

That would be why they don't hire women - On male spaces and feminine-primary imperative

August 27, 2014 | 79 upvotes | by [redpillschool](#)

<http://alphagameplan.blogspot.com/2014/08/that-would-be-why-they-dont-hire-women.html>

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

[deleted] 27 August, 2014 05:59 PM*

[permanently deleted]

gekkozorz • 24 points • 27 August, 2014 09:27 PM

This is why women go for the weaker, more beta-filled circles when trying to find male spaces to destroy.

NikolaTeslaMGTOw • 8 points • 27 August, 2014 11:30 PM

Exactly, I was posting this stuff in those gamer threads on TRP. I always wondered why gamer circles are so full of beta phaggots. I worked for a short while testing video games and the guys there are all massive beta phaggots, like not just beta, but such bitches it makes me sick (this was before TRP). Needless to say I didn't fit in but I got out of that job. This is why one of the last male spaces, aka video games and comic books, etc is going to be destroyed. It's too bad because I really love it (PC gaming).

There are some interesting videos for fighting game communities that talk about how you have to prove yourself, and how women don't have to and they destroy the culture. I can't find the video... I really looked, it's a robot voice kind of doing a documentary.

So basically it's another reason to put video games on the back burner, like don't sacrifice if you like it, but realize where it's going and why.

[deleted] • 1 point • 28 August, 2014 12:29 PM

how you have to prove yourself, and how women don't have to and they destroy the culture.

You're saying that women do such work due to intrinsic and men due to extrinsic motivation?

sternje • 35 points • 27 August, 2014 07:25 PM

The link to the WSJ leads to further illogical statements based solely on her mis-interpretations and her self-perceived victimhood. This guy had the best response I'd like to share, but it's too long, so I'll just leave you with his conclusion:

I'm disappointed that someone can behave this way — ungratefully, showing lack of judgement, of loyalty, of logic — and expect accolades. You were clearly surprised when that partner “confronted” you. Maybe if he had gone and written a blog post on the GC website about how disappointed he was with you, you would prefer that. Have you heard of open, real-time conversations? Of taking responsibility for your actions?

If anything you have tainted all women. And especially all Sloan women. The next time a VC firm is thinking about hiring a woman, they will think twice because if they don't treat her like the entitled brat she is, she will go and write a tale tattling blog post about it. Whining and complaining through backdoor channels with absolutely no constructive feedback.

Go ahead: write a blog post about this. Tell lies. Make up stories. Seek attention. Tell the world how you received a brutally honest comment and broke down crying and then sought to exact revenge by writing up that person in the WSJ. Absolutely disgusting.

exit_sandman • 23 points • 27 August, 2014 07:38 PM

Thanks for the link, here is another comment from a female executive.

I am a senior exec in a firm I helped found over 10 years and we have been very successful in a male dominated industry. **I have advocated and mentored for other women who have entered my field and have zero problem calling myself a feminist.** I am better than almost any other person, male or female, that works in my profession, and I absolutely expect to be very well compensated for this and we women should make sure we always get what we deserve because that is what men do! **Ms Swallow, you would never be hired by me or any other smart business person. To be a part of an organization, you need to show a shred of loyalty and discretion, and you showed neither.** Yes, is it tough to be a woman in the man's world of business absolutely. If you wanted to stay with the VC, you should have spoken to your mentor about it and seen what could be done internally. As you advance in leadership, blog or publish your views..but don't air your organization's laundry if you want to grow there.

chakravanti93 • 4 points • 28 August, 2014 02:50 AM

No shit. Learning a company's real dirty secrets is practically a doubling of salary.

I'd tell she's doing it wrong but she'd probably just publish it on her blog and point fingers.

At least she'll find a proffession better suiting her name.

[deleted] • -1 points • 27 August, 2014 08:57 PM

She's probably a senior HR executive. Women in management tend to gravitate towards HR management since production and finance are male-fields.

incraved • 8 points • 27 August, 2014 10:08 PM

Based on what she said, I doubt she is in HR

[deleted] • -5 points • 28 August, 2014 12:27 AM

Why not? I don't see anything that doesn't say she is not in HR

lloopy • 2 points • 28 August, 2014 01:05 AM

No, she's just the rare exception to the rule. Notice the clear logic behind her words? Notice the lack of emotion? Notice the expectation that she should have understood the culture (woman's sphere, after all) and acted appropriately?

Nope, definitely a woman. Just not like the intern that was fired.

4io84 points 27 August, 2014 11:17 PM **[recovered]**

No, she is probably more talented and capable than you.

[deleted] • -2 points • 28 August, 2014 12:26 AM

Nothing on there that says that she is probably more talented or capable than me, except her word.

4io84 points 28 August, 2014 01:25 AM **[recovered]**

Its not what she said thats giving it away. Its what you said.

[deleted] • -2 points • 28 August, 2014 01:46 AM

You can't deny that most women managers are in HR. Production management managers are mostly male. Same with finance executives.

lloopy • 1 point • 28 August, 2014 01:06 AM

And the fact that probably everyone takes her on her word, and isn't disappointed. Just like if she were a man in an alpha position.

[deleted] • 0 points • 28 August, 2014 01:11 AM

I don't see evidence of whether her employees are disappointed or not. And her saying she is the best without any evidence to back it up doesn't necessarily mean she is telling the truth, even if most people here believe her.

lloopy • 1 point • 28 August, 2014 01:50 AM

What do you want, her fucking resume?

She doesn't have to prove herself to a fucking twit posting crap on reddit. Just like every fucking alpha venture capitalist doesn't have to prove himself. I have people I take advice from. These are people whose advice I actively seek out. I don't know what their resume is, nor do I care. I judge them on the words they speak, and how much sense it makes.

If the founder of TheRedPill starts talking about TRP, I'm going to fucking listen. Not because he has a PhD in psychology, but because the words he says make sense.

[deleted] • 0 points • 28 August, 2014 01:57 AM

If the founder of TheRedPill starts talking about TRP, I'm going to fucking listen. Not because he has a PhD in psychology, but because the words he says make sense.

Sure, but if /u/redpillschool started saying that he was a 6'4 8% bf 300 lb behemoth, you wouldn't necessarily believe him unless he showed you a picture. Or if he said he was the owner of a Fortune 500 company or said he was the best entrepreneur out there, you'd probably want some proof. This is the same as me wanting proof to the woman's claim that she is the best in her field.

I have no problem with what she is saying, except the part where she claims that she is better than all the other male and females in her field.

lloopy • 1 point • 28 August, 2014 02:00 AM

Every VC says this. You have to have this attitude to be successful. If you thought other people knew what to do more than you, you'd stop doing your job and just take their advice.

It doesn't mean she IS, but she damn well better have the attitude.

Cyralea • 72 points • 27 August, 2014 05:31 PM

She's since revealed that the firm 'wasn't exactly ecstatic' about her decision to blog about gender bias, and scheduled several lengthy meetings during the final week of her internship in which her bosses wanted to know why she hadn't consulted them first and how they could spin positive publicity out of the incident.

You mean a company is concerned about its public image, especially since it's being derailed by an intern, potentially costing them millions?

'They didn't see that I felt left out; they saw that their firm was under attack,' she added.

ME ME ME. Typical Western woman. "Who cares about this company worth millions of dollars, *my feelings* are more important!"

Most men do not have this limitation. This is why men dominate the upper echelons of business. This is why women who make it to that level do not act anything like this woman. It's a prerequisite for being the best at your job, the same way that being able to hit a ball long distances is a prerequisite for golf.

Women want equality of outcome without equality of merit.

gekkozorz • 9 points • 27 August, 2014 09:24 PM

That's the real issue here. If she felt something wasn't right about her treatment there (assuming her grievance was valid and not just some bullshit), she should have gone through the appropriate channels, ie HR or the managers of the problematic individuals. Instead she posts a public validation-seeking blog entry saying "look at how oppressed I am guyz!!"

She bit the hand that was feeding, and then got upset when she had to deal with the consequences of her actions.

[deleted] • 20 points • 27 August, 2014 06:39 PM*

This is why women who make it to that level do not act anything like this woman.

These women act like men. But a lot of women who make it to the upper echelons are there because the company is trying to fulfill some gender diversification quota.

And if a woman needs to act like a man to be better at a job, shouldn't you replace her with the real thing?

Lyrad1002 • 10 points • 27 August, 2014 11:12 PM

if a man is judged by his deeds, a woman who acts like a man IS the real thing.

[deleted] • -4 points • 28 August, 2014 12:38 AM

Women aren't men. If a woman takes effort to deny her natural urges and act like a man in the office, then it makes more sense to hire a man, To hire someone who doesn't need to utilize effort to act like a man, because that's his nature. All that effort that the man would be using to act masculine if he were a woman could be used for something else in the corporate sphere since he is a man.

adrixshadow • 6 points • 28 August, 2014 08:24 AM*

A women can do what she wants as long as she is responsible.

This is no necessarily a bad strategy for her as she would be in a social circle with a lot of high value men she could get.

Women can switch their brain to the rational part, its just that they are emotional by default.

IQ isn't also a problem since its at least average compared to men who vary widely.

TheJollySatan • 1 point • 28 August, 2014 03:26 AM

They are outlying deviations from the bell curve of where everyone sits with regard to their masculine and feminine traits in comparison to where the rest of their gender sits.

The ones that are the real deal will be that way through deviations in their own **biology** and environment. It's just rare but it does happen.

[deleted] • -4 points • 28 August, 2014 03:39 AM*

The ones that are the real deal will be that way through deviations in their own biology and environment. It's just rare but it does happen.

But they are still not more masculine/ do not have more masculine traits than most men. Thus, they are not as suited for the job than most men. Most men produce more testosterone than even the naturally manliest of women. Testosterone leads to masculine traits/ masculinity.

rebuildingMyself • 0 points • 28 August, 2014 06:25 AM

And if a woman needs to act like a man to be better at a job, shouldn't you replace her with the real thing?

Not with the government thugs pointing guns and lawyers at you.

southernmost • 5 points • 27 August, 2014 08:36 PM

Actually, being able to read a green and having good touch with the putter is far more important than a 400 yard drive. Big swing can save you a couple shots every round; good putting can knock of a shot every other hole.

Drive for show, putt for dough.

Cyralea • 12 points • 27 August, 2014 08:59 PM

I'm Canadian, I knew I should have used a hockey analogy.

Pornography_saves_li • 6 points • 27 August, 2014 09:46 PM

If you're Canadian, beer analogies only. Haven't you read the Charter?

colombianguy • 32 points • 27 August, 2014 06:32 PM **[recovered]**

Most men learn in their childhood, especially if they belonged to a group of neighborhood boys, that whenever a girl comes into an all-male space, it changes things, and nearly always for the worse. As they grow up, with the same group or others they join later, the lesson is re-affirmed time and time again.

I used to resent women for invading traditionally male spaces and blame them for inevitably spoiling them, but now I tend to blame men for letting them in in the first place because they should have already learned the lesson by now.

NikolaTeslaMGTOW • 3 points • 27 August, 2014 11:34 PM

If that happens get rid of that man if he doesn't stop doing it. If the circle of friends takes his side, find a new circle of friends. You should be able to drop male friends too or at least keep them at a distance. This is your life, don't be afraid to drop friends, just like women.

garlicextract • 28 points • 27 August, 2014 05:47 PM

What the fuck? There are very strict work instructions and company policies you must adhere to in order to keep your job, and that's for actual employees, not even interns.

'They didn't see that I felt left out; they saw that their firm was under attack,' she added.

That's because it fucking is! She's almost literally slandering the firm. I'd expect to lose my job over badmouthing my firm.

RedBigMan • 13 points • 27 August, 2014 07:24 PM

She should have been canned after the blog post was causing problems.

However, they went about it the wrong way by having some hot head go and yell and scream at her in front of everyone. They should have pulled her in to a meeting with HR and informed her that her internship was being terminated coolly and calmly.

Now she's just gonna sue them for emotional distress and crap.

QQ_L2P • 9 points • 27 August, 2014 07:39 PM

Hold on, are you saying you can literally sue people, for real money, over "hurt feelings"?

thebears1986 • 7 points • 27 August, 2014 07:44 PM

Nope. Damages for emotional distress require an accompanying physical injury. But that doesn't mean other BS causes of action don't exist. Oh well.

redpillschool[S] • 1 point • 27 August, 2014 08:49 PM

Wrongful termination doesn't exist in an internship, so we can rule that out...

thebears1986 • 1 point • 27 August, 2014 08:55 PM

Maybe. Was this an unpaid internship? She is starting her MBA second year in a couple weeks. Usually these summer jobs are paid at a pro-rated full year salary rate.

[deleted] • 9 points • 27 August, 2014 08:01 PM

However, they went about it the wrong way by having some hot head go and yell and scream at her in front of everyone.

That's assuming her account of said hothead can be taken at face value. Perhaps the guy was cool and calm and, in spinning the tale after the fact, she projected her own emotional instability on him.

RedBigMan • 2 points • 27 August, 2014 09:01 PM

Good point... either way she needed to be canned.

vengefully_yours • 2 points • 27 August, 2014 08:37 PM

Hey, that never happens, women aren't like that! Why would she lie about something? She's the real victim here! /s

I can't even write that with a straight face.

rikitikicr • 1 point • 28 August, 2014 02:00 AM

some hot head go and yell and scream at her in front of everyone

Remember, we only have her word that this happened. And we all know how much that is worth.

redpillschool[S] • 19 points • 27 August, 2014 05:02 PM

From the article:

Notice how her priority at her INTERNSHIP was not learning how to do her job, but changing the firm to better meet with her approval.

Read also, Rollo's take on this:

The cover story is the same trope the Feminine Imperative (and its social arm, feminism) always finds useful; the never ending push towards gender equalism. The practice however reveals the push into male space serves two purposes – social control and male oversight.

Social control is the easier of the two to grasp. Even when changing the rules of an all-male game to accommodate a lack of genuine female interest in a male endeavor, it fundamentally alters the nature of that game. The first woman allowed participation in that game is novelty enough to extend the Feminine Imperative's social control into that male space (i.e. "nowadays women do it too").

[deleted] • 1 point • 27 August, 2014 11:02 PM

Rollo always bringing the gold

BetterToBeFeared • 18 points • 27 August, 2014 07:24 PM

tears falling from my eyes and my breath becoming uncontrollable

Grow up. If you can't handle getting criticized in the financial industry then you won't go very far. This is how we play in the big leagues lady - sometimes you're going to get a big steamy pile of straight talk and no we don't care about the delivery, it's only the content that counts.

[deleted] • 15 points • 27 August, 2014 06:21 PM*

Its irritating how the feminine-primary imperative starts invading male spaces, such as the corporate sphere and the military. Because when they do, they tend to mess things up. They don't realize that they are not suited for a male-oriented job. there is a reason why it is male-oriented.

Also this girl went to MIT. Doesn't she fucking know that the point of an internship is to learn, not to go about and start changing the social structure of the company to your own whims?

If a person proudly talks about championing this cause, leading that initiative, or launching any "effort" that involves buzzwords like diversity, outreach, inclusivity, or whatever, then you know their focus in the future will be attacking the organization, not doing their job

[deleted] • 17 points • 27 August, 2014 08:02 PM*

Also this girl went to MIT. Doesn't she fucking know that the point of an internship is to learn, not to go about and start changing the social structure of the company to your own whims?

MIT is *now* the most overrated college in the world. They recruit people who have proven themselves in high school. You do that by actually turning in assignments and you get a 4.0. There *isn't* competition in high school anymore because of the shit-state of them in the US. Because of this they've had to add academically unrelated criteria like diversity and extra curriculars to further separate incoming students to see who is elite enough for MIT. Unfortunately by doing this they've just shot themselves in the foot by moving their selection rubric away from outstanding students.

More culture savvy universities are switching to a model which makes students prove themselves in the freshmen and sophomore years before they get into a real program so they have a better idea how a student will behave in college, when they run their own lives and they have actual course work. This also incentives recruiting students from other universities, head hunting the best of the best for their core programs. It will be very common soon to hear people say they went to different places for their last and first two years. MIT laughably still refuses to accept transfers at large.

MIT also used to be a slaughterhouse, literally because of suicides, but they've toned down every part of their curriculum. They've changed to a more feelings friendly place and it shows. They've definitely started to lose their prestige as of late. We can't fail people they will kill themselves!

These two facts have lead to a school which lets in unproven high school students from a failed education system and unlike a decade ago refuses to cut the chaff. I would argue that MIT is failing in exactly the same way the poor high schools they recruit from are.

There's a clear divide between old MIT and new MIT. The culture there has just done a complete 180. A majority of people out in the real world right now who are associated with MIT are from old MIT. You will start seeing a stark change in their prestige and reputation soon. They've still got a boatload of money from their alumni and research though so it'll be a slow ship to sink.

garlicextract • 4 points • 27 August, 2014 07:35 PM

I had a coworker who thought she "understood men" and how they think. Maybe she did, but her rationale was that "guys don't censor themselves or change what they say around me"

[deleted] • 5 points • 27 August, 2014 07:44 PM

"guys don't censor themselves or change what they say around me"

Wow thats very insightful into masculine thought process./s

Except she forgot the emphasis on logic part.

redpillbanana • 13 points • 27 August, 2014 08:15 PM

This is why there are no billionaire social justice warriors. Professional victimhood doesn't pay very well.

FA_in_PJ • 10 points • 27 August, 2014 11:01 PM

Went back to her original post. This woman is a fucking idiot.

It's no wonder, then, that my proposal to research "female founders" as a sourcing opportunity for the summer was turned down. When I suggested the topic, pointing to the fact that it would be great to have more women in the tech startup ecosystem, and that I had found data that proved there was a bias towards men in VC, **my project lead said it was a great topic, but something that couldn't exist without me, a woman, coming on full-time.** That is to say, all the sourcing I would do over the summer, focused on female founders, wouldn't be a project the firm was interested in continuing after I was gone -- because, hey, who wants to focus on sourcing females only? That should be a woman's job, right?

At least to my testosterone-fueled mind, the bold text is a pretty clear signal that they were interested to taking her on full time. Were I in her shoes, that is certainly how I would've taken it and moved from there.

And how does she take it? As rejection! Talk about looking for a reason to be outraged. Fucking hopelessly stupid.

frequentlywrong • 9 points • 27 August, 2014 07:49 PM

She is pictured in the original article. Notice the lipstick. There is a really high correlation to feminist crazy and that kind of bright red lipstick. Avoid women with lipstick like that.

FLFTW16 • 8 points • 27 August, 2014 11:20 PM

You know what is really funny? These men actually took time out of their busy schedules to have meetings and discuss the actions of this shitty, bitchy intern. They could have just dismissed her without any explanation. She

is a lowly intern. She is *privileged* to even be allowed into their space. When she fucked up, they *discussed* the issue. Basically they used their kid gloves with her until it became apparent that she wasn't playing for their team and wouldn't change her behavior.

raceAround126 • 6 points • 27 August, 2014 10:18 PM

I'm sad to say that a good cross section of hires I've had to make have not at all been based on merit. The fact is, I have had to pass on people who would have been excellent team members due to the fact I had a female-strong ultra-do-the-right-thing HR team on my back. There were more than a few occasions during managerial reviews that I would be blasted for not observing the company's culture on diversity and equal opportunity. I was once outright asked by a female oligarch, oops, I mean, female head honcho who absolutely earned her position through merit and hard work why I had predominantly white males working in my department.

My answer was that both females had been promoted out of my department to other roles ahead of other employees who, I felt, deserved the position more. Added to that, we were in deepest darkest Essex. The fact is, if only white males are applying for the positions I am advertising, how could I possibly make any sort of decision to the contrary.

Of course, this wasn't what she wanted to hear and demanded she sat in with a few of my future interviews. And yes, my next hire, I got saddled with an unbelievably useless chump whose only real contribution to the team was when they left early so we could get on with some work without their constant distractions. But you know, equality!

It's a shameful thing to do; telling someone they didn't land a good career-making promotion despite having demonstrated the aptitude and applying themselves. No, instead, someone else gets it based on skin color or gender. And yes, I've had to do it more than once.

I could rant for days. But that would make me some sort of misogynistic racist, right?

atleastitsnotaids • 6 points • 27 August, 2014 11:30 PM

I interned for this company before I switched majors. It was amazing. They have no thoughts towards "diversity" because they are too busy making decisions about millions of dollars and listening to pitches of amazingly cool new tech. In my time there in 2009 the only woman I saw remotely involved in the investment side was another intern from Brown. All of the other women were secretaries and the girl up at the front desk.

Two of the secretaries had desks right outside of the boardroom they had me and the two other interns posted up in and all they did was gab all day long in between fielding calls. And they were absolutely thrilled with their jobs. After holiday bonuses they were taking home over 100k.

This company is amazingly generous (literally allowing the interns to expense gas, parking, lunch out to eat in Cambridge every day) and extremely interested in helping little guys with cool new ideas make it happen. This chick probably just realized she couldn't hang and needed to find a new way to make it all about her. Fucking twat.

ekjohnson9 • 4 points • 27 August, 2014 10:27 PM

How the fuck does a clown like this even get an internship.

lloopy • 3 points • 28 August, 2014 01:01 AM

You don't post shit about the company that you work for, and expect anything positive to come of it.

She's lucky that she doesn't have any equity, 'cause that would have been gone in a heartbeat. Didn't she sign a massive non disclosure agreement when she was hired? Did she read it?

Ugh. Just ugh.

Swiss_Cheese9797 • 1 point • 28 August, 2014 04:29 AM

Um if I have a problem with my boss, and I sometimes do, I take it up with my fucking boss, not the blogosphere. How much more passive aggressive can you get?