

Did successive waves of feminist ideals primarily benefit the top 10% of women at the expense of others?

3 upvotes | 6 August, 2022 | by TriggurWarning

By top 10%, I mean the top 10% of intellectually gifted women who were being artificially held back from producing large economic value in society.

I therefore introduce the concept of [assortative mating](#).

Assortative mating is the process by which people of similar backgrounds, such as educational attainment or financial means, select a partner. Over the past half-century, there has been an increase in positive assortative mating within the marriage market.

In the past many of these women, denied opportunity, were forced to hitch their wagon to a man for success, and used their intellectual capacity to help advance his career (leading to the old saying: 'behind every great man is a great woman'). But in more recent generations, we've seen a dramatic increase in assortative mating at the top end, which has resulted in more high IQ men and women pairing up and combining their economic capacities.

The obvious result of this is doubly beneficial to the top women in particular, because not only are they earning dramatically more than the median, but they're doubling up (or more) by matching with a equal or higher earning male. It's not hard to imagine why this phenomena is exacerbating income inequality, as these relatively new 'super couples' (often choosing not to pursue having children at all or only limiting it to 1 after building a career) grow their wealth early and dramatically, buying up valuable assets like housing that average or median couples need (but increasingly can't afford) to build a family, and passing it on to fewer kids once they die.

These couples are in essence gaming the system as the birthrate continues to fall and normal women are left wondering 'where all the good men are' and why life seems so hard. While men do have a general willingness to 'date down' that inherently reduces inequality that is obviously not a static tendency, and the prospect of doubling a high income is still economically enticing. How much women make and how smart they are does matter to the top producing men of society, it's just that it matters less than women think it does from their perspective.

It is for this reason, I believe it would be wise for society to economically tax these couples to a larger degree than would otherwise be the case if they had 3 or more children, because they're disproportionately driving up the cost of living through asset price inflation. It's not all about the billionaires reaping untaxed capital gains (though that's certainly a concern too).

This money should be allocated to subsidize home loans for the bottom 80-90% of society on a sliding scale designed to facilitate family formation and higher birth rates. Owning multiple properties under 5000 square feet should be regulated as well, to further disincentive rich childless couples from buying up all the necessary assets for life.

I believe this phenomena explains the [paradox of declining female happiness](#) better than most. Most women just want a normal life, they aren't super-women that want to compete against other top men, but increasingly they are denied this for largely economic reasons. The other side of the equation is that since female empowerment in the labor market, median male wages have remained stagnant despite rising productivity (reducing the attractiveness of settling). Instead, normal women are now relegated to wage slavery out of necessity that's arguably not beneficial to their long term happiness.

Comments

EnteFetz • 5 points • 7 August, 2022 01:53 PM

The so called DINKS (Double income no kids) should be taxed more taxes and the tax rate should depend on the number of children one has. We need to encourage rich people to have more children. Too many children are born into poverty while rich couples remain childless or pass on their whole wealth to one inheritor. Rich people should have strong tax incentives to have many children and to split up their wealth amongst many heirs. That is the most effective way to reduce inequality. There should be an inheritance tax that for example the state gets an equal amount to the largest fraction any of the inheritors get. If there is only one inheritor, then the tax would be 50% But if there are 9 people who get an equal share then everyone would get 10% and the state would also only get 10%. That way generational wealth is split up. Just imagine people like Elon Musk splitting up his wealth over all his kids to save taxes. That would significantly distribute his wealth.

TriggurWarning[S] • 1 point • 7 August, 2022 03:55 PM

Exactly

Hodgekin • 1 point • 6 August, 2022 07:12 PM

I agree this is a phenomenon for dating. But it's actual size effect on housing inflation is only part of the issue. There's also stuff like fiat currency, market manipulation, government regulations, replacing blue collar jobs with artificial intelligence, and supply demand issues.

I'm not saying you're wrong. But even if you're propose solution was implemented, it wouldn't be enough to offset the situation. If anything, it may have a negative unintended consequence. Like the introduction of a welfare state. It was intended to help people get out of proverty. Instead, it's made a permanent under class of people who subsist off of government handouts and are generationally perpetually poor.

TriggurWarning[S] • 1 point • 7 August, 2022 12:29 AM

All of it goes together, certainly, but housing is the primary pre-requisite of having a family. Without it there is no hope. It may not be enough to offset the situation, but anything is better than nothing. I don't see it in a socialistic context, because the loan still has to be paid back with productive work, the interest rate would just be less (like student loans for the poor and middle class helps people get an education). I don't see the off-ramp to permanent dependency. And the current predicament is unsustainable in the long run anyway. It will collapse under it's own weight eventually, the collapse will be far worse for everyone.

Hodgekin • 1 point • 7 August, 2022 12:51 AM

Well, since you've brought up student loans, all it's really done was make education more expensive, while making young people servitude to the state with a loan they can't declare bankruptcy on.

I can imagine a similar effect, if you have government subsidizing housing, it will just make house prices higher.

TriggurWarning[S] • 1 point • 7 August, 2022 12:54 AM

The expense is up because the value of education in society keeps going up, just like the value of the stock market overall, which is tied to the productivity of the educated class (mostly). Loans certainly help them get away with increasing it, but without them many kids would simply have to make due without an education, and that is a no-win scenario for many kids who aren't equipped to make it on

their own. Regardless of the price, if the interest rate is subsidized, the payment will be affordable.

Hodgekin • 2 points • 7 August, 2022 01:16 AM

Colleges have become top heavy. More of the cost of college is dedicated to administrative positions that aren't necessarily important in providing quality education.

I agree the necessity of education has gone up. But... I would argue the value of colleges actually gone down. Colleges themselves are shooting themselves in the foot by teaching students non-educational items such as propaganda and political ideologies.

I believe we are paying more for lower quality education nowadays.

But this is getting off topic.

Admirable_Bee_8714 • 1 point • 15 August, 2022 01:36 PM

Anything the government touches rockets up in price. Universities have a perpetual and guaranteed source of income flowing in and they have no incentive to provide an education that is pocketbook friendly. Couple that with the explosion of useless degrees offered that provide no viable path to a meaningful income. It's why I always laugh at people who sneer at for profit colleges, like the \$600 per credit University is any better.