

Reddit CEO bans salary negotiations because women are poor negotiators.

April 10, 2015 | 838 upvotes | by [Oxdada](#)

If you had any doubt about the cynical opportunism of feminism, Ellen Pao (of recent false sexism lawsuit fame) has allegedly banned salary negotiations at the company she is CEO of (this one.)

Third wave feminism is a totalitarian mindset, but that a company has staked out a policy saying "take it or leave it, because feminism" is the most Orwellian example I have seen so far.

<http://sanfrancisco.cbslocal.com/2015/04/08/reddit-ceo-ellen-pao-bans-salary-negotiations-to-equalize-pay/>

By banning salary negotiation, it necessarily means that she has a policy of paying everyone less than market rates, because market rates are *negotiated*. It's her company, she can do what she wants with it. But wow, just wow.

This sub should seriously consider moving off reddit soon, as it is only a matter of time before the current CEO comes around to TRP for some kind of insane ideological symbolic act to make up for her humiliation.

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

AnotherLostCause • 131 points • 10 April, 2015 11:43 PM

Women arent poor negotiators. The mere thought is silly, they spend half of every day negotiating so they will be given things others have to earn. They fair out badly in salary negotiations because they want equal pay for less work. That just doesnt work when their accomplishments get listed and a value is placed on those accomplishments.

[deleted] • 76 points • 11 April, 2015 12:11 AM

Exactly. Its not that they're bad at negotiating, its that they are bad at negotiating when they bring nothing of value to negotiate with.

RosewoodPill • 20 points • 11 April, 2015 01:39 PM

Ellen Pao

Because in the workforce, their pussy isn't as powerful. It's muffled.

copralalic • 2 points • 12 April, 2015 03:46 AM

A cunning pun.

CptGoodnight24 points 11 April, 2015 07:25 AM **[recovered]**

They are good COVERT negotiators. But this is about overt negotiating.

grendalor • 6 points • 11 April, 2015 04:21 PM

Exactly. That's the KEY.

Women are great at manipulation, and much less great at directness. Salary negotiations are directness. Many of them are just not comfortable with, or good at, the kind of direct confrontation involved, so they avoid it. By manipulation they also avoid being fired and are pretty good at being promoted, but demanding more pay is a direct confrontation thing -- that's the part they don't like.

StephenObi • 3 points • 11 April, 2015 10:40 PM **[recovered]**

Nature has not destined them, as the weaker sex, to be dependent on strength but on cunning; this is why they are instinctively crafty, and have an ineradicable tendency to lie

<https://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/s/schopenhauer/arthur/essays/chapter5.html>

Attica_Sc • 0 points • 16 April, 2015 07:09 PM

Ya! It's the same with the Jews too! Just replace the word sex with race! Fucking women Jews!

cover20 • 1 point • 11 April, 2015 10:41 PM

And this reminds us of the redpill truth: you gotta contradict the woman and shove her shit tests right back up her ass (with a smile of course.) Otherwise she'll needle you to death.

Only when she feels like a loser will she stop it.

riverraider69 • 12 points • 11 April, 2015 08:14 AM

Negotiation is based on roughly two components: open practical discussion centered on solving a common problem, and a game of chicken (aka both need to consider that the other party may leave the table).

The risk of leaving the table "irrationally" is directly proportional with testosterone, and the interesting thing is that apparently people can guess if they're dealing with a high or low T person, and adjust their offers accordingly. Make a lowball offer to a high T person and there is a fair chance of him getting pissed. Do the same thing to a low T, and worst that can happen is that he'll say "no" (but you still gain some because of anchoring effects).

I'm too lazy to look for sources right now, but all of the above is backed by solid research.

StephenObi • 5 points • 11 April, 2015 10:56 PM [recovered]

That's correct, T plays a major part in a person's ability to ignore fear and be assertive. While men obviously have more T on average than women, but both sexes have T of various degrees, which is why you can have assertiveness or non-assertiveness in people of both sexes.

But look at Pao's background on Wikipedia

Her father, Young-Ping Pao, was a professor at New York University's Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences

Pao graduated from Princeton University with a bachelor's degree in Electrical Engineering in 1991, Harvard Law School with a juris doctor in 1994,[2] and Harvard Business School with an MBA in 1998

Pao essentially won the genetic lottery and has a high IQ. If her IQ was closer to average, she probably wouldn't have gone to Ivy schools.

The irony is that people are claiming it's unfair that people are more assertive (because they were genetically born with higher T) but no one's claiming unfairness for the people who weren't born with high IQ's.

riverraid69 • 2 points • 13 April, 2015 10:51 AM

Oh yes. People talking about discrimination are very very careful not to talk about factors which actually discriminate, like wealth or IQ. That would mean having to tackle real problems, instead of just using identity politics for profit.

[deleted] • 2 points • 12 April, 2015 09:02 AM

However, women get loads of special benefits for being women. *Hot* women get extreme benefits.

Therefore, in the interest of consistency, Pao should ban hot women. (Not that it would likely result in a very large workforce reduction at Reddit)

It's only fair.

[deleted] • 264 points • 10 April, 2015 10:15 PM

Imagine you are there for a job interview: "our offer is \$50,000" do you want the person who takes it desperately without question, or the person willing to walk away from it to find a better sum elsewhere? That's a surefire way to ensure you only hire those who you overvalue.

Ultimately, this won't last long once other companies start negotiating with Reddit employees. The beautiful thing about horrible policies is they self implode without anyone working against it.

Redpillthriller • 139 points • 10 April, 2015 10:53 PM

That would work in a free market.

Modern America isn't a free market.

She will underpay workers who will leave, while offering potential employees a pittance. Then when she can't get any staff, she will run to the government and get 1000s of Indians on working visas.

[deleted] 10 April, 2015 11:30 PM

[permanently deleted]

Overkillengine • 116 points • 10 April, 2015 11:37 PM

Every time I see yet another article about corporations complaining that there is a lack of talent to hire, I make sure to remember the unspoken "...at the wages we are willing to pay."

It's a good way to figure out which companies are probably shit to work for.

Claude_Reborn • 19 points • 11 April, 2015 12:28 AM

I'm a year into updating my qualifications to a Comms / EE engineer and I am already getting companies courting me.

Apparently we are rare as hens teeth right now.

DrXaos • 27 points • 11 April, 2015 12:51 AM

Uh, that's not "rare as hen's teeth", that's just what used to be normal demand for employees in the USA most of the time until 1980's about.

IllimitableMan • 10 points • 11 April, 2015 01:32 AM

What changed? Free higher education for all that saturated the value of a degree or...?

[deleted] • 24 points • 11 April, 2015 06:50 AM*

One, there is a greater supply of labor because of women entering the workplace and because it's easy nowadays to outsource production and services to Asia.

Two, there is a lesser need of labor because of efficiency improvements. You'll find different figures in the literature, but some sources claim that US worker productivity since about 1980 has almost doubled. (Computers and automatisisation play a large part in this.) This means that you need half as many workers.

You might say here "no, that means that they'll keep their workers and make twice as many products." That's not how it seems to work in practice. If you're Apple and you already make enough iPhones to fulfill global iPhone demand, then why would you hire more workers to make iPhones you can't sell anyway?

There's also a popular theory that companies simply can't afford to hire because of cumbersome taxes and regulations. I don't think that this is a significant factor, because corporate profits are at an all-time high. For instance, Apple's sitting on 178 billion dollar. Apple's production is not limited by their ability to hire employees, it's limited by global demand for Apple products. Thus, efficiency improvements means less Apple jobs.

Now, I'm not saying that it's impossible for companies to be limited in their ability to hire by taxes and regulations. I'm saying that this is not a major problem right now for big companies, at least in the US. (It may be a problem for smaller companies; I don't know. That being said, the right-wing push to help business mostly seems to benefit big companies and not small companies.) And even if big US companies would hire

more, it wouldn't really help the US, because they'd hire asian workers and then they'd pay little to no US taxes over their profits.

Third, as resources (mostly fossil fuels) become scarcer, it becomes less profitable to convert resources into products. Peak oil isn't "we're 100% fine, we're 100% fine, we're 100% fine, oh now we're falling off a cliff and we're completely screwed."

Rather, it's a gradual tightening of a noose. In economic terms, the energy return on investment ratio is decreasing, which means that we need to expend more energy to extract fossil fuels, which makes fossil fuels more expensive.

misunderstandingly • 5 points • 11 April, 2015 09:39 PM

Second response to your posting, which I really appreciate and thank is well thought out, I think there is a Nother major facet that it seems to me is broadly ignored-perhaps because the consumer is so clearly complicit in this problematic direction.

Consumers have absolutely been wooed by the predictability and price of chains. What they don't realize is that the complete domination of our small community business environment by large chains has a deeply destructive impact on individual income, community well, and community philanthropy.

A lot of my business is small business to business and so I have seen it very directly over the last 20 years.

And to expose my own hypocrisy, I am an Amazon prime member and shop extensively on mine.

But 20 years ago there would've been multiple bookstores some local yo multiple clothing stores some locally out multiple bike stores some locally out-multiple hardware stores some locally out multiple grocery stores some locally out all here in town.

Today's workers do not have any way of realizing that if you worked at a small mom-and-pop hardware store 20 years ago-there was an opportunity to move your way up through their business, perhaps some employee would eventually be in a position to purchase the business thereby allowing the owner to retire, perhaps the children would take over the business,

Instead if you go into Home Depot you will find that the system is so deeply simplified that all anyone has to do is operate whatever dumb terminal computer is in front of them and answer basic questions most of the time their mind is turned off. The last once again they are easily replaceable and it is possible to pay them low wages.

The erratic and unpredictable nature of small businesses was such that employees. Could learn a skill set that included payroll, taxes, basic accounting, marketing initiatives, who knows what else because everyone had to do a little bit of everything. Maybe this sounds like more work-but I think that you had a lot less office space glazed I drudgery in environments where you were being challenged all the time.

[deleted] • 2 points • 12 April, 2015 05:53 AM

Great point. It is indeed much more convenient to shop at Amazon than it is to

walk/drive to your local book store, but this does cost jobs.

misunderstandingly • 2 points • 11 April, 2015 09:26 PM

I am a small business owner and I definitely concur with your observations on why there is less room in the marketplace and less demand for higher paid employees.

When you say automation, you talk about efficiency and a reduction in the need for as many workers. My observation is that even more potent in terms of the pressure on income levels, is that automation and technology has reduced the value of experience and seniority.

For example in the past we would've had to outsource photography which is something My Business needs to very expensive independent freelancers. Instead for a quarter of what that used to cost us we now have a staff, full-time, photographer who is basically self taught using the Internet and the comparative simplicity of modern digital equipment-in spite of the fact that he has a "useless degree "in religion or philosophy social studies or something like that.

Back in the film era it would've taken that guy a decade or more to get the experience and skills needed. Good for him as he gets to be a staff photographer, bad for him in that as an employer I know that he is relatively easily replaceable.

cariboo_j • 8 points • 11 April, 2015 04:53 AM*

Useless degrees in genderqueer theory and whiteman=evil history (aka most arts degrees). If they funded exclusively STEM and business degrees there wouldn't be a shortage of skilled workers. Instead we had leftist indoctrination centres pumping out middle class "revolutionaries" who contribute nothing to the economy and whine about how oppressed they are and how the government should take money from productive workers and give it to single mothers and under employed genderqueer theory PhD's.

[deleted] • 11 points • 11 April, 2015 07:07 AM

As /u/overkillengine said, companies love to shout that there's a shortage of skilled workers, but what they really mean is that there's a shortage of skilled workers who are willing to work for less than their market value.

Overkillengine • 8 points • 11 April, 2015 07:59 AM

Basically. It's one of the end results of the concept of seeing payroll as an expense rather than an investment. Which is incredibly shortsighted when you are in need of skilled workers.

Offer shit wages, get workers willing to work for shit wages.

trpobserver • 8 points • 11 April, 2015 01:42 AM

Huge amounts of regulations on companies making them less inclined to expand and hire more people.

Minimum wage and discrimination laws ensuring that companies can't hire people who aren't already educated or experienced because they can't afford inexperienced workers and they aren't willing to risk endless discrimination lawsuits for creating performance exams for potential employees

As you say, subsidized education leading people into college even when they would have been better off doing something else, adding to the establishment of "having a degree" as a baseline for a decent paying job

Further regulations making employment a very large and expensive investment, causing companies to work to find ways to expand without hiring more employees or to completely relocate and find places with more reasonable wages and regulations and taxes

CreateTheFuture • 7 points • 11 April, 2015 05:14 AM

While I agree with your point about college shenanigans, the other three amount to "corporations don't make enough money", which is clearly horse shit.

xyzeche • 1 point • 11 April, 2015 12:49 PM

Socialism is really terrible, and money is not the indicator of wealth or else zimbabwe would be a fucking rich country. Read some austrian economics to understand what I mean, it is to extensive for me to explain neither do I have the time.

trpobserver • 0 points • 11 April, 2015 05:24 PM

corporations don't make enough money

Saying "they make a lot of money therefore they must be fucking us over" is absurd. They need employees, and they need skilled employees. If laws make employees more and more expensive, at a certain point their labor will cost more money than they make for the company, and would thus be a **loss to hire**.

Decrease regulations and restrictions, allow way more room for employees and employers to negotiate, reduce taxes, and every time you will see more job openings.

Right now everybody is asking to do the exact opposite, and its that economic ignorance that is going to continue draining this country. There will be no economic recovery.

Without a doubt the big corporations like our current system, because competition is completely locked out because they cannot deal with the legal hurdles and employee expenses that the big, established companies are able to manage.

mrp3anut • 0 points • 11 April, 2015 07:55 PM

You seem to think that just because someone "has a lot of money" that they are willing to spend it on you. This is shortsighted. Someone that has a billion dollars then hires a bunch of people that earn less for the company than they bring in will quickly have 0 dollars.

In the engineering field there is a rule of thumb that if your contributions don't equal 2-5 times what the company pays you then you are not worth it. For a licensed PE this making ~100-150k a year the expectation is that you earn 300-750k for the company.

Newdist2 • 6 points • 11 April, 2015 03:16 AM

You left out "mass immigration".

[deleted] • 7 points • 11 April, 2015 07:05 AM

Look at the growth percent column. Despite "mass immigration" it seems like the US population isn't increasing by more than it did historically. So if we were prosperous in the 1960s and we're not prosperous now, but the growth percent hasn't increased, then I don't think we can blame immigrants for this. Something else changed.

fido5150 • -2 points • 11 April, 2015 05:59 AM

You left out the #1 cause, Union busting by Republicans. Take away the worker's leverage to negotiate with management, and wouldn't ya know, their wages have stagnated for thirty years.

But nah, it's always business that suffers at the hands of government, and in turn hurts their workers.

trpobserver • 2 points • 11 April, 2015 05:17 PM

I am not against unions, but in Detroit unions pretty much run the city and while union workers get decent pay, nobody has a job because employees are too expensive.

Unions are fine until they get the government to *help* them, because then they will simply force businesses to hire fewer employees. Unions negotiation power should not be assisted by giving them special permissions from the government, nor should it be actively punished by the government.

You cannot take away a unions leverage without having laws that punish people for forming unions. They have those in China, they have the *opposite* of those in America.

mrp3anut • 1 point • 11 April, 2015 07:58 PM

Sorry but "Union Busting" isn't a real thing. Unions are heavily protected under the law and the corruption in a lot of them are why so much labor has been outsourced.

There is a healthy balance of having decent working conditions and pay to just being greedy and expecting to get paid like a CEO for being a garbage man.

Easih • 1 point • 11 April, 2015 02:20 AM

interesting as I graduate in CS(With a finance degree already on top) with top grade in Canada in dec14 and now working for a bank and this was not my experience at all; even when I search new opportunity since I started working.

Claude_Reborn • 5 points • 11 April, 2015 02:25 AM

Yeah because they can get cheap cs/finance grads from india for half your price.

Electronic engineers who specialize in commications tech are in world wide shortage at a time of booming demand for them

cocaine_face • 1 point • 11 April, 2015 05:07 AM

Really? I'm somewhat surprised by this. CS jobs are the highest in demand in the US, and I'd be surprised if they weren't at least near that rate in Canada.

I have headhunters contacting me every few weeks on average.

Easih • 1 point • 11 April, 2015 01:17 PM

how? Where are from recruiting finding your info/C.V?; cant be linkedin.

cocaine_face • 1 point • 11 April, 2015 09:49 PM

LinkedIn, I signed up for various tech-related job sites, have a website online with my resume.

Easih • 1 point • 12 April, 2015 01:04 AM

interesting, I guess Canada is way different for linkedIn.

SprTpSecret • 1 point • 15 May, 2015 02:18 PM

Stack Overflow Careers and GitHub. If you have a half-decent presence (upwards of 10K rep on the former, and significant contributions to medium-to-high-profile projects on the latter), you will be swimming in recruiters.

Easih • 1 point • 15 May, 2015 09:43 PM

oh I saw my stack overflow profile was on private all this time; guess I will start to work on my rep more.

RedBigMan • 7 points • 11 April, 2015 09:33 AM

Rich people want slaves not employees.

mrp3anut • 4 points • 11 April, 2015 07:59 PM

Poor people want free money not jobs. Greed is a universal human trait, the only difference between the rich and the poor is effectiveness.

destrah • 24 points • 11 April, 2015 01:29 AM

Step 1 - Force all workers to relocate to San Francisco or quit

Step 2 - Force all new workers to take a salary without a negotiation

Step 3 - I can't fucking wait to see this one

ThePedanticCynic • 10 points • 11 April, 2015 07:11 AM

Step 3 - You get what you pay for

This is especially true in anything software related. I know of companies that use the tactic of being unwilling to pay fair market wages in order to complain to the government and import Indians. It turns out, when you pay someone with no education 8 bucks an hour to do a job that would normally require a graduate degree you're going to get undeployable software. I have never heard of a company being happy with imported workers.

jerpta • 3 points • 11 April, 2015 09:06 PM

Well, considering the Bay area is chock-full of high tech companies and the tech industry is

nowhere near as big as you think - lots of people know each other and bounce around employers all the time - I imagine Step 3 is "watch all your good staff walk".

[deleted] • 2 points • 11 April, 2015 06:05 PM

Step 4 - Make sure all new workers learn to ration water at the watering hole.

lightfire409 • 31 points • 10 April, 2015 11:58 PM

Corporations tried outsourcing tech jobs to india already and they found out its a bad idea.

nmagod • 38 points • 11 April, 2015 12:25 AM

Hello sir how are you today my name is Vince and I work for Windows we recently noticed you computer was infected online

IllimitableMan • 8 points • 11 April, 2015 01:36 AM

Hahahahaha oh god this is brilliant.

xwm • 8 points • 11 April, 2015 01:12 PM

Its not quite so funny when your mentally declining parent almost bought it before thinking to run it by their son, the family computer expert. It actually scared me a little because he really should know better by himself.

IllimitableMan • 5 points • 11 April, 2015 01:41 PM

Yeah, scamming old people who know no better about modern technology is pretty low on the totem pole of moral integrity.

nmagod • 7 points • 11 April, 2015 04:52 AM

it's literally a call I KEEP GETTING

DrQuaid • 5 points • 11 April, 2015 05:13 AM

It's even better when you get the call and are running Linux or are using a Mac.

nmagod • 4 points • 11 April, 2015 05:29 AM

It's **best** when your windows computer *doesn't, and hasn't, ever been online*

aphelion3342 • 6 points • 11 April, 2015 07:16 AM

Just in case it wasn't clear (or to anyone reading it), it's not Microsoft on the other end of the line.

TekkomanKingz • -1 points • 11 April, 2015 08:03 AM

STOP IT.....

STOMACH HURTS....

RedPope • 15 points • 11 April, 2015 02:18 AM

You are correct. Many companies got quite frustrated with India. So now we find them engineers in Southeast Asia and Eastern Europe. Quality in SEA is still unpredictable, but Romanians and Bulgarians are highly skilled and reliable. They are true geeks who grew up hacking, not Indian "PHP School" drones.

Outsourcing is not a "bad idea" that will go away.

cocaine_face • 7 points • 11 April, 2015 05:12 AM

That's true, but while labor cost savings are an important metric, there's a lot to be said for clear communication. In large organizations, unclear communication can easily cost millions. Having someone that is somewhat similar to your culture is important. In some cases, SEA will suffice, in others, EE will, and in some you have to just purchase native engineers.

There's a general overall shortage for CS engineers though, so just about anyone who has skills is getting hired.

evilquesadilla • 1 points • 11 April, 2015 01:27 AM **[recovered]**

Yet corporations keep doing it.

ThePedanticCynic • 2 points • 11 April, 2015 07:16 AM

New corporations, or corporations who don't give a shit about the quality of their work or the satisfaction of their customers. Fast food of the software world. Sure, they'll get it done cheap; but it won't be good for you.

[deleted] • 8 points • 11 April, 2015 03:11 AM

Bullshit. Any developer worth their salt can get offers almost anywhere in the country right now. Of course they will have to compete. You somehow think reddit is the market maker Google or Microsoft is? It's a tiny company. If they pay poorly they'll get very poor talent.

Redpillc0re • 13 points • 10 April, 2015 11:25 PM

It doesn't work that way, there is a shortage of talent and you have to shell out good salaries to attract the best engineers (which are not replaceable btw).

ioncloud9 • 1 point • 11 April, 2015 02:58 AM

her company will suffer at the hands of the poor policy then with poorer labor pools. Sure SOME people will work for lower rates but are they the ones you want to hire?

cariboo_j • 1 point • 11 April, 2015 04:52 AM

Modern America isn't a free market.

If you think about it, international borders are ultimately an arbitrary barrier against free trade...

[deleted] • 1 point • 14 April, 2015 10:44 PM

Wait! So what's wrong with getting Indians here?

Are you saying that below average American deserves job more than above average Indian? If so, I have to say that you're bigot and racist (not technically racist, but discriminatory based on national origin).

I'm an Indian here working in IT industry at salary most Americans would not accept. Based on the number of upvotes you're getting, does it mean that I am unwelcome on this subreddit?

Redpillc0re • 169 points • 10 April, 2015 11:12 PM*

It's not just that

She has passed over candidates who are not committed to gender and racial diversity, according to the interview. "We ask people what they think about diversity, and we did weed people out because of that," she said.

So, if you are not an *active* feminist, you are not allowed to work in reddit. Yes you heard that right, the woman who sued KP for discrimination is discriminating candidates based on their personal beliefs. Did you hear about any candidates suing reddit for discrimination?

She has already changed the policies about posting pics since february. Because protecting the honour of sluts is apparently a priority in reddit.

I blame the idiots who put her in that position. Now they can't remove her because she will cry discrimination.

Dont be surprised if reddit is bought by jezebel next year. There are other forums, no need to lament on anything.

[deleted] • 57 points • 11 April, 2015 12:35 AM

Yes you heard that right, the woman who sued KP for discrimination is discriminating candidates based on their personal beliefs.

You can discriminate against people, as long as they're unpopular. Don't get it twisted - in spite of her recent failed lawsuit and seeming cloud of incompetence that follows her, Ellen Pao is fluent enough in powertalk to understand that "discrimination" doesn't count when it happens to people that don't belong to the approved categories.

hamsterbator • 39 points • 11 April, 2015 12:42 AM

why the eff would you hire someone as CEO who cares more about being a SJW than about turning a profit?

This ain't like Google, an immensely profitable company where the genius inventors are steering the direction of the company towards humanitarian causes.

This is just some random bitch hijacking a company for which she had no role in creating its success.

destraht • 28 points • 11 April, 2015 01:57 AM*

why the eff would you hire someone as CEO who cares more about being a SJW than about turning a profit?

I stopped thinking about top large corporations in the media space as being setup to make a profit. I figure that the media is in place to change societies along the lines of the Zbigniew Brzezinski time periods. So it exists to subvert and steer cultural evolution. Under our system (basically after the show 60 minutes) it became possible to generate a profit while doing this and so they did. People began to erroneously believe that the media is a business and only exists to generate profit and that when they were losing money that they were losing comprehensively. Now I figure that sometimes they feel a need to push society in a direction that is unpopular and they will spend their various forms of capital to make that change. If viewership and earnings go down then that is fine. They can always have another "investor" sweep in and save the corporation. When you figure in the ability to print money on the press and with trillion dollar taxation schemes and pork barrel projects then injecting \$5 billion in a large news corporation to effect dramatic exploitative changes on society and devolving it into a culture is not a huge sacrifice.

I come from the /r/conspiracy scene and I've been studying the methods of control. In the Western case

they are using women as a means of controlling men and many of the traps that effectively turn us into slaves have been built into in our relationships with women through the literal subversion of our society that has turned it into a sick and pathetic place full of weak spineless men. I'm wondering how many men are studying the Federal Reserve, international banking, etc are laying next to a person who will turn on them and initiate a process that allows the government to lock him down. Many people are waiting for tanks in the street and not the pussy in their bed. Its the Trojan Horse.

RedBigMan • 12 points • 11 April, 2015 09:27 AM

There is no counter for MGTOW which is what current society is steering all young men who are beta towards.

Not getting married is just the tip of the iceberg. When these men realize they can work less and enjoy life more without giving some bitch half of everything they own + years of alimony for a marriage that lasted a year... Yeah.

destraht • 3 points • 12 April, 2015 01:29 PM

Their counter to MGTOW would be a very overt hard power dictatorship. IMO it looks like they have the power and have built the grid for that so I say its best to force their hand. I subscribe to the theory that they've long since consolidated the power and that the more overt police state is a proportional response to people waking up. If they had the full illusion going without resistance then why put it in our faces? So in many ways I'm celebrating the huge militaristic police build up as an evolution in our culture. Unfortunately I feel that it plays out over a time period that basically would suck up all of the time period where I will still have a solid head of hair and so I've bailed out.

I love this quote:

Thus, far and wide, they migrate either to the Goths or to the Bagaudae, or to other barbarians everywhere in power; yet they do not repent of having migrated. They prefer to live as freemen under an outward form of captivity, than as captives under the appearance of liberty. Therefore, the name of Roman citizens, at one time not only greatly valued, but dearly bought, is now repudiated and fled from, and it is almost considered not only base, but even deserving of abhorrence.

Jasmudda • 9 points • 11 April, 2015 03:37 AM

If you've never seen it, you should check out The Century of the Self

destraht • 2 points • 11 April, 2015 03:43 AM

Yes, I've seen it and I agree its great. Its probably worth watching again. I think that I hadn't lived in the ex-USSR yet when I saw that and I just got done with two months in weird commie-capitalist land Shanghai. I'm sure that I'd get more out of it this time.

kingofpoplives • 6 points • 11 April, 2015 12:45 PM

I stopped thinking about top large corporations in the media space as being setup to make a profit. I figure that the media is in place to change societies along the lines of the Zbigniew Brzezinski time periods. So it exists to subvert and steer cultural evolution.

So much this.

The amount of money a site like Reddit could hope to make is a pittance compared to the fortunes of

the global elite. It is vastly more valuable as a propaganda organ to promote the success of other interests.

Hoodwink • 8 points • 11 April, 2015 03:18 AM

Yep. Media companies are not out to make money. At least, not from the direct 'selling' of news. It's only necessary they have some eyes and prominence. They control the topics of debate. Reddit has already headed this way. The /r/politics subreddit basically died when you couldn't editorialize news headlines or point out the actual interesting piece in the article.

I think Journos like Matt Tabbi are rare. People like him get killed like Michael Hastings. If you know anything about the new project he was supposed to jump unto where he was supposed to have a lot of resources for actual news that turned out that the investor/boss would steer him away from his main promise. I think that entirely business was just to fuck with Matt and get him out of the picture for awhile.

[deleted] • 9 points • 11 April, 2015 04:28 AM

Like how the only conservative TV network is like a fucking parody of conservatism?

Hoodwink • 1 point • 11 April, 2015 04:37 AM

Politically, for Republicans, conservatism is just a way to hand money over to corporations in return for political seats and future careers in modern-day America. As it was done in the past and will probably continue towards the near future.

Redpillc0re • 2 points • 11 April, 2015 11:13 AM

Reddit is a user-contributed community, which claims it stands for freedom of speech and net neutrality (and its not even profitable of course). You do not bite the hand that feeds you by telling people what to think. Reddit is nothing without the users, forums on the internet have come and gone and will come again.

[deleted] • 6 points • 11 April, 2015 08:11 AM

The most humorous part is that Reddit is a few moves away from being a serious multibillion dollar power house. Ellen was preoccupied with weazling her past employer out of a few million when she could have been becoming a legit billionaire the honorable way. Its unreal.

[deleted] • 1 point • 11 April, 2015 01:00 PM

Get used to it. The takeover by incompetents is nearing critical mass. The sjw hiring games are a short sighted marketing ploy, which will ultimately fail due to it's hamster-greed synergies. Remember, mediocrity is the new standard of excellence.

Newdist2 • 19 points • 11 April, 2015 03:20 AM

She has passed over candidates who are not committed to gender and racial diversity, according to the interview. "We ask people what they think about diversity, and we did weed people out because of that," she said.

So, if you are not an active feminist, you are not allowed to work in reddit.

If you aren't smart enough to claim to love diversity, you're out. No biggy.

[deleted] • 9 points • 11 April, 2015 04:32 AM

She has passed over candidates who are not committed to gender and racial diversity

Why anyone would answer negatively to either of those and expect the hiring process to go in a positive direction is beyond me...

I guess I'd like to know what it means to be "committed", though.

[deleted] 11 April, 2015 04:25 PM

[permanently deleted]

kingofpoplives • 3 points • 11 April, 2015 12:42 PM

So, if you are not an active feminist, you are not allowed to work in reddit.

This our future. The leftist singularity accelerates. Shits gonna get cray.

Declare your undying love for the party or be purged!

Left singularity: <http://blog.jim.com/tag/left-singularity/>

That Reddit seems to be leading the charge is quite disturbing, given the site's importance as a news and content aggregator.

labiaflutteringby • 4 points • 11 April, 2015 06:16 AM

She has already changed the policies about posting pics since february. Because protecting the honour of sluts is apparently a priority in reddit.

That's actually more about creepshots and photos taken off facebook.

thedude122487 • 1 point • 11 April, 2015 04:57 PM

There's a difference between discrimination against someone because of what they say and discriminating against someone because of their biological sex.

Redpillc0re • 1 point • 11 April, 2015 10:39 PM

So, for example, you can refuse to hire anyone who says "i am gay" or "i am muslim" and that is not discrimination? Courts would say otherwise...

Fellatio_aficionado • 206 points • 10 April, 2015 11:21 PM

This isn't stupidity or ignorance, it's business. It's a handjob to shareholders under the guise of gender equality, much like dove's "Beautiful vs Average" campaign or Always' "Like a girl" ad.

Pao doesn't give a shit about empowering anyone, she's using the movement to make more money. Is she a hypocrite? sure, but let's not get lost here, she's a businesswoman focused on her bottom line: monetary progress. Using a silly cause like gender equality is exactly what the movement deserves: to be mocked and taken advantage of.

Reminds me of what Seneca said about religion: *"It's regarded by the common people as true, by the wise as false, and by the rulers as useful."*

Those of us who consider ourselves to be above the bullshit shouldn't even be mad at this, we should be impressed. We should be thinking up ways to take advantage of stupid feminists as well, just like Ellen Pao did.

OneRedYear • 28 points • 10 April, 2015 11:42 PM

Nice analysis. Best in thread in my opinion.

[deleted] • 2 points • 11 April, 2015 05:23 PM

And you can be sure what she said is not what will play out. They won't let great talent walk away if he has an offer of 5k more from a rival. Those people taking this seriously are the greater fools.

the99percent1 • 16 points • 11 April, 2015 12:21 AM

Except you need to employ the right people with the right skills and talents to drive your business forward..

Talents are assets and you cannot put a price on valuable employees. Fixed starting salary will handicap you and only encourage mediocre recruits, ultimately leading to business failure..

If it is a guise, it's utterly stupid. Your workforce is your engine. If you don't maintain it or feed it cheap crap, what do you think is going to happen?

[deleted] • 49 points • 11 April, 2015 12:40 AM

You've missed the point, she's not going to be around for long enough to be held responsible for the repercussions, just enough to brag about the profits.

She's going to say "Look how much money I saved!" put it on her resume, and be CEO somewhere else by the time reddit falls apart because she's staffed it with shittily paid feminists.

destraht • 9 points • 11 April, 2015 01:40 AM

Some months ago she forced everyone to go to SF or quit and I bet that now she gets a free pass to hire all kinds of feminist ideologues. I bet that she could convince them all that low pay is fine because of the superb feminist culture that they are buying into and how they are changing the world. I wouldn't be surprised if a chick would be willing to take a pay cut of \$20k a year to be puffed up with non-stop "go feminism" mantra. She could be working elsewhere but at Reddit under Chairmen Pao she can change the world. Ironically taking less pay (in a corporation) to be empowered feminists.

Stopher • 16 points • 11 April, 2015 02:51 AM

So she moved all her software engineers to the most expensive place on the planet to hire software engineers. Brilliant.

destraht • 4 points • 11 April, 2015 03:40 AM*

Yeah on a good day there appears to some liberal hipster bubble in San Francisco. I'm from an hour North of there and I have a CS degree and I said meh to that place and expense wise I really went the opposite direction to Ukraine. I just programmed all night and I'm thinking about hitting up a massage but I want the girls to get proper sleep first.

[edit] After living in Nicaragua for a year and in other parts of Central America for another half year I was bar hopping in San Francisco and I became majorly depressed being out there. It seemed incredibly fake and I was very alienated. There is no way that I'm going to be able to man up and take the shit tests and drill into the pussy in that frame of mind. The environment made me fucking depressed. I mean fuck I'd rather drink with some random Mexican construction workers at the beach on 4pm then with my fancy Bay Area people any day. I can go either way to prefer the laid back could-give-a-fuck si manana culture of Central America or the stoic respectful and dry (but wet in two ways) Ukrainian thing. In Ukraine I

don't have to fake smile please people and its extremely nice once you get used to it.

[deleted] • 2 points • 11 April, 2015 08:34 PM

This man gets the corporate world. Where long term productivity of the company is the least of anyone's concern.

[deleted] • -7 points • 11 April, 2015 03:12 AM

I know this isnt the sub to say it, But happy cakeday.

thedude122487 • 3 points • 11 April, 2015 05:01 PM

Finally someone who gets it. Pao doesn't give a fuck about feminism or women's equality, she cares about two things: money and power. That's what her lawsuit was about, and that's what this is about. It has nothing to do with the differences between men and women, it has to do with human greed.

[deleted] • 1 point • 11 April, 2015 05:09 PM

Yeup. That ugly ass face says it all.

[deleted] • 1 point • 11 April, 2015 05:50 PM

Yep. It's a mating of predatory capitalism and the social justice movement. Her husband is also a litigious parasite.

[deleted] • 2 points • 11 April, 2015 12:34 PM

Show me one "professional feminist" who doesn't do that. And that's the nicest irony of feminism: their elites milking the masses (SJWs, battered women etc.) and doing so smoothly they'll never realize. The moment the parasites are seen for what they are they'll be dealt with by women (maybe by proxy).

cover20 • 2 points • 11 April, 2015 10:45 PM

yes, she (like feminism generally) is hardest on the women. She threw every other woman at Kleiner under the bus that she could -- Mary Meeker was too strong for that so she just avoided Meeker.

Women are naturally attracted to men (even though they don't mind screwing them over) and naturally hate other women. So it's fun to play these games as a guy even if you don't want to take the risk of trying for or having sex.

Lyrad1002 • 2 points • 11 April, 2015 12:41 AM

I'm mad because she's so transparent. At least don't insult people's intelligence.

choomguy • 1 point • 11 April, 2015 03:54 AM

Yep, solid post, nailed it.

[deleted] • 1 point • 11 April, 2015 09:09 PM

Saved your post --- that quote is awesome.

[deleted] • 60 points • 10 April, 2015 09:23 PM

But . . . but . . . I thought they were our equals?!?! This woman obviously has excellent negotiation skills, or else how the hell did she become a CEO in the first place? What a crock of shit.

Kill_Your_Ego • 125 points • 10 April, 2015 10:58 PM

My guess from reading the stories about how she got her last job is that she negotiated on her knees making excellent use of her mouth.

Newdist2 • 29 points • 11 April, 2015 03:21 AM

Shadowban on /u/Kill_Your_Ego in 3... 2.. 1...

sweetgene051 points 11 April, 2015 06:32 PM **[recovered]**

nope...got too many up votes too quicky

the mods have to catch ya quickly, or it stays.

btw, great post and probably closer to the truth than you think

would not be surprised if her hubby solicited capital for his fraud hedge fund the same way

Newdist2 • 1 point • 11 April, 2015 08:59 PM

the mods

You mean reddit admins, I think.

Redpillc0re • 43 points • 10 April, 2015 11:26 PM

She is acting as interim CEO after the previous CEO resigned. She did not earn that position. She will eventually be replaced (and then she will sue for discrimination, of course).

[deleted] • 18 points • 10 April, 2015 11:36 PM

shes elaine as j peterman president

Luckyluke23 • 3 points • 11 April, 2015 03:32 AM

would not be surprised if she ends up as CEO.

who the fuck would want to be bragged threw the courts?!

kirkgobangz • 21 points • 11 April, 2015 02:14 AM

I read this as "women are bad at something, they shouldn't be expected to get better, we should lower the bar."

Dyalibya • 14 points • 10 April, 2015 11:23 PM*

She also interviews them looking for the "right attitude" = maximum BP

Also, heads up, people were shadow banned for discussing Pao

cover20 • 3 points • 11 April, 2015 10:42 PM

Hm, wonder if I am shadow banned ... I was pretty direct about her.

Zanford • 11 points • 11 April, 2015 12:13 AM

Hilarious b/c she's saying women are intellectually inferior in one respect, negotiation. I thought women were the superior communicators? Negotiation is a type of communication...

The real reason for this is lower salaries. "Not negotiating" is, itself, a form of negotiation.

denmaur • 14 points • 11 April, 2015 06:11 AM

That's stupid. Women have been fucking their way to the top since time began. So what if they're bad negotiators, a well placed blow job is a tactical advantage that serves them well.

cover20 • 1 point • 11 April, 2015 10:19 PM

This is perhaps the purpose. To take away any asymmetrical advantage of men while jealously guarding and strategically increasing those of women.

But given the number of women at Kleiner she threw under the bus, for the promotion of only one female's career (her own), I don't believe she cares about other women any more than other "feminists" do.

[deleted] • 11 points • 11 April, 2015 12:01 AM

That's a great way to scare off top talent in this industry.

GayLubeOil • 21 points • 11 April, 2015 04:28 AM

By that logic she should also ban driving, peeing while standing up, any task involving spatial reasoning, and not clogging the toilet with tampons. All toilets must be clogged with tampons regardless of which restroom they are in. Equality.

VinylGuy420 • 2 points • 11 April, 2015 02:58 PM

I think there is a small (also ridiculous) movement to ban peeing while standing. I'll have to find the article, but it was some super feminist, patriarchy thing.

Edit: Found it

Independentmale • 4 points • 11 April, 2015 03:46 PM

When I was a kid, my mom tried to make a new rule that I had to sit down to pee. Apparently there was a dribble or two on the seat one too many times (I was little, cut me some slack) and she'd had enough. Beta Dad went along with it, said he would do the same thing.

I ignored her and continued to pee standing up. Even as a young boy I knew that was some dumb girly bullshit and there was no way I was going along with it.

GayLubeOil • 2 points • 11 April, 2015 06:36 PM

Sounds like a reason to ceran wrap the toilet seat

the99percent1 • 9 points • 11 April, 2015 12:11 AM

And that's why she is temporary CEO..

Heraclitus94 • 10 points • 11 April, 2015 12:24 AM

Out of all of this, this is what I don't understand. Why does Reddit have a CEO? It's a fucking website, not a fortune 500 company. 4chan doesn't have a CEO, just a bunch of volunteer moderators who have way too much time on their hands. What exactly does Reddit do that requires that type of business hierarchy

Arbitrage84 • 2 points • 11 April, 2015 12:34 AM

Reddit wants to become a legitimate profitable company and the business community looks for CEO's to lead companies to the golden ticket - an IPO.

Heraclitus94 • 3 points • 11 April, 2015 12:37 AM

But what does Reddit produce? You could argue it's somewhat a news company, but what the hell does

Reddit offer to the world as a tangible product?

bat_mayn • 9 points • 11 April, 2015 08:10 AM*

It offers livestock. Reddit's users are the company's livestock. They are traded for value and promise of exposure to advertising companies and other nonsense. All mostly to sell for advertising, web campaigns, activism, propaganda, etc.

Facebook is the same way. They regard their users as livestock, they get away with as much as the cattle will let them before bucking and breaking through the fence. If you keep the livestock corralled and docile, you can start "selling" them to any interested party. Just completely abusing them for profit. With Facebook, it's profit is mostly selling a user's information to a third party for intelligence purposes - metadata.

With reddit, the profit is mostly in social engineering, activism and creating "grass roots" advertisements that sell themselves. That's why celebrities love coming here for their "AMA", aka, to sell themselves. Then the reddit cattle do the rest.

Arbitrage84 • 7 points • 11 April, 2015 12:41 AM

traffic. Reddit has to find a way to have ads. Also, reddit can (and is) scoured for original content to distribute to other channels (fuck you buzzfeed!)

[deleted] • 9 points • 11 April, 2015 04:51 AM

If you think something is for free, that just means *you* are the product.

Revo_Luzione • 3 points • 11 April, 2015 05:13 AM

But what does Reddit produce?

Aside from TRP, Reddit seems to produce a lot of internet keyboard warriors & hamplanet grrrlpower types.

Still, those demographics do consume shit, so whatever half-assed talent that hasn't been snaked by other tech firms will figure out a revenue model. Advertising. Think Chef-Boyardee, Twinkies, tattoo removal services, etc. The bar is pretty low, really.

drallcom3 • 2 points • 11 April, 2015 11:21 AM

It produces content for free.

sometimestraveled • 1 point • 11 April, 2015 07:32 AM*

Reddit is significantly bigger than 4chan.

168 million uniques last month, versus 22 million for 4tran.

Advertisers will buy ads on reddit, but not 4tran, because the content is a lot more kosher for major brands.

Most importantly, though: Reddit is a company that was built from the start with the intention of making money. It has revenues and expenses. It's a business that is attempting to make a very large profit. Businesses need CEOs. Delaware C Corps are required to have a CEO by law.

Reddit apparently raised money at a \$500 million valuation last year. Not that far from Fortune 500 territory. (<http://venturebeat.com/2014/09/08/reddit-reportedly-raising-50m-at-a-500m-valuation/>)

rcglinsk • 16 points • 10 April, 2015 09:44 PM

She might also just not want to ever give anyone a raise...

NakedAndBehindYou • 8 points • 11 April, 2015 04:13 AM

Reddit isn't exactly managed by business experts. They give 10% of advertising *revenue* away to charity each year (starting this year) despite the fact that they don't actually make a profit yet. Only some kind of bleeding heart dumbass could have possibly made that decision. At this rate, the only way they'll create some kind of return on investment for the owners is by selling out to Google or some other company.

Vay93 • 26 points • 10 April, 2015 09:33 PM **[recovered]**

lol. I really do wish this sub wasn't on reddit.

[deleted] • 18 points • 11 April, 2015 12:44 AM

Eh, at the same time it's basically a free forum hosting service.

[deleted] • 3 points • 11 April, 2015 12:43 PM

We could go back to old www dotcoms but then that would mean TRP would constantly get DDOSd by betas

7_legged_spider[] • 8 points • 10 April, 2015 11:45 PM

Honestly, I'm surprised that the liberal reddit management, (along with help from the hivemind user base), hasn't banned any and all subreddits and users that contravene the liberal/feminist/homosexual/socialist agenda.

Rhenthalin • 5 points • 11 April, 2015 01:21 AM

How to start the brain drain 101

[deleted] • 9 points • 11 April, 2015 03:13 AM

What? They can't negotiate? BUT THEY'RE STRONG, INDEPENDENT WOMEN?

[deleted] • 1 point • 11 April, 2015 12:38 PM

strong independent womyn who don't need no negotiation

[deleted] 10 April, 2015 10:23 PM

[permanently deleted]

vandaalen • 11 points • 11 April, 2015 10:44 AM

I already did.

Top 500 Red Pill posts

[deleted] • 1 point • 11 April, 2015 05:33 PM

You're a Guardian Angel of the Manosphere.

cocaine_face • 6 points • 11 April, 2015 05:21 AM

It's a little hard with the Reddit API. I've written something that will let people download page after page including comments, and send it to PDF or Word document, etc though. Could easily add the ability to export to CSV too if people want that.

I'll be releasing it when it and a few other projects are 100% done. It's about 95% done though.

Luke666808g • 6 points • 11 April, 2015 01:33 AM

There's already contingencies in place in the event that this sub gets taken down

Sir_Shitlord_focker • 3 points • 11 April, 2015 12:39 AM

I agree 100% we are going to get banned, we should get a proper website.

[deleted] • 3 points • 11 April, 2015 01:50 AM

This is mind boggling. TRP will definitely be banned, someone start prepping.

[deleted] • 3 points • 11 April, 2015 12:54 PM

Start writing the reddit eulogy. This boat is about to sink due to leadership incompetence.

[deleted] • 3 points • 11 April, 2015 12:36 AM

What the actual fuck? The literal reason being given is that men are better negotiators than women so now no one can negotiate. Fuck that shit. Negotiating skills are hella important to have in life. That kind of mentality where because things are hard you must make the world conform to you is dangerous. Nut up or shut the fuck up.

[deleted] • -1 points • 11 April, 2015 06:01 AM

Apparently the studies also show that women who do try to negotiate end up getting penalized for it.

[deleted] • 1 point • 11 April, 2015 03:44 PM

Men do too, its a dangerous game. And when you make more money after successfully negotiating you need to perform at that level or you get canned. It's not being "penalized" its being held to a standard of performance.

cover20 • 1 point • 11 April, 2015 10:38 PM

Maybe those women aren't really so desired, so if they turn down an offer (that's what negotiation really is) they are simply dropped. Now they scream foul.

drallcom3 • 2 points • 11 April, 2015 11:28 AM

This isn't helping women at all. If men can't push the average salary, women can't get more money, too. It's just a way to keep salaries down. And to keep talent out of your company.

I think it's only done to please the users and reddit will be sold soon. Until then everything will be done to maximize the target audience.

Sir_Shitlord_focker • 1 point • 13 April, 2015 01:20 AM

Look at Reddit, doesn't take mad programing genius to keep this going... technology wise it's basic (and effective) like a Volkswagen.

needmorefat • 2 points • 11 April, 2015 07:57 PM

Just because you eliminate haggling doesn't mean market rates don't still apply. It's just that now *taking it or leaving it* is what determines market rates.

It's only the difference between haggling for vegetables at a stall vs. buying them from a cash register at set price. In both scenarios, the seller has a lower limit for price and the buyer has an upper limit. In one scenario you arrive at some arbitrary point between those two values via haggling, and in the other you arrive at it via

market forces and competition determining where buyers choose to shop.

In short, it's pretty much the exact same thing, it *does* eliminate a well studied source of wage gap, and you people are economically illiterate. Ellen Pao is wielding her tremendous power to influence society in the direction that she would like to see it go. What have YOU done today?

[deleted] • 1 point • 11 April, 2015 10:15 PM

Except the economic illiterates are you and Ms Pao.

Let's accept her proposition that men are generally more comfortable negotiating higher salaries than women and this contributes to a meaningful gender wage gap.

Let's say for argument this is 10%

For every man who they want to employ (a salary offer comes from reddit, setting initial price offered for male labour) the average take it or leave it offer is 5% less than they would have negotiated for previously and for every woman 5% more.

Male rational actors are far more likely to reject the offer as competitors can offer at least 5% more whereas women are far more likely to accept the offer as its higher than what they could otherwise get elsewhere with lesser negotiation.

Fast forward 2 years and your company is staffed with a female majority and tanking. Why? You priced yourself out of all of the male labor that previously you were prepared to pay a premium for because you saw at least 10% more value from your male applicants.

Or

The wage gap is bullshit (as has been repeatedly shown) and Ellen Pao is making a career out of being a gender victim.

needmorefat • 2 points • 12 April, 2015 12:51 AM*

You're *mostly* correct yet you've missed the key point:

- 1) you can simply raise the starting price by 10% and the men come back.
- 2) You lose money from paying women more than you can get away with, but that's something Pao is okay with.

It's true you take a loss because you fail to profit from paying women less, but that's essentially altruistic (And potentially offset by good PR anyway).

because you saw at least 10% more value from your male applicants.

No, the premise here is that Pao sees equal value from male or female labor, but men are superior *negotiators*, creating disparity. (We're not here to argue the premise, we're talking about whether Pao's actions align with her stated goals.)

The wage gap is bullshit (as has been repeatedly shown) and Ellen Pao is making a career out of being a gender victim.

The negotiation disparity has been repeatedly shown as well, and the wage gap has repeatedly been shown to be *overblown*, not completely non-existent.

Thus, it's possible for "claims about the wage gap are B.S. *and* for "claims about negotiation disparity are correct" to be true.

Bottom line:

If you believe genders to provide equal value and are profit motivated, you hire only women, and pay them less.

If you believe genders to be unequal and are profit motivated, you pay them differently and hire both.

If you believe genders to be equal and are altruistically motivated, you do what Pao does (but at the cost of flexibility - now if someone happens to come along who is worth more or less you are stuck with what you committed to.)

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 April, 2015 02:32 AM

Except that altruism and economics are at opposite ends of the spectrum.

Increasing the mandated wage by 10% vs market for women means you're going to be swamped with female applicants/hires - sounds very 'equality driven'.

Incidentally it must be nice being able to play SJW with other people's money - kinda like her hubby playing successful hedge fund manager with his Ponzi scheme victims.

needmorefat • 1 point • 12 April, 2015 06:51 AM

Increasing the mandated wage by 10% vs market for women means you're going to be swamped with female applicants/hires - sounds very 'equality driven'.

...No it won't, and you're really thrashing wildly in an effort to confirm your opinion at this point. If the wages are as high as men can earn anywhere else, then the same men will want those jobs too (and will be competing for those jobs). If the employer truly prefers men, this wage elevation will actually lead to fewer women hires.

Incidentally it must be nice being able to play SJW with other people's money - kinda like her hubby playing successful hedge fund manager with his Ponzi scheme victims.

...which is completely unrelated to the economic issue being disgussed, but I just want to point out that you write this within two sentences of "altruism and economics are at opposite ends of the spectrum." If this isn't hamstering I don't know what is.

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 April, 2015 09:55 PM

Except this is a company run by Ellen Pao, implementing a pro-female salary negotiation policy. The price might be the same (although arguably a rising tide raises all boat so may have upward pressure on wages elsewhere where there's no gender neutral mandate) but the feminist agenda will still influence hiring decisions.

Come back when you've done at least high school microeconomics.

needmorefat • 1 point • 13 April, 2015 12:56 AM

Uh...okay? General feminist hiring policy outside of the negotiation-to-fixed-price hiring model is totally unrelated to the econ discussion.

So you've basically accepted that the negotiation policy in and of itself does exactly what I said it did in the beginning, and I'm the one who needs to go back to high school?

[deleted] • 1 point • 13 April, 2015 03:34 AM

Yes, setting a gender neutral, price fixing policy would have the effects of being both gender neutral and fixing the price, QED.

I said that it was economically illiterate to do so.

Go look up demand/supply curves and price equilibrium and come back to me. I'll wait.

...back? OK Good. A free market (no price fixing) means a price will be arrived at through an alignment of demand and supply.

We're accepting for the sake of argument that the male labour will only be supplied at a 10% higher price per quantity than female labour.

Economically, this suggests that there is a higher demand for male labour vs female labour (higher value - Scenario A) OR that companies are price inelastic for 10% +/- differences (Scenario B)

Now we have the price fixing mandate - assume that its higher for women and the same for men, otherwise the supply of men plummets and my initial comments remain true.

If you raise the price you're willing to pay, there will be an increase willingness to supply, but as this price is only an increase relative to women, only the supply of female applicants will increase.

Through a combination of both increased applicants and a general feminist hiring policy (you can't possibly think that the pro-female, no-negotiation policy would happen in a vacuum) your new hires will certainly skew female.

In scenario A, its a double whammy as you're paying more for something you value less.

In scenario B, you just gave all of your (increasingly) female staff a pay rise straight off the bottom line.

Companies that continually overpay their suppliers vs their competitors will be at a long term disadvantage.

Fast forward 2 years and your company is staffed with a female majority and tanking.

If you believe genders to be equal and are altruistically motivated...

Altruism is also unrelated to the econ discussion, whats your point?

needmorefat • 1 point • 15 April, 2015 04:45 PM

So... I'm still not sure I understand your objection.

Pao *believes* she's getting the same market value out of both genders, but that women are selling their labour cheaper.

The rational-self-interest response to this belief would be to hire more cheap female, at said lower price, which is essentially what the policy does, yes? We both agree on this I think.

So why do you think Pao is being stupid? Granted, if she's *wrong* about male and female labor granting equal value, this hurts her company. But her actions are *consistent with her beliefs*, and this is my point.

Oxdada1 points 12 April, 2015 12:25 AM [recovered]

In terms of economic illiteracy, negotiation and haggling are very different things. I recommend looking them up.

However, yes, it is her company, she can do what she wishes. The trouble is that she is staking out a bargaining position based on an ideological stance, and that is divorced from the realities of the issue at hand.

Her company, her call, but the policy signifies that either her interpretation of feminism is maliciously cynical, or destructively irrational.

If a man made this policy, we would call him unstable and a hysterical reactionary, then find a way to short his company's stock. Pao's alleged policy (not a lot of details in the articles) is hysterical and unstable as well. That behavior also happens to be a feminine cliché.

needmorefat • 2 points • 12 April, 2015 12:34 AM*

negotiation and haggling are very different things. I recommend looking them up.

<https://hbr.org/2014/06/negotiating-is-not-the-same-as-haggling/>

I followed your recommendation, and after reading the above I still don't really see the difference from an economic standpoint. It just seems like haggling with more delicate pretense at caring about fairness so you don't alienate the other party. What do you think the difference is?

her interpretation of feminism is maliciously cynical

Not cynical, realistic. For a red piller to accuse someone of cynicism is laughable. We at the redpill know that women behave submissively and will tend to lose in salary negotiations. The data supports it. If you assume that eliminating wage disparity is a worthy goal, then this is a reasonable way to do so. Way better than quotas and shit.

What would you suggest? (Let's assume we *want* to eliminate wage disparity, rather than accepting that men will tend to make more.)

Robert_Walker2 points 11 April, 2015 12:25 PM [recovered]

“There is unrest in the forest;

There is trouble with the trees.

For the maples want more sunlight and the oaks ignore their pleas.

There is trouble in the forest;

And the creatures all have fled.

As the maples scream oppression and the oaks just shake their heads.

Now there's no more oak oppression, for they passed a noble law.

And the trees are all kept equal, by hatchet, axe, and saw.”

Rush - The Trees

cruyff8 • 1 point • 11 April, 2015 08:08 AM

The CEO of a corporation or company typically reports to the board of directors and is charged with maximizing the value of the entity. Since Reddit is primarily advertising supported, I don't think it Ms Pao wants to be in the business of censoring speech on reddit, but I could be in the wrong. Time will tell.

PartTimeLegend • 1 point • 11 April, 2015 09:28 AM

The more I hear about this woman the more I consider going back to digg.

jakeinmn • 1 point • 11 April, 2015 02:50 PM

Hold on, I'm confused. Isn't one of the anti feminist arguments the fact that there's unequal gender pay but there's the federal act that mandates equal pay. Unno if it's called the act of 1968, but it makes it illegal to offer different wages to different sexes.

systemshock869 • 1 point • 11 April, 2015 03:25 PM

I'm sure she'll pay a lot. They're not retarded. Pay high wages and give good benefits, nobody can say shit. Plausible deniability a la corporate.

Swanksterino • 1 point • 11 April, 2015 03:37 PM

God, this finally confirms my suspicion, that any pay discrepancy is clearly the result of being a poor negotiator. Their are pay differences at my work, and they are not at all along gender lines, generally the people whose work is valued AND if they make a demand, get higher pay. My dept (sales) is run by a woman. Not the first I've worked for, but definitely the first who eliminated ALL competition in form of contests, or even results posting. I am not seeing that increase production, and has resulted in some folks forgetting they are in sales, which will simply cost my boss more money, when she has to hire new. It feels like the Special Olympics in there, where everyone one's a champ, yay! Sheesh.

GrantNexus • 1 point • 11 April, 2015 06:45 PM

Yeah I shall not be guiding anyone until these terms change.

redjube • 1 point • 11 April, 2015 08:17 PM

If a male CEO said this about women, those SJWs would scream SEXISM and demand for his resignation.

cover20 • 1 point • 11 April, 2015 10:12 PM

They're required to offer equal or better pay to women, but men can negotiate easier because actually they are higher value.

Now after Ellen's edict, men simply won't join the company. They'll negotiate by accepting someone else's better offer. In fact they won't even want to interview at Reddit with this ultra-feminist tool in charge.

Women say they're just as good. Reddit will soon be a test case, because it will be predominantly female before long.

fyreNL • 1 point • 11 April, 2015 12:05 PM*

Hey guys.

I never comment on TRP. In all honesty, i lurk TRP sometimes, and for the most part, don't agree with your views. I believe it's healthy to have a counter-culture to anything - to have negotiaton and work to compromise, but i think that TRP is generally one big circlejerk.

But i wanted to comment on this anyway, in the hope you guys read this. I believe this 3rd wave feminism culture is - in ideology - a good thing. In practice, however, many a times isn't. And this is a great example of how to abuse it.

How, can ever, in any way, removing negotiation be an empowerment to women? If you ask me, it's juist a guise to make more money. Nobody wins, everyone loses (except for her, of course). This is extortion, and she hides

behind the values of a cultural movement to protect herself. If she truly believes equality is something important to her company, then she would've figured out something else than this. But she doesn't.

She's a fucking parasite, and i am glad this made the headlines, this will blow up in her face entirely. And best of all? Every feminist with a bit of a brain will agree that this is absolute BS. It also just proves furthermore, that American 'free-market capitalism' isn't. It's an oligopoly, and looks more like 21st century serfdom.

Bottom line: She's a bitch, a liar, and a leech on an ideology she looks like she's supporting, but actually isn't.

That's all.

[deleted] • 1 point • 11 April, 2015 08:24 PM

Every feminist with a bit of a brain will agree that this is absolute BS.

This is not how feminism works. Even when something has been proven completely wrong, like the bullshit university rape scandals, they keep on keepin' on as if it hasn't.

Swiss_Cheese9797 • 1 point • 11 April, 2015 03:10 AM

I feel like Ive read this before

HaveTwoBananas • 1 point • 11 April, 2015 05:56 AM

Funny thing is if a man did this, people would lose their shit.

[deleted] • 0 points • 11 April, 2015 06:30 AM

She is basically dictatator of ~~north-korea~~ reddit.

profeyn • 0 points • 11 April, 2015 08:57 AM

What can we do about this? I assume nothing as always?

savedarticles • 0 points • 11 April, 2015 05:34 PM*

This will likely work for Reddit but not in the open market. What attracts people to working for Reddit? Bacon, cats, stupid memes, etc. These omegas likely suck at negotiation anyways so they'll celebrate this policy as some kind of progress.

Reddit culture has no men- it has overgrown children. What separates your Reddit geek from a female? not much. They may as well be the same. We wouldn't want competition either because that would involve courage, guts, and possibly failing. We don't want children to feel that. Momma CEO will watch over them and make sure everyone behaves and everything is "fair".

[deleted] • -1 points • 11 April, 2015 12:47 AM

She's right.

Source: my wife is underpaid, despite my prep

Speelt1 points 11 April, 2015 03:45 PM **[recovered]**

I honestly feel like companies try to undercut employees as much as they can. The reason isn't gender, it is profits. So, I've got questions:

1.) How is she underpaid? Where is your source? (preferred stats: list of employees at that location, with their wages.) 2.) If she is underpaid, is she not giving 100% to her job? 3.) If she is giving 100%

to her job, is she actually good at her job? 4.) What is the female:male ratio at her place of business? 5.) Does she get along with the higher ups? 6.) Has she tried to get a raise?

[deleted] • 1 point • 11 April, 2015 08:13 PM

- 1) We're both software engineers so I know the market well. My wife thinks most people in her company are underpaid. She has a Phd in CS and started out making only \$70k. It's a contractor but with an academic slant, everyone there has a Phd.
- 2) She works the same as others.
- 3) She's average I would say.
- 4) She's the only female engineer.
- 5) Yes they like her.
- 6) Yes they gave her a good raise last year but she has a lot of ground to recover.

Basically, when it came time to negotiate I knew she wouldn't do a good job. I did some research by speaking to several recruiters, looking on relevant websites, etc first so I had an idea. I advised her not to give a number, just say that she expects to be paid competitively and let them propose a number. The owner asked her to give a number. She quickly caved and gave him her salary as a research assistant. They aren't comparable jobs but he agreed and that became her salary. I think they'll bring her up to market wages over a few years but that mistake easily cost us \$50k or more.

Speelt • 2 points • 11 April, 2015 08:42 PM [recovered]

Ah, man. That is quite the mistake. I'm curious how many people do that... If women have that happen this much, maybe this could explain the wage gap people are always talking about. (Let's say there is no corruption in those studies for a moment) I'm curious if that was a leading issue. You know?

[deleted] • 1 point • 11 April, 2015 09:03 PM

I suspect it happens a lot. Women are often more timid than men. It's not that they're singling out women. I think they do it to everyone. They just don't do as well in negotiations in practice. It seems the Reddit CEO agrees and that's why she instituted this policy. I don't think it's a good solution, as it fixes one problem but creates new ones as others have noted.

cover20 • 1 point • 11 April, 2015 10:36 PM

Indeed, if as you say women are unable to obtain their market value in negotiation, then Reddit will hire them for cheap. But men, being able to come much closer to their market value in negotiation, will not accept Reddit's lowball offer and will stay at their current jobs or go elsewhere. So Reddit will manage to fill with underpaid females (Ellen doesn't like women, she never did a favor for one that we know of, so this is fine with her) and at least until the place implodes, there will be no resistance to her social engineering.

But the women will come to hate her and someone might out-bitch her. Will be entertaining to watch.

[deleted] • 1 point • 11 April, 2015 11:06 PM

The point of the policy is to force Reddit to pay the same for both genders so if managers want to attract talented men, they'll have to pay the same for women. What it does is either

lower the bar for the kind of talent Reddit can hire or increase the cost of hiring people.
Either way, it's inefficient. I don't see a way around that.

_makura2 • -9 points • 11 April, 2015 06:50 AM

So she's hiring to create a more diverse work area but sacrificing some potential for talent and this is a bad thing because..?

Different companies have different priorities when hiring and it's not necessarily tied to work performance, get over yourselves.

sweetgene051 points 11 April, 2015 06:18 PM [recovered]

bwwwaaaaa....oh wait, are you serious?

"different priorities"

wow, just wow

cover20 • 1 point • 11 April, 2015 10:17 PM

Shareholders generally only have one priority. Well two: expected return, and risk. I didn't notice "diversity" in that list.

_makura2 • 1 point • 12 April, 2015 04:26 AM

Who says they won't get a return when a company gets good press for a diverse employee base?

cover20 • 1 point • 27 July, 2015 08:08 PM

I would see it as negative that they've taken their eye off the ball to hire racially. The "press" is full of PC types who don't think that way, but you can imagine how much I care about their PC opinions.

I think there are many like me. Such "good press" may not be a positive for the stock price or sales.