

This e-book is available at <http://genepoolsurvivalguide.com>
How prosecution of those more capable to be productive has hurt everyone.

Copy Right Notice

This eBook is © copyrighted by the author, Jim Thio 2000-2003.
The eBook is short, and hence free. Fill free to make any copy you want as long as this notice and references to website <http://genepoolsurvivalguide.com> remains intact.

About Author

Jim Thio won a silver medal in International Physics Olympiad and 2nd price for Jakarta's math competition. He is the author of <http://genepoolsurvivalguide.com>, a book using evolution theory on understanding humans' nature.

How Can a Rabbit Outrun a Turtle

Sounds simple? Too simple? Of course a rabbit can... It can. Really... But it's not simple. When something is too obvious, it's anticipated. When something is anticipated, it's no longer simple.

In Hans Christian Andersen's story, there was a rabbit that raced with a turtle. The rabbit thought that it was so fast anyway it should be no problem to wait for the turtle. The story went that the turtle was so determined to win that he did his best and actually won. Now what about if the rabbit greedily try to win as much as possible from the turtle, then there will be no way the turtle will win then. So what would turtles do?

Let me give you several examples before I get to my point.

Minority Cases

During Suharto era, Chinese in Indonesia have much harder time to become government employee, and to attend public university. Despite their disproportionate tax payment to government, only 2% of Chinese went to government's public university. Are Chinese dumber? No! The 2% are there because of a racist quota.

The Chinese are blamed for not assimilating, for not loving their country as much, for corruption. That's strange. Corruption is a natural consequence of big government. It's the people that insist on wanting bigger government than letting the market take care of it. If good ways to make money are prohibited, and bad ways are tolerated, people become bad. Non Chinese businessmen are the one more likely to get Government's help. In fact, corruption can be good to, as a balancing force against deviation from meritocracy. Why blame the Chinese?

How prosecution of those more capable to be productive has hurt everyone.

Although racial tensions have greatly diminished in Indonesia, out of fear of Chinese capitals' flight, I still remember 7 years ago, where there were riots against ethnic Chinese in Indonesia.

It makes me wonder, why the Chinese? Why some people in south East Asia despised Chinese? Are they misled?

The same phenomena can also be seen from the Jews

I've heard about the prosecution of Jewish people in Europe. The justification for their prosecution is often hard to believe, but hard to disprove either. They supposedly kill Jesus, which is a Jew by the way. Most Europeans are Christians, which is a branch of Judaism, or at least Roman customs with Judaist mask. All twelve apostles were Jewish. It's ridiculous that the religion created by the Jews was interpreted in a way to prosecute Jews.

Later Hitler accused the Jews of causing world war. World War 2 was caused by restriction of trade. Because German cannot get natural resources, and cannot buy it, they try to get it through war. It was not the Jewish's fault. It was the protectionists fault in other country. But it's the Jews again that were blamed. Why the Jews?

Let me give you a different kind of examples!

Disproportionate Punishment

In Europe, the fines for smoking in public places are high. In US, arguing against income tax in court can be declared "frivolous" with \$50,000 fine. I mean, the damage caused by the most frivolous argument is little compared to the damaged caused by robbing, for example. So why the argument is fined by \$50,000? Apparently, the \$50,000.00 is there to discourage powerful arguments that would win all the way to Supreme Court canceling income tax, rather than to discourage "frivolous" ones.

Even worse, the trend did not stop in social and legal issues, but extend to economic, academic, and even sexual selection.

In US, businessmen can get sued black and blue with ridiculously high cost lawsuits. Why businessmen?

Then I heard Martha Steward went to jail, Bill Gates were blamed for monopoly, McDonald were fined more than \$1 million because one lady pour coffee into her own lap. Why Martha? Why Bill? Why McDonald?

Take Thomas Arthur Green for example. He was convicted under polygamy laws for legally marrying and divorcing several women in succession (never

How prosecution of those more capable to be productive has hurt everyone.

simultaneously). So he's not actually committing polygamy, but his acts of cohabitation with several women were constituted as polygamy anyway. I don't see how Thomas coerces or fraud the women into anything. Why was he sent to jail?

What about the rest of us? Let's take a look at one of the least bad country in the world. US. The mere act of making honest money is punishable by tax. There are so many regulations against consensual immigration, sex, jobs, and schools. If a foreigner lose I-94 document, he can get fined for US\$3,000. When a person argues against income tax in US court, he'll be fined for US\$50,000.00.

There is no argument whatsoever that the penalty is so disproportionate to damage caused. When good people make mistakes, it doesn't matter if the mistake is small. It doesn't matter that the mistake is undeliberately done. It doesn't matter that the law itself is so difficult to understand and open to interpretation. People simply shrug it off and say it's the law. If you don't like being punished just obey it. It doesn't matter that the law used to nail those people are often so twisted and complicated; people simply blame them for "arguably" break the law.

Governments often appease rather than punish though. Conviction records of thieves are not available in internet to protect the thieves' reputation. Some companies are given tax deduction for hiring thieves. The argument is that if the thieves have enough opportunity, in the form of implicit welfare, they don't steal.

But why appease? Why not just resort to more punishment. That's the way it's done against productive people. Heavy threat of punishment for not paying tax, not appeasement is what's used against productive financially responsible humans.

Penalty to get people to pay tax, to get father pay child support to a child, often which he doesn't own is enforced through heavy punishment. Child support is set to be proportionate to a man's wealth and productivity rather than the child's need, Child support and tax are the only debtor jail enforced loans. Is it a coincidence that the only loans enforced by debtor jail are loans generated by financial responsibility and capability?

Yet for thieves and other crooks, it's just appeasements after appeasements.

Why?

The Evil of Envy

One word: Envy.

How prosecution of those more capable to be productive has hurt everyone.

What do the Chinese in Indonesia, the Jews in Europe, Martha Stewart, Bill Gates, McDonald, productive individuals, and Thomas have in common. They're successful in some important way. All of the above, except Thomas, is successful financially. Thomas is successful in some other ways. He is successful at attracting many females.

And middle class hate successful people. It turns out the kind of success Thomas has is somewhat related to the kind of success the others have. What's the link?

Gene pool survival.

Our instincts are built for gene pool survival. Those whose happiness and pleasure inducing algorithm, in other word, preferences, matched what worked in the Gene Pool in the past are the kind of humans that are common nowadays. We like to have sex because sex improved gene pool survival. Humans who abhor sex, or whose sexual desire is not strong enough to overcome societies' trick to and religious pressure to get out of the gene pool are out. We avoid human excrements because eating them would decrease gene pool survival.

Gene pool survival is almost a zero sum game. What does that mean?

Well, because the earth is getting full, gene pool survival issue is more about who will be in the gene pool than how to get bigger pool. When one gains more the other get less.

Under capitalism, we can make a lot of money in ways that's mutually beneficial. Money wise, Capitalism is NOT a zero sum game. The main issue in Capitalism is not who should get the money. In capitalism, the main issue is how to make more money for the good of all.

So, with capitalism, one country can be richer and richer. So a person can make so much money without hurting others' interest right?

Wrong! Depend on what you mean by interest. When a male makes so much money, he'll become more attractive to females. Then more females will choose to share him than be the only one for other males. Such males, the alpha males, will survive well in the gene pool. This of course hurt the gene pool survival of less capable males.

Hence if A chooses an act that profits him by \$10 and profits B by \$1, B will still hate A. That's because A's and B's instincts are built for gene pool survival. A will try to mate with as many females as possible. Because A makes more money, more females will be attracted to A, reducing females available to B.

How prosecution of those more capable to be productive has hurt everyone.

Under capitalism, when A makes money, he doesn't make B poorer. He does make B look poorer.

That's the reason why many losers in US are pro communist. Those workers are already benefited under capitalism. However, they are envy that the productive even earn more than them.

A second type of losers would demand government to prohibit many consensual sexes. The purpose is to ration sex partners to those not attractive enough to attract partners without regulation. Quite closely, to ration pretty females to mediocre males. Why else polygamy and prostitution is prohibited? Why child support is proportional to a man's wealth? Why not let the women choose, before being knocked up, the level of commitment she demands?

A third type of losers would demand far more expensive implicit welfare in the form of job protection and minimum wage so they can keep their pride and illusion of productivity, which they cannot get under explicit welfare for the same amount. Often I think, among the 3, the first one is the least evil.

A preference is then developed among many humans to stop, prevent, and if possible, exterminate superiority. The preference manifests in envy and unexplained hatred to those that shows any sign of superiority and potential of sexual attractiveness. Norms and laws are there to get rid sexually attractive people from the gene pool. Because beauty is a big factor in females' attractiveness, most beautiful virgins are sacrificed to volcano.

Because brain and wealth is the main factor in males' attractiveness, smart scholars and monks shouldn't get married. Wealth is taxed. Greed is sin. Prostitution is immoral. High IQ kids in schools are beaten up without retaliation from government. Government would "protect" kids from porn far more than from bullies, thieves, and robbers.

But how does everyone detects superiority? By achievements. That is why those who achieves more are often those that are hatred.

When you are successful, expect hatred. It doesn't matter how you do it. You can do it in the most fair, consensual, and beneficial ways as possible. Still someone, somewhere, somehow, will come up with who knows what fairy tales to somehow justify that you're wrong and that you shouldn't do it.

You may not mean to offend them, but the mere acts of being successful offend people, especially losers, enough.

You can make a lot of money honestly while providing many jobs for others. Then what? Then someone, that takes jobs, rather than creating it, will say that you have to use inferior technology so you can hire more workers.

How prosecution of those more capable to be productive has hurt everyone.

Someone that works from 9 to 5 will say that you are enslaved by money because you want more after you have enough. Then they accused you of greed and somehow greed is evil.

Then what should smart more capable people do then?

Solutions

One solution is to proceed as usual. Make a lot of money through capitalism. And then complain when you get killed. That's what libertarians, Jews, and Chinese do all over the place.

Their cause is just, but not a winning one. After all, if you're dead, even if you're right, you're not really a winner right? Others will just prejudicially conclude that you're wrong. They envy you. They want people to believe you're inferior. The only way they can do so despite their obviously lack of achievements is by concluding that your achievements are "wrong" and they don't achieve as much because they're morally superior, rather than mentally inferior.

Another solution is to stop being too successful so not to arouse envy from people. Now that's simply pathetic. First of all, people want to exterminate those who are superior to them. Hiding achievements won't help. It's the genes they want to kick out.

Up to the 10th century, the Jews practiced polygamy. Thanks to inquisition killing of their dumb, and lack of prohibition of marriage against smart scholars, Jews' are smarter, which soon leads to richer. Jewish males consensually attract more females. Needless to say the other Europeans' males were mad, but too embarrassed to say frankly what the real reason was. So to appease the Europeans, a rabbi prohibits polygamy where customs prohibit it. The prohibition's true purpose is to ration females in equal share for everyone manner to all men. The pretext varies from religious, ideology, females' interest (usually something vague, like dignity) to who knows what now.

Then what? Did the prosecution of the Jews ended. No. History shows that Jews kept being prosecuted till the end of WW II.

I like the third solution. Did you ever notice that Saddam, Suharto, Evita, Marcos, Kim Yong III, are pretty smart. They "balance" their financial achievements with military and political achievements.

Dictatorship is simply a natural answer against stubborn cultures that fail to embrace meritocracy and individual freedom. Winners will be winners anyway. If not through capitalism, through dictatorship. If not through productivity, through corruption.

This e-book is available at <http://genepoolssurvivalguide.com>
How prosecution of those more capable to be productive has hurt everyone.

Problem solved, for the actor that's willing to fight fire with fire.

Hei, what can we say? It's the society that deviates from capitalism and meritocracy. Under capitalism, you enjoy the fruit of your labor. But society want to take away from the productive to give to the less productive.

If the rest of the population wants to deviate from meritocracy, it's natural that what maximizes one's profit is not what maximizes productivity as a whole. So humans resorts to other means to enrich himself, like robbing, when penalty of stealing is not heavy enough, or corruption, when people demand the bigger and bigger government.

Perhaps that'll teach all society a lesson in meritocracy. Any deviation from meritocracy will simply make everyone lose.

Isn't there a more humane solution?

Yes there is. There is a time when superior people and inferior people live in harmony. Soldiers under the command of Zhuge Liang, knows that their life expectancy is an increasing function of Zhuge's IQ.

The Jews also get more respects among European not after they appease Europeans more, but after one Jew, Einstein, help builds nuclear bomb for the lesser evil, suggesting how valuable smart people is for a society. Doing so shows that being smarter benefit less capable humans' gene pool survival too.

The time when people live in harmony is when they have common enemy. In other word, war. I sense problem in this solution. So bear with me okay.

The Old Testament in the bible, for example, suggests of attacking other countries, kill all the males, and grab the females. Apparently, few things are serious sin under Christianity, save polygamy and watching porn.

Anyway, the acts mean males can have many females, and the rest in his society get a share too. The existences of the smart people then help improve the gene pool survival of the other males. Am I suggesting that? No!

But there is a humane capitalistic libertarian version of that. In many countries, women are treated badly. They have to wear burgha, or hijab. They can't work. Their clitoris is cut, etc. They can't pursue Britney's career. Not surprisingly, countries that treat women badly are poor countries. Women are attracted to wealth. Poor people cannot resort to positive incentives, they use negative incentives.

Why not invite those women to be prostitutes for rich countries. Then, when A enriches himself by \$10 in a way that enriches B by \$1, B can use that \$1 to

How prosecution of those more capable to be productive has hurt everyone.

hire prostitutes from Mexico, or Ethiopia. Hence, a capitalistic act of earning more money will please other males too. Poorer countries will have fewer females. They breed less. That'll solve their poverty problem.

However, no amount of bribing will persuade pretty females to consensually mate with the bottom 20% of male population. That's why we have all this sex laws restricting consensual sex. So that there are enough females for those bottom, financially irresponsible, less capable males. If only there's a way, perhaps it'll be easier to just tell those bottom 20%, you're out of luck!

Females Interest

So far, I've only talked about males' interest. What about females' interest? Females just want the best gene, if not money. What constitute best vary from females to females. However, wealth and power are proven signals across the globe.

Like males, females are benefited the most when they have choices. Let them choose. As long as you give females consensual choice rather than force, they'll be better off. Ugly females, out of envy, will prejudicially argue that many consensual offers to females hurt females' interest. Ignore them.