



## Episode 1,427: Are Men the Oppressors and Women the Oppressed?

Guest: Karen Straughan

**WOODS:** I had you on because I've been looking at some of your material that I hadn't seen before, and it's very interesting. And in fact, the talk you gave, called something like "Toxic Masculinity and Toxic Femininity" was viewed by someone who was extremely dear to me, who did use the term – she thinks of herself traditionally as a feminist, and she listened to that, and she said, "I think my mind is blown. I think the way I look at the world has been changed by this one talk." So you affect people you don't even know about, and that's one of the interesting things about this world of the internet that we're in, that you can't even know the lives and the minds that you change. So very glad to have a chance to talk to you again. So let's start with a little note about your conference coming up in August in Chicago. This is 2019 as we're recording this.

**STRAUGHAN:** Yes, my compatriots over at Honey Badger Radio – which is a YouTube podcast group team; we discuss men's issues and sort of feminism's excesses within the culture – we're actually organizing and hosting the next International Conference on Men's Issues. This will be the fifth one. There was one in Gold Coast, Australia; one just outside of Detroit in 2014; there were a couple in London, England. This one's coming back to the United States, which is sort of its birthplace. And so Chicago, August 16th to 18th, there's going to be a lot of awesome speakers there, and we will be discussing sort of not just men's issues, but issues that are men's issues-adjacent. So we'll be talking about free speech and deplatforming and political polarization and identity politics. And we'll be having Robby Soave from *Reason* magazine come talk about the Covington Catholic school incident, the hoax and all kinds of other things. So it should be a really, really good conference and lots of good information there. So you can find information on it; if you just go type in ICMI.info on your URL bar, it'll lead you're right to the page. You can see what our speaker roster looks like so far.

**WOODS:** Well, this is Episode 1427, so I'll also link to that at [TomWoods.com/1427](https://TomWoods.com/1427). I'm Robby Soave was excellent on that Covington Catholic High School thing.

**STRAUGHAN:** Oh, he was sort of one of the first mainstream journalists who kind of blew the whistle on it and went, *Hey, hey, hey, hey, hey*. And I mean, it was the same with the University of Virginia *Rolling Stone* magazine rape hoax story that turned out to be such an example of botched wishful thinking on an epic scale style of journalism that the Columbia School of Journalism just gave it a grade F all the way down and said –

**WOODS:** Wow.

**STRAUGHAN:** Oh, yeah, no, they looked into it, they did an inquiry, and they said, *Okay, here's where you failed, and here, and here, and here, and here, and here, to apply even the most basic journalistic practices.*

**WOODS:** Oh, my gosh.

**STRAUGHAN:** Yeah, and I mean, there have been lawsuits that have been filed, and least one of them I know of has won against *Rolling Stone* magazine. I think they had to pay out \$2.1 million to I guess it was the Title IX coordinator at University of Virginia, because they essentially just slammed her in this – or libeled her in this article, completely defamed her based on nothing, based on the word of one person and no further investigation.

**WOODS:** Can we jump off from that to ask about the slogan that a lot of people use, not just in the Me Too movement, but more broadly, when they say, "Believe survivors?" Because I really don't want to be a caricature of a right-wing host who just ridicules everything and everybody. I really do genuinely want to try to understand people who are different – not necessarily the ideologues who are running the show, but the average person for whom that resonates, the average person maybe who has endured some kind of sexual assault and thinks, look, the number of hoax reports is fairly low, according to what they've read in the papers, the number is fairly low, so in general, it is best to believe stories told by people who say they've been assaulted. Is there something wrong about having that as the default position?

**STRAUGHAN:** Well, I think it puts the cart before the horse. I mean, well, you believe survivors, but you've already just identified them as a survivor through your belief. So it's kind of faith-based rather than actually knowing the truth of something by testing its veracity, of a claim, the truth of a claim. So essentially, I don't hold it with that. I essentially say, unless the evidence is overwhelming immediately, then you give both parties the benefit of the doubt until you've done a thorough investigation. And I think that this sort of idea that – you know, like I have been a victim of sexual assault. I was sexually assaulted by two older boys when I was 14 or 15 years old. And it wasn't a pleasant experience to go through, but I would certainly not expect to be able to point my finger and have those two boys just automatically put in prison or socially ostracized, shunned from the community.

Like there should be some kind of test that anyone's claims needs to go through before you actually take action. And I think that that definitely goes for the criminal justice system, but I think it certainly should apply to journalists, and even to just regular, ordinary people on social media. You know, enough of these cases, particularly when it comes to sexual assault or any kind of crime against a woman or that we perceive to be male-perpetrated against women. People just lose their minds. And these allegations, whether they're proven true or not, or even if the guy is demonstrated to be innocent, they stick with you forever, particularly in this day and age of Google. Nothing on the internet ever goes away. And they can be absolutely life-ruining. I've read story after story of the accused was demonstrated to be innocent after an investigation, but he'd already killed himself.

**WOODS:** Oh, my gosh.

**STRAUGHAN:** Yeah. Oh, yeah, I know. And it's often young men, men between the ages of 15 and 18, who do something that drastic, because the accusation itself is so ostracizing, and it makes them feel so devastated and ashamed and buried under a gigantic system that's essentially there to prove them guilty and put them in prison. And it's just way too much for

some of these, particularly these younger men who I mean, they're just teenagers for crying out loud.

**WOODS:** I'm looking at your Twitter account, and you have a very interesting pinned tweet that I thought we might explore a bit. It's a poll. It's closed now, but you asked, "When were you first taught that women were historically oppressed and men historically privileged?" And it's elementary school, middle school, etc. Obviously, there's a strong implication behind the very existence of that poll, which is that there's something flawed about the premise. But what is flawed about the premise? Because of course, the standard argument would be women couldn't hold property, they couldn't vote, you know, whatever. You could go on and on about that. And men did have all these various powers, and so how is this even debatable?

**STRAUGHAN:** Oh, well, I mean, that wasn't actually the purpose of the poll. The purpose of the pole, it pertained to a conversation where I essentially said to somebody on Twitter that feminism's narrative of the historical oppression of women is the mainstream cultural narrative right now. And he said, oh, no, it's not —

**WOODS:** Oh, okay. And of course, it is. Right.

**STRAUGHAN:** And I said, I learned about this in elementary school in the 1970s, for crying out loud. And then he was like, "Oh, one anecdote from somewhere in Canada." So I made that poll, and the vast majority of people who answered the poll were like, *Yeah, I learned about it in school*. And there were a few, like 17 replies, where they said, well, I didn't really notice it being taught in school, but I learned that from the broader culture while I was still in school. So it is the mainstream narrative.

There are some issues with the narrative, as — I've gone looking back through history, hundreds of years looking for the patriarchy of feminist imagining, is what I call it, that kind of system where women were basically slaves, and they were basically owned by men, and they had no rights, and they were just crushed under men's boot heels, and men had all of this power and all of this authority, just because — I guess, sometimes they say: because, penis — for no other reason whatsoever.

And I think that when we want to look at history, we need to take a much more balanced approach, and not just look at the one side who didn't have certain rights and freedoms, but look at the other side, who may have had those rights and freedoms, but they also had a ton of obligations that were only for men, things like the military draft or being pressed into service. Even when there was not draft legislation, conscription legislation enacted, there were press gangs going around at times in Britain, basically, shanghaiing men into the Navy. You know, like, a man comes out of a pub, he gets bonked on the head, and he wakes up on a boat miles from shore, right? And then he's just stuck, and he has to work on the boat. So I mean, there were things that most people probably don't realize, that posse, or what is more formally called posse comitatus, that was actually a sheriff or a marshal or some other person empowered by the state could press into service any able-bodied male over the age of 15 to help deal with a criminal, to help track down outlaws or suppress a crowd. There were all of these powers that the state had over men and all of these obligations that men owed to the state.

And there were also obligations that men owed to their wives and families. So yes, women, when they got married — single women could always own property, by the way. But when

single women got married, the property and their income was subsumed under the rubric of their husbands and under his administratorship. That was because he was the only one who had a legally binding financial responsibility to the family. So if the family went into debt, he was the one who went to debtors' prison. He could be charged with criminal abandonment for refusing to support his wife and kids or failing to do so to the best of his ability. So she traded the right to control her property in exchange for those obligations on his behalf. And then she also had something called the law of agency, which was an entitlement to purchase goods on her husband's credit. She had the status of his legal agent in terms of purchasing goods for the household and for herself and her children. So you essentially had this sort of really, really nested set of rights and privileges and exemptions and obligations and benefits and all of these things that were part of what marriage was. And there were some disadvantages and some advantages for both sides.

And then when feminists started fiddling with it, with this system of laws, they kind of did something really wonky. I think one of the first things they did was – under the patriarchy, I guess, father custody after divorce or separation was sort of the default. There were exceptions. The courts actually made room for exceptions. If the man was a drunk or if he was abusive or whatever, the woman could often get custody of the children.

But because he was 100% financially responsible for those kids, they went into his custody, and then came this – it was called the Care of Infants Act in the UK, in I believe the 1830s, where that default custody transferred from the father to the mother, but all of the financial responsibility for the kids still rested on the father. So he didn't get custody, but he still ended up having to pay for these kids. And because the mother was the de facto head, in de jure head of the kids' household, he had to pay for her upkeep as well. So even if she was at fault for the marriage breakdown and all of that, she still essentially got alimony through the payments into the household to support the children.

And then when they wanted to deal with marital property, they didn't actually give married women equal access to the marital income and property. What they did was they emancipated women's income and property from the entire institution of marriage. So all of a sudden, she owned that property as if she were a single woman. And therefore, it was her private information, the documentation of that property and that income, and it was hers and hers alone. But they maintained the husband's obligation to purchase all of the necessities for his wife and his kids. So she had no obligation to use any of that money for even her own upkeep, even her own benefit. That was still his responsibility.

And that, in the UK, even boiled down to the tax burden on her income and property. So if she refused to pay that out of her money, that bill fell on him, and if he couldn't pay it, or if she – in one case, Mark Wilkes and his physician wife, Elizabeth Wilkes, in 1910, she wouldn't even give him documentation of it so he could calculate what taxes were owing on it. So he's a school teacher. She's a physician. She's wealthier than he is. She's keeping all of her money. He's paying all of the bills, and he ended up going to prison for tax evasion, because she wanted to have sort of a suffragette tax protest. You know, no vote, no tax, right? She was a fairly well-to-do suffragette in the UK at the time, and there were tax resistance societies pushing for the vote for women. And she figured, well, I'll get my husband to go to prison because he can't pay these taxes, and that'll generate a lot of publicity and all of that.

And so I mean, things just were not changed in such a way that they actually looked at the entire body of laws. They just said, this one thing that women have to deal with, this is

unfair, so we're going to change that, and we're going to leave everything, all the responsibility and obligation on men exactly the same. And so that's really, I think, the problem with actually looking at history in a one-sided way. We're only going to look at women's history, rather than the history of men and women as they existed together. So that's really where I take offense at feminism's historical-oppression-of-women narrative.

**WOODS:** That's a very, very interesting way to look at it, and in addition, the point about the corresponding duties that the man had. It's not just that he had all these rights. He had a tremendous array of responsibility. So whether you like that arrangement or not, you have to at least acknowledge it and not just tell one half of it.

I mentioned to you earlier that there's a video you have, that I'll link to at [TomWoods.com/1427](http://TomWoods.com/1427), on toxic masculinity and toxic femininity. Now, I'm sure you're tired of talking about toxic masculinity, but doggone it, you've got to do it one more time for me, because I haven't actually bothered to look at exactly what's being referred to by this term, because I can more or less guess what it is. And I guess part of it would be, they must think that masculinity has associated with it, traditionally, certain traits that they believe to be undesirable. And so maybe some of them would just be aggressiveness or disrespect toward women or treating women as second-class citizens or whatever. But also teaching boys, for instance, that they're pansies if they have feelings. That they're not supposed to have feelings; they're not supposed to cry and all that. Well, that stuff, I mean, I think that is dead wrong. You shouldn't be teaching boys that. But by and large, what exactly are they trying to say when they use that term, toxic masculinity, and where do you find fault with it?

**STRAUGHAN:** Okay, toxic masculinity is a set of, I guess, norms and expectations placed on men that are detrimental to men or to the people around them. And so that would include stoicism and aggression, violence, promiscuity, all kinds of things like that.

One of the things that's most interesting about the entire toxic masculinity concept is a lot of it is based on they call a conformity to masculine norms inventory that was developed by a researcher by the name of Mahalik. And how he put this together was he brought together a focus group of his grad students— and keep in mind that this inventory is about the norms and expectations that are imposed on all men by the dominant group of men, which is straight white men. Those are the dominant group that we perceive in society, or that feminists say are dominant in society in imposing their values on everybody else. So we're off to a great start already. But so he had this focus group of three women, two men of color, and one white man, and they kind of did some brainstorming sessions and found some traits, and then they put them to a larger body of people to say, *Do you think that this is an expectation placed on men? This, this, this, and this.*

One of the most interesting things is he wrote a paper on how he had developed this inventory, and in it, he references a book. One of the norms was called playboy, which would just be promiscuity, being able to score. And he referenced a book on masculinity to justify this being in the inventory. And in that book, they had surveyed a whole bunch of men from all kinds of different cultures and asked them what they find intrinsic to their sense of masculinity, how they feel about themselves, that they feel that they're a real man or a good man. And the majority of the respondents answered being a faithful partner. More than 50% said being a faithful partner was intrinsic to their masculinity. Being nurturing to those around them was also a majority said that this was intrinsic to their sense of masculinity. And playboy, 1%. 1% of men said that that was important to their sense of self-worth as a man.

Playboy made it into the masculine norms inventory, but being nurturing and being a faithful partner did not. And you know why, is because women can be and are expected to be faithful partners, and women can be and are expected to be nurturing, and therefore, it's not a masculine norm.

And you can see the pattern over time with these inventories, because Mahalik's was not the first one, that year after year, they prune out any of the masculine virtues on the basis that, well, women can be courageous and are sometimes expected to be courageous, so that's no longer a masculine norm; get rid of it. Get it off the inventory. So they've whittled all the good stuff, and now it's just what they consider to be masculinity, in general, is almost more than half negative traits. So there's that.

And on top of it, I always look at traits on a spectrum, a spectrum based on intensity of the trait and based on whether it's constructive or destructive in its expression. So you can have something like aggression. Well, we honor our police officers, we honor our military, we just honored the men who died to bring us freedom and had the D-Day thing and that ceremony in France at the beaches of Normandy. We have all of those ways of honoring aggression, because we understand that aggression is sometimes constructive, right? So to just use the word "aggression" or "violence" and say that it's 100% bad and wrong, that's really not a way to productively deal with those kinds of traits. Anything taken to an extreme or used in an immoral or unethical way can be a negative thing, including passivity.

**WOODS:** So what did you mean by the expression toxic femininity?

**STRAUGHAN:** Oh, toxic femininity, I think one of the best parts of or the most telling part of toxic femininity is this feminine trend or their tendency towards plausible deniability. I often sort of describe it through Lady Macbeth. She did not go and stab King Duncan. She shamed and harangued and nagged her husband to do it. When he was having second thoughts, what did she do? She questioned his manhood. She essentially said I'm more of a man than you are. That's what she did in the play. She undermined his masculinity in order to coerce him into doing something that she wanted him to do, because she was hungry for power above her station. And I think Shakespeare got that part right, but I also think that what he got wrong was I don't think she would have killed herself out of guilt over it.

**WOODS:** Yeah. Yeah, in fact, I think that's in the talk.

**STRAUGHAN:** It is. It is. She would have just attached herself – you know, once everyone was dead, including her husband, she would have attached herself to the most powerful man left standing and then told him a sob story about how her husband abused her and how he was crazy and how he killed King Duncan and he made her just go along with the whole thing.

Warren Farrell, Dr. Warren Farrell, he's written a whole bunch of books on men, masculinity, boys, just came out with a one called *The Boy Crisis* recently. One of his my favorite quotes from him is, "Women's greatest strength is their facade of weakness, and men's greatest weakness is their facade of strength." And I think that's where you really have the yin and yang of masculinity and femininity, that women can leverage the perception of their vulnerability to do some really crazy things.

I mean, when you actually put it in layman's terms, or when you actually take something like a false allegation and you put it in slightly different terms that remove the distance between the woman and what happens to the man that she's accused – so if I was mad at my boyfriend – which I often am, thank you very much. But if I was mad at him and I wanted to punish him and maybe get him out of my house, I could try and rough him up and tie his hands together and lock him down in the basement, put the key on the shelf and leave him down there for a few days until he's learned his lesson. And if I could do it, I'd be guilty of a whole string of violent felonies. I could call a couple of my male friends to come over and do all of those things on my behalf. Let's rough him up, lock him in the tool shed for a few days, and he'll be good and sorry, and he won't make me mad anymore. And we'd all be guilty of all of those felonies and conspiracy.

But if I call police and tell them he's been hitting me, they'll come and do all of that stuff for me. They'll rough him up a little, cuff his hands, put him in a cell for a few days until he's good and sorry, and learned his lesson. And all I'm technically guilty of is lying to police.

**WOODS:** Yeah.

**STRAUGHAN:** Yeah. And that's the danger of toxic femininity. And the fact that women – they don't necessarily understand they have this power. In one case where young woman, maybe like 18, 19 years old, she lied to her friends at a pub and pointed to a guy who she was not happy with. I think he just didn't want to date her something. And she lied to her friends and told her friends that he had raped her. And then after they all went home, her friends got together and plotted to beat this 18-year-old boy to death, which they did savagely beat him to death. And she's sitting on the stand saying, "I had no idea anything like that would happen."

**WOODS:** Oh, my gosh.

**STRAUGHAN:** And I'm thinking, you just told a bunch of people he raped you.

**WOODS:** Yeah.

**STRAUGHAN:** Like, do you think that this kind of stuff doesn't happen? You had no idea it could happen? No, it happens. And it's because it's such an emotionally charged kind of crime, kind of accusation. And that's all based on – the reason that it kicks in that kind of response so much more often than any other accusation is because of the perceived sexual vulnerability of women.

**WOODS:** You know, this brings to mind that – there are actually just a couple more things I want to raise with you, but this one's kind of a big one. And you could do a whole episode on it, but I'm going to see if you can summarize it somehow, because it's tricky. And that is the simple question of the word "feminism." Because I know people who let's say, young women, who are not – they're not like ideologues. They're not subscribing to all the different implications of the word feminism today. What they mean by feminism is, I just want to have opportunities, and I want the same opportunities available to me that are available to men, and I don't like the presumption that has existed for a lot of time that – well, for example, the church will have a special camp for the boys, but yeah, we don't have anything for the girls this year. That sort of thing. You know, come on, that's just stupid, and so we just want

the girls to have a fair shot at things. And that's the way they look at it, and that's what they think feminism is. So when you hear people like that, who they think feminism, it's just common sense, so if somebody goes around, talking about the toxicity of feminism, this must just be an incorrigible, chauvinist. What do you say to that?

**STRAUGHAN:** Well, I mean, first off, I would suggest that any woman who – I call these women sort of coffee shop feminists. They're feminist in name only. And like I said, they will have bought into that mainstream feminist narrative of the one-sided oppression and enslavement and subjugation of women throughout all of eternity while men were all sitting around smoking cigars and living like kings, apparently. Most people have bought into that to one degree or another.

I would essentially – I really hate that there are women out there who use the word feminism and don't buy into all of that stuff, right? They don't buy into the whole rape culture narrative, and they don't buy into the idea that domestic violence is always about men beating their wives and never the other way around, and all of these other issues, that these gender narratives that we have, thanks to feminism, largely – they may have always existed to one degree or another, but feminism has actually sort of entrenched them in law and policy to a degree that did not exist before.

And so I would say to them: just call yourself an equalist or an egalitarian. I mean, that's really what you are if you just want to have the same opportunities as men. And when I talk to new people who are like, *Oh, you're an anti-feminist. What's up with that?* I just start talking about how the National Organization for Women has opposed every single shared parenting bill proposed in the United States. Most of the time, they're successful in blocking that legislation. They want to maintain the sole-custodial-and-visiting-parent model, because that overwhelmingly favors mothers in terms of custody and marginalizes fathers. And it maintains levels of child support, because it's usually based on, if you have the kid all time, you get more child support than if you only get the kid half the time. So all of these things that feminists have, you know, *Oh, we want things to be equal; we want things to be equal, but not this thing*, you just have to sort of look at it.

Things like sexual coercion and sexual violence, not as one-sided as you would think. Women are perpetrators more often than a lot of people would ever suspect. Men are their victims much more often than people would ever suspect. And when it comes to the consequences of being violated sexually, sure, I think that probably there's a more intense, immediate emotional trauma felt by women who are violated by men than the other way around. But when you're actually looking at 15-year-old boys who are having their paper routes garnished because the adult woman who statutorily raped him and went to prison for it got custody of her child when she got out and went on welfare and the state is now collecting child support from this kid, like, those are the kinds of consequences when men get careless or allow somebody or are in a position where somebody is able to take advantage of them in that way.

I've seen, there was a case in the US of – they were two doctors, believe it or not, and he refused to have any kind of reproductive, vaguely even close to reproductive sex while they were dating, because he didn't want any kids before marriage and he wasn't sure he wanted to marry her. So they were not even having protected heterosexual intercourse. They had oral sex one night, and after she got up and went into the bathroom and inseminated herself with the semen from the oral sex, got pregnant, and was awarded child support. And these are all

facts before the court. There was no question about whether like she actually did this. No, the court said, *Yeah, no, we found that she did this. Doesn't matter. He has to pay.* So these are the kinds of risks that men and consequences that men have to deal with.

And we're not even looking at the situation in such a way as to admit that men can be sexually violated by women, period. One of the most astounding things about one of these statutory rape cases of child support, is the person prosecutor – or no, I think it was the DA of the city in question, made a comment to media. He was 14 at the time that the sex occurred. And he said, "Well, he wanted to act like a man then, but now he wants to be a kid."

**WOODS:** Oh, boy.

**STRAUGHAN:** Yeah. Like, absolutely no sympathy whatsoever. And I'm just blown away by this. And one of the reasons why even now, after a whole bunch of research, most people don't know that the sexual victimization of men by women, however it happens, whether some woman took advantage of the passed-out or drunk man, a man who was drunk out of his mind or some other means; coercion, saying, "If you don't have sex with me, I'll scream rape, and you know what's going to happen to you," and things like that – most people don't know about any of that, and it's because the leading feminist sexual assault expert, Mary P. Koss, who was the originator of the "one in five college women will be raped" statistic that sort of *Ms. Magazine* promoted back in the 1980s, I believe, she's just defined male victims of female perpetrators out of the definition of rape. She consults for the CDC. Those men aren't counted as rape victims; they're counted as "other sexual violence."

**WOODS:** All right, so that's about as good an answer to my question as I could have asked for, because that's a lot of stuff nobody knows about.

**STRAUGHAN:** You just have to kind of let people know that, I mean, feminists say they want equality, but they don't seem to want it if it would benefit men or if it would make a woman somewhere unhappy or not able to get everything she wants. So that really just seems to be what it is.

**WOODS:** Let's pivot over to the last thing I wanted to ask you about, but before we went on the air, I asked you, because I wanted to help try and get more supporters over your way, if you were on Patreon. And you said that you had quit Patreon in protest, which I know a number of people have done, but I'm curious to get your personal thoughts on that subject, why you did it.

**STRAUGHAN:** Well, I'm a big proponent of free speech. I think you have to be if you're a men's rights activist or advocate. You certainly want to maintain your ability to speak in the face of objection from the mainstream. So there's that. And a man in the UK who was kind enough to actually admit publicly that I'm the reason he exists; he's a YouTuber called Carl Benjamin; his screen name is Sargon of Akkad. And his channel has far surpassed my channel, which inspired him to make his, which I'm very pleased about. So he's sort of an anti-political correctness, classical liberal, just really wants as little government interference in people's lives as possible. He wants fairness under the law. He doesn't want special treatment for anybody, all of those things that I agree with.

He was debating some white nationalists somewhere on YouTube on some obscure channel with 100 subscribers or something like that. And he's actually been in real life harassed by them. He's been doxed by them, his wife has been harassed on her social media accounts, because she's his wife, by white nationalists and their followers. So he's not too pleased with these guys. But he essentially said — he used an ethnic slur against them that begins with N, and said, essentially: exactly the way you describe black people as behaving, is how you're behaving.

**WOODS:** Ah, okay.

**STRAUGHAN:** And he just absolutely despises — he used to actually on Twitter — his Twitter account got deleted. I think he got kicked off Twitter for tweeting interracial gay porn at white nationalists.

**WOODS:** Oh, I had heard that. That's right.

**STRAUGHAN:** Yeah. So anyway, Patreon, the white nationalists actually start sending the link to this hangout, this livestream to Patreon, demanding that Carl Benjamin be removed from the platform for his use of this ethnic slur while debating white nationalists and calling them bad people and all of that. So that's why he got kicked off of Patreon, was because white nationalists launched a campaign to essentially say he used the N word, to tell on him to Patreon. So he used the N word, and that's not acceptable, and Patreon has kicked him off. And I was like, well, you know, I have this money, I have my principles, and I think I'm going to go with my principles and say goodbye, Patreon.

**WOODS:** Well, I totally understand that. And of course, Jordan Peterson and Dave Rubin left in a very high-profile way.

**STRAUGHAN:** And Sam Harris, as well.

**WOODS:** Sam Harris, that's a good point. Yeah, Sam Harris is particularly interesting, because on most of his politics, he's not really all that close to Sargon.

**STRAUGHAN:** No, he's quite left-wing.

**WOODS:** Yeah.

**STRAUGHAN:** But he's a speech free-speech enthusiast, as well, and I think he thinks that a free market, public marketplace of ideas is really the only way to avoid things descending into conflict and sometimes violence, just like Jordan Peterson says. And that's the one thing I think that they both agree on. They disagree on many, many other things, but they both agree that if people cannot feel like they have a voice to discuss their problems or the problems that they have with how things are done, if they don't have a means to redress a grievance as well, if they're just shut up, if they're just shut down and silenced, that's when they start radicalizing. That accelerates their radicalization. And it doesn't turn them into nice people; it actually turns them into extremists, and then you end up with things like political violence. So nobody wants that. And so I'm a proponent of everybody should be allowed to speak, particularly, if you're speaking on topics that are relevant in the culture and if you're doing so in an entertaining way, it shouldn't matter.

Like when Steven Crowder came up against this is Carlos Maza from Vox, and Crowder's channel got completely demonetized, because he used some gay slurs. He insulted Carlos Maza by making gay jokes at him. But a minute of gay jokes over the course of nine videos over the course of several years. And Carlos Maza decided the day before Gay Pride Month that he was going to raise a stink with YouTube about this, and YouTube did something that made everybody unhappy: they demonetized Crowder's channel, but they didn't kick him off the platform. Maza says that's not good enough; he needs to go completely. And it's just this big brouhaha. But he should be allowed to joke. And Crowder put up a compilation of late-night talk show hosts – Trevor Noah, Samantha Bee, Stephen Colbert – making all kinds of homophobic and racist jokes on their shows and misogynist slurs on their shows. And they're still fully monetized. They still have their blue checkmarks on Twitter.

**WOODS:** You don't mean to tell me there's a double standard here.

**STRAUGHAN:** I know. It's like the craziest thing. So now I'm on a Russian Patreon – it's not a Patreon clone, but it is an alternative to Patreon, run by a bunch of guys in Russia, called Subscribe Stars. You can find me there if you feel like throwing some shekels in my hat. And I've got a PayPal link on my YouTube channel, as well. And you can donate directly, one time or monthly. You can set something up there if you want to throw some money my way. But yeah, I now have a wonderful man – who I'm frequently angry at, but that's neither here nor there – a wonderful man who is making enough money that I don't have to focus so much on promoting ways of donating to my channel, and he really values my work. He's actually the one the people who really pushed me out of my shell and said, "Do videos."

**WOODS:** Wow. Well, that's terrific to hear. Well, all the same, I'll link to all these things you mentioned at [TomWoods.com/1427](http://TomWoods.com/1427). But just in case people don't go there, what's the name of your YouTube channel so they can get to it right away?

**STRAUGHAN:** Oh, it's [YouTube.com/User/GirlWritesWhat](https://www.youtube.com/user/GirlWritesWhat).

**WOODS:** Okay.

**STRAUGHAN:** Or you can just Google my name, Karen Straughan, you'll find me.

**WOODS:** Yeah.

**STRAUGHAN:** There aren't very many of us who have any kind of notoriety. And you can find me on Twitter @GirlWritesWhat, as well.

**WOODS:** Okay, I'm going to put all that at [TomWoods.com/1427](http://TomWoods.com/1427). Hope the conference is very successful, and thanks for your time again.

**STRAUGHAN:** Thank you so much for having me.