SO-06 The contemporary mating market and loneliness

The contemporary landscape of human mating, partnership, and social integration is undergoing a profound, historically unprecedented transformation. Across developed societies, the traditional mechanisms of partner selection and relationship formation are rapidly yielding to digital intermediation, while the institutional frameworks that once governed family life are loosening. Paradoxically, in an era defined by unprecedented digital connectivity and the theoretical democratization of romantic choice, indicators of social isolation, sexual inactivity, and ideological polarization between the sexes are rising.

To systematically dissect the present state of relations between the sexes, this analysis separates the phenomenon into three distinct but interacting layers: *physiology* (the measurable biological substrates, health trends, and pharmacological influences on the mating drive), *behaviour* (the statistical realities, overlapping demographic distributions, and economic actions of humans in the mating market), and *culture* (the variable, socially constructed frameworks, technologies, ideologies, and cultural moods that shape how individuals perceive and navigate relationships). By strictly distinguishing what is known about statistical averages from what can be deduced about specific individuals, and by presenting the strongest evidence on both sides of active academic controversies, this report provides a comprehensive foundation for understanding how men and women live together in the modern era.

Layer 1: Physiology—The Biological and Pharmacological Substrates

The physiological layer encompasses the measurable, biological realities that underpin the human mating drive and fertility. While evolutionary frameworks often emphasize the fixed nature of sexual dimorphism, contemporary physiological and epidemiological research reveals a highly plastic landscape, heavily influenced by environmental inputs, pharmacological factors, and the lens through which biological data is interpreted.

The Sperm Count Controversy: Existential Pathology or Biovariability?

A central physiological debate with immense sociological spillover centers on the reported global decline in human sperm counts. The current scientific and cultural panic was largely catalyzed by a highly cited 2017 meta-analysis in *Human Reproduction Update* by Levine, Swan, and colleagues, which claimed a 59% decline in sperm counts among men in "Western" countries between 1973 and 2011[1]. This finding has been widely interpreted as evidence of a biological crisis threatening male fertility and human survival, frequently weaponized in popular culture and by specific political subsets—including men's rights and alt-right communities—as proof that modern lifestyles, feminism, or demographic diversity are biologically castrating men[2].

However, this narrative has faced rigorous scientific criticism. A leading counter-framework was proposed by Boulicault, Richardson, and colleagues at the Harvard GenderSci Lab in a

2021 study published in *Human Fertility*[2]. They introduced the "Sperm Count Biovariability hypothesis," arguing that the 2017 meta-analysis relied on scientifically and ethically problematic assumptions[2]. Boulicault et al. argue that the physiological baseline of the 1970s Anglophone nations does not necessarily represent a "species optimum." Rather, sperm count varies within a wide range, much of which constitutes non-pathological, species-typical variation[2].

Crucially, the assumption that male fertility scales proportionately with sperm count is unsupported by clinical evidence; above a critical threshold, higher sperm counts do not predict a higher probability of fertility[1]. The critics also highlighted the methodological flaw of dividing data into "Western" and "Other" categories, which obscures rural and urban variance and relies on geographically imbalanced data[1]. The strongest physiological evidence currently suggests that while environmental factors such as endocrine disruptors warrant continued study, the apocalyptic framing of a physiological male collapse conflates natural biological variance with pathology.

The Pharmacological Dampening of the Mating Drive

A highly measurable physiological factor directly altering the contemporary mating market is the widespread use of antidepressants, specifically Selective Serotonin Reuptake Inhibitors (SSRIs). The physiological intervention of SSRIs on the central nervous system has profound, well-documented secondary effects on the physiological substrates of sexual desire, arousal, and orgasm.

Clinical data indicates that the incidence of SSRI-induced sexual dysfunction is remarkably high. Research suggests that between 15% and 80% of users are impacted, depending on the specific medication, dosage, and diagnostic criteria utilized[5]. The 14-week STAR*D prospective observational study, which included 1,473 patients treated with citalopram, provided robust effect sizes: 54% of patients experienced decreased libido, 36% had difficulty achieving orgasm, and among the 574 male participants, 37% experienced erectile dysfunction[6].

Pharmacological Impact	Prevalence Estimates	Physiological Manifestation	Psychological Consequence
SSRI-Induced Sexual Dysfunction	15% - 80% (varies by drug/dosage)[6]	Anorgasmia, erectile dysfunction, delayed ejaculation	Relationship distress, medication non-adherence[7]
Emotional Blunting	Correlated with sexual dysfunction ($r = 0.76$)[8]	Dampened affective and reward circuits	Reduced intensity of positive emotions, romantic detachment[8]

Post-SSRI Sexual Dysfunction (PSSD)	Rare but clinically documented[5]	Persistent genital numbness, pleasureless orgasm	Indefinite continuation of symptoms post-discontinuation[5]

The physiological mechanism is theorized to involve serotonergic inhibition of dopaminergic reward pathways. A 2024 cross-sectional study of female patients with Major Depressive Disorder (MDD) in remission under long-term sertraline therapy found that 81.8% met the criteria for sexual dysfunction, compared to 0% in the healthy control group[8]. Furthermore, this study found a strong positive correlation ($r = 0.76$) between sexual dysfunction and "emotional blunting"—a generalized dampening of emotional responsiveness across all domains of life[8].

While SSRIs are vital psychiatric tools, their widespread prescription introduces a massive physiological headwind into the mating market. The physiological blunting of reward circuits inevitably filters up into the behavioural layer, reducing the frequency of mate-seeking behaviours, dampening the physiological feedback loops required for pair-bonding, and altering the subjective experience of romantic attachment. A rare but severe complication is Post-SSRI Sexual Dysfunction (PSSD), wherein genital numbness and pleasureless orgasm persist indefinitely even after medication is discontinued, suggesting potential long-term epigenetic or receptor-level alterations[5].

Layer 2: Behaviour—Statistical Realities, Skews, and Overlapping Distributions

The behavioural layer examines how individuals and cohorts act within the mating market, mapping the statistical realities of partnership, sexual frequency, and economic trade-offs. It is mathematically and philosophically crucial to distinguish what is known about statistical averages from what can be safely deduced about specific individuals.

The Gender Similarities Hypothesis vs. Evolutionary Dimorphism

When evaluating the mating behaviour of men and women, public discourse often defaults to evolutionary psychology models that emphasize profound sexual dimorphism—the idea that men and women possess fundamentally distinct psychological architectures and mating strategies.

However, the most robust statistical evidence challenges the magnitude of these differences. In a foundational paper in *American Psychologist*, Hyde (2005) proposed the "Gender Similarities Hypothesis," based on an exhaustive review of 46 meta-analyses encompassing hundreds of studies[10]. The findings demonstrated that men and women are fundamentally similar on most psychological variables. The vast majority of gender differences yielded effect sizes (Cohen's d) in the close-to-zero ($d \leq 0.10$) or small ($0.11 < d < 0.35$) range[10]. The average absolute difference between males and females across diverse psychological

domains was $d = 0.21$, indicating massive overlapping distributions[10].

To distinguish averages from individuals: a d of 0.21 means that the distributions of male and female psychological traits overlap by approximately 85%. Therefore, knowing an individual's biological sex provides very little predictive power regarding their specific psychological profile. While evolutionary psychologists correctly point out that specific domains—such as stated target traits in partner selection (men prioritizing youth/attractiveness, women prioritizing resources) and jealousy triggers—do yield moderate to large effect sizes, the *behavioural* reality is that within-sex individual variance far outweighs the mean differences between the sexes[10]. Hyde warns that overinflated claims of gender differences carry substantial sociological costs by fostering stereotyped expectations and creating self-fulfilling prophecies in intimate relationships[10].

Stated vs. Revealed Preferences: The Failure of Introspection

The gap between evolutionary theory and actual mating behaviour is further highlighted by the distinction between stated preferences and revealed preferences. In a heavily replicated 2008 study published in the *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology (JPSP)*, Eastwick and Finkel investigated whether individuals actually pursue what they claim to desire in a mate[13].

Historically, surveys repeatedly show that men state a higher preference for physical attractiveness, while women state a higher preference for earning potential. However, when Eastwick and Finkel measured *revealed* preferences during in-person speed-dating events, these sex differences vanished. In vivo, both men and women weighted physical attractiveness and earning potential almost equally when deciding whom to actually pursue[13]. A massive 2024 replication study across diverse global samples confirmed this finding: men's stated preferences underestimated how much they cared about earning potential in reality, while women's stated preferences overestimated it[13]. This proves that human beings lack accurate introspective access to their own mating algorithms; they rely on culturally provided scripts when answering surveys, but act on complex, emergent physiological and psychological cues when face-to-face.

The "Sex Recession" and the Retreat from Partnership

Despite the biological imperatives of the mating market, behavioural data across developed nations reveals a stark, well-documented decline in both sexual frequency and relationship formation—a demographic phenomenon colloquially termed the "sex recession."

The most rigorous primary literature on this trend is provided by Ueda et al. (2020), published in *JAMA Network Open*. This study analyzed repeat, cross-sectional data from the US General Social Survey (2000–2018), encompassing highly representative samples of 4,291 men and 5,213 women[16]. The analysis found a substantial increase in sexual inactivity, predominantly driven by young, unmarried men. Between 2000-2002 and 2016-2018, the proportion of 18- to 24-year-old men reporting absolutely no sexual activity in the past year surged from 18.9% to 30.9% (age-adjusted odds ratio [aOR] for trend across survey periods, 1.20; 95% CI, 1.04-1.39)[16].

Crucially, this behavioural retreat is heavily stratified by socio-economic status. Men with lower

incomes (aOR 0.37 for an annual income of $\geq \$50,000$ vs $\$0 - \$9,999$), part-time employment (aOR 2.08), or no employment (aOR 2.94) were significantly more likely to be sexually inactive[16]. Twenge, Sherman, and Wells (2017, *Archives of Sexual Behavior*) corroborated these findings, noting that the decline in sexual frequency is driven by two primary factors: an increasing baseline of individuals without a steady or marital partner, and a simultaneous decline in coital frequency among those who are already partnered[19].

Economic Shocks and the "Marriageable Man" Hypothesis

Historically, sociological and economic consensus posited a direct, causal link between male earning power and relationship formation. The assumption was that improving the economic prospects of lower-educated men would increase marriage rates, rendering them more "marriageable" in the eyes of female partners. However, recent empirical evidence contradicts this assumption, indicating a fundamental structural break in mating behaviour.

Kearney and Wilson (2018, *Review of Economics and Statistics*) utilized a sophisticated quasi-experimental shift-share design to test the reverse marriageable men hypothesis. They exploited the positive, localized economic shocks associated with the "fracking booms" in the United States[22]. The fracking boom significantly increased the wages of non-college-educated men in specific geographic PUMAs (Public Use Microdata Areas). If the traditional sociological model held true, this influx of male earnings should have triggered a proportional increase in marriage rates.

Instead, the reduced-form analysis revealed a striking behavioural shift: while both marital and non-marital birth rates increased significantly due to the positive income effects, there was *no evidence* of any increase in marriage rates[22]. This represents a distinct departure from previous economic booms; for example, the Appalachian coal boom of the 1970s and 1980s did result in higher marriage rates alongside higher fertility[22]. The contemporary decoupling of male earnings from formal marriage suggests a profound behavioural adaptation: modern individuals are willing to increase fertility in response to resources, but the institutional structure of marriage is no longer viewed as a mandatory or even desirable prerequisite for family formation.

Educational Divergence and Assortative Mating

The structure of assortative mating (the tendency to select partners of similar socioeconomic or educational status) has fundamentally inverted. Van Bavel, Schwartz, and Esteve (2018, *Annual Review of Sociology*) meticulously documented the reversal of the gender gap in education across Western countries[25]. Consequently, couples in which wives possess more education than their husbands now statistically outnumber those where the husband is the educational dominant[25].

Contrary to earlier sociological warnings, which posited that men would reject higher-status women or that women would refuse to "marry down," these female status-dominant relationships no longer exhibit higher rates of instability or divorce[25]. This indicates a successful behavioural adaptation to new socio-economic realities. However, as Greenwood et al. (2014, *American Economic Review*) demonstrated, the intensification of positive assortative mating (high earners marrying other high earners) has become a primary driver of household income

inequality, further stratifying society into dual-high-income households and isolated, low-income single households[26].

Layer 3: Culture—Algorithms, Ideologies, and the Deinstitutionalization of Mating

The cultural layer involves the shifting norms, technologies, and institutional frameworks that define how humans interact. The contemporary mating market is defined by the financialization of romance, the algorithmic mediation of choice, and the collapse of traditional social scripts.

Disintermediation and the Rise of Algorithmic Matchmaking

For the entirety of human history up to the late 20th century, mate selection was primarily brokered by local social networks: family, friends, religious institutions, and neighborhoods. This traditional system provided built-in vetting, "enforceable trust," and social closure, which optimized long-term relationship stability[28].

This paradigm has collapsed. Rosenfeld, Thomas, and Hausen (2019, *PNAS*) demonstrated that the internet has fundamentally displaced friends and family as the primary mechanism for relationship formation[28]. Using a nationally representative survey of American adults (HCMST), they found that meeting online eclipsed meeting through friends for the first time around 2013, with approximately 39% of heterosexual couples meeting online by 2017[30].

This cultural shift toward digital platforms—such as Tinder, Bumble, and Hinge—creates massive choice sets and introduces asynchronous, depersonalized evaluation[28]. Finkel et al. (2012, *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*) provided an exhaustive critical analysis of this transition[33]. While online dating provides unprecedented access to potential partners, it simultaneously elicits an "assessment-oriented mindset." Users are forced to browse and compare large numbers of profiles, which leads them to commoditize and objectify potential partners, ultimately reducing their willingness to commit to any single individual[34].

Furthermore, the architecture of these apps creates severe behavioural skews. Bruch and Newman (2018, *Science Advances*) mapped the "aspirational pursuit" of mates in online dating markets, finding that the majority of users consistently message individuals who are significantly more desirable than themselves (roughly 25% out of their league)[37]. This mathematical skew ensures that a tiny fraction of highly desirable users receive an overwhelming majority of the attention, while the majority of users experience chronic rejection or invisibility, fostering deep resentment within the cultural landscape.

The Unpredictability of Unique Desire

The foundational cultural promise of the digital mating market is that sufficient data and "scientific algorithms" can predict compatibility. This promise has been rigorously falsified by the scientific literature. Finkel et al. (2012) emphasized that matching algorithms marketed by dating platforms lack scientific validity; they rely largely on stated preferences and trait similarities, which have been repeatedly shown to account for a negligible proportion of the variance in long-term relationship satisfaction[33].

In a landmark study, Joel, Eastwick, and Finkel (2017, *Psychological Science*) used advanced machine learning (Random Forests models) to attempt to predict initial romantic attraction[38]. In

two independent speed-dating samples (Sample A: $N = 163$; Sample B: $N = 187$), romantically unattached participants completed over 100 self-report measures regarding traits and preferences identified by past research as relevant to mate selection[39]. The researchers utilized nested cross-validation to prevent model overfitting.

The models successfully predicted 4% to 18% of *actor variance* (a person's general tendency to like others) and 7% to 27% of *partner variance* (a person's general desirability to the room)[38]. Crucially, however, the machine learning models were completely unable (predicting exactly 0% of the variance) to predict *relationship variance*—the unique, dyadic desire between two specific individuals above and beyond their general tendencies[39]. As Eastwick noted, romantic desire is less like a predictable chemical equation based on stated traits and more like an unpredictable earthquake—a chaotic, emergent property of human interaction that cannot be decoded via pre-date algorithms[41]. The culture of online dating forces users to filter based on variables that machine learning proves are useless for predicting actual interpersonal chemistry.

The Deinstitutionalization of Marriage

The technological shift in partner selection is occurring alongside a broader sociological dissolution of traditional frameworks. Cherlin (2004, *Journal of Marriage and Family*) outlined the "deinstitutionalization of American marriage"—defined as the weakening of the social norms that previously dictated partners' behaviour[43].

Over the 20th century, marriage transitioned from an *institutional* necessity (organized strictly around reproduction, economic survival, and legal obligation) to a *companionate* ideal (focused on emotional support and traditional gender roles), and finally to the contemporary *individualized* marriage[44]. The individualized marriage focuses heavily on personal choice, self-development, and flexible roles. While marriage retains high symbolic significance as a "capstone" achievement, its practical necessity has completely dissolved[44]. Cohabitation, serial monogamy, and prolonged singlehood are no longer stigmatized deviations but normalized, statistically prevalent alternatives[29].

This deinstitutionalization means that every couple must negotiate their own roles, divisions of labour, and relationship boundaries from scratch. While this increases the freedom of the individual, it drastically elevates the cognitive load and potential for conflict within the partnership[43].

A highly controversial perspective on this cultural shift was offered by Mark Regnerus in his 2017 book *Cheap Sex: The Transformation of Men, Marriage, and Monogamy* (Oxford University Press)[46]. Applying sociological exchange theory, Regnerus argued that the advent of the birth control pill, combined with online dating and ubiquitous pornography, drastically lowered the "cost" of sex. He posits that because women's sexual liberation made sex more freely available outside of commitment, women lost their traditional bargaining power to secure marriage[46]. This thesis has been heavily criticized by sociologists like Tristan Bridges, who argue that Regnerus relies on pseudo-evolutionary premises, ignores the agency of sexual minorities, and falsely frames women's sexual autonomy as the root cause of institutional collapse, rather than recognizing broader macroeconomic and structural shifts[46].

The Demographic and Psychological Fallout: Loneliness, Polarization, and Disaffection

The collision of physiological realities, shifting economic behaviours, and the cultural deinstitutionalization of mating has yielded a profound psychological toll, characterized by structural loneliness, intense ideological polarization, and the emergence of radicalized romantic subcultures.

The Loneliness Epidemic and Singlehood in Germany

The normalization of singlehood and the subsequent rise in loneliness are highly visible in European demographics. Destatis (the German Federal Statistical Office) reported that in 2024, approximately 17 million people lived in single-person households in Germany[48]. This constitutes 42.1% of all households, a figure significantly above the EU average[49].

The German Family Panel (Pairfam), which tracks relationship dynamics longitudinally (utilizing data from over 7,165 non-residential relationships across 13 waves), highlights a nuanced psychological reality. While many young adults report being satisfied with singlehood, those with a high, unfulfilled desire for a romantic partner experience severe and compounding declines in life satisfaction[51].

This unfulfilled desire feeds directly into the structural loneliness epidemic. Data from the German Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP), analyzed by the *Einsamkeitsbarometer 2024* (Loneliness Barometer) under the Federal Ministry for Family Affairs (BMFSFJ), reveals that 19% of the population in Germany feels lonely at least sometimes[53]. The data meticulously deconstructs loneliness into three facets: isolation (20%), exclusion (28%), and "Alleinsein" or feeling alone/missing company (56%)[53].

Loneliness Facet (SOEP 2021/2022)	Prevalence in Germany	Primary Demographic Vulnerabilities
Overall Loneliness	19%[53]	Below median income, male, migration background[54]
Alleinsein (Feeling Alone)	56%[53]	Higher in Western and Southern Germany[54]
Ausgeschlossenheit (Exclusion)	28%[53]	Unemployed, health-impaired individuals[55]

Luhmann et al.'s analysis of SOEP data ($N = 1,491$ in the Berlin Aging Study II) further indicates complex age trajectories. While popular narratives assume loneliness is exclusively an affliction of the elderly, predictive effects of social loneliness are actually highly pronounced in

younger and middle-aged cohorts. Older adults often possess stabilized emotional regulation strategies and selectively curate emotionally rewarding relationships, whereas younger adults are exposed to the full volatility of the deinstitutionalized mating market[56].

Ideological Divergence: The 2024 Gallup/FT Data Controversy

Compounding the structural isolation is a rapidly widening ideological chasm between young men and women. John Burn-Murdoch's analysis of 2024 Gallup data for the *Financial Times* triggered massive debate by highlighting a "new global gender divide"[58]. The analysis claimed that over the past six years, women aged 18 to 30 in the US have become 30 percentage points more liberal than their male contemporaries[58]. Similar stark divides were mapped in Germany (a 30-point gap), the UK (25 points), and South Korea (where the fertility rate has subsequently collapsed to 0.78)[59].

However, this finding is subject to intense methodological controversy. Data scientists Allen Downey and Vishal Singh have rigorously critiqued the FT analysis, pointing out that the 30-point gap in the US Gallup data relies heavily on noisy, unweighted sub-samples from 2022, which artificially inflated the trend line[58]. Singh's analysis of the massive Cooperative Election Study (CES), which interviewed 60,000 Americans, suggests the under-30 gender gap in two-party voting is closer to a 6.5 percentage point margin[61]. Furthermore, the CES data indicates that in 2024, *both* young men and young women actually shifted rightward compared to 2020, though men shifted further[61]. Regardless of the exact statistical magnitude, all datasets acknowledge that a record-high ideological polarization exists, which creates immense friction in a mating market that historically relied on shared values (assortative mating), effectively shrinking the pool of "acceptable" partners for both sexes.

Radicalization: Incels and the "Black Pill"

At the absolute margins of the mating market's failure are "Involuntary Celibates" (incels). The incel phenomenon is primarily a sociological and psychological reaction to the perceived hyper-stratification of the modern digital mating market.

Costello et al. (2022, *Evolutionary Psychological Science*) conducted the largest psychological profiling of incels to date, comparing 151 self-identified incels to 149 non-incel single men[62]. The findings shatter the mainstream media caricature of incels as merely entitled, violently misogynistic extremists. Statistically, the incel cohort exhibited devastatingly poor mental health, with 74.1% reporting severe anxiety and 67.5% reporting severe depression, alongside exceptionally high levels of loneliness[63]. Notably, a disproportionate percentage exhibit traits of Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD), which severely complicates their ability to navigate the highly nuanced, unscripted, text-based flirting required on modern dating apps[65].

Rather than entitlement, Costello found that incels actually report *lower* minimum mate standards than non-incels and possess a chronically low sense of self-perceived mate value[62]. The defining psychological framework of the incel is the "Tendency for Interpersonal Victimhood" (TIV)—an externalized locus of control where they view themselves as genetic victims of a rigged societal game[63]. This fatalistic ideology, termed the "Black Pill," posits that sexual attraction is fixed by genetic determinism (e.g., bone structure, height) and is fundamentally immutable. This worldview renders self-improvement futile and therapy

pointless, locking the individual into a self-reinforcing echo chamber of despair[64].

Heteropessimism: The Female Disaffiliation

While marginalized men may retreat into the Black Pill, a parallel psychological phenomenon has emerged among women, termed "heteropessimism." Coined by Asa Seresin (2019, *The New Inquiry*), heteropessimism consists of performative disaffiliations with heterosexuality—expressed as regret, embarrassment, or hopeless cynicism regarding straight relationships and men in general[67].

Heteropessimism is highly visible on platforms like TikTok and Instagram, manifesting in viral statements like "men are trash" or the performative wish that one were gay[68]. Crucially, as Seresin notes, this disaffiliation is *performative*—it is rarely accompanied by the actual abandonment of heterosexuality, creating a jarring dissonance between stated ideology and actual behaviour[68].

Rather than serving as a revolutionary feminist catalyst to dismantle patriarchy, Seresin argues that heteropessimism acts as a conservative, anesthetizing force[68]. It functions as a preemptive emotional shield against the pervasive disappointments of the individualized, algorithmic dating market[68]. By viewing heterosexuality as inherently toxic or a "prison," women manage their expectations in a market where male emotional availability is perceived as scarce. This results in a culture of emotional minimalism, suspicion, and low-effort attachments (often referred to as "heterofatalism"), which ultimately reinforces the isolation it claims to critique[68].

Summary of Robust Findings

1. **Rising Sexual Inactivity:** The proportion of 18- to 24-year-old men reporting zero sexual activity in the past year rose from 18.9% to 30.9% between 2000 and 2018, predominantly affecting low-income, unemployed, and unmarried men.
2. **Algorithmic Disintermediation:** Online dating has eclipsed friends and family as the primary way couples meet, fundamentally altering choice architecture and removing traditional "social closure" and vetting mechanisms.
3. **Failure of Predictive Matching:** Machine learning algorithms utilizing self-reported traits and preferences can predict general desirability but explain 0% of the variance regarding unique dyadic desire between two specific individuals.
4. **Decoupling of Earnings and Marriage:** Positive economic wage shocks for non-college men (e.g., fracking booms) successfully increase fertility but fail to increase marriage rates, indicating a break in the historical "marriageability" paradigm.
5. **Overlapping Psychological Traits:** The Gender Similarities Hypothesis holds firm; the average absolute difference between men and women across diverse psychological domains is $d = 0.21$, indicating massive overlap.
6. **Stated vs. Revealed Preferences:** While men claim to value physical attractiveness and women claim to value income on surveys, in-person interactions show both sexes weight these traits equally.
7. **Stability of Status-Dominant Women:** The reversal of the education gap means women regularly out-earn or out-educate their husbands; these marriages are highly stable and

no longer at a statistically higher risk of divorce.

8. **Incel Psychological Profiles:** The incel cohort is primarily defined by severe mental health crises (depression, anxiety), autism spectrum traits, and an externalized locus of control, rather than high baseline entitlement.
9. **Structural Loneliness Epidemic:** 19% of Germans report loneliness; the highest demographic predictors are low income, male gender, and migration background, heavily impacting younger and middle-aged demographics, not just the elderly.
10. **Intensification of Assortative Mating:** Modern couples increasingly pair with educational and economic equals, a behavioural shift that is a primary driver of rising household income inequality.

Contested or Open Questions

- **The Magnitude of Political Polarization:** While divergence exists, is the gender gap a 30-point chasm (as per Gallup polling) or a much narrower 6.5-point gap (as per the 60,000-sample CES data), and how heavily does this actually inhibit real-world partner selection?
- **Sperm Count Variances:** Does the globally observed variance in sperm counts represent an existential pathological threat driven by endocrine disruptors, or is it non-pathological biovariability as posited by the Harvard GenderSci Lab?
- **Reversibility of PSSD:** Are the physiological changes induced by long-term SSRI use on sexual and reward circuitry permanent for a subset of the population, and what are the exact epigenetic or receptor-level mechanisms?
- **The Trajectory of Heteropessimism:** Will performative disaffiliation from heterosexuality among women eventually lead to actual demographic drops in relationship formation, or will it remain an online coping mechanism masking traditional desires?
- **The Future of Institutional Marriage:** As marriage becomes purely companionate and individualized, will it stabilize as a luxury good exclusive to the highly educated, or will alternative legal and social structures emerge to replace it for the working class?

5 to 10 Most Important Sources to Read in Full

1. **Finkel, E. J., et al. (2012).** *Online Dating: A Critical Analysis From the Perspective of Psychological Science.* Psychological Science in the Public Interest.[33]
2. **Joel, S., Eastwick, P. W., & Finkel, E. J. (2017).** *Is Romantic Desire Predictable? Machine Learning Applied to Initial Romantic Attraction.* Psychological Science.[38]
3. **Ueda, P., et al. (2020).** *Trends in Frequency of Sexual Activity and Number of Sexual Partners Among Adults Aged 18 to 44 Years in the US, 2000-2018.* JAMA Network Open.[16]
4. **Cherlin, A. J. (2004).** *The Deinstitutionalization of American Marriage.* Journal of Marriage and Family.[43]
5. **Hyde, J. S. (2005).** *The Gender Similarities Hypothesis.* American Psychologist.[10]
6. **Kearney, M. S., & Wilson, R. (2018).** *Male Earnings, Marriageable Men, and Nonmarital Fertility: Evidence from the Fracking Boom.* Review of Economics and Statistics.[22]
7. **Costello, W., et al. (2022).** *Levels of Well-Being Among Men Who Are Incel (Involuntarily*

Celibate). Evolutionary Psychological Science.[63]

8. **Seresin, A. (2019).** *On Heteropessimism*. The New Inquiry.[68]
9. **Boulicault, M., et al. (2021).** *The Future of Sperm: A Biovariability Framework for Understanding Global Sperm Count Trends*. Human Fertility.[2]
10. **BMFSFJ (2024).** *Einsamkeitsbarometer 2024 – Langzeitentwicklung von Einsamkeit in Deutschland*.
    [cite: 54, 55]

Implications for Living Together

Note: In delineating these implications, we actively reject the naturalistic fallacy. The observation that a behaviour is statistically common or evolutionarily rooted (e.g., stated preferences for status, youth, or homophily) does not render it morally "good," legally optimal, or structurally necessary for modern human flourishing.

For couples and families, the most pressing implication of this data is the necessity of intentional, conscious relationship construction. The "deinstitutionalization of marriage" means that couples can no longer rely on default cultural scripts to resolve conflicts regarding the division of labour, financial responsibilities, or emotional support. While this requires a much higher cognitive load and exposes couples to the paralysis of "heterofatalism" when negotiations fail, it also permits the construction of highly egalitarian, customized partnerships. Because machine learning and algorithmic matching cannot predict unique dyadic desire, individuals seeking partnership must actively prioritize face-to-face interaction over extended text-based vetting, acknowledging that online profiles trigger an objectifying "assessment mindset" that runs counter to genuine pair-bonding.

For organizations and policymakers, the decoupling of male earnings from formal marriage indicates that traditional macroeconomic incentives (such as tax breaks specifically for married couples) are highly unlikely to reverse the trend of singlehood or non-marital childbearing among the working class. Instead, social policy, urban planning, and corporate benefits must adapt to support a population where over 40% of households consist of a single person.

Finally, for society at large, addressing the dual crises of the "Black Pill" (incel radicalization) and "Heteropessimism" requires shifting the cultural discourse away from biological determinism. Both ideologies rely on a fatalistic, stereotyped view of the opposite sex that ignores the massive psychological overlap between men and women proven by the Gender Similarities Hypothesis. Mitigating loneliness—particularly the "Alleinsein" (missing company) that afflicts 56% of lonely individuals—demands the intentional rebuilding of third spaces: community arenas outside the home and the workplace that facilitate low-stakes, non-algorithmic human interaction, allowing organic social integration to bridge the currently widening ideological divide.

Works cited

1. Threat of falling sperm counts 'greatly exaggerated,' Harvard, https://studyfinds.com/threat-of-falling-sperm-counts-exaggerated/
2. Should we panic over declining sperm counts? Harvard researchers,

https://www.eurekalert.org/news-releases/867935
3. Fears over falling human sperm count may be overblown, https://news.harvard.edu/gazette/story/2021/05/fears-over-falling-human-sperm-count-may-be-overblown/
4. Can Declining Trend Of Sperm Count Extinct Human Race?, https://www.medindia.net/news/can-declining-trend-of-sperm-count-extinct-human-race-201141-1.htm
5. Sexual side effects of SSRIs in men & what you can do about them, https://healthymale.org.au/health-article/ssris-antidepressants-erectile-dysfunction-low-libido-delayed-orgasm
6. Sexual dysfunction caused by selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors, https://sniv3r2.github.io/d/topic.htm?path=sexual-dysfunction-caused-by-selective-serotonin-reuptake-inhibitors-ssris-management
7. Depression, selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors, and sexual, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12208855/
8. Sexual Dysfunction and Emotional Blunting in Women with Major, https://www.simmr.info/article_234425.html
9. The Off-Label Use of Selective Serotonin Reuptake Inhibitors ... - MDPI, https://www.mdpi.com/2227-9032/13/19/2433
10. The Gender Similarities Hypothesis | Request PDF - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/7589797_The_Gender_Similarities_Hypothesis
11. Gender Similarities Hypothesis - DORAS | DCU Research Repository, https://doras.dcu.ie/32718/3/Encyclopedia%20of%20Sexual%20Psychology%20and%20Behavior_Gender%20Similarity%20Hypothesis.pdf
12. David Schmitt Ph.D., Personality Psychology, University of Michigan, https://www.researchgate.net/profile/David-Schmitt-11
13. (PDF) A Worldwide Test of the Predictive Validity of Ideal Partner, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/382253515_A_Worldwide_Test_of_the_Predictive_Validity_of_Ideal_Partner_Preference_Matching
14. Do People Know What They Initially Desire in a Romantic Partner?, https://faculty.wcas.northwestern.edu/eli-finkel/documents/EastwickFinkel2008_JPSP.pdf
15. Ideal Partner Preferences 1 - Northwestern University, https://faculty.wcas.northwestern.edu/eli-finkel/documents/InPress_EastwickFinkelEagly_JPSP.pdf
16. (PDF) Trends in Frequency of Sexual Activity and Number of Sexual, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/342142309_Trends_in_Frequency_of_Sexual_Activity_and_Number_of_Sexual_Partners_Among_Adults_Aged_18_to_44_Years_in_the_US_2000-2018
17. Trends in Frequency of Sexual Activity and Number of ... - PubMed, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32530470/
18. Trends in Frequency of Sexual Activity and Number of Sexual, http://tedluistome.pt/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/Ueda.pdf
19. [PDF] Trends in Frequency of Sexual Activity and Number of Sexual,

https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Trends-in-Frequency-of-Sexual-Activity-and-Number-Ueda-Mercer/42ae2366f0e3ce291a27de2e828bfe23bc093bc4
20. Brooke Wells - Google Scholar, https://scholar.google.com/citations?user=AkXpcIQAAAAJ&hl=en
21. Declines in Sexual Frequency among American Adults, 1989–2014, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/314273096_Declines_in_Sexual_Frequency_among_American_Adults_1989-2014
22. Male Earnings, Marriageable Men, and Nonmarital Fertility, https://www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w23408/w23408.pdf
23. Male Earnings, Marriageable Men, and Nonmarital Fertility, https://www.nber.org/papers/w23408
24. Happily Ever After: Immigration, Natives' Marriage, and Fertility, https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/journal-of-economic-history/article/happily-ever-after-immigration-natives-marriage-and-fertility/23372E12B930F2513E2BA83207D539D7
25. The Reversal of the Gender Gap in Education and Its, https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/10.1146/annurev-soc-073117-041215
26. Trends in assortative mating in the United States, 1700–1910, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1081602X.2024.2352539
27. The mechanism of assortative mating for educational attainment, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/genetics/articles/10.3389/fgene.2023.1150697/full
28. Disintermediating your friends: How online dating in the United, https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.1908630116
29. Re-Examining the Case for Marriage: Union Formation and ... - PMC, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3352182/
30. How online dating in the United States displaces other ways of, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/335286455_Disintermediating_your_friends_How_online_dating_in_the_United_States_displaces_other_ways_of_meeting
31. How online dating in the United States displaces other ways of, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31431531/
32. Stanford Study: Meeting online is displacing meeting through friends, https://www.reddit.com/r/PurplePillDebate/comments/k2figk/stanford_study_meeting_online_is_displacing/
33. Online Dating: A Critical Analysis From the Perspective of, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/251230695_Online_Dating_A_Critical_Analysis_From_the_Perspective_of_Psychological_Science
34. Online Dating: A Critical Analysis From the Perspective of, https://faculty.wcas.northwestern.edu/eli-finkel/documents/2012_FinkelEastwickKarneyReisSprecher_PSPI.pdf
35. Online Dating: A Critical Analysis From the Perspective of, https://www.psychologicalscience.org/publications/journals/pspi/online-dating.html
36. Online dating research shows Cupid's arrow is turning digital, https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2012/02/120206092552.htm

37. Elizabeth Bruch - Google Scholar, https://scholar.google.com/citations?user=jJk-cJIAAAAJ&hl=vi
38. Joel et al. (2017) - error.reviews, https://error.reviews/reviews/joel-et-al-2017/
39. (PDF) Is Romantic Desire Predictable? Machine Learning Applied to, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/319381288_Is_Romantic_Desire_Predictable_Machine_Learning_Applied_to_Initial_Romantic_Attraction
40. Is romantic desire predictable? Machine learning applied to initial, https://reshare.ukdataservice.ac.uk/852716/
41. Dating? A magic formula to predict attraction is more elusive than ever, https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2017/08/170830132200.htm
42. Computers can predict little about attraction, https://www.jhunewsletter.com/article/2017/09/computers-can-predict-little-about-attraction
43. The Deinstitutionalization of Marriage Revisited - Ovid, https://www.ovid.com/journals/jftr/fulltext/10.1111/j.1756-2589.2010.00039.x~the-deinstitutionalization-of-marriage-revisited-a-new
44. (PDF) The Deinstitutionalization of American Marriage - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/247826513_The_Deinstitutionalization_of_American_Marriage
45. For the Children: Attitudes Toward Marriage and Divorce in the US, https://par.nsf.gov/servlets/purl/10623908
46. Review Symposium of "Cheap Sex: The Transformation of Men, https://www.academia.edu/35844278/Review_Symposium_of_Cheap_Sex_The_Transformation_of_Men_Marriage_and_Monogamy_by_Mark_Regnerus_
47. Sex in Zero Gravity - The Gospel Coalition, https://www.thegospelcoalition.org/reviews/cheap-sex-mark-regnerus/
48. Haushalte und Familien in Deutschland - Statistisches Bundesamt, https://www.destatis.de/DE/Themen/Gesellschaft-Umwelt/Bevoelkerung/Haushalte-Familien/_inhalt.html
49. Haushalte und Haushaltsmitglieder - Statistisches Bundesamt, https://www.destatis.de/DE/Themen/Gesellschaft-Umwelt/Bevoelkerung/Haushalte-Familien/Tabellen/1-1-privathaushalte-haushaltsmitglieder.html
50. Singles in Deutschland: Zahlen, Fakten & Profile 2026, https://herzblatt-journal.com/blog/singles-deutschland-zahlen-fakten/
51. (PDF) Reduced relationship desire is associated with better life, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/350498115_Reduced_relationship_desire_is_associated_with_better_life_satisfaction_for_singles_in_Germany_An_analysis_of_pairfam_data
52. Non-cohabiting Partners' Economic Characteristics and the ... - PMC, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12508365/
53. Einsamkeit in Deutschland : die gefährdetste Gruppe ... - DIW Berlin, https://www.diw.de/de/diw_01.c.935067.de/publikationen/wochenberichte/2025_05_1/einsamkeit_in_deutschland__die_gefaehrdetste_gruppe_sind_menschen_mit_niedrigem_einkommen.html
54. DIW Wochenbericht 5,

https://www.diw.de/documents/publikationen/73/diw_01.c.934978.de/25-5-1.pdf
55. Einsamkeitsbarometer 2024 - BMBFSFJ, https://www.bmbfsfj.bund.de/resource/blob/240528/5a00706c4e1d60528b4fed062e9debcc/einsamkeitsbarometer-2024-data.pdf
56. Age Trajectories of Perceptual Speed and Loneliness - MPG.PuRe, https://pure.mpg.de/rest/items/item_3327206_5/component/file_3361860/content
57. Do We Become More Lonely With Age? A Coordinated Data ... - PMC, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11788814/
58. Is the Ideology Gap Growing? - Probably Overthinking It, https://www.allendowney.com/blog/2024/01/28/is-the-ideology-gap-growing/
59. A new global gender divide is emerging : r/ukpolitics - Reddit, https://www.reddit.com/r/ukpolitics/comments/1abkttb/a_new_global_gender_divide_is_emerging/
60. A New Global Gender Divide Is Emerging - Edward Conard, https://www.edwardconard.com/macro-roundup/jburnmurdoch-highlights-a-growing-ideological-gap-between-women-and-men-under-the-age-of-30-us-women-are-now-30-percentage-points-more-liberal-than-their-male-counterparts-with-similar-gaps-in-ger/
61. The Gen Z gender war is real, new — and a third the size you've heard, https://vishalsingh.org/studios/gen-z-gender-war-overstated
62. Incel Mating Psychology: Insights and Findings | PDF - Scribd, https://www.scribd.com/document/670560326/The-Mating-Psychology-of-Incels-by-William-Costello
63. Levels of Well-Being Among Men Who Are Incel (Involuntarily, https://labs.la.utexas.edu/buss/files/2023/04/LevelsofWellbeingAmongMenWhoAreInvoluntarilyCelibate.pdf
64. (PDF) Levels of Well-Being Among Men Who Are Incel (Involuntarily, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/363484489_Levels_of_Well-Being_Among_Men_Who_Are_Incel_Involuntarily_Celibate
65. Self-reported psychiatric disorder and perceived psychological, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/358658348_Self-reported_psychiatric_disorder_and_perceived_psychological_symptom_rates_among_involuntary_celibates_incels_and_their_perceptions_of_mental_health_treatment
66. The Psychological Profile of INCELS (Involuntary Celibates) SPSP, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/358706723_The_Psychological_Profile_of_INCELS_Involuntary_Celibates_SPSP_Sexuality_Pre-conference
67. What TikTok reveals about Gen Z dating | Penn Today, https://penntoday.upenn.edu/news/what-tiktok-reveals-about-gen-z-dating-hyperindividualism-heteropessimism
68. On Heteropessimism - The New Inquiry, https://thenewinquiry.com/on-heteropessimism/
69. On refusing to become, or to remain, heterosexual - Taylor & Francis, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/10894160.2025.2513842
70. Escape Heteropessimism | Clara Drummond - Astra Magazine, https://astra-mag.com/articles/escape-heteropessimism/

71. This Pride Month, will no one think of the straight people? - Salon.com, https://www.salon.com/2026/06/03/this-pride-month-will-no-one-think-of-the-straight-people/
72. Why do we keep dating men? Heterofatalism and straight desire, https://lampoonmagazine.com/heterofatalism-straight-dating-women-desire-men-survival-instinct/