

## Why Christians need game.

Posted on [August 6, 2012](#) by [Dalrock](#)

If you are a Christian in the manosphere you likely have asked the question:

*Shouldn't Christians be able to learn what they need to know about men and women and marriage from the Bible, and not from the studies by pickup artists and Evolutionary Psychologists?*

The short answer is yes. The Bible *should* be all you need.

The problem is Christians have decided not to follow the Bible on the question of marriage in specific, and men and women in general. I'm not just talking about Christian enthusiasm for providing [moral cover for frivolous divorce](#). I'm also talking about the numerous sections of the Bible which modern Christians are embarrassed about because the sections offend their newer and more dominant religion, *feminism*.

Before we go any further, I want to acknowledge that Not All Christians Are Like That (NACALT). To avoid lumping all Christians together, I'll outline the boundaries so those who don't practice feminism first and Christianity second can take comfort in the fact that I'm not referring to them. What follows is not intended to be a complete list of areas where the Bible clashes with feminism, but it hopefully is representative enough of the conflict for you to determine which side of the fence you and those you know have landed on.

I'll start with an admittedly contentious question, whether Christian women should cover their heads in church. Paul's instructions to the church at Corinth in [1 Corinthians 11:2-16](#) seem to leave at least some room for interpretation. However, what is most telling isn't just where one lands on this question but the *reasoning* used to arrive there. Consider for example the exegesis on the topic by [Dr. Daniel B. Wallace](#) at Bible.org: [What is the Head Covering in 1 Cor 11:2-16 and Does it Apply to Us Today?](#) Dr. Wallace lays out the case for several different readings. He tells us that he originally held the view that the passage means real head covering and is applicable today (emphasis mine):

*The argument that a real head covering is in view and that such is applicable today is, in some respects, **the easiest view to defend exegetically and the hardest to swallow practically**. Since it is never safe to abandon one's conscience regarding the truth of Scripture, I held to this view up until recently. Quite frankly, **I did not like it (it is very unpopular today)**. But I could not, in good conscience, disregard it.*

Later in the article he explains his new view that only a *meaningful symbol* of submissiveness is required today, although he isn't able to suggest what might function as that symbol (emphasis mine):

*Today, however, the situation is quite different, at least in the West. **For a woman to wear a head covering<sup>z</sup> would seem to be a distinctively humiliating experience**. Many women—even biblically submissive wives—resist the notion precisely because they feel awkward and self-conscious. But the head covering in Paul's day was intended only to display the woman's subordination, not her humiliation. Today, ironically, to require a head covering for women in the worship service would be tantamount to asking them to shave their heads! The effect, therefore, would be just the opposite of what Paul intended. Thus, in attempting to fulfill the spirit of the*

*apostle's instruction, not just his words, some suitable substitute symbol needs to be found.*

His argument is that head covering was intended as a gesture of submissiveness, and isn't needed so long as the woman is in fact submissive. Yet at the same time he declares that actually *being* submissive would be humiliating to modern Christian women in our feminist world. There needs to be a meaningful symbol of submission, so long as it doesn't actually symbolize submission. This is rationalization at its finest, and it also shows that when feminism and the Bible collide Christians very strongly tend to choose feminism while conjuring up a suitable excuse for disregarding the parts of the Bible they are ashamed of.

You will find Christians performing a similar dance where the Bible tells wives to submit to their husbands ([1 Peter 3:1&5](#), [Eph 5:22&24](#), [Col 3:18](#), [1 Tim 2:11](#), & [Tit 2:5](#)). The same occurs when the Bible says that women are to remain silent in church and not teach ([1 Tim 2:11-12](#)); how many Christians are comfortable with Paul's instruction in 1 Corinthians 14:34-35?

*<sup>34</sup> Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience as also saith the law.*

*<sup>35</sup> And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the church.*

I'll stop here for a moment and ask my fellow Christians who are reading: **Have you located your inner feminist yet?** If any of the passages I reference above make you uncomfortable because they feel *sexist*, then you just did.

This is the reason Christians need to learn game. The Bible is sufficient, but it isn't what 99% of Christians are following when it comes to men and women. Where the Bible clashes with feminism, feminism almost always rules the day. The problem is insidious because very often Christians have swallowed feminism [without even realizing it](#). How many Christians that you know see the movie [Fireproof](#) as teaching about biblical marriage? How many see nothing wrong with the movie [Courageous](#) and the non stop modern Christian practice of [cutting leaders off at the knees](#)? Why do none of the [amazon.com](#) reviewers of Sheila Gregoire's book [To Love, Honor, and Vacuum: When You Feel More Like a Maid Than a Wife and Mother](#) note that she has [inverted the concept of submission](#)? Why do none of the reviewers of Glenn Stanton's book [Secure Daughters, Confident Sons](#) notice that he has an [incredibly foolish and unbiblical view of women](#)?

The answer to the question of why Christians need game is because Christians have adopted feminism over the Bible. Not all Christians have done this. For example, the Amish still follow strict gender roles including headship and submission. From what I can find they have a divorce rate less than 1%, and they are [growing rapidly](#) due to their high fertility rate. So if you are Amish, you probably don't need to learn game. Of course if you are Amish you aren't likely to be reading this either. For the rest of us, Christians need game because:

1. Abandoning the [biblical frame of marriage](#) kills the attraction wives feel for their husbands. Game will help get some of it back. If you insist on indulging in feminism even a little, you *absolutely* need to learn and practice game.
2. Game will help you stop rejecting and being ashamed of the Bible when it comes to men and women. Game will help you understand that your wife wants and needs to look up to you. She needs you to lead her and at times overrule her emotions with your strength of will and frame. It

will also help you understand that women aren't the morally superior sex that our [foolish culture](#) claims they are.

On the topic of wives being attracted to their husbands, the first thing most Christians need to learn from game is that it really is natural for wives to be attracted to their husbands. This of course flies in the face of modern Christian thought. Modern Christians view the urge for sex as a somewhat distasteful need that applies almost exclusively to men. This is evident in the [Christianese](#) expression "hubba hubba". For an example of this view, see the article [Motivating Men to be Caring Communicators](#) by Jay & Laura Laffoon:

*Men lust after women. Women lust after being lusted after. Your wife wants you to want her. She desires to make herself desirable. Now we don't mean lust as the world means lust- hubba hubba – we mean your woman needs to know that she is beautiful to you.*

Note to my readers: Only follow the advice in the article quoted above if you want your wife to [feel unloved](#).

Sheila Gregiore used the same expression in a [recent blog post](#):

*When a woman takes her shirt off at the end of the day, her husband immediately starts thinking sexy thoughts. When a man takes his shirt off, a woman tends to think, "Is he going to put that in the laundry hamper?" We don't tend to think, to the same extent, "Oh, come get me, hubba hubba." It's not that we NEVER want to be taken; it's just that our sex drive is far more caught up in feeling safe, and feeling cherished, and feeling loved, than it is in pure visual stimuli.*

Sheila has a similar passage in the introduction to her book [Honey, I Don't Have a Headache Tonight: Help for Women Who Want to Feel More In the Mood](#):

*While sex may be wonderful, for many women it's not always worth the effort. And unlike our dear spouses, for us it is an effort. We don't automatically get "in the mood." When we glimpse our darlings getting undressed, "hubba hubba" doesn't usually come to mind. Instead, we watch him shedding his clothes and think, "I hope he's not going to leave that laundry for me." We need to have our to-do lists ready, make sure everyone has something to wear tomorrow, and get the house somewhat livable before we even entertain the possibility of making love.*

If you learn nothing else about game, learn that the quote above is *absolute nonsense*. Women do experience a strong desire to have sex, and it has nothing to do with whether she has finished her to-do list. The modern Christian misconception that women generally don't experience strong sexual desire is a result of Christian wives [not keeping their chastity](#) prior to marriage and Christian husbands becoming less dominant and thereby less attractive to their wives (and the wives themselves rebelling). While there are of course medical exceptions, in general if your wife isn't feeling "hubba hubba" towards you on a regular basis, *something is very off*. This isn't just a harmless myth; large numbers of Christian husbands have learned the hard way that their wives do in fact experience strong sexual desires, [they just feel them for other men](#).

Keep in mind that the condescending “hubba hubba” expression being used to shame husbands who feel sexual desire for their wives represents a sentiment that is anything but biblical. This kind of desire is exactly what Paul explains is the very reason to marry in [1 Corinthians 7:2-5](#). Far from minimizing this desire, Paul instructs husbands and wives to fulfil their spouse’s needs in this regard. Likewise, a husband thinking “hubba hubba” when his wife takes her shirt off is doing exactly as husbands are instructed in Proverbs 5:18-19:

*<sup>18</sup> Let thy fountain be blessed: and rejoice with the wife of thy youth.*

*<sup>19</sup> Let her be as the loving hind and pleasant roe; let her breasts satisfy thee at all times; and be thou ravished always with her love.*