

**There is a stereotype that men are funnier than women. New research (n=5,057) found that, on average, men appear to have higher humor production ability than women. Humor may play a role in mating, with an evolutionary basis. It is correlated with intelligence, which may explain why women value it.**

October 26, 2019 | 816 upvotes | by [Aggressive\\_Beta](#)

---

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/au/blog/humor-sapiens/201910/are-men-really-funnier-women>

---

Archived from [theredarchive.com](http://theredarchive.com)

---

## Comments

---

AutoModerator[M] [score hidden] 26 October, 2019 02:00 PM stickied comment

**Why are we quarantined? The admin don't want you to know.**

**Register on our backup site: <https://www.trp.red> and reserve your reddit name today.**

*I am a bot, and this action was performed automatically. Please contact the moderators of this subreddit if you have any questions or concerns.*

hiroshimatruthbombs • 422 points • 26 October, 2019 03:02 PM

Women don't like risk.

You have to take risk to be funny as it can go wrong.

Men are willing to take the risk of being funny.

Woman are pretty much never funny.

They play it safe.

DTTron2332 • 136 points • 26 October, 2019 04:27 PM\*

I haven't met one women that was actually funny, maybe that's why I've never had friendships with them at all. Their style of humor is usually associated with groupthink.

They also suck at flirting, since that also requires a good amount of risk as well.

SocietyLivesInUs • 59 points • 26 October, 2019 09:20 PM

They also suck at flirting, since that also requires a good amount of risk as well.

I'm 21, and the girls my age are SO goddamn awkward. I kept thinking I was doing something wrong or weirding them out because they'd be perfectly fine and chatty with their girl friends, but couldn't flirt their way out of a paper bag with me.

It's not like they weren't interested, these are women I ended up fucking, but I had to do pretty much all of the heavy lifting, and a less confident me from 6 months or a year ago would've assumed they were into it and bailed.

Marketing\_Baboon • 36 points • 26 October, 2019 11:07 PM

Flirting is a skill, just like anything else. Both men and women at age 21 tend to suck at it. If it takes women longer to learn it's because they can usually just take a passive role and be just fine. Things get a lot better around 26 I've found.

SocietyLivesInUs • 19 points • 27 October, 2019 12:29 AM

The point about taking the passive role is true, but it seems even worse than that. It's like dancing - the man is leading but normally the woman follows his lead and matches his steps, even if one or both is a little clumsy. With these girls it's like they just freeze up and stand still on the dance floor.

Verstappen3363 1 points 27 October, 2019 12:44 AM\* [recovered]

18 here. I reckon it's significantly to do on us, the blokes, and our confidence. I remember back when I was extremely blue pill'd during my days at school, and girls were never awkward around me, they felt comfortable around me, because I was a little bitch, bottom of the ladder in terms of social status. However, after swallowing the pill, it seems like every girl I interact with is one way or another awkward and quiet around me.

You do the slightest thing 'out of line'? They have no idea how to react. You introduce yourself? They can't even make eye contact with you. You can sit there with them in a social gathering, and you will barely hear a whisper out of them.

I too thought the same, I thought it was because I said something wrong, or that I acted too directly. I often felt that I have to lower my guard, and not be so stoic, blunt and quiet, and be more welcoming, just to get them to open up (something I've just very recently realised), which worked quite successfully, but I was getting less respect from them. I suppose it's just a very foreign feeling for me personally to act stoic around others, and it's something I have to get used to.

Social media + a growing mental health problem amongst our generation I also reckon are other significant reasons why this is the case, girls our age are very much used to guys hitting them up in their DM's, and DM's is something every man could do. So when a young bloke comes along and is in fact confident, which is rare, they have no idea how to react, and they start getting nervous. I've also heard several times where girls can't even go to the shop and buy something, because their anxiety goes through the roof because they have to speak to the cashier. This shit ain't uncommon.

To expand - this ain't even limited to girls, this is Generation Z in general. I could count on one hand the amount of people my age who I've met and instantly, off the bat, had a good, mutually respectful conversation without any awkwardness or hesitations in the last 6 months.

SocietyLivesInUs • 14 points • 27 October, 2019 01:02 AM

You make a good point about guys being that way too. Smartphones and social media have massively warped social interactions/interpersonal communication for Gen Z and rendered face to face conversation skills a severe deficiency among most of them.

Everyone is addicted to little consistent dopamine hits from their phone and anything that's more difficult than that gets thrown by the wayside.

WantAdvicePls333 • 2 points • 27 October, 2019 01:53 PM

I too thought the same, I thought it was because I said something wrong, or that I acted too directly. I often felt that I have to lower my guard, and not be so stoic, blunt and quiet, and be more welcoming, just to get them to open up (something I've just very recently realised), which worked quite successfully, but I was getting less respect from them. I suppose it's just a very foreign feeling for me personally to act stoic around others, and it's something I have to get used to.

Social media and smartphones completely destroyed and fucked up the girls of your generation that were raised by them bro. I'm sorry.

\_do\_not\_read\_this\_ • 44 points • 26 October, 2019 07:17 PM

*They also suck at flirting, since that also requires a good amount of risk as well.*

Ain't this the truth!

The other day I was meeting with a woman to talk about business stuff - networking over coffee, we'd

met a few times before at networking events. Maybe a little attraction but I wasn't clear in my head if I wanted to go for it or not so I didn't even flirt with her (might try to bang her next week I finally decided).

At some point near the end of the meeting a meetup comes up and I said something like, "definitely see you at X in two weeks" and just \*barely\* audible she says "okay, maybe I'll see you before then", like literally it took me until I got out the door to replay what she mumbled at me.

helenvgladys • 12 points • 27 October, 2019 12:04 AM\*

Nah I've known plenty of women who were genuinely funny. True to stereotype, it's usually directly proportional to how mentally and emotionally fucked up they are. Men and women definitely have different styles of humor though, which I think is what's really being talked about in the "are women as funny as men?" debate. Most men can do female humor, but very few women can pull off male humor. That's why female comics are so godawful, because standup is based around a very masculine style of humor.

PaganButterChurner • 17 points • 26 October, 2019 08:51 PM

Their game is being a "good girl". Someone of them are quite good at it

Locko\_O • 0 points • 27 October, 2019 06:57 AM

Well they are told to be feminin and cute early on and not to make a hassle

throwlaca • 3 points • 27 October, 2019 07:04 PM

I haven't met one women that was actually funny

I've met several. They are funny, specially while flirting. They are savage roasting men and they own friends.

They are never funny in public tough.

RealMcGonzo • 47 points • 26 October, 2019 04:36 PM

Being funny helps you get laid if you are male. Doesn't help if you are female.

khutulun8 • 2 points • 26 October, 2019 11:10 PM

Uh no lol to be funny you do not have to embarrass or ridicule yourself to make people laugh. I am a female and one thing that all my exes kept telling was that I am hilarious. My taste in humor is a bit British. I like irony, satire, and sarcasm. I do puns and they love it. So, there are funny women who attract men with their humor too.

B\_ILL • -11 points • 26 October, 2019 05:29 PM

I would say it actually hurts them as some guys might feel inferior.

Jejmaze • 32 points • 26 October, 2019 06:43 PM

I have a hard time seeing this being the case. Who would turn down a woman for being funny? If anything that will make me more interested.

themackattack90 • 11 points • 26 October, 2019 08:37 PM

You're correct. It's sort of like a college degree. Women who have a sense of humor (or college degree) believe that men who aren't interested in them aren't interested because they're threatened.

In reality, she just can't fathom that she isn't worth the trouble.

TheGreatConst • 2 points • 27 October, 2019 05:26 PM

In reality she just can't fathom that most men aren't attracted to 200lbs women.

LazerSpin • 1 point • 27 October, 2019 11:08 AM

Plenty of insecure guys out there who find confident or competent women a turnoff or “manly”.

DeChef2 • 5 points • 26 October, 2019 06:53 PM

They don't want to be with a guy like that in the first place, so it would actually help them.

a7000-a • 19 points • 26 October, 2019 08:35 PM

Men are funny because we need to be.

We take risks because we need to be.

The alternative is oblivion.

\_do\_not\_read\_this\_ • 105 points • 26 October, 2019 03:10 PM

I'm seeing a woman that makes me laugh, even in her texts. She's my Saturday night gal.

Another one just sits and looks at me like a puppy, "what's next? what's next? what's next?" She's my Tuesday afternoon gal. See how that works for them?

mountainbiker178 • 29 points • 26 October, 2019 08:52 PM

See how that works for them?

Yep. They both get fucked regardless of their ability to make you laugh. They would both carry your seed if you were prehistoric. More to the point of this article, I assume you're a funny confident guy. You get girls on any day of the week. See how that works for you?

swampbastard69 • 55 points • 26 October, 2019 05:07 PM

I have never met a funny girl (im 37), some girls have a good 'sense of humor' but they aren't funny themselves.

\_do\_not\_read\_this\_ • 11 points • 26 October, 2019 07:19 PM

The ones that make me laugh are the ones I've kept around for a while.

RedPillFusion • 19 points • 26 October, 2019 06:11 PM\*

I've met *maybe* 4 or 5 legitimately funny women. Similar to you I'm 36 years old. That should speak volumes to the younger dudes.

Greaterbird • 9 points • 27 October, 2019 10:00 AM

Women's jokes tend to boil down to "i'm a woman! I have a vagina! Aren't periods gross!"

nine-acorn • 3 points • 29 October, 2019 03:59 PM

Men use humor to both get laid, and disarm big angry brutes that want to bash their head in. So it's probably most a genetic thing.

That said, there are some funny women out there, just like there are 7+ feet tall women out there.

Not usually stand-up sadly as that encourages some kind of "you go girl" "vagina" humor for some odd reason.

When I was at university studying abroad in Australia, there was this older grizzled Australian woman professor/ former police detective teaching a criminology class.

Sadly I forget most of her jokes in the large class but she was fucking hysterical. Obviously seeing the worst dredges of society probably helped somehow.

I just remember asking her where the midterms were and she said "What funny fucking accent is that from?" which just seemed hilarious given ... well .. Australia ...

EliteAlmondMilk • 10 points • 26 October, 2019 05:48 PM

I almost never find women funny, but Nikki Glaser's pretty funny, because she's the rare one that like you said is willing to take the risk of not being funny, just puts it all out there I recommend her JRE

speardane • 9 points • 26 October, 2019 06:16 PM

That woman is hysterically funny.

Sad\_Sleeper • 4 points • 28 October, 2019 10:01 AM

Lmfao, at 1h50min, the hamster is spinning at full speed hahaha

ramaga • 3 points • 28 October, 2019 03:23 PM

Regarding Nikki's podcast appearances on JRE and elsewhere, I alternate between finding her funny and finding her insufferably annoying. I feel the same way about Whitney Cummings.

As far as Nikki's comedy specials are concerned, I think they're steaming piles of dog doo. I've never been able to finish one.

nine-acorn • 3 points • 29 October, 2019 04:03 PM

Her last special wasn't the greatest because it was just "IM SEXUALLL" shock humor but her comedy roasts are funny.

I even heard some of her "cut" jokes about Caitlyn Jenner that seemed funny.

"Keeping up with the Car Crashians."

"I can't believe what a beautiful, inspiring woman it was you killed with your car" (something like that).

SKRedPill • 2 points • 27 October, 2019 03:56 AM

It's not about risk. This one is inherent talent. Women are just not naturals at this art form.

PS : They are however unparalleled at the art of getting offended by what someone on the other side of the planet posts on their twitter.

SirKolbath • 227 points • 26 October, 2019 03:17 PM

I have one word for you: Amy Schumer. Women think that the key to being funny is to be vulgar. The intricacies of wordplay, timing, tone, and even simply reading a crowd are beyond them.

When I did stand up I absolutely *hated* going after a woman on live mic nights. They'd kill the crowd and it was literally the only time I went on stage and felt it was downright *hostile*.

Wingflier • 95 points • 26 October, 2019 03:22 PM

You should have used that as part of your routine. "Women aren't funny huh?"

SirKolbath • 76 points • 26 October, 2019 03:23 PM

Right after "And what's the deal with airline food?"

bowsenira 1 points 26 October, 2019 05:32 PM **[recovered]**

I Like To LauGH AnD EnJOY TrAveLinG

muricanwerewolf1 • 45 points • 26 October, 2019 04:20 PM

"And anyway, that's the second time I was raped. Oh, there's the light. Alright thanks everyone have a good night!"

SirKolbath • 12 points • 26 October, 2019 04:32 PM

Pretty much everything she says, really.

Psycholephant • 6 points • 27 October, 2019 06:33 AM

Dear god, Steve-Os reaction of pain after that extremely cringe joke. I was glad I had erased that from my memory until now.

throwlaca • 3 points • 27 October, 2019 07:10 PM

Holy shit, had to stop the video right there. That was not funny. Goes to show you how women's mind work. They can make fun of the death of a friend because it's not a big deal to them. In the same way we can make rape jokes.

nine-acorn • 0 points • 29 October, 2019 04:12 PM

Meh. You're not allowed to be offended at anything on a Roast. It's all on the table.

She might suck, but Steve-O was a baby back bitch lol. The point of Roasts is to literally be as offensive as possible.

Psycholephant • 3 points • 29 October, 2019 04:24 PM

No, the point of a roast is to banter. Banter is supposed to actually be funny. A roast is not me making fun of someone losing their best friend. How socially inept do you have to be to make a statement like that?

nine-acorn • 1 point • 29 October, 2019 04:29 PM

You're a fucking idiot lol. Pete Davidson was making 9/11 jokes about his own dad dying.

It's not banter there -- it's literally to be as offensive as possible. Don Rickles style. BUT it should also be funny, yes, but you can call someone out for being unfunny, not offensive.

You not understanding it doesn't mean shit lol. You're probably an SJW.

Maybe Steve-O was as dumb as you for what he signed up for, but I doubt it.

She didn't even make fun of his friend. She just say "we wish it coulda been you instead too." -- which is kinda funny.

Yeah you're wrong.

Psycholephant • 2 points • 29 October, 2019 04:37 PM\*

Hmm defending Amy Shumer and using Pete Davidson as an example? You sure you're not the SJW? And the difference with Davidson is that he's making fun of his own pain. It's at his own expense. You must be one of those knuckle draggers who thinks the gold standard of comedy is being tactlessly offensive. No wonder you're defending Schumer. That joke was still super unfunny. I wish you had died instead? Hilarious... No reason to waste my time any further with you. Especially with such ad hom arguments.

nine-acorn • 1 point • 29 October, 2019 05:52 PM

Actually someone else made fun of his dad. Idiot

fannyfire • 23 points • 26 October, 2019 10:57 PM

For some reason, women like to think that saying vulgar jokes about their vagina and how they love to suck cock somehow will make them one of the boys. I remember a show I went to last year with my wife. The only female comedian out of five comedians train wrecked the entire show. She talked to us about how her family was nudist. She ended up disgusting and alienating the entire audience by telling us how she would lay around the house with her parents nude.

majaka1234 • 14 points • 27 October, 2019 07:56 AM

Women have this weird idea of locker room talk developed only through reading op-eds by sour feminists.

It's like if you asked a guy who had never fucked a girl to invent what a vagina looked like.

\_do\_not\_read\_this\_ • 72 points • 26 October, 2019 02:26 PM

A woman's ability to make me laugh can make up for lots of other faults.

damnyoutall • 3 points • 26 October, 2019 03:44 PM

Why? You can't fuck funny.

nine-acorn • 7 points • 29 October, 2019 04:14 PM

A truly funny woman (and I've met a good number, though some unfuckable) is a gem.

It's like a woman who is a plastic surgeon or extremely rich (have also met these).

Do these alone make them attractive and fuckable? Of course not. A male is very visually-oriented with attraction.

However it's a great fucking bonus.

Ledoborec • 0 points • 29 October, 2019 03:02 PM

Lets Admit She makes you laugh ONLY with her stupidity, does it count?

Giant-\_-Otter • 62 points • 26 October, 2019 03:43 PM

Read Hitchens' article "Why women aren't funny? ". Must be still online. That's all you need to know. Matter of fact, read everything from him.

Tezcatlipoca1993 • 25 points • 26 October, 2019 04:58 PM

Agreed. Hitchens is a gift to humanity. A lot of his writing can be useful for people here.



nine-acorn • 2 points • 29 October, 2019 04:15 PM

Hitchens was smart but also pompous and a bitter old fatass.

Don't take advice from someone who has lost all zest for life, unless you want to be a miserable old bitter fatass like him.

I agree with him on atheism and some other topics but he was still pompous and annoying as fuck.

Also, Hitchens wasn't funny. So why would I accept a treatise on funny from him.

if\_i\_could\_trade 1 points 30 October, 2019 05:28 PM\* **[recovered]**

I think you just don't get dry humour to be honest, Hitchens was as funny as they come

nine-acorn • 2 points • 30 October, 2019 06:26 PM

I like a lot of British comedy.

Hmm well is there any particular footage of him you find funny? Maybe I missed the good parts.

He seemed mostly like a cocky militant atheist.

Of which I am similar so that must mean he's exceedingly unfunny, but to each their own.

SteveStJohn • 4 points • 27 October, 2019 11:57 AM

There is also a video done by Vanity Fair where he explains it.

Even better (not related to humor) is him on a panel with 4 women talking about Lorena Bobbit. He has these feminists eating out of his hand in minutes. Even when one of them shit tests him with her incredulity over his comments he pulls them all into his frame.

He was a true master.

nine-acorn • 3 points • 29 October, 2019 04:22 PM

He wasn't funny himself.

Also, I kind of see his explanation, but I kind of don't.

You honestly think the primary reason men are funny is to impress/ fuck women?

I mean, it sounds right at the onset, but on closer look, it doesn't hold up.

Most of the funniest riffs you've experienced (outside professional comedy clubs) is you and your boys sitting around the poker table. Or as kids before you were obsessed with women. Etc etc. It wasn't to "get ass" and if it were primarily for that, it would be more obvious.

It's partly to pass the time, and I think it's partly a "disarming" technique to promote comradery, diffuse violence and conflict, etc. Probably has more to do with violence and tribal unity/ warfare than fucking women if I'm being honest.

SteveStJohn • 2 points • 2 November, 2019 05:55 PM

If humor were about tribal unity more than getting laid, women would be better at it than men. They aren't.

HighTesticles • 1 point • 28 October, 2019 08:50 PM

Tried Google but no luck

RightHandWolf • 21 points • 27 October, 2019 01:45 AM

I've met a few girls in my day-to-day existence that not only had a good sense of humor, but could come up with some pretty good jokes on their own. Puns and other word play, risque comments that sounded like normal conversation *unless* you had heard the whole context, stuff like that. Most of them had above average intelligence, and also had some degree of class and manners out in public. There are still a few left, but not many.

By and large, though, I see two big problems for the younger girls these days in terms of "being funny."

1) The feminism movement is poisoning itself because there really aren't that many boundaries to bust through in a man's world anymore. Women are in the military, in law enforcement, the UFC, and the firehouse. They can vote, own property, start businesses, and put up with all the regulatory and financial headaches involved with doing so. The problem is that any movement that achieves it's stated goals suddenly fades into irrelevance, and that means an end to the grievance industry. The party's over, but nobody wants to be the first to leave and call it a night. In order to stay relevant, new causes have to be created and championed, which brings us to reason number two.

2) This social media insanity is a godsend for the marginalized masses with axes to grind. Anybody can claim to be offended, outraged or just less than perfectly pleased with anything from a police shooting in New York to getting a Whopper with cheese that didn't have enough lettuce and they have a platform to bitch about it. It's all outrage, all the time, and these special snowflakes take themselves far too seriously to even attempt to develop a sense of humor.

Some of them might grow out of it eventually. Around 25 or 26 is when most people start getting a handle on the world really works, as opposed to what they might have been told in their college classes. All the difference between being book smart and street smart.

SKRedPill • 5 points • 27 October, 2019 07:06 AM

Much of that is cultivated specifically to keep up with the boys - of course, any skill can be cultivated and mastered, but we're talking about default behaviors. Boys just do it like they take to cars and gadgets.

Very few girls I know are joke experts. They're usually gigglers. Boys just take to roasting each other like fish take to water.

TheGreatConst • 2 points • 27 October, 2019 06:54 PM

IDK, I know very few guys who are joke experts either. In fact, if I try to view it from an outsider's perspective then I'm probably the funniest guy out of anyone I know. Most other guys can't really joke, rather they only can shit test each other in a funny way. Like talking shit about each other without really meaning that. I can't imagine most women being able to even endure this sort of "rough" humor when you are so harsh to each other what you look more like mortal enemies than the best friends, lol.

PickUpScientist • 32 points • 26 October, 2019 06:27 PM

i used to make jokes all the time to crickets. great jokes too, imo. then i put on 15 pounds of muscle, started grooming myself properly, forcing myself to speak from my diaphragm. now i get laughs regularly, whether i am telling a joke or not.

Hviterev • 4 points • 27 October, 2019 07:59 AM

Can you develop about talking from your diaphragm?

PickUpScientist • 27 points • 27 October, 2019 09:34 AM

plug your nose and talk. if your voice changes to nasally, you ain't doing it.

Hviterev • 14 points • 27 October, 2019 12:31 PM

9/10 explanation, clear and concise, would ask details again. □

vullnet123 • 14 points • 26 October, 2019 06:47 PM

I dont ever see women making jokes. I'll laugh if they do/say something stupid, but thats really it. Theres a reason all the good comedians are male.

Siddicky • 13 points • 27 October, 2019 12:34 AM

Christopher Hitchens made a video on the subject

Women don't have a need to be funny, as men will chase them regardless, while men who are not physically attractive depend on humour to attract a mate.

SKRedPill • 10 points • 27 October, 2019 03:47 AM\*

Statistics uses vague words like 'may appear' to be 'not insignificant'. You might get the impression that men are on average 0.5% funnier or something.

Let me give you real life - in virtually all the groups and gatherings I've been in, only the men ever crack the jokes and the funniest stories. Women are at best mildly funny when they try to tease the guys (and even that is basically done in a shit test way), otherwise when men are totally the more amusing sex. I mean look at some of the tools in our kitty.

Parody Humor

Dark Humor

Dirty Trash talk humor - only men can endearingly insult each other in such politically incorrect ways

Real life humor - I mean the funniest stuff happens only in real life.

Teasing humor (especially negging guys and the girls)

The Pranks

Pulling each other's legs

Every type of joke in the book - especially the long story with a twist ending

Humor is a powerful kind of frame control - when you can make a parody of life and spin it into something funny, you are that guy who can deal with the hard times good.

The best part is that it comes naturally to us. Women would have to really work hard for it - what they do very naturally however is giggle and lols or rofls at the men's jokes, or even when the hot guy does nothing more than just look in their direction.

Any woman who's the exception would definitely have had to train herself to master a skill that is not her first language. It can be trained, but we're looking at first tendencies, and in the absence of any kind of social conditioning, boys just learn humor and mutual roasting like a fish takes to water. I know women who simply don't get jokes, cause they end up taking it way too personally (insert any outraged social media woman here).

Truedemocracy5 • 1 point • 27 October, 2019 05:25 PM

Vast majority of women don't understand banter. Similarly, most men don't understand the subtleties that women engage in

SKRedPill • 1 point • 29 October, 2019 03:24 PM

Women's communication is all about everything at least 1 layer deeper than what they actually talk. They

are incredibly critical of each other's behavior and motivations. Women study the person behind the words more than the actual content of the words. This can lead to a few complications when women try to get in the way of a conversation between two men, they forget that things are simpler and more direct. So the term I have for this is "At least 1 level deeper".

ntvirtue • 16 points • 26 October, 2019 04:38 PM

This is from Psychology today.....a publications completely DOMINATED by feminists and betas. Don't think that's relevant? Who gets more pussy Stand up comedians or rock stars?

redditpuff • 11 points • 26 October, 2019 04:51 PM

Who gets more pussy, rock stars or NBA basketball player Serge Ibaka?... Haven't you heard of the recent scandals of like 20 famous comedians?... They aren't lacking in pussy.

SirKolbath • 8 points • 26 October, 2019 06:53 PM

Haven't you heard of the **recent scandals** of like 20 famous comedians?... They aren't lacking in pussy.

Think about what you said. Not only are comedians *not* getting laid as often as sport and rock stars, but after the fact they are getting accused of deviancy and sexual assault.

redditpuff • 5 points • 26 October, 2019 07:43 PM

That's because of the #metoo movement.. And those that held frame did better than those that went on an apology tour, canceled shows and put their life on halt...

SirKolbath • 2 points • 26 October, 2019 07:56 PM

It's *all* because of the pound metoo movement. And while I agree with you about holding frame and telling them to fuck off, I can only think of one pro athlete to have a sex scandal in the last ten years (Anthony Brown? That fucktard receiver the Patriots picked up and cut after his trainer suddenly decided after five years that he'd forced himself on her. I don't watch pro sports, but even that made it through my radar.)

Roethlisberger had *some* kind of an accusation a few years ago, but it was right when I realized that the NFL in general is a bunch of overpaid shitstains playing a recess game to distract the mindless plebes from their lives and quit watching. (I miss coaching, though.)

Unless a rock star actually Chris Browns a girl, nobody seems to accuse them of sexual assault (and the last word I read on that, he actually hit Rhianna after she punched him in the groin while he was driving. Hell, I don't believe either side on that, but given how violent women are, I tend to come down for him.)

throwlaca • 1 point • 27 October, 2019 07:18 PM

nobody seems to accuse them of sexual assault

There are several rock stars in my country being accused of sexual assault and more than one in jail for it.

WantAdvicePls333 • -1 points • 27 October, 2019 02:19 PM

Roethlisberger had some kind of an accusation a few years ago, but it was right when I realized that the NFL in general is a bunch of overpaid shitstains playing a recess game to

distract the mindless plebes from their lives and quit watching. (I miss coaching, though.)

All pro sports are as rigged and scripted as WWE. Ex NBA ref Tim Donaghy wrote a book about it and the media smeared him in to oblivion to prevent people from looking in to what he had to say. Panem et circenses.

SirKolbath • 2 points • 27 October, 2019 04:30 PM

I coached football for 17 years. There are way too many variables to script something as complex as a football game. Plus, you're telling me that 44 players, 35 coaching staff, 150 support staff, 52 owners and co-owners, and hundreds of other individuals can be counted on to keep a secret like "we script the games and it's all fake"? Not bloody likely. A friggin football was underinflated by less than half a pound and congress, actual fucking congress, got involved.

Pro sports are a lot of things, but faked they are not. I just can't for the life of me understand why adults are willing to spend so much time and money and literally obsess year round over a bunch of assholes playing a recess game. It's one thing when you are a *part* of the team. I loved coaching high school football and I miss it every day. I worked year round to give those kids the best sixteen weeks I possibly could. But if you're arranging your week around sitting in front of a TV for six hours on Sunday watching someone you don't know throw a ball to someone else you don't know for the sake of some imaginary points and a possible title that no one is going to give a shit about eighteen months later, you have some significant issues to resolve in your personality.

WantAdvicePls333 • 0 points • 28 October, 2019 04:36 PM\*

I coached football for 17 years. There are way too many variables to script something as complex as a football game. Plus, you're telling me that 44 players, 35 coaching staff, 150 support staff, 52 owners and co-owners, and hundreds of other individuals can be counted on to keep a secret like "we script the games and it's all fake"? Not bloody likely. A friggin football was underinflated by less than half a pound and congress, actual fucking congress, got involved.

LOL.

Offensive coordinators and defensive coordinators and coaches are all micced up and talking to each other all the time. Commentators are fed lines. The world class athletes practice plays over and over until they can run them to near perfection.

Games are scripted that's why scores are always so close to the Vegas odds. Just look at that ridiculous Atlanta vs New England superbowl a few years ago, how can you say it's not rigged?

You're brainwashed by the bread and circus of professional sportsball and nothing can help you. Ignorance is bliss. I prefer playing sports myself rather than living vicariously through other grown men on TV.

Plus, you're telling me that 44 players, 35 coaching staff, 150 support staff, 52 owners and co-owners, and hundreds of other individuals can be counted on to keep a secret like "we script the games and it's all fake"? Not bloody likely. A friggin football was underinflated by less than half a pound and congress, actual fucking congress, got involved.

This is brainlet tier logic. Every single Hollywood movie is kept secret exactly as you describe, sometimes by thousands of people. What is the motive? MILLIONS AND MILLIONS OF DOLLARS.

For the record, players aren't really in on it, though some know it's fake. It's compartmentalized. Players just run the plays their coaches tell them to run. They spend all season long practicing these plays over and over so they can run them to perfection when the coaches and producers tell them to. It's just like how the Undertaker practiced tombstoning people over and over again so he could do it safely when he had to do it live in PPVs.

Pro sports are a lot of things, but faked they are not. I just can't for the life of me understand why adults are willing to spend so much time and money and literally obsess year round over a bunch of assholes playing a recess game. It's one thing when you are a part of the team.

I loved coaching high school football and I miss it every day. I worked year round to give those kids the best sixteen weeks I possibly could.

Good for you. That emotion based argument has nothing to do with anything.

But if you're arranging your week around sitting in front of a TV for six hours on Sunday watching someone you don't know throw a ball to someone else you don't know for the sake of some imaginary points and a possible title that no one is going to give a shit about eighteen months later, you have some significant issues to resolve in your personality.

I agree. Professional Sportsball is a bread and circus designed to distract us-exactly like the Gladiator games. Panem et Circenses is one of the oldest tricks in the playbook.

Pro sports are a lot of things and one of those things is fake and rigged. Ask Tim Donaghy. Do you think he made it all up?

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tim\\_Donaghy](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tim_Donaghy)

You're a grown ass man. How did you ever get so naive?

SirKolbath • 2 points • 28 October, 2019 04:44 PM

I know you wrote a lot in supposed support of your conspiracy theory bullshit, but I want to make it clear that not only did I not bother to read even a word of it, but I'm blocking you because you are, in fact, a raving nutjob.

Shut the fuck up.

WantAdvicePls333 • 1 point • 28 October, 2019 04:45 PM

I know you wrote a lot in supposed support of your conspiracy theory bullshit, but I want to make it clear that not only did I not bother to read even a word of it, but I'm blocking you because you are, in fact, a raving nutjob.

Ignorance is bliss.

Shut the fuck up.

The meltdown is real. This is what cognitive dissonance looks like.

if\_i\_could\_trade 1 points 30 October, 2019 05:38 PM\* [recovered]

Games are scripted that's why scores are always so close to the Vegas odds

Scores are close to bookmaker odds *because the bookmakers have elite mathematicians giving them extremely precise stats on what the scores are likely to be, given the teams' skill*

WantAdvicePls333 • 1 point • 4 November, 2019 11:21 PM

Scores are close to bookmaker odds because the bookmakers have elite mathematicians giving them extremely precise stats on what the scores are likely to be, given the teams' skill

You are a true sucker if you actually believe that.

TheDopestPope • 1 point • 4 November, 2019 09:16 PM

For someone so adept at talking out of your ass it's kind of funny that you could only come up with one piece of evidence, which is one guy saying that the NBA is rigged, not the NFL. You're just wrong dude

WantAdvicePls333 • 1 point • 4 November, 2019 11:14 PM

For someone so adept at talking out of your ass it's kind of funny that you could only come up with one piece of evidence, which is one guy saying that the NBA is rigged, not the NFL. You're just wrong dude

You sure are brainwashed by bread and circus distractions. To each their own, ignorance is bliss ;)

Jejmaze • 4 points • 26 October, 2019 06:51 PM

It's almost like having a pair of balls and being funny makes a man attractive

SteveStJohn • 2 points • 27 October, 2019 11:59 AM

I've known some comedy groupies, you know, chuckle fuckers.

NabroleonBonaparte • 26 points • 26 October, 2019 04:03 PM

Could you imagine a *Rachel* Dangerfield?

*Let me tell you folks, I get no respect, none at all...  
because of the Patriarchy*

IRunYourRiver • 1 point • 26 October, 2019 06:08 PM

Red Pill gold comment.

muff\_marauder • 25 points • 26 October, 2019 04:28 PM

"Humor production ability"



Jesus Christ...

SpankKing\_ • 12 points • 26 October, 2019 09:26 PM

Yea the guy who writes like that gets his cock sucked on the regular for sure

gastrocks • 13 points • 26 October, 2019 11:17 PM

Women think sarcasm is funny. Sorry ladies, when you put 'sarcasm is my second language' in your online profile it is an automatic hard pass for me. Sarcasm is always at someone else's expense and just makes you sound bitter and insecure.

WantAdvicePls333 • 5 points • 27 October, 2019 02:22 PM

Women think sarcasm is funny. Sorry ladies, when you put 'sarcasm is my second language' in your online profile it is an automatic hard pass for me. Sarcasm is always at someone else's expense and just makes you sound bitter and insecure.

sarcasm is just passive aggression. Fat bitches usually like being "the sarcastic humorous one" because it's an excuse for them to be passive aggressive cunts to everyone around them while using the excuse of "it's just jokes tee hee"

gastrocks • 1 point • 27 October, 2019 03:30 PM

yeah...it usually is the big-boned girls that are the specialists.

Anusunset • 17 points • 26 October, 2019 03:25 PM

Man, I've started a shit show on that thread. Find me at the bottom downvoted for stating the obvious.

Sperm\_Bank\_Keg\_Stand 1 points 26 October, 2019 08:14 PM **[recovered]**

They removed all the comments that said something remotely negative about women.

Anusunset • 6 points • 26 October, 2019 11:56 PM

Yea. It's a shame. Imagine being that much of a snowflake.

majaka1234 • 4 points • 27 October, 2019 07:57 AM

They couldn't even just say "women weren't funny", they had to couch it in a passive soft "humor deficient" double speak to avoid ruffling feathers... As if you could pop some vitamins and get funnier or something.

PaganButterChurner • 2 points • 26 October, 2019 08:52 PM

You got a screen shot or can you copy paste here?

Anusunset • 1 point • 26 October, 2019 11:56 PM

I probably should of. I knew it was coming. Maybe next time but wow did everyone downvote me.

PizzaAndProtein • 1 point • 26 October, 2019 03:36 PM

Permalink?

TheRedPike • 1 point • 29 October, 2019 01:39 PM

Be sure to put it through an archiver.



tenpointmatt • 10 points • 26 October, 2019 07:38 PM\*

sometimes you really dont need a study for shit like this.

the gold standard of hypothesis testing is replication. and whats so powerful about red pill communities and field reports is the statistical significance compounds with repeated, small replications.

specifically, because each individual anecdote is very statistically weak on its own, some people will (rightly) dismiss it when presented in isolation. but what the rabidly anti-TRP bluetards neglect (when they demand 'cItAtiOnS!'), is that every anecdote is a replication study with an n of 1. and when millions of those weak replications compound (with virtually no counter-evidence presented to the contrary) the statistical significance compounds to an insane factor. (side note of interest: this concept forms the basis of incredibly powerful methods of machine learning that incorporate ensemble modeling with many 'weak learners' instead of a model that produces a single estimate.)

although not a rigorously conducted human study with IRB approval, this method of 'real world science' is actually much, much more powerful, statistically. especially since the researcher 'activism bias' of far left social science departments has been circumvented.

Jimmy2e • 10 points • 26 October, 2019 09:09 PM\*

I understand what you're saying, but most people probably probably won't. Too long winded.

Essentially what you're saying is that when someone makes an observation it's statistically insignificant. But when there are several singular observations all of which find the same thing they become significant as a result. You then assert the multitude of individualized findings as a cohort are legitimate given biases in the social sciences profession.

I don't disagree, but it was hard to tease out what you were going after.

tenpointmatt • 4 points • 26 October, 2019 09:10 PM

TL;DR: red pill replicates. replication good.

shrimpeye • 1 point • 27 October, 2019 10:00 AM

This is what I grasped from his comment, but I fully agree.

if\_i\_could\_trade 1 points 30 October, 2019 06:02 PM\* **[recovered]**

This is a *really* bad argument and I'm astounded it's getting upvotes.

So firstly, **we're in a community that self-selects for evidence that agrees with the sub's core tenets.**

People who agree are more likely to come here, remain here, not get banned, comment, etc.

Accordingly, you're not seeing thousands of *randomly sampled* anecdotes that collectively show a TRP bias. You're seeing thousands of anecdotes *that likely made their way here because they contain TRP bias*, and then obviously determining a TRP bias here.

You may as well head to TwoXChromosomes and see the thousands of stories there about how they're attracted to guys who are nice, and deduce that there is statistical significance in that. Well, no, because anecdotes that *don't* say that are less likely to be posted on that sub or upvoted there.

I don't know on what basis you could possibly assess that ALL anecdotes across ALL communities favor TRP - you would obviously need to show data on that because that's an insanely far reaching claim, if you want to go there.

Second, **statistical significance does not rise out of many weak examples.**

Let's say that you find 1,000,000 anecdotes from women online saying that they're attracted to guys who are

kind and willing to wait for sex. You could *absolutely* find those with enough effort, they're in virtually every female-centric community, magazine, etc.. Is that good evidence?

*Not necessarily, right?*

Because *the same kinds of bias* can apply to the vast majority of those anecdotes. Bias doesn't magically cancel out once you get enough samples - you have to CONTROL the samples in the first place to remove it.

Maybe they're just saying things for validation, maybe they're incorrect about what actually attracts them, maybe they only want this behaviour from already-attractive guys, maybe they only post it if they think people will approve (and they don't post "I like assholes"), maybe they DO post other stuff and it doesn't get attention... *maybe all your samples are shit.*

This is why you need scientific studies. Because anecdotal evidence *doesn't* magically become good when you collect enough of it. You need to collect it in a systematically proper fashion.

Again, I'm *astonished* anyone bought your bullshit. This would be laughed out of any scientific community.

tenpointmatt • 1 point • 30 October, 2019 08:04 PM

no offense, but you sound like a fuckin grad school nerd.

first off, when you talk about sampling bias, you misunderstand my main point - im talking about a fat tony, real world heuristic. one thats based on behavioral evidence, not on self-reporting. (thats the reason why you can disregard - for example - twoX posters, because their words do not reflect their actual behavior.)

in reference to anecdotal evidence collection, i also specifically mention "virtually no counter-evidence presented to the contrary", but you chose to neglect that part. and yeah, im not an idiot, i understand sampling bias - but when you start talking about huge numbers across disparate cultures, involving BEHAVIORAL evidence from people in all walks of life (and not just from red pill people - im talking about blue pillers too... 'why did my wife leave me? i did all the dishes!') you've got a working heuristic you can bet your life on. maybe if i call it 'heuristic significance' instead of 'statistical significance', you'd be happy? i really DGAF - the same result follows, based on the accumulation of individual weak replication.

i also gotta directly address this moronic claim:

This is why you need scientific studies.

conduct all the 'unbiased' (LOL) research you want, i'll run fuckin circles around you in the end with my FT rule of thumb. whats the social science replication rate these days? 15%? i get the need for testable science, but when doing so requires an IRB approval, is primarily conducted on cohorts of 20 year olds, and carried out by far left researchers, and then passed through a filter of peer review which compounds the left wing bias of what is published versus rejected, its a hard nope. ill stick with real world heuristics any day, and crush the fuck out of you with them.

and for the record, scientists laugh a lot of shit out of their community. but those same people will keep a straight face as they ramble on about infinite genders, so...

if\_i\_could\_trade 1 points 30 October, 2019 08:19 PM\* [recovered]

im talking about a fat tony, real world heuristic. one thats based on behavioral evidence, not on self-reporting

Alright, and who says the behavioural evidence backs your model of the world?

Let's say somebody comes along and tells you — *"I see LOTS of anecdotes about women being glad*

*they finally left their asshole boyfriend and now they're with someone much nicer, and they're happier. All the behavioural evidence suggests that TRP dark triad stuff is wrong, with virtually no counter-evidence."*

What makes **your** assessment of which way the vast majority of evidence points better than theirs?

After all, **you** are certainly subject to your own internal biases, and you are working with a different data set to them. It's not like both of you have seen exactly the same anecdotes across cultures and interpreted them in the exact same way — so what makes your interpretation of the evidence better?

It can't be that you consider it a *working heuristic*, because other people have contrary beliefs to yours that they think work too.

So what is it?

i get the need for testable science, but when doing so requires an IRB approval, is primarily conducted on cohorts of 20 year olds, and carried out by far left researchers, and then passed through a filter of peer review which compounds the left wing bias of what is published versus rejected, its a hard nope. ill stick with real world heuristics any day, and crush the fuck out of you with them.

The same incredibly biased system *that has published a study showing men are funnier than women, literally linked as the start of this thread?*

You're just spouting nonsense mate. You're dressing up use of anecdotal evidence as some glorified counter-establishment scientific approach, now as "heuristic significance", but it's really just the same way *anybody* without training forms their beliefs - they look at the world, with their own biases and with an imperfect data set, come to some beliefs, and then *by definition they think those tenets are the most prevalent in the evidence because that's how they got those tenets in the first place*. That doesn't mean they actually went through a correct process in the first place to get there.

You're more than welcome to reject science, that's fine. I actually agree with lots of the comments on the social sciences being imperfect.

But don't give people this shit about your anecdotal evidence actually gaining statistical significance through its replicability and yadda yadda. That's horseshit.

tenpointmatt • 1 point • 30 October, 2019 09:22 PM

Im not even going to read your fucking scientism drivel. Get fucked, you fuckin IYI.

if\_i\_could\_trade 1 points 30 October, 2019 09:26 PM\* [recovered]

If you hate science so much that's fine, just don't disguise your bullshit as it and claim it's statistically significant, a hallmark of science. We should both be able to agree on that, yeah?

tenpointmatt • 1 point • 30 October, 2019 09:44 PM

i AM a genetics phd holding scientist. you fucking moron. im AGAINST bullshitters (ie YOU) and scient-ism. which I see everyday amongst many of my phd holding colleagues. piss off.

if\_i\_could\_trade 1 points 30 October, 2019 09:50 PM\* [recovered]

You're against people pointing out that *you don't get to group a whole lot of personally-perceived anecdotal evidence together and call it statistically significant?*

Nah mate that's bullshit regardless of who says it, and you *know* that.

tenpointmatt • 1 point • 30 October, 2019 10:56 PM

you are that special combination of breathtakingly stupid and unbelievably arrogant. somehow you've have managed to fuck up/misinterpret everything i've said.

you're the kind of idiot who conducts 14 different tests and only publishes the one with  $p=0.048$ . the kind of fuckup who does a t test on non-normal data, or reports a pearson correlation with a n of 9. you refuse to accept anything other than 'pEeR rEviEwEd sCienCe' even as your face is getting ripped off in real time by someone like me, who is happy to operate with heuristics when in domains where traditional science is not effective. you strike me as the kind of jerkoff who retweets nate silver.

fuckin IYIs man, you're all the same.

if\_i\_could\_trade 1 points 30 October, 2019 11:07 PM\* [recovered]

I didn't fuck up what you said at all. Here's you:

specifically, because each individual anecdote is very statistically weak on its own, some people will (rightly) dismiss it when presented in isolation. but what the rabidly anti-TRP bluetards neglect (when they demand 'cItAtiOnS!'), **is that every anecdote is a replication study with an n of 1. and when millions of those weak replications compound (with virtually no counter-evidence presented to the contrary) the statistical significance compounds to an insane factor.**

And here's my characterisation of you just now:

**you don't get to group a whole lot of personally-perceived anecdotal evidence together and call it statistically significant**

That's exactly what you were doing. Considering a lot of anecdotal evidence (you even use the word 'anecdote' multiple times) and claim the statistical significance compounds. And it's *bullshit*.

All you've got is shitty insults — and this weird obsession with ripping my face off / crushing me / keyboard warrior shit — because you can't handle the idea that *someone is calling your idea fucking garbage and is simultaneously doing just fine in life*.

Nobody has said anything about heuristics not being useful. Nobody has said anything about traditional science always been effective (I even *agreed* with some of your comments about its imperfections).

All I've done is rightly call you out on claiming anecdotal evidence can become statistically significant because you personally 'see' it being replicated.

Why don't you write another comment back talking about how you could **CRUSH MY BONES!!1** or **CHOKE ME TO DEATH** if it makes you feel any better about not being able to stop me calling out your shitty science?

dasCooDawg • 7 points • 26 October, 2019 09:41 PM

In other news: water is wet

SKRedPill • 3 points • 27 October, 2019 07:20 AM

And here's the part you missed - women find it harder to deal jokes themselves because they tend to take it way too personally - solipsism to blame. Hence a lot of women not attracted to you on social media are often the ones getting outraged at any joke they get personal with. And one reason for that is that written words are really serious, the 93% of non-verbal communication is missing. So the same joke when cracked properly in person with a huge smirk or a straight face can result in ROFLs, but on social media it becomes offensive.

In fact any woman is capable of taking a joke badly - it all depends on how they feel about you and how serious you sound, and which emotion gets stirred. Hence outrageous stuff can reach a point where it's no longer outrageous, but hilarious enough to the point of parody.

To roast a fellow guy, a certain amount of impersonal element is needed. That and a lot of frame, because your sense of humor is directly connected to your way of seeing life, as well as handling it well when someone roasts you in turn. Now you know why.

Men can endearingly call themselves the worst stuff in the world and be close brothers, but if that trust is broken, it's gone and it will never be the same again. Women tell each other "I love you, sweetie dear" while seething with many Machiavelian complications within and can blow hot and cold faster than the weather changes. Earth vs Water.

In fact, discussing about jokes on a forum with women reading is the easiest way to kill the humor - too serious, just too damn serious, too much thinking, analyzing. But crack it in person, make it absurdly hilarious and their rationality will shut down, their minds will flip out and they'll all be giggling like the girls they are.

trueliberal1 • 3 points • 28 October, 2019 09:33 PM

From the article...

What does it all mean? It means that to the best of our knowledge, on average, men appear to have higher humor production ability than women. Note that I emphasized the word average because the study does not mean, as Christopher Hitchens famously proclaimed, that women are not funny. The fact that men, on average, appear to be funnier than women, does not imply that every single man is funnier than every single woman. There are many great female comedians such as Sarah Silverman, Tina Fey, Ali Wong and historically, Lucille Ball, Joan Rivers, and many, many more. All these great comedians are funnier than 99.9 percent of all men.

Translation: The science shows something that is politically unacceptable, so we'll make non-scientific disclaimers and qualification to avoid offending idiots.

The entire purpose of science is to precisely and accurately describe reality. What you want to do with that reality is another issue, but the science should just honestly report on the reality as it is.

Of course men are much funnier than women in over 99.9% of male-female pairings in the cross set of all men and women. Of course this is entirely due to evolution and biology. Of course the evolutionary reason is that making a woman laugh meant sometimes a guy got laid and offspring, but no man has ever turned down sex with a woman because she wasn't funny. These things are so obvious that they don't even need scientific confirmation, but if a scientist is going to study these things then he -- and I'm using he as the generic pronoun for brevity -- should study it honestly and report on it honestly. Also, any media that covers the science should report on it honestly.

We all know that men are vastly funnier than women. Preferencing women by preceding this fact with patronizing platitudes to sooth their egos only makes women look childish and incapable of adult conversation. I

can only conclude that the author, Gill Greengross, is afraid of political backlash like so many in evolutionary psychology. This is a terrible thing. Politics should be heavily influenced by science. Science should not be influenced at all by politics.

oldslut • 5 points • 26 October, 2019 04:29 PM

a funny chick that is bad in bed isn't very funny at all.

Lyxeka • 2 points • 26 October, 2019 07:32 PM

Not with that attitude

HeiligKo • 3 points • 26 October, 2019 05:26 PM

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VV7vv3rFxNA&t=238s> Patrice O'neal on the matter.

PlebsFelix • 2 points • 27 October, 2019 12:24 AM

Christopher Hitchens did this best

MachoToughGuy • 2 points • 27 October, 2019 12:43 AM

Is there one about black comedians being funnier than white comedians? I cant think of any white comedians funnier than Richard Pryor, Dave Chapelle, Chris Rock and Eddie Murphy.

[deleted] • 5 points • 27 October, 2019 05:07 AM

Alive? I find Bill Burr funnier, but not by that much.

SuperSmith\_ • 1 point • 29 October, 2019 02:11 AM

Norm Macdonald is the greatest alive, and possibly ever.

SalesyMcSellerson • 4 points • 27 October, 2019 05:23 AM

There's a lot of greats that are white and right up there with those guys:

George Carlin, Bill Hicks, Sam Kinison, and those are all just the top guys from way back. Bill Burr, Louis CK, etc. are well known from more recent times.

Using the top .01% as a comparison isn't probably the best idea. Because they're all extreme outliers. Even in spite of this thread there are many women comedians who are exceptionally funny and funnier than the vast majority of comedians. The difference with female comedians probably comes from the fact that the general demographics of the audience is different. So some female comedians can become more famous relative to their peers as a result of the demographics that they draw and the differences in taste that they draw as a result. Similar to how some terrible "blacksploitation" or "christian exploitation" films can outperform in the box office. The comparison can even be drawn to other demographic based comedy. I recall seeing Shaquille O'Neal presents def jam comedy and it was an all black lineup with a mostly all black audience. The first few comedians all told jokes about how black people have bigger dicks than white people and it killed. So, no I definitely don't think you can draw the comparison there.

EdmondDaunts • 2 points • 27 October, 2019 06:43 AM

Says a man who has never watched Billy Connolly

Gullible\_Comfortable • 1 point • 28 October, 2019 02:33 AM

Norm MacDonald is a Canadian treasure



Endovelico • 1 point • 28 October, 2019 10:13 AM

Jeselnik, hinchcliffe, Burr, ck, big jay, Tim Dillon, segura. All from the new wave alone

Plus, Eddie Murphy was the Dane cook of his time and it's known thing that neither Chappelle or rock write their own stuff.

Pryor was the most influential comic ever tho, imo.

Mordor\_Folker • 2 points • 27 October, 2019 01:56 AM

Say the most obvious shit and get labeled as a bigot, misogynist, incel. Have scientific data to back your stance. Get treated the same exact way "because you wouldn't have brought it up if you weren't"

Jimmy2e • 2 points • 26 October, 2019 08:56 PM\*

I'm going to post my removed comment from this thread. My assertion is that the feminist doctrine asserted in rebuttal to these findings is incomplete.

The specific comment I'm replying to asserts that seeing a bias towards gynocentrism in reddit is representative of my personal biases.

### Original Comment

I think that's the bias of feeling attacked.

While I believe what you're inferring is that I *personally* have biases and therefore I have a proclivity to seek content that fulfills those biases, I would have agree to a certain extent. But only insofar in that it's human nature to form biases and that those biases can be socially engineered via popular culture/education.

This is why I don't brazenly touch pans sitting on the stove and also why I believe the US won the war of 1812. Two year old me and a lot of Canadians would disagree.

Keeping this in mind, I would tend to agree overall with your assessment. There seems to be a lot of people out there that have been led to view the world in terms of group identity.

Therefore, if I believe all women are historically oppressed and I see content like an all female flight crew flying 120 girls to NASA, I'm going to upvote it. It makes total sense that I would view this as an achievement if I believe a form of ambiguous societal oppression (both direct and indirect) had disenfranchised women in the past from taking part in aviation.

This ideologically driven belief is in turn opposed (or supported depending on how you look at it) by the fact that the military, which initially pioneered the innovation of aviation during war times, and produces the vast majority of commercial pilots to this day are by en large made up of men.

As such, I would also agree that historically the military has discriminated against women; albeit positively, via drafts, marketing, and general cultural norms (especially during times of war). Thereby reducing female participation in military aviation which has since dampened both the participation and normalization of women in commercial aviation over the last few decades given where the predominance of commercial pilots are trained, licensed, and start their career.

In this case, as to whether or not women not being forced or incentivized into serving in aviation based combat roles is seen as a form of oppression seems to be a subjective issue in feminist circles, but is still a form of discrimination nonetheless.

Therefore if we were truly interested in advancing gender equality in commercial aviation we would need to normalize the gender gap in military service to ensure equal female representation in combat roles.

This solution seems to be an unpopular idea though. Especially when weighed against simply treating the

symptoms of the gap by circumventing the root cause entirely and directly advocating for government programs/entitlements that greatly reduce the personal risk and extrinsic public service requirements for females to enter into the aviation industry.

Personally, I wonder if there would be a strong push for women in infantry roles if the occupation was a direct feeder into a high paying civilian occupation. My gut says probably not directly, but I would be willing to bet there'd be a large feminist push for non-military based programs specifically targeted at women to gain easier entry into said occupation.

But I digress.

So what I'm saying is that it's other people's biases pushing a greater than average amount of intersectional content to the front-page. Those of us who browse reddit frequently just happen to notice the recurring theme and frequency of such content.

It'd be as though popular reddit culture believed green eyed people were historically oppressed. Because of this, any green eyed person's achievements no matter how trivial are upvoted to the front page because it highlights the social progress of green eyed people.

Then in the comments section of these threads it's typically people on the fringes of the ideology talking about how in the past, brown eyed people were responsible for oppressing green eyed people. These very same people then aggressively downvote any significant content or opinion outlining brown eyed achievements or struggles because they view the green/brown eyed struggle as a zero-sum game.

They don't want to hear about the problems or successes of brown eyed people. In their eyes they are historically advantaged and their issues, no matter how large, should therefore be trivialized in popular culture/discussions because it takes away from the perceived oppression and overall attention given to the issues of green eyed people.

PaganButterChurner • 1 point • 26 October, 2019 09:02 PM

“Proclivity” “Therefore” “As such”

You are gold material for r/ iamverysmart .

You are also the biggest beta I’ve encountered probably in several months. You are completely into worshipping victim hood .

TheRedPike • 1 point • 29 October, 2019 01:38 PM

r/ iamverysmart .

Still enough to piss off automod. Put spaces on both sides of the /.

Jimmy2e • 1 point • 29 October, 2019 01:44 PM\*

You are also the biggest beta I’ve encountered probably in several months.

Funny enough, I said the exact same thing when I saw your photo on the dresser while I was deep dicking your mom the other day.

But in all seriousness, re-read the comment you stupid fuck. If we let feminism's inch-deep bullshit go unchallenged in our popular debates then we're essentially surrendering western culture to the female imperative.

Personally, I'm not interested in being the generation that killed the American Dream and Liberal Democracy.



ShotgunTRP • 1 point • 31 October, 2019 02:26 AM

Dude chill off reddit for a couple weeks

d-quik • 1 point • 26 October, 2019 04:10 PM

Uhhhh wow @ the censorship in the original thread like 7/10 comments are removed even one that yielded 700+ subthreads (children) and was awarded two golds. Damn

TheRedPike[M] • 1 point • 29 October, 2019 01:37 PM

I'm not here all the time assweasel. We have to spend a lot of time undoing what automod does, so shitace the concern troll.

SteveStJohn • 1 point • 27 October, 2019 12:06 PM

Watch male and female comics. Remove the jokes about sex, and the amount of material women have goes down by 70%. That's all Amy Schumer had. Most female comedians lean heavily on sex for humor.

Notable exceptions include Ellen Degeneres, and Rita Rudner,

schmolch • 1 point • 27 October, 2019 12:53 PM

Humor depends on abstraction and prediction. It plays with the predictions the human brain is making 24/7 and takes them for a clever surprise (jumping to another "place", requiring abstraction). Needless to say women lack exactly these skills, which are probably the primary reasons for a larger brain.

Truedemocracy5 • 1 point • 27 October, 2019 05:19 PM

This is obvious to anyone who is actually honest with themselves. Men are more likely to be better storytellers, more charismatic, wider variance in sense of humor, funnier, etc

And this isn't even a brag. Women have built in social equity based on their pussy - they don't need to develop these traits like men do. Men also are more likely (or perceived to be) to be creepier, socially stunted, weird, etc

adequatebeing • 1 point • 28 October, 2019 05:16 PM

How does one develop a good sense of humor?

cupshadow • 1 point • 30 October, 2019 02:11 AM

This is subjective but if you want to make people laugh, it's basically trial and error.

verumvelfalsum • 1 point • 30 October, 2019 04:52 AM

You have to start with being fully honest with yourself about yourself and about the rest of the world.

[deleted] • 1 point • 29 October, 2019 06:50 PM

You're at a party, your having fun. The bros are having fun, it's an altogether good time. I've never heard this at all, NEVER; "you know what would make this a better night? If my girl was here."

Girls just copy us at what we're good at and the men who don't usually copy them and stay righteous to our ways but still being aware to what we learn from them. That's the way I believe.

cupshadow • 1 point • 30 October, 2019 02:10 AM

It really takes a good chunk of brainwashing to make a narrative against something so common. Guys who are good at storytelling and humor are generally surrounded by woman and we see that since high school.

Wax\_Man\_ • 0 points • 27 October, 2019 02:09 AM

Reading between the lines here, the last line should be "why women don't have it"