrogen prevents the growth of facial bone, reduces the size of the nose and chin, and leads to large eyes, increased thickness of lips and fat deposition in the cheek area, along with hips and buttocks, features that announce that a woman is fertile.

[Source.](#)

Translation: more beautiful women are more likely to be fertile and thus can better conceive and carry a child during their childbearing years. It might not sound fair, but it's true.

That's why men chase attractive women; because they're healthy, fertile, and more likely to bear healthy children.

Can you fault a man for (*subconsciously*) wanting someone who's likely to produce healthy children? I can't. It makes very good sense once you understand the reasons behind it. God's first command to man was to "be fruitful, multiply and fill the earth". Beautiful women are more fertile, and therefore have an easier time fulfilling God's command.

Sidenote: why men love long hair.

You guessed it, it's a health and fertility indicator. Plus, it also displays a woman's recent health history. According to "The Handbook Of Evolutionary Psychology" by David M. Buss:

Grammer et al. (2002) found that hair length was significantly correlated with female attractiveness. Hair Grows at a rate of about one-half inch per month, until it falls out upon reaching 2 to 3 feet in Length. Starvation causes loss of hair, nutritional deficiencies in vitamins and minerals cause damaged hair, and malnourishment causes observable changes in hair color (e.g. dark hair takes on a reddish tone). Hair therefore provides an **observable record of an individual's recent health and nutrition** (serving as an indicator of diet and health over a 2- to 3-year period) **and reflects heritable genotype quality** (Etcoff, 1999). Shiny, strong hair provides a cue to recent good health, developmental condition, and genotype quality. Tellingly, long hair is preferred across

cultures, and long, lustrous hair is often associated with beauty (Etcoff, 1999).

Hinsz, Matz, and Patience (2001) collected hair samples and contributor information from over 200 women ages 13 to 73 and found that younger, higher reproductive value women tended to have longer hair than older women, as predicted if higher value women were more likely to use their hair as an advertisement of that fact. And hair samples that beauticians rated as higher quality came from women who self-reported to be in better health. It is interesting that hair grows fastest among women around the ages of peak fertility (Etcoff, 1999), with the result that evidence of environmental damage has less time to accumulate before new hair grows in, and evidence of health or dietary problems reflects a shorter period of time.

Takeaways:

- Longer hair length is perceived as more beautiful across a wide range of cultures
- Long healthy hair indicates good health (*and thus fertility*) for the preceding 2-3 years
- Broken, limp, or ugly hair indicates poor health (*and thus fertility*) for the preceding 2-3 years.

Men love long, lustrous hair because it indicates the woman has been healthy for the previous 2-3 years, meaning she's probably better able to bear healthy children without complications.

Why low “waist-hip-ratio”?

A woman with a low “waist-hip-ratio” has the classic hourglass figure, with hips that are significantly wider than her waist. To quote a [Psychology Today article](#):

Around the globe, across cultures, and throughout history, one physical feature has stood out as consistently correlated with [attractiveness](#) in females: waist-hip-ratio (WHR). The [desirability of a low WHR](#) often cuts across other preferences in body size and shape both among individuals and in cultural predominance.

Men's preference for a good waist/hip ratio universal... and it's a powerful fertility indicator:

An evolutionary model of mate choice predicts that humans should prefer honest signals of **health**, youth, and **fertility** in potential mates. Singh and others have amassed substantial evidence that **the waist-hip ratio (WHR) in women is an accurate indicator of these attributes**, and proposed that men respond to WHR as an attractiveness cue.

[Source](#).

I could go on citing sources for this, but this article is already over 10k words long. Men (*often subconsciously*) want young, beautiful women because they are more fertile and “moldable”, and thus more likely to be a better wife to him.

One Final Thing: Biblical marriage is NOT – nor has it ever been – about (Romantic) “Love”... and that’s a GOOD Thing

Notice I put “love” in quotes.

This is the 7th article in our series about marriage, and have you noticed we haven’t discussed romantic “love” even once? It’s been mentioned in passing, but that’s it.

There’s a reason for that.

Marriage is not about (romantic) love.

It never has been.

It never will be.

Real love is involved to be sure, but not the emotional feelings we typically call “love”, but are more correctly called “emotional infatuation”. This emotional infatuation is prized in our culture, but essentially never discussed in the Bible, and certainly not in the context of marriage.

See the article: [In Greek, the Greatest Commandment isn’t About “Love”](#) here on Berean Patriot.

In the Bible, husbands are never – not even once – commanded to “love” their wives in the sense of emotional infatuated (*see the article link just above*). They are commanded to “show preference” to them in Ephesians 5, to honor them in 1 Peter 3, and not to be harsh with them in Colossians 3; but the “emotional infatuation” version of “love” never shows up.

The idea that marriage is about emotionally infatuation comes from women, not the Bible.

When marriage is based on emotional infatuation, you end up with our current insane divorce rate. Eventually marriage becomes regarded as archaic, and is replaced by cohabitation. Feelings change, so if “intimate relationships” between men and women (*marriage/dating/cohabitation*) are based on emotional infatuation, and a woman becomes emotionally infatuated with someone else, then why shouldn’t she move on?

As we saw in the first article, it leads to society’s destruction.

(And I didn’t mention this in the first article, but cohabitation grew to replace marriage in the other great civilizations in world history before they fell also.)

So what is marriage about then?

Going back to first principles, God created women (*and thus marriage*) so man wouldn’t be alone. He then commanded them to have lots of kids. Ultimately, that seems to be the purpose of marriage.

- So humans aren't alone
- To provide the proper environment to raise children.

Once upon a time, most any woman would be a good wife because she married young, the husband had all the authority to make her behave properly, and women were raised from a young age to be good wives. In this day and age, none of those are the case.

The “Sexualization” of American Culture

As we covered above, men traditionally got three things out of marriage: sex, children, and a homemaker. However, modern American women doesn't want to have kids so she can “focus on her career”, and doesn't want to be a homemaker for the same reason, plus others.

Women are conditioned to think they are “less than” if they stay home to raise kids, with the result that many of them don't want to. Further, some realize how much work it is and simply don't want the hassle, or maybe these “*girls just want to have fun*”, and kids/housekeeping will interfere.

However, they still want men to provide for and protect them, and they need to entice men to do so somehow.

Since women won't bear/raise kids or keep the home, they have only one thing left to entice men: Sex.

That's it.

Granted, it's a powerful enticement. Women subconsciously realize that, which is why they advertise it. Women used to advertise other skills (*related to children and keeping a home*) to entice husbands. But since they won't do those things, they're only left with one card to play: sex. (*And some women only dangle the card, reserving its use to control or manipulate.*)

Earlier, we looked at marriage like this:

The agreement between the sexes, as exemplified by marriage:

- **What women say:** “***If** you will protect and provide for me my *entire life*, **then** I will give you exclusive sexual access to my body, bear your children, and keep your home*”
- **What Men say:** “***If** you give me exclusive sexual access to your body, bear my children, and keep my home, **then** I will protect and provide for you your entire life.*”

However, modern America Marriage looks more like this, because it's controlled by the woman.

- **What women say:** “***If** you will protect and provide for me my *entire life*, **then** I will occasionally have sex with you (*when I feel like it*), *if* we have kids I *might* help raise them, though you have to help take care of the house in addition to providing for me, and I'll feel free to ignore you or yell at*”

you whenever I feel like it. Further, I might leave you, taking half of everything you own and your children with me when I go.”

That's a pretty raw deal for men. To avoid getting such a raw deal, great care is required.

Advice to Men about Picking a Wife

Be ruthlessly practical when it comes to selecting a wife. Be 100% clear, open and honest that you want a Biblical marriage, and all that entails. (*You can even show her this article series if you like.*) If she isn't in full agreement (*or her father isn't supportive*) move on. It's not worth the headache being married to a feminist. Remember, feminist = rebellious = wicked. You don't want to be married to a wicked woman, not matter how much you might like her.

The Bible says:

Proverbs 25:24 It is better to live in a corner of the roof than in a house shared with a contentious woman.

Millions of men can attest to the truth of those words.

Conclusion

Let's recap:

- Women are “irresistibly attracted” to wealthy, high serotonin men because they are far more likely to provide for and protect them and any children she bears.
 - Unfortunately, this attraction to high-serotonin men has a dark side, specifically a woman's tendency to pick “bad boys” (*including The Dark Triad*) who make poor husbands and fathers.
 - In a patriarchal society, fathers pick husbands which helps prevent women from being married to poor husbands/fathers.
 - In a patriarchal society, the girl will marry a much higher serotonin man, and thus is likely to become “irresistibly attracted”, especially because he's a good man.
 - In a patriarchal society, fathers choosing their daughter's husband means only good men will get wives and be able to reproduce, thus drastically improving the quality of the average man.
- Men want young, beautiful women because they are incredibly fertile, healthy, and more likely to bear healthy children. Further, they are more likely to survive pregnancy.
 - Biblically, a girl should be “fully bloomed” before being married, which has typically happened around 16 for much of world history

- Young women this age are more “moldable” because their brain’s reward system is more active. This mean she’s more likely to adopt her husbands views, and thus be a more compatible wife.

Because of this, a patriarchal structure in a Christian society is far more likely to result in happy marriages than marriage based on emotional infatuation.

Again, here’s why:

- Women marrying a (*much*) higher serotonin man will be “irresistibly attracted” to him, especially if he has good moral character. (*Which is far more likely if her father has a say.*)
- Men marrying a young woman in her mid-late teens gain a beautiful, fertile wife who’s likely to “mold” to his unique way of living life, increasing compatibility.

If you ignore what men and women say they want, and focus on what they actually pick, Here’s what’s going on.

- When women look at wealthy, masculine men they subconsciously think: “*he can protect and provide for me and my children.*”
- When men look at young, beautiful women, they subconsciously think: “*she can bear healthy children for me.*”

To no one’s surprise, men and women are hard-wired to fulfill God’s first three commandments: “*Be fruitful, and multiply, and fill the earth*”.

In the next article – the 8th in this marriage series – we’ll finally take a look at the role of men in society and marriage. We’ll also start getting into some more controversial topics. Yes, more controversial than we’ve already covered (*by a significant margin*) while still being 100% Biblical.

The 9th article will be even more controversial, diving into one of the most controversial topics of the series. (*But not the most controversial one, which will be in an addendum article.*) The 9th article is about the catalyst whose presence absolutely guarantees that women won’t get equal rights, but whose absence absolutely guarantees women will get equal rights. Fair warning: it would be considered heresy by 99% of Christendom (*perhaps more*), but it’s fully – and clearly – Biblically supported.

Marriage Series Index:

- a. [How Crucial are Women to a Biblical Household? Very!](#) (*This article was written later, but serves as an excellent, balanced intro to gender roles in marriage. I highly recommend reading this article before the others.*)
1. [How Getting Marriage 'Wrong' Destroyed Every Great Civilization in World History](#)
2. [Gender Differences and the Biology of leadership](#)
3. [The “Why” Behind God Telling Wives to Submit to their Husbands in Marriage](#)

-
- a. [Does 1 Corinthians 11 Require Women To Wear "Head Coverings"](#)
 4. [The Bible on Authority & Submission in Marriage](#)
 5. [Does God View Women as the \(Social/Political\) Equals of Men?](#)
 6. [Biblically, What's the Role of Women in Society and Marriage?](#)
 7. [Gender and Attraction: What Men vs Women REALLY Want](#)
 8. [Biblically, What's the Role of Men in Society and Marriage? \(still writing it...\)](#)
 9. [Is Polygamy \(Polygyny\) Biblical? Does God Allow it?](#)
 10. [Follow up articles coming...](#)
 - o [Appendix A: Biblical Reasons for Divorce, When Remarriage is Allowed, and How Adultery Figures In](#)