

GirlWritesWhat gives speech at NY Libertarian Convention on Feminism. Must Read

April 30, 2013 | 80 upvotes | by [redpillschool](#)

<http://owningyourshit.blogspot.com/2013/04/my-address-to-ny-state-libertarian.html>

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

[deleted] 30 April, 2013 02:20 AM

[permanently deleted]

Ill_mumble_that • 25 points • 30 April, 2013 02:27 AM

It's sad day when men won't believe something about their own rights unless a woman is the one that tells them it...

Demonspawn • 18 points • 30 April, 2013 04:51 AM

Men who complain are whiners and not achievers. You don't want to associate with them because it will lower your own value in the eyes of others (esp women).

Women who complain have men rush to them to solve their problems in order to prove they are providers, and hope to earn women by displaying their value as a provider.

It's the world order, nothing new about it.

lachiemx • 2 points • 1 May, 2013 12:46 AM

Well, I also think it's partly the fact that if a man speaks on gender, then he is immediately castigated as a sexist, a hateful misogynist, and financially penalised. The only way this kind of material can get out is if a woman or a homosexual says it.

chiefroaringpeacock • 10 points • 30 April, 2013 03:40 AM

I feel like this is sidebar material. I want to know so much more though, what was the audience reaction? Were there other speakers before or after her? If so what did they discuss? This is the type of well thought out rational debate that helps TRP community and men's rights!

Also I just had to mention that I laughed so hard at the part about men dying from "faulty rafters". I suppose technically it could be a legitimate problem, but I would use an example more like inadequate access to safety training(which is being addressed). Not trying to nit pick about one thing she got wrong, just saying I thought it was hilarious.

Demonspawn • 9 points • 30 April, 2013 04:43 AM*

I have to laugh. I still remember when /r/Libertarianism shit a brick when I mentioned that it could have 90% of it's goals (small non-intrusive government) simply by removing women's suffrage.

But they'd rather have their ideology than their goals, so fuck em. They'll accomplish nothing because they don't understand the system.

Edit: wrong spelling correction on the reddit in question.

[deleted] • 9 points • 30 April, 2013 05:47 AM

Libertarians aren't exactly known for being pragmatic, true, but do you really think removing women's suffrage is even remotely feasible?

Demonspawn • 6 points • 30 April, 2013 06:26 AM

Not without revolution. But like I've said before, there are only three solutions to feminism: Revolt, Expat, or Turtle.

real-boethius • 2 points • 30 April, 2013 11:12 PM

Civilizations that adopt feminism invariably collapse.

So there is a fourth solution: collapse of society and takeover by a patriarchy. I am thinking of Islam here.

Demonspawn • 2 points • 1 May, 2013 06:24 AM

That's basically what Turtling is. Wait for the collapse/takeover and hope to rebuild something successful out of the ashes.

Pecanpig • 1 point • 26 May, 2013 05:55 PM

What exactly do you mean by "Expat" and "Turtle" in this context?

Demonspawn • 2 points • 26 May, 2013 09:09 PM

Expat: Leave the country.

Turtle: Prepare for the coming collapse and plan to rebuild from the ashes.

Pecanpig • 1 point • 26 May, 2013 09:38 PM

Why not just say "Leave"?

Demonspawn • 4 points • 26 May, 2013 09:44 PM

Meh. "Expat" is a term for people who leave their countries. That's the word that popped into my head when I first wrote down the answers.

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Expatriate>

Judge_Jackass • 3 points • 30 April, 2013 11:00 PM

Why is removing women's suffrage a magical solution in your view? I'm not convinced, but then I don't think voting will solve these problems at all.

Demonspawn • 5 points • 1 May, 2013 02:04 PM

Why is removing women's suffrage a magical solution in your view?

Because the women's vote is a moral hazard. Women have 55% of the vote, but contribute around a quarter to a third of the taxes which government redistributes. Women also vote in very very predictable patterns. A married woman votes for smaller government (so that her husband can keep more money to spend on her) while single/divorcing women vote for larger government (so that government will have more money to spend on her).

Studies in multiple countries have shown that once women get the vote, government expands (and then has to justify that expansion by intruding into citizen's lives). And, really, that's the main thing libertarians want: a pre-women's suffrage government. In the US, the federal government was 3% of GNP from 1776 till 1920 (sans major wars), instead of the 40% it is today.

Judge_Jackass • 2 points • 5 May, 2013 04:23 AM

This is actually insightful. Do you have any sources you're willing to share?

Demonspawn • 2 points • 6 May, 2013 01:00 AM

<http://www.springerlink.com/content/x737rhv91438554j/>

Abstract: In this paper we test the hypothesis that extensions of the voting franchise to include lower income people lead to growth in government, especially growth in redistribution expenditures. The empirical analysis takes advantage of the natural experiment provided by Switzerland's extension of the franchise to women in 1971. Women's suffrage represents an institutional change with potentially significant implications for the positioning of the decisive voter. For various reasons, the decisive voter is more likely to favor increases in governmental social welfare spending following the enfranchisement of women. Evidence indicates that this extension of voting rights increased Swiss social welfare spending by 28% and increased the overall size of the Swiss government.

<http://johnrlott.tripod.com/op-eds/WashTimesWomensSuff112707.html>

<http://www.people.fas.harvard.edu/~iversen/PDFfiles/LottKenny.pdf>

Excerpt: Academics have long pondered why the government started growing precisely when it did. The federal government, aside from periods of wartime, consumed about 2 percent to 3 percent of gross domestic product (GDP) up until World War I. It was the first war that the government spending didn't go all the way back down to its pre-war levels, and then, in the 1920s, non-military federal spending began steadily climbing. President Franklin Delano Roosevelt's New Deal — often viewed as the genesis of big government — really just continued an earlier trend. What changed before Roosevelt came to power that explains the growth of government? The answer is women's suffrage.

Gentle-Mang • 2 points • 30 April, 2013 02:47 PM

But they'd rather have their ideology than their goals, so fuck em. They'll accomplish nothing because they don't understand the system.

You just described most of the mens rights movement too unfortunately.

Demonspawn • 4 points • 30 April, 2013 02:49 PM

Unfortunately, yes. That's why I've started switching from MR to TRP.

MR used to be very much like TRP. It's been taken over in the last 3-4 years.

[deleted] • 1 point • 30 April, 2013 06:17 PM

whats wrong with it exactly?

(ive never actually gone there)

Demonspawn • 6 points • 30 April, 2013 07:00 PM

It used to be about understanding the differences between men and women and then from there understanding how feminism is so destructive to a society. Now it's just feminism 2.0 (everyone should be equal!), basically a "male friendly" version of egalitarianism. It's not about understanding reality anymore, it's about pushing an ideology.

The problem is the old coots like me do have that red pill knowledge. We understand how egalitarianism is simply yet another female supremacy movement. Due to the differences between men and women, we will never treat women as disposable as we treat men... meaning we can't hold them to the same responsibilities, and as such there is no case for equal rights. But the "new" MR wants to ignore that.

Admittedly, some of them have this idea that we can end male disposability. But I prefer to have a

solution that doesn't require finding a way to turn lead into gold.

[deleted] • 1 point • 4 June, 2013 03:21 AM

The problem is the old coots like me do have that red pill knowledge. We understand how egalitarianism is simply yet another female supremacy movement. Due to the differences between men and women, we will never treat women as disposable as we treat men... meaning we can't hold them to the same responsibilities, and as such there is no case for equal rights. But the "new" MR wants to ignore that.

I know you wrote this more than a month ago, but I just wanted to say as a long-time MR poster, that what you wrote here makes a hell of a lot of sense.

Gentle-Mang • 0 points • 30 April, 2013 06:57 PM

I recommend hanging out there and forming your own impression.

The impression that I got was that there was too much of a victim culture and a lot of casual misogyny. It was clear that a large proportion of the community only arrived there after suffering some kind of personal injustice, and their emotional wounds manifest quite conspicuously in the culture.

When I tried to point this out to them they were like "but feminists do all this too, therefore this behavior is valid!"

They seemed to overlook the small fact that women can easily get sympathy from being victims, whereas men get told to suck it up and get on with it. Likewise women can be abrasive cunts and people will let it slide, but if men do it they're seen as hateful.

It's easy to see why they're so easily dismissed as whining neck-beards who are scared of girls. I did for a long time before seeing certain youtube videos and realising that actually they may have a point that they are very very poor at conveying.

But as I say that's just my perspective, you should form your own opinions.

r_rships_account • 1 point • 30 April, 2013 04:47 AM

Interesting point.

[deleted] • 3 points • 30 April, 2013 09:05 AM

On the intersection between RP theory and libertarianism:

If men are naturally hardwired to be competitive, then the best system is one that encourages positive-sum competition, forbids negative-sum competition, and limits zero-sum competition to the hookup bar and the sports stadium.

You can try to engineer a culture where men are not competitive, in the short run it even works, but in the long run it just results in women going on a sex strike. I have the impression that e.g. Norway managed to do this. From there on, it is not clear what happens. We don't really have a lot of historical precedences, the ones we had ended with war and that sounds unlikely now. I guess some men will figure out it is equally easy to game women and game the system i.e. negative or zero sum economic competition, like sweetheart contracts with the government. Some kind of fascism is also a possibility. Such ideologies are basically a form of ultra-masculinism, in a destructive way.

[deleted] • 6 points • 30 April, 2013 01:55 AM

Good stuff, but I've always been a bit upset over the fact that the manosphere tends to be right-wing.

quiet_wish • 24 points • 30 April, 2013 02:16 AM

Red Pill favors truth over idealism. Both major political parties in the States are corrupted by feminism, but Liberals are far more corrupted.

Through their aversion to change, the Republican party has been able to keep out some of the toxic philosophy. For now.

Bobsutan • 10 points • 30 April, 2013 03:41 AM

Just remember that tradcons are not our friends either.

NiftyDolphin • 2 points • 30 April, 2013 01:59 PM

errr.... traditional conservative?

Bobsutan • 2 points • 30 April, 2013 04:32 PM

Yes.

[deleted] 30 April, 2013 02:27 AM

[permanently deleted]

silent_regard • 4 points • 30 April, 2013 07:57 AM

I like Vox's word for such Christians: "Churchians," because they only go to church for the feel good socialization and sense of moral superiority and clearly have little understanding of actual Christianity.

[deleted] • 3 points • 30 April, 2013 09:08 AM

This is so hard to understand from a European perspective. We tend to get neither, we tend to get people who are primarily nationalists, and use religion as an element of national/traditional identity and value system.

Ill_mumble_that • 15 points • 30 April, 2013 02:26 AM

Red Pill favors truth over idealism

This should be our slogan.

socal83 • 7 points • 30 April, 2013 02:17 PM

me too. i'm not white (asian ancestry), and much of today's right wing rhetoric is designed to appeal to marginalized white guys. i.e. blue pillers.

Demonspawn • 6 points • 30 April, 2013 04:28 AM

Back before the MRA turned into Feminism 2.0, it was quite conservative. The reason was the early MRA was more about fixing society rather than the current "let's have a society with no standards (and ignore that we'll fall on our ass)" movement.

Think about it for a second... apply the red pill on a social scale. Conservatism works on a social level because it follows the same natural law you are exploiting on an individual level. Liberalism doesn't work because it ignores this natural law, just as the blue pill approach to women fails.

[deleted] • 5 points • 30 April, 2013 04:41 AM

Think about it for a second... apply the red pill on a social scale. Conservatism works on a social level because it follows the same natural law you are exploiting on an individual level. Liberalism doesn't work because it ignores this natural law, just as the blue pill approach to women fails.

On economic issues- what do you think about progressive taxes? The idea that people who earn more income should pay more taxes?

Demonspawn • 6 points • 30 April, 2013 04:48 AM

On economic issues- what do you think about progressive taxes?

Not really a fan of it. But, I'd like to go back to head-of-household landowner vote, abolish the 16th, 17th and 19th... and, of course, re-write tons of the tax system and virtually eliminate government "charity"

On the other hand, depending on what else is in play, if someone is capable of demonstrating that progressive taxation is still the best for society (still incentivizes advancement, growth, and brings up the rest of society with it) then I'd support it even if I did pay more.

For example, I know I'd pay more if we simply moved to a flat tax and I'm all for that. Need to have skin in the game... too many people are using government to rob from others rather than having the balls to rob them themselves, with absolutely zero consequences to their own bottom line.

[deleted] • 5 points • 30 April, 2013 04:54 AM

Here's the thing- we know that the rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer *even though the amount of work being done by both groups is constant*.

Competition from outsourcing, immigrants, and technological advancements are causing employers to rethink how much a person's labor is worth; which is why more and more wealth is concentrated up top even though the economy is cruising at normal speed.

And with the information age and globalization, our economy is headed towards a "winner-take-all" economy, where industries are being dominated by fewer and fewer big businesses rather than many small businesses.

Regardless of what the Red Pill mindset implies, these circumstances suggest that a more progressive income tax would be beneficial.

Demonspawn • 0 points • 30 April, 2013 05:03 AM

even though the amount of work being done by both groups is constant.

So? A guy who digs a ditch for 8 hours does as much work as a guy who builds bridges for 8 hours, but we value the latter more and as such compensate him more.

What's really causing the wealth disparity? All the "gimmies" to workers. All the mandatory benefits. All the liberal 'feel good' bullshit.

How? Because the 49ers aren't just a football team, they are the thousands of small businesses across the USA which refuse to hire a 50th employee and be bound by all the federal regulation for employee benefits that they simply just can't afford. And what does that do? That stifles competition. And that is what is concentrating wealth; that is why industries are having fewer larger businesses... because startups can't compete.

I think there's a lot of ways to solve the wealth disparity issue which are more effective, better

for society overall, and still incentivize growth and advancement than a progressive tax.

Regardless of what the Red Pill mindset implies, these circumstances suggest that a more progressive income tax would be beneficial.

The RP mindset is truth and understanding the system in play. That's all.

But it also relies on critical thought. And part of that critical thought is that you have failed to mention any *benefit to society* from a progressive tax. You've only mentioned that it works as a punishment system for those who have earned.

[deleted] • 4 points • 30 April, 2013 05:14 AM

1st of all, taxes and regulations are 2 separate issues.

2nd, I pointed out that in our modern society, people are doing the *same* amount of work but are earning less.

How? Because the 49ers aren't just a football team, they are the thousands of small businesses across the USA which refuse to hire a 50th employee and be bound by all the federal regulation for employee benefits that they simply just can't afford. And what does that do? That stifles competition. And that is what is concentrating wealth; that is why industries are having fewer larger businesses... because startups can't compete.

A 50th employee costs the same as a 500th or a 5000th employee; there is no reason to believe that large businesses pay less per employee than small businesses.

But it also relies on critical thought. And part of that critical thought is that you have failed to mention any benefit to society from a progressive tax. You've only mentioned that it works as a punishment system for those who have earned.

A progressive tax, in theory, would have 2 effects-

1. More money in the pockets of more people, thus increasing more people's quality of life.
2. Less money in the pockets of earners, thus, in theory, creating a disincentive to work.

My point is that with so few people controlling the market, and so many people whose salaries are depressed because of the market, the effect of #1 is dominante, and the effect of #2 is minimal.

Speaking of critical thought, here's an actual economic paper about how globalization affects income inequality. This is why I lean liberal- liberals actually have things right when it comes to economic issues.

One last thing: Do you support making everyone pay an \$8,000 flat fee to the government annually, regardless of income? Or do you prefer a more progressive form of taxation than that? If you prefer a more progressive form of taxation, then how can you call your ideal tax system more fair than both 1) a more progressive one than we have now, and 2) the flat \$8000 fee for everyone?

Demonspawn • 2 points • 30 April, 2013 06:37 AM

1st of all, taxes and regulations are 2 separate issues.

No they are not. They play together. In fact, you can consider many regulations to simply be taxes, just that they are directly distributed rather than done so with government as the middle person.

2nd, I pointed out that in our modern society, people are doing the same amount of work but are earning less.

Again... so what? Red pillers and blue pillers are doing the same amount of work in seeking women, but the Red do it much more effectively and therefore reap greater rewards for their work.

If you refuse to reward what works, or even actively punish it, you're gonna have a bad time.

A 50th employee costs the same as a 500th or a 5000th employee; there is no reason to believe that large businesses pay less per employee than small businesses.

It is obvious you don't understand the rule sets in play. There is a large amount of federal regulation on businesses that don't apply if the company has less than 50 employees. So yes, the 50th employee is much more expensive than the 49th or the 51st (given that they are not already behaving in a way that these regulations require, which most small businesses are not).

More money in the pockets of more people, thus increasing more people's quality of life.

Steal from those who accomplish to give to those who don't. Communism is a great idea, but we are the wrong species for it to work.

Less money in the pockets of earners, thus, in theory, creating a disincentive to work.

Exactly. If I have to work more for less money, perhaps I'll just stay comfortable where I'm at. And if I'm a great person for the society (likely, as I'm generating a lot of value and therefore income) then you are encouraging your great minds to coast rather than keep accomplishing and allow the whole of society to ride on their shoulders.

One last thing: Do you support making everyone pay an \$8,000 flat fee to the government annually, regardless of income?

If I went flat tax, it'd be a percentage rather than a flat rate. People aren't equal, some can't produce enough to afford their equal share divided by population.

then how can you call your ideal tax system more fair

I don't give a shit about fair. Fair is what losers and blue-pillers whine about. I give a shit about effective. I give a shit about producing results.

[deleted] • 4 points • 30 April, 2013 06:51 AM*

I don't give a shit about fair. Fair is what losers and blue-pillers whine about. I give a shit about effective. I give a shit about producing results.

A more progressive tax is more effective at increasing quality-of-life than a less progressive tax.

If I went flat tax, it'd be a percentage rather than a flat rate. People aren't equal, some can't produce enough to afford their equal share divided by population.

The point I was getting across is that going with a percentage rather than a rate *is in fact progressive*. If you agree that people aren't equal, why don't you make the tax as progressive as possible without hurting productivity? If you don't think that's valid reasoning, then why don't you go all the way and support a completely flat fee? Logically, there is no reason to choose anything besides option A or option B.

It is obvious you don't understand the rule sets in play. There is a large amount of federal regulation on businesses that don't apply if the company has less than 50 employees. So yes, the 50th employee is much more expensive than the 49th or the 51st (given that they are not already behaving in a way that these regulations require, which most small businesses are not).

So you're saying that the government supports small businesses? If that's the case, then how can large businesses dominate the market? Could it be that the game itself is rigged, and that a progressive tax is an efficient way of unrigging the game?

Steal from those who accomplish to give to those who don't. Communism is a great idea, but we are the wrong species for it to work.

That's exactly what you're doing when you support a flat percentage tax instead of a flat annual fee to the government. The thing is, you have yet to justify why your system is optimal. I already sourced one paper from an economic journal that justifies a more progressive tax, but what do you have that shows that a more regressive tax leads to a higher quality of life for everyone (or even increased productivity)?

Here's another way to look at it. Poor, destitute, third world countries (such as in Africa) usually don't have *any* form of taxation system. Most first world countries have a progressive taxation system.

Have you considered that the progressive taxation system is a necessary requirement to maintaining social order in an increasingly globalized economy? If the consequences of your system was a decrease in the quality of life for *everyone*, would you still support it?

Blind ideological devotion never helped anyone with progress, but a devotion to truth has always led to progress.

Edit: To go into more detail about this:

It is obvious you don't understand the rule sets in play. There is a large amount of federal regulation on businesses that don't apply if the company has less than 50 employees. So yes, the 50th employee is much more expensive than the

49th or the 51st (given that they are not already behaving in a way that these regulations require, which most small businesses are not).

You claimed earlier that these regulations allow more large businesses to dominate the market.

How? Because the 49ers aren't just a football team, they are the thousands of small businesses across the USA which refuse to hire a 50th employee and be bound by all the federal regulation for employee benefits that they simply just can't afford. And what does that do? That stifles competition. And that is what is concentrating wealth; that is why industries are having fewer larger businesses... because startups can't compete.

Exactly *how* is it difficult for startups to compete if they pay less per employee than large businesses??? How will imposing fewer regulations on big businesses result in them losing a competitive edge??? That math really doesn't add up.

Demonspawn • 0 points • 30 April, 2013 07:07 AM

A more progressive tax is more effective at increasing quality-of-life than a less progressive tax.

Is it more or less effective in increasing the quality of life of the general population than not stifling advancement and allowing those who earn to keep what they make, encouraging them to work more, advance more, and bring all of society up with them?

Are you trading short term gains for long term losses?

So you're saying that the government supports small businesses?

No, I'm saying government enforces expensive regulations on any business of 50 employees or more. I thought that would be clear from what I said, but you're still not getting it for some unknown reason.

Here's another way to look at it. Poor, destitute, third world countries (such as in Africa) usually don't have any form of taxation system. Most first world countries have a progressive taxation system.

Ok, if I have to teach you the difference between correlation and causation then you're too uneducated on logical discourse for me to have an effective discussion with you.

[deleted] • 1 point • 30 April, 2013 09:03 PM

most people agree with progressive tax. you also have to consider where much of that tax money goes and why

not every single tax dollar goes to infrastructure, transportation and the environment (which i think just about every single person ever thinks is a positive and good thing).

some of my tax dollars are going to fund the girl's welfare down the street who had a baby at age 17. some of them are going to the violence against women act, which demonstrably does almost nothing to stop violence and seems more effective at pushing political propaganda.

most conservatives actually do agree that the rich should be heavily taxed. there's very few out there in support of mitt romney paying 14% in taxes.

[deleted] • 0 points • 30 April, 2013 01:33 PM

Regardless of what the Red Pill mindset implies, these circumstances suggest that a more progressive income tax would be beneficial.

This is policy based on feelings. You seem to believe that the richest in society derive their wealth from income when it's really capital gains.

Government is the direct cause of reduced competition in different markets. ISPs, telecom, pharmaceuticals, mass transportation, utility companies, energy providers... these are all highly regulated industries. This enables the top players to cement their position lobbying government for even more regulations that produce barriers to entry for new competition. At which point only they have the resources to comply with said regulations.

I would recommend a book like Basic Economics or Economics in One Lesson to get a grounding in some of these ideas. For example it may seem counterintuitive at first but minimum wage actually hurts the poor (and this is commonly agreed upon by most economic schools of thought).

[deleted] • 4 points • 30 April, 2013 01:48 PM*

I would recommend a book like Basic Economics or Economics in One Lesson to get a grounding in some of these ideas. For example it may seem counterintuitive at first but minimum wage actually hurts the poor (and this is commonly agreed upon by most economic schools of thought).

The top economic adviser in the country disagrees about how cut-and-clear the effects of the minimum wage are.

I also assume that you've never heard of the Card & Krueger study, which states that a 10% rise in the minimum wage creates a 4% rise in the price level, but has a negligible effect on employment (the basic model for this is that the supply of labor is inelastic and the demand for labor is elastic).

I've taken courses on microeconomics and macroeconomics, I have a firm grasp of the issue, from the basics of the Walrasian auction, to the mechanics of the IS-LM model, to the dynamics of the Fisher equation. Not to mention that one of the most decorated economists of all time disagree with a lot of what you consider "basic economics".

This is policy based on feelings. You seem to believe that the richest in society derive their wealth from income when it's really capital gains.

What do you think about all these citations that I've provided in this post here?

[deleted] • 1 point • 30 April, 2013 01:55 PM

If you are disagreeing from an informed position that's fine. There are certainly different schools of economic thought and room for legitimate disagreement. I don't have interest in an extended debate but my position is vehemently against government interventions in the marketplace, and against redistributions of wealth.

[deleted] • 4 points • 30 April, 2013 09:11 AM

This is such a dumb way to ask this question, sorry. A flat rate lik 18% tax makes people who earn more pay more, in proportion. Progressive taxation generally means a progressive *rate* of tax, which means people who make more pay a higher proportion of their income. So confusing this two sounds like you no idea what you are talking about.

[deleted] • 3 points • 30 April, 2013 09:31 AM

A flat rate lik 18% tax makes people who earn more pay more, in proportion. Progressive taxation generally means a progressive rate of tax, which means people who make more pay a higher proportion of their income. So confusing this two sounds like you no idea what you are talking about.

"Taxes" is generally used synonymously with "tax rates". Later on in the discussion, when I refer to total amount paid, I use the term "fees".

In any case, how do you respond to the critique that only one of two systems can be justified on a moral level?:

1. A flat annual fee that is paid regardless of income (which maximizes equality/fairness), or
2. A progressive tax system that maximized productivity by placing the optimal burden on the rich, which can be shown to be more progressive than a flat tax.

[deleted] • 4 points • 30 April, 2013 10:04 AM

My answer would be that it is not a moral issue at all. I am not of the extreme deontological libertarians who see all taxes as theft, I don't think that utilitarianism in the sense of government engineering optimal outcomes is a moral obligation but merely an option at best, and I find the virtue ethics subset of ethics the most important which has little to do with taxation.

Frankly I would focus more on what government does with the money, and not on financing it, because cutting taxes without spending just leads to debt crisis.

I would use incentive logic. Spending is a reward, so my budget would be "Is behavior X good enough to be rewarded with money?"

Once the spending is low and focused on what matters, I would not care that much how it is collected. My intuitive appeal would be making it progressive but not as much for income but as much for rent-seeking income like land taxes. Henry George. Or generally progressive on bad ways of making an income like excise on booze.

My logic would be "Does this person deserve some punishment for doing this?" if yes, higher taxes. Just generating a higher income does not deserve a punishment. Some ways of doing so yes.

Ultimately I would gear any system towards producing better people, reward / punishment, not towards social utilitarianism.

[deleted] • 2 points • 30 April, 2013 04:42 PM

Great speech. I like how she points out that women only look at the men above them, while the men below are invisible to them (hypergamy).

Tell me radfems, if men are all but extinct, who will mine the metals to use in your smartphones, take your trash to the dump, or unclog your tampon stuffed plumbing?

SoftHarem • -1 points • 30 April, 2013 01:55 AM

It is strange and rare feeling to respect a woman outside of her noble domestic duties.

[deleted] • 7 points • 30 April, 2013 01:36 PM

You're telling me you've never met a woman you respect in the working world?

nicethingyoucanthave • 1 point • 30 April, 2013 02:18 PM

My task, as I see it, is to try to uncover the nature of things, and then deprogram as many people as I can. To encourage people to think from a different angle, to entertain thoughts that are forbidden in our politically correct culture, to educate as many as I can about the hidden nature of society, gender and ideological feminism.

Among those of us who talk about these issues, it's called "taking the red pill".

wow.

[deleted] • -2 points • 30 April, 2013 02:26 AM

Unfortunately no feminist thinking type will read this due to then generally having the attention span of a gnat. A video would be good.

[deleted] • 8 points • 30 April, 2013 02:44 AM

A video would be good.

Straight from the horse's mouth:

Just to let everyone know it went very well, and there will be video of it available soon. Hugs to all of you.