

# Blue is Bad for Women: NTB Wants Everyone to Vote Red

By Postliterate

Source: <https://medium.com/@postliterate/blue-is-bad-for-women-ntb-wants-everyone-to-vote-red-f9a934e70206>

An article by Christian-conservative news source Not The Bee (abbreviated NTB hereafter) from today pointed out the unusually small percentage of women who voted Republican in the 2016 election. The article empathizes with female voters who were turned away from the Republican platform due to Trump. However, the article then proceeds to point out the many reasons why the Democratic party, which more women voted for, was a bad choice on the part of those women. The reasons are:

1. The Democratic party's approach to welfare has encourage the absence of fathers in the household
2. The promotion of abortion allows for the exploitation of women
3. The Democratic party is trying to wipe motherhood by replacing Mother's Day with androgynous Parents' Day
4. The allowing of trans women into women's sports hurts women
5. Inclusionary language for trans people is wiping away mother-related terms and by extension women's identity
6. The Democratic party has denounced gender roles, also wiping away women's identity
7. The Democratic party has promoted the female draft

What is really going on here is a couple of empty arguments and a couple of points that only suggest that according to NTB, no one should vote blue.

With the first point, I agree that there is something to be said about the need for two parents in the household that is not being addressed, expressed by rapper JPEGMAFIA in the lyric, “*you could be a beacon of hope by why bother... most of us ain’t even got no fathers*”. However, this point still remains hollow at its core. It should be obvious that single-parent households are in need of more help than two-parent households (that’s one less parent working to sustain the family), but NTB interprets this as promoting single-parent households. It’s the equivalent of believing that in a welfare state, everyone will want to be poor in order to get money from the government. The only way to hold this idea with any degree of consistency is to be an Anarcho-Capitalist.

The second point is also nonsense. NTB believes that the sex trafficking will flourish due to the accessibility of legal abortions. But in an illegal act like sex trafficking the traffickers would most likely give their trafficked women abortions illegally anyway. NTB seems to think that sex trafficked women and sex traffickers are going to walk into a public hospital and ask for an abortion. In reality, illegalizing abortion simply strips women of their rights, due to the very basic fact that most women simply want to get abortions. Abortion is referred to as bodily autonomy because to the average woman that’s what it is. What is most interesting is that not only will illegalizing abortions simply force women to have to find illegal (and much more dangerous) methods of getting them, but in fact in many countries the rate of abortions after it was illegalized did not go down, and in fact in some cases went up. Recall the amount of drinking that occurred during prohibition, which was somehow more than before.

Take a look: <https://www.gutmacher.org/fact-sheet/induced-abortion-worldwide>

The fourth point relies on you not fully accepting trans women as women, which NTB openly does, calling them “biological men”. Unfortunately trans women are women and allowing them in women’s sports does not hurt women... because they are women.

The seventh point is interesting because many conservatives pride themselves with pointing out that men granted women the right to vote. Most women at the time did not support women's suffrage. What is most interesting is that now that more equal responsibilities are being placed on women, suddenly conservatives believe it's a bad thing. It almost seems that equal rights doesn't matter to conservatives except when they can point out something that makes men look good.

It is all the remaining points (points 3, 5, and 6) that make this article so confusing. The points involve the Democratic party using language that doesn't directly acknowledge women, such as holidays like androgynous Parents' Day instead of Mother's and Father's day. NTB interprets this as being the Democratic party wiping away women's identity. And yet, this is the same ideology that becomes angered when people with less common sexualities or genders identify as such, or when people refer to people of color as people of color. In those cases conservatives would claim that these labels and identities are widening gaps between people, making us more divided, that we need to be more colorblind, etc. This is a valid point, except that conservatives are inconsistent with it. Thus in this case when the Democratic party attempts to bridge the gap between men and women with more inclusionary language, NTB sees this as a bad thing. Is this not the unification and the bridging between people of all creeds that conservatives want? Apparently not.

What is also interesting is that these examples of inclusionary language don't just affect women's identity, but men's too. NTB acknowledges this, but uses the arguemets still to only explain why women shouldn't vote Democrat. In reality, according to their own logic, neither men nor women should vote Democrat due to points 3, 5, and 6.

The question then is, who should women vote for? NTB offers no alternative. Considering the rigid two-party system we live in today, the entire article boils down to NTB understanding why women were turned away from Trump, but still wanting them, and everyone else, to vote not blue (i.e. red).

This is not an article explaining why the Democratic party is harmful to women. This is an article telling all men and women to vote Republican.

Make sure I don't misrepresent:

<https://notthebee.com/article/i-get-why-they-dont-vote-republican-but-why-are-women-voting-for-democrats>