

UNITED WISDOM

You Are Not Loved Just for Your Pretty Eyes: Love, Value, and Exchange

Relationships and Shared Life

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

E01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

You Are Not Loved Just for Your Pretty Eyes: Love, Value, and Exchange

Why a Man Is Chosen for His Value—and Why Cowardice Calls That “Unspiritual”

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut
United Wisdom · Love, Value, and Exchange · unitedwisdom.world

Take this in at once, without anesthetic: adult life begins at precisely the moment a man stops whining that a woman can be kept by “sincerity” and a few memorized pretty phrases alone. People are not loved in a vacuum. They are loved because being beside them brings more life, more safety, more beauty, more meaning, more future. Now an honest question, point-blank: what exactly becomes greater beside you? If there is no answer, the problem is not the “mercenary world.” The problem is you. [6,1]

Self-deception always begins with the same sweet fairy tale: supposedly, real love must be selfless, unconditional, and almost blind. This story appeals precisely to those who have built nothing yet already demand adoration. Reality is harsher and has no intention of apologizing: relationships always involve choice, assessment, reciprocity, and exchange—even when an immature person prefers to call it “the magic of feelings.” Let us ask the uncomfortable question: why is “unconditional” love always demanded by those who have not a single condition that would make them worth choosing? [1]

This is not a dirty truth that kills love. It is an adult truth that restores love's dignity. Love between a man and a woman does not deny value; it is value's highest form. You see the other's value, respond to it, invest, and bind your destiny to it. Everything else is begging disguised as poetry. [4,5]

For United Wisdom, this subject touches the central nerve, because it lies on the fault line between two languages: the language of the heart and the language of structure, poetry and exchange, romance and matter. Here is the first blow to your habitual thinking: United Wisdom does not choose between these poles or let you hide behind either. It brings them into collision and compels a synthesis through a picture of the unity of opposites, where conflicting truths turn out to be parts of one reality. [6,4,5]

This article will defend a hard, uncompromising thought: yes, a man is loved for what he can give a woman; yes, a woman is loved for how she adorns and strengthens a man's life; yes, love almost always has grounds, form, and a price. But do not hurry to hide behind the cynical

slogan “everything is for sale.” It does not follow that love is the prostitution of feelings or a bare marketplace. Something else follows, harsher than either comfortable extreme: genuine love begins not where there are no conditions at all, but where the material, psychological, bodily, and spiritual finally stop lying to one another. Are you ready for a conversation that leaves no cozy corner for self-deception? [1,4]

The Young Man's Illusion

Most young men carry the same cowardly myth: if you are sufficiently “good,” sincere, romantic, and “real,” a woman must see your “soul” and love you as you are. There is something touching in this myth—exactly as much as there is childish whining. Ask yourself directly: do you really want to be loved “as you are,” or are you simply afraid to discover what you are actually worth? [1]

This is the outlook of a boy who still hopes the world will mother him: without selection, demands, or assessment of usefulness, strength, form, and results. But a woman in a couple is not a mother. She is not obliged to love a man merely because he exists. She chooses. That choice is almost always connected with his value—visible or hidden, material or symbolic, biological or cultural. Who convinced you that you are an exception to this law? [1]

Let us name things without a polite cover: if a man is poor, spineless, unformed, fails to keep his word, cannot earn, cannot lead—and nevertheless demands love for his “inner world”—he is not a romantic. He is a petitioner. He is begging for adult life's grand prize without having become an adult. The most painful question is: how, exactly, are you different from him right now? [1]

Modern science on mate choice leaves naivety no chance. Research into human mating strategies shows that people read whole clusters of qualities: outward characteristics, the ability to provide, the ability to be a reliable parent, status, character, resources, prospects, and willingness to invest. [1]

In David Buss and David Schmitt's review, mate choice is described as a complex system of preferences that depends on sex, context, a short- or long-term strategy, one's own value on the “relationship market,” cultural norms, and the sex ratio in the environment. [1] This means something simple and unpleasant: the romantic fairy tale of “love beyond criteria” falls apart at its first collision with biology, psychology, and practice. Do you still want to argue with reality—or will you finally start working with it? [1]

Particularly uncomfortable for naive romance is the fact that women's long-term preferences consistently include signs of resources, ambition, industriousness, social status, an ability to protect, and willingness to invest in a partner and children. [1] Men's long-term preferences

just as consistently include attractiveness, reproductive value, kindness, and reliability within the pair bond. [1]

Put simply: a man needs a woman who is desirable, beautiful, warm, and suited to a deep bond; a woman needs a man who is not merely pleasant-looking but able to carry the weight of reality. This is not a moral defect in either side. It is the very fabric of human choice. So why do you call “selling out” what you do yourself every day when you turn to look at a beautiful woman? [1]

The Exchange Everyone Pretends Not to Notice

In public, people talk about love as though it floats above life and has nothing to do with usefulness. Remove this social makeup and a rough mechanism appears beneath it: lasting relationships almost always rest on an exchange of values. Hypocrisy here is no ornament; it is a way to avoid paying the bills. [1]

A man brings more than emotion into a relationship. In the healthy version, he brings direction, safety, discipline, problem-solving, resources, the capacity to hold a framework, take responsibility, and guide a woman through uncertainty. That is why studies of women's long-term preferences include “good provider” and “protection” alongside kindness and love. Now a cold question: cross out emotion—what remains in you from this list? [1]

A woman also brings more than emotion. She brings beauty, sexual attraction, a sense of home, social radiance, emotional warmth, inspiration, a man's connection with life and the body—and the very atmosphere in which his strength acquires meaning at all. [1]

Let us name it all the way through. When a man declares, “I should be loved for no reason, not for money, strength, character, status, or prospects,” he is generally bargaining for the right not to grow or compete. He wants a woman to shut her eyes and not notice that other men have more form, will, results, and ability to lead. That is not nobility. It is surrender dressed up as virtue. [1]

This is the most convenient male lie: first build nothing, then call women's criteria “mercenary,” then resent not being chosen. The problem is not that the woman is “too earthly.” It is that you are too weak to withstand an earthly test. The blunt question: is it easier to rewrite reality around your weakness, or rewrite yourself around reality? [1]

And do not pretend men are “above” this. A man notices just as clearly when the woman beside him inspires no admiration, does not adorn his life, gives no warmth, awakens no desire, and does not support his path. Men also choose embodied value rather than an abstract soul. They simply love accusing women of materialism for doing what they

themselves do in relation to the body, youth, appearance, and social shine. The double standard is convenient only until someone points it out. [1]

Honesty begins precisely here. Love between a man and a woman is not a random mystical lightning bolt striking a void. It is recognition of value, a response to it, and exchange through it. Not merely “money for beauty,” as the crudest people bleat; much more broadly, strength for inspiration, status for radiance, protection for trust, resources for loyalty, form for desire, meaning for tenderness. [1,5]

In this sense, relationships really resemble a system of mutual giving. But giving does not abolish asymmetries or conditions. A gift has weight only where it costs something. What do you bring to this exchange—apart from resentment toward those who bring more? [1,3]

Why Romance Without Material Grounding Becomes Immaturity

Romance is necessary. Without it, relationships degenerate into a dull accounting contract where everyone merely tallies contributions and benefits. Yet romance without a material foundation becomes a beautiful lie even faster. Here is the front line you must finally see: “romance versus usefulness” is not a choice between good and evil, but two halves of a cripple, each presenting its impairment as a principle. [1]

It is impossible to go on loving a man who speaks beautifully about the stars but cannot earn, fails to keep his word, cannot withstand pressure, cannot protect, builds no trajectory, and has no inner backbone. For the first weeks this passes as “sensitivity” and “depth.” After a year, it reads as weakness, chaos, and an inability to bear life's weight. How much of your “depth” will survive a year without money, discipline, and character? [1]

A woman may initially convince herself she loves the “soul.” But if there is no strength behind that soul, there is nothing from which to build respect. Without respect, a woman's love begins to drain away, and no amount of talking will hold it. [1]

Let us say it more harshly, down to the bone: a man who cannot be respected almost always becomes a man who is no longer desired. However much he swears loyalty, kindness, and “real feelings,” without strength these words sound like a request for a discount on his own weakness. Are you offering love—or asking for indulgence? [1]

Do not imagine this is a one-sided game. A man may also insist that only a woman's “inner world” matters to him. But if her body does not attract him, if she inspires no pride, fills the space with neither beauty nor warmth, and does not make him want to live more vividly, his “spiritual love” will fall apart against the first dreary Wednesday. Hypocrisy has no sex. [1]

That is why the hard thought—a man is loved for what he can give—should not frighten a mature person. It frightens only someone who hoped to consume love for life without

becoming valuable. Adult love is not handed out as a poverty benefit. It is earned, maintained, and deepened through the ability to be valuable to another. [1]

Nor is this only about money: money is merely the crudest, most easily measured marker. A woman also loves a man for the shoulder she can lean on, the calm she feels beside him, clarity of decisions, authority, the ability to withstand blows amid chaos, and a path she wants to join. But these, too, are forms of value, not mythical “disinterestedness.” Stop acting out selflessness and ask: which of these values do you actually offer? [1]

Why Materialism Without Romance Is Also Pitiful

Now a blow to the opposite camp, before the cynic has time to smirk. It is easy to slide into the other extreme: if love always has grounds, everything must be a bare marketplace, cynical exchange, and trade in attributes. This is the same immaturity in a macho wrapper. The cynic is the same wounded romantic who has learned to bare his teeth. [1]

Reduce love to price and benefit, and you lose the very thing for which people endure intimacy's risks. No woman wants to remain as an ornament and a function if she does not feel seen as a living person. No man will endure a woman who uses him as an ATM while giving no admiration, loyalty, warmth, desire, or living involvement in return. How is your calculation better than someone else's naivety if both lead to loneliness? [1]

Even studies emphasizing resources also show that long-term choice involves not only “provider traits” but “good parent” qualities: kindness, honesty, love for children, reliability, and a disposition to invest. [1] Women are not looking for a wallet, but for a man able and willing to direct resources toward a shared destiny. A wallet without a destiny keeps no one for long. [1]

Men, too, seek more than a body: a body with a soul, gentleness, attachment, a living response, and willingness to enter a union. A purely material view tries to cut all this away as “weakness” and “sentimentality,” but simply fails to understand how human attachment works. [1]

Here is the verdict on both extremes: the cynic and the naive romantic are far more alike than they wish. One shouts, “There is no love, only advantage.” The other whispers, “If there is advantage, it is no longer love.” Both think in primitive dualities. One does not understand spirit, the other form. In defending their half of the truth, both renounce the whole. Which camp are you hiding in—and is it not time to leave both? [4,5]

United Wisdom: Unite the Poles Rather Than Choose One

United Wisdom strikes at the root of dualistic thinking. It does not politely reconcile the poles; it refuses to recognize them as enemies. The Handbook describes the project as an attempt to gather religions, philosophies, and science into one structure that emphasizes unity and resolves differences through a higher frame. [6]

That is why the dispute between romantic and materialist touches the project's central nerve. These are not two incompatible theories between which we must choose. They are two incomplete, stumbling languages describing the same reality. Each declares itself the only one because it fears admitting its own incompleteness. [4,5,6]

Romantic language sees the inner fire: experience, uniqueness, attraction, the mystery of meeting, the feeling of being chosen, the poetry of union. Material language sees the outer architecture: resources, form, body, hierarchy, usefulness, advantage, abilities, functions. Both are truthful. Both are half-blind. [1,4]

Error begins when one language declares itself the only one. Yet the traditions on which United Wisdom draws stubbornly insist otherwise: truth most often unfolds as the coincidence of opposites, a broader perspective in which polarities form a whole rather than destroy each other. Duality is not depth. Duality is where thinking stopped. [4,5]

In love, this means the following. At the relative level, people really do choose by signs of value: a man by beauty, warmth, sexuality, femininity, loyalty; a woman by strength, resources, status, direction, protection, and the ability to invest. [1] At a deeper level, these are different masks of one movement: the striving toward fullness, completeness, and greater life through union with the Other. [5,6]

That is why romance without matter is a lie, and materialism without romance blindness. One gives meaning, the other form. One gives experience, the other foundation. One gives the flame, the other the vessel. To choose only one is voluntarily to remain a cripple. Why choose? [4,5]

What Religions and Philosophies Say About This

Christianity

In popular imagination, Christianity is presented as a religion of unconditional love that supposedly denies all reciprocity. A convenient substitution, false through and through. Even within Christian reflection on love, the theme of reciprocity constantly returns: mutual response, mutual gift, mutual fidelity. [3]

Some Christian texts describe love between God and humanity not as violence or mechanical obligation, but as a free offer calling for a response. They explicitly state that genuine love cannot be imposed by force, and that relationships live only through a responding movement. Where, then, is your “love for no reason”? [3]

Transfer this principle to a man and a woman, and the pink haze disperses. A husband does not merely “harbor elevated feelings”: he serves, carries, protects, invests, loves through action. A wife does not merely “exist beside him”: she responds with respect, fidelity, warmth, help, and trust. [3]

Here, too, love does not abolish the structure of exchange but sanctifies it. In Christian marriage, selflessness does not mean the absence of form or reciprocity. It means exchange ceases to be petty bargaining and becomes a voluntary gift of what you genuinely have. What do you genuinely have to give? [3]

Aristotle and the Philosophy of Reciprocity

Long before psychology, philosophy already knew that human relationships are impossible without proportion and reciprocity. Buss and Schmitt explicitly recall that early theories of human mating included exchange and equity theories: accounts of exchange and a relative balance of valuable resources between people. [1]

The Aristotelian line distinguishes friendship for pleasure, friendship for usefulness, and friendship for virtue. Even the highest form does not abolish usefulness entirely; it merely ceases to be its slave. People value one another not only for convenience but for the quality of the soul, while reciprocity remains an essential part of the bond. [2]

Here is a blow to those who wrinkle their noses at “usefulness.” Usefulness is not always base. There is low usefulness: being used as a wallet or a pretty doll. There is high usefulness: becoming stronger, more honest, calmer, more collected, more alive beside someone. Do you despise usefulness—or are you simply unable to offer it? [2,5]

Buddhism, Hinduism, and the Level of Relative Truth

United Wisdom's materials give a special place to two levels of truth, nonduality, and the relative world of forms. “Through Duality” explicitly argues that absolute unity must not be confused with relative manifestation. The world of forms, roles, and distinctions does not disappear merely because a nondual depth lies behind it. [4]

This is a devastatingly precise frame for discussing love as well. At the absolute level, one can speak of love as unconditional openness to being, unity, recognition of oneself in another. But at the relative level, a man and woman remain embodied, social, historical beings who assess,

choose, and enter a union through concrete signs of value. Hiding behind the “absolute” to avoid paying the relative world's bills is spiritual fraud. [4,5]

That is why discussing money, appearance, the ability to provide, sexuality, status, reliability, or fertility does not “defile” love. It simply belongs to the relative level of form. The mistake is not that this level exists, but that people either absolutize it or hypocritically pretend it does not. Which form of lying do you resort to? [4,1]

The Confucian and Traditional Line

Traditional philosophies of relationships were almost never naively romantic in the modern sense. They considered the union of a man and woman a complementary structure of duties, roles, virtues, and contributions—not a spontaneous emotion without content. [2]

In this view, a man is valuable not because he is “nice,” but if he can bear responsibility, maintain order, and be a support. A woman is valuable not because she is “a person too,” but if she brings harmony, beauty, continuation, warmth, and cultural form to the union. Harsh? This is simply the language spoken for millennia by those who could not afford self-deception. [2,1]

A modern person is free to dispute the particular historical distribution of roles. But the idea of mutual contribution has not disappeared; it has merely put on softer words. Reality is stubborn: everyone wants a union to provide not only feelings but what they lack alone. No rhetoric cancels that. [1]

The Male Mistake: Demanding Love Without Value of One's Own

Here is the central painful thesis for a male audience, and I will not soften it: a huge proportion of men are complaining not about women's mercenary attitudes but about their own negligible market and existential value. Instead of raising their level, they try to shame women's choices morally. Shaming another person's choice is always cheaper than changing yourself. [1]

They ask, “Why did she leave for someone more successful?” Yet almost never ask the only honest question: “Why should she have been better off beside me in the first place?” [1]

They declaim, “Real love does not look at money.” They do not explain why a woman must calmly enter the life of a man unable to provide even his own stability. [1]

They repeat, “But I am a good person.” Yet in the world of a couple, “goodness” without strength, structure, growth, and usefulness scarcely converts into respect. Without respect, there is none of the love this “good person” so hungrily awaits. Good for whom, and for what, if nothing changes beside you? [1]

The hard truth: a man's inner poetry interests a woman little if it is not embodied. A man can be infinitely “deep,” but if he cannot manage his body, money, word, boundaries, state, profession, focus, and direction, his depth becomes decorative drama staged for himself. [1]

Science offers no romantic concessions here. Women's long-term preferences include economic resources, ambition, industriousness, social status, protection, and willingness to invest. [1] Men dreaming of winning without strength or usefulness therefore argue not with “bad women” but with the very structure of human choice. It is an argument with gravity. Who do you think will win? [1]

Here is the harshest thought, without a drop of comfort: the world owes you no compensation in love for your failure to develop. If you are empty, no one is obliged to fill you. If you are weak, no one is obliged to choose you. If you have not become a support, do not be surprised that you are not seen as a home. This is not the world's cruelty. It is a bill you wrote yourself through inaction. [1]

Yet there is no humiliation in this truth. On the contrary, there is a path. If you are loved for what you can give, you can become someone who is loved more deeply. You can build value rather than beg for acceptance. You can become a source of attraction rather than an object of pity. There is only one question: will you begin today—or once again blame someone else for your emptiness? [1]

The Female Side: Beauty, Form, and the Power to Adorn a Man's World

Honesty requires saying the other half aloud, with no concessions to this side either. Yes, a man is loved for what he can give. But a woman is not loved in abstraction either. A man almost always loves her for something: beauty, sexuality, gentleness, taste, the ability to offer warmth, a living sparkle, the power with which she makes his life desirable. [1]

If a woman neglects herself, cannot be attractive, creates no warmth, inspires no respect, gives no feeling of home, and can neither inspire nor support nor adorn life's space, relying solely on an “inner world” is as naive for her as hoping for a beautiful soul without strength or resources is for a man. The law is symmetrical and makes no exceptions by sex. [1]

This does not humiliate women; it recognizes symmetry. Men and women enter relationships not as empty entities but as bearers of different kinds of value. Male culture today simply forbids direct talk of women's function of adornment and inspiration, while female culture forbids talk of men's function of provision and structure. Both taboos serve the same purpose: the right not to answer for one's half of the bargain. [1]

Both sides consequently behave hypocritically. A woman wants someone strong, resourceful, stable, but says she merely wants someone "kind." A man wants someone beautiful, desirable, easy to be with, inspiring, but says he wants only a "rich inner world." Then both suffer because they pretended to be better than they were. How much longer are you willing to pay for your own pretense? [1]

Love as the Union of Form and Spirit

Genuine reconciliation begins when a person accepts a double truth and stops hiding behind half of it. The first truth: love needs a foundation, often the partner's value. The second: value by itself does not produce love unless it becomes experience, fidelity, warmth, participation, and an inner meeting. Reject the first and you become a penniless dreamer. Reject the second and you become a wealthy corpse. [1,4]

A man may be chosen for strength, money, status, and direction. But he will be loved deeply only when a living soul stands behind them, able not merely to command but to feel, not merely to lead but to see, not merely to win but to love. [1]

A woman may be chosen for beauty, sexuality, and radiance. But she will be loved deeply only when a heart, fidelity, gentleness, intelligence, a taste for life, and the ability to be an ally rather than a prize stand behind them. [1]

Here the false enmity between romance and materiality collapses. Romance without form is barren. Form without romance is dead. Love emerges where form begins to glow with spirit and spirit acquires a worthy form. Everything else is two varieties of loneliness. [4,5]

United Wisdom uses this language for everything: not destroying distinctions, but placing them in a larger wholeness; not fleeing the poles, but finding their deep coincidence; not choosing between heart and world, but building a way of seeing in which the heart does not lie to the world and the world does not betray the heart. [5,6]

What a Man Should Do

Strip away the beautiful wrapping. The practical conclusion is simple and cruel: stop demanding love in advance and start building value. This does not mean turning into a cold resource machine. It means becoming a person beside whom a woman's quality of life genuinely grows, outwardly and inwardly. Everything else is an excuse. [1]

For a male audience, this means several directions of growth, each a personal challenge:

• Increase your ability to provide and manage resources, because material helplessness is incompatible with being a support in a long-term union. [1]

• Strengthen your body and nervous system, because a woman is rarely reassured by a man who is himself tossed about by every wind. [1]

• Build character, because a weak promise destroys respect faster than a poor bank balance. [1]

• Find a direction, because women follow a man with a vector, not someone who merely demands to be loved. [1]

• Develop depth, because status alone without a soul turns a union into a scorched contract where everything seems present but there is no air to breathe. [1]

One final thing you must grasp: a man's value is not his salary. It is his integrated form. Money without backbone does not save him. Muscles without meaning do not hold anyone. Charisma without reliability burns through trust. Yet spirituality without strength, income, a body, and discipline is worth almost nothing in actual choice. Which of these supports are you developing, and which are you hiding behind? [1,6]

Real masculine maturity means accepting reality without bitterness. A woman chooses not because she is corrupt, but because a union has a price. A man is not loved just for his eyes, and that is normal. He, too, loves a woman not for her passport and the fact that she exists, but because through her his world becomes more beautiful, more alive, more significant. Stop taking revenge on reality for not being your nanny. [1]

The Final Point

The most dangerous lie for a young man is that love should arrive before value. No. First you become someone who can be respected, desired, relied on, someone with whom to enter the future. Only then does love have something in you to hold on to. There are no other entrances. [1]

The second lie is just as dangerous: that love is exhausted by advantage. No. Advantage opens the entrance but does not create the sacred center of a union. Love is born where two people recognize value in each other and begin an exchange not from fear of loss, but from an abundance of being. [4,5,3]

The hard truth about male value therefore does not kill love; it purifies it. It draws a man out of an immature dream into maturity, and a woman out of silent shame about her criteria into honesty. Romance and matter cease to be enemies and become two sides of one coin: love's spirit and form, which either work together or collapse together. Now the last question, which you will answer not to me but to yourself: will you still wait to be loved “for no reason”—or start becoming someone who cannot help being chosen? [4,5,1]

Connections Across the Topic

This article continues the project's recurring lines. Related texts:

• Through Duality.

• Facets of One Truth.

• United Wisdom Project Handbook.

Related United Wisdom Materials

This article continues the project's recurring lines and draws on the United Wisdom corpus. The following materials complement and deepen its subject: the union of form and spirit, value and exchange, and moving beyond dualistic thinking.

• **Through Duality — philosophy.** Distinguishes absolute unity from the relative world of forms: the “two levels of truth” frame through which this article reconciles romance and matter.

• **Facets of One Truth — philosophy.** Shows the language of spirit and the language of form as facets of one reality rather than enemies: the basis for “unite the poles rather than choose one.”

• **The Shadow — psychology.** Explores the mechanism of self-deception: what a person has not lived through and has rejected in themselves is projected outward and called “the world's mercenary nature.”

• **The Mask (Persona) — psychology.** On the gap between the image of being “good and deep” and actual embodied value, strengthening the discussion of hypocrisy on both sides.

• **Stoicism — practice.** Distinguishing what depends on us from what does not, and working on character: a practical language for “build value rather than beg for acceptance.”

• **Mature Love — psychology / practice.** Extends the conclusion: love arises not from fear of loss but from an abundance of being, where value becomes encounter, fidelity, and warmth.

• **The Science of Choice and Attachment — science.** Evolutionary psychology of mate choice and the neurobiology of attachment confirm that choice always reads clusters of value.

Primary Sources and Academic References

I. Evolutionary Psychology of Mate Choice

• Buss, D. M., and Schmitt, D. P. (1993). *Sexual Strategies Theory: An Evolutionary Perspective on Human Mating.* Psychological Review, 100(2), 204–232. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.100.2.204

• Buss, D. M. (2019). *Evolutionary Psychology: The New Science of the Mind.* Routledge. https://www.routledge.com/Evolutionary-Psychology-The-New-Science-of-the-Mind/Buss/p/book/9781138088610

• Mate choice in humans—Sexual strategies theory, overview. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sexual_strategies_theory

II. Philosophy of Love and Reciprocity

• Aristotle. *Nicomachean Ethics*, Books VIII–IX: friendship for usefulness, pleasure, and virtue. https://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/nicomachaen.8.viii.html

• Aristotle's Ethics—Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/aristotle-ethics/

• Philosophy of Love—Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy: eros, philia, agape, reciprocity. https://iep.utm.edu/love/

III. The Christian Tradition: Agape and Reciprocity

• Love—Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy: agape, union view, reciprocity. https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/love/

• The Highest Form of Love and Its Role in Peace—Philosophy Institute: agape versus philia. https://philosophy.institute/metaphysics/agapeic-love-highest-form-peace/

IV. United Wisdom Project Materials

• Through Duality—United Wisdom: two levels of truth, nonduality, and the relative world of forms. https://unitedwisdom.world/skvoz-dualnost

• Facets of One Truth—United Wisdom: unity of the languages of spirit and form. https://unitedwisdom.world/grani-odnoi-istiny

• United Wisdom Project Handbook: a structure uniting religions, philosophy, and science. https://unitedwisdom.world/handbook

Archival Editor's Note

This is a full translation of an intentionally confrontational archival essay. Its insults, gender prescriptions, and claims of universal laws are preserved as the authors' rhetoric, not endorsed as a measure of anyone's dignity or worth. Poverty, illness, disability, appearance, fertility, or a partner's rejection do not establish a person's inferiority. The disability metaphor used in the body is inherited polemical language. Neither material contributions nor self-development create entitlement to another person's attraction, sex, loyalty, or continued relationship; choice and consent remain free.

The archive repeatedly uses mate-preference research to support categorical claims about all men, all women, unavoidable relationship outcomes, and a prescribed division of roles. Such conclusions are not newly verified scientific or clinical findings. Aggregate preferences, context-dependent theories, and normative advice are different kinds of claim. This package has not independently reviewed the cited studies, religious texts, or the article's appeal to Confucian tradition, and it does not establish that the cited research supports every sentence marked [1]. The archive's closing assertion about neurobiology is likewise not independently demonstrated here.

The numeric markers [1]–[6] are preserved from the supplied text. Its final reference list groups material into four thematic sections and does not provide an unambiguous one-to-one key for all those markers; no new mapping has been invented. The account of the United Wisdom Handbook and project materials is historical archive content, not confirmation of the current canon or of the current availability of those URLs. Comparisons among theological, philosophical, and scientific accounts remain authorial synthesis, not proof that their claims are identical.

References Inherited from the Archive

Source IDs and URLs below are inherited archive references, not newly verified readings.

- PDF-L001
- PDF-L002
- PDF-L003
- PDF-L004
- PDF-L005
- PDF-L006
- PDF-L007

- PDF-L008
- PDF-L009
- PDF-L010
- PDF-L011
- PDF-L012
- PDF-L013
- PDF-L014
- PDF-L015
- PDF-L016