Google Fires Ph.D Biologist/Engineer For Claiming -- "On average, men and women biologically differ in many ways. "

August 8, 2017 | 5773 upvotes | by [M_Justice](#)

As reported in Bloomberg, Google has fired a senior software engineer, James Damore, for authoring a 10-page memo (pasted below) condemning the company's diversity efforts and claiming men are biologically more predisposed to working in the tech industry than women. According to his LinkedIn profile, Mr. Damore has a masters degree in systems biology from Harvard. (correction: the original posted stated he had a Ph.D, this has since been corrected after Damore updated his LinkedIn profile)

A full reading of the memo shows that Mr. Damore was making a fair and well-reasoned argument for why pay gap and hiring gap issues could not be solely attributable to gender bias against women, and that to understand the full picture, Google (governments and institutions included) need to also consider biological, psychological, social and cultural factors which explain the differences between the genders. Men and Women are actually different, right?

Apparently, this speech violated Google's "code of conduct". The CEO fired Mr. Damore for sexist stereotypes. However, I would ague that Mr. Damore's memo was not "sexist" but rather very logical and scientific. It simply did not sit well with the prevailing cultural elites at the company who believe there is no room for debating authoritarian policies which seek to use artificial quotas and policies to correct for alleged discrimination. However, there is no data to support the fact that the discrepancies between representation of women in science and tech industries has anything to do with other than chosen educations and vocational preferences.

Nice work Google. Before you retaliate against your employees for exercising political speech, perhaps you should give room for other points of view which are actually supported by scientific data.

The memo:

Background [1]

People generally have good intentions, but we all have biases which are invisible to us. Thankfully, open and honest discussion with those who disagree can highlight our blind spots and help us grow, which is why I wrote this document.[2] Google has several biases and honest discussion about these biases is being silenced by the dominant ideology. What follows is by no means the complete story, but it's a perspective that desperately needs to be told at Google.

Google's biases

At Google, we talk so much about unconscious bias as it applies to race and gender, but we rarely discuss our moral biases. Political orientation is actually a result of deep moral preferences and thus biases. Considering that the overwhelming majority of the social sciences, media, and Google lean left, we should critically examine these prejudices.

Left Biases

Compassion for the weak Disparities are due to injustices Humans are inherently cooperative Change is good (unstable) Open Idealist Right Biases

Respect for the strong/authority Disparities are natural and just Humans are inherently competitive Change is dangerous (stable) Closed Pragmatic Neither side is 100% correct and both viewpoints are necessary for a functioning society or, in this case, company. A company too far to the right may be slow to react, overly hierarchical, and untrusting of others. In contrast, a company too far to the left will constantly be changing (deprecating much loved services), over diversify its interests (ignoring or being

ashamed of its core business), and overly trust its employees and competitors.

Only facts and reason can shed light on these biases, but when it comes to diversity and inclusion, Google's left bias has created a politically correct monoculture that maintains its hold by shaming dissenters into silence. This silence removes any checks against encroaching extremist and authoritarian policies. For the rest of this document, I'll concentrate on the extreme stance that all differences in outcome are due to differential treatment and the authoritarian element that's required to actually discriminate to create equal representation.

Possible non-bias causes of the gender gap in tech [3]

At Google, we're regularly told that implicit (unconscious) and explicit biases are holding women back in tech and leadership. Of course, men and women experience bias, tech, and the workplace differently and we should be cognizant of this, but it's far from the whole story.

On average, men and women biologically differ in many ways. These differences aren't just socially constructed because:

They're universal across human cultures They often have clear biological causes and links to prenatal testosterone Biological males that were castrated at birth and raised as females often still identify and act like males The underlying traits are highly heritable They're exactly what we would predict from an evolutionary psychology perspective Note, I'm not saying that all men differ from women in the following ways or that these differences are "just." I'm simply stating that the distribution of preferences and abilities of men and women differ in part due to biological causes and that these differences may explain why we don't see equal representation of women in tech and leadership. Many of these differences are small and there's significant overlap between men and women, so you can't say anything about an individual given these population level distributions.

Personality differences

Women, on average, have more:

Openness directed towards feelings and aesthetics rather than ideas. Women generally also have a stronger interest in people rather than things, relative to men (also interpreted as empathizing vs. systemizing). These two differences in part explain why women relatively prefer jobs in social or artistic areas. More men may like coding because it requires systemizing and even within SWEs, comparatively more women work on front end, which deals with both people and aesthetics. Extraversion expressed as gregariousness rather than assertiveness. Also, higher agreeableness. This leads to women generally having a harder time negotiating salary, asking for raises, speaking up, and leading. Note that these are just average differences and there's overlap between men and women, but this is seen solely as a women's issue. This leads to exclusory programs like Stretch and swaths of men without support. Neuroticism (higher anxiety, lower stress tolerance).This may contribute to the higher levels of anxiety women report on Googlegeist and to the lower number of women in high stress jobs. Note that contrary to what a social constructionist would argue, research suggests that "greater nation-level gender equality leads to psychological dissimilarity in men's and women's personality traits." Because as "society becomes more prosperous and more egalitarian, innate dispositional differences between men and women have more space to develop and the gap that exists between men and women in their personality becomes wider." We need to stop assuming that gender gaps imply sexism.

Men's higher drive for status

We always ask why we don't see women in top leadership positions, but we never ask why we see so many men in these jobs. These positions often require long, stressful hours that may not be worth it if you want a balanced and fulfilling life.

Status is the primary metric that men are judged on[4], pushing many men into these higher paying, less satisfying jobs for the status that they entail. Note, the same forces that lead men into high pay/high stress jobs in tech and leadership cause men to take undesirable and dangerous jobs like coal mining, garbage collection, and firefighting, and suffer 93% of work-related deaths.

Non-discriminatory ways to reduce the gender gap

Below I'll go over some of the differences in distribution of traits between men and women that I outlined in the previous section and suggest ways to address them to increase women's representation in tech and without resorting to discrimination. Google is already making strides in many of these areas, but I think it's still instructive to list them:

Women on average show a higher interest in people and men in things We can make software engineering more people-oriented with pair programming and more collaboration. Unfortunately, there may be limits to how people-oriented certain roles and Google can be and we shouldn't deceive ourselves or students into thinking otherwise (some of our programs to get female students into coding might be doing this). Women on average are more cooperative Allow those exhibiting cooperative behavior to thrive. Recent updates to Perf may be doing this to an extent, but maybe there's more we can do. This doesn't mean that we should remove all competitiveness from Google. Competitiveness and self reliance can be valuable traits and we shouldn't necessarily disadvantage those that have them, like what's been done in education. Women on average are more prone to anxiety. Make tech and leadership less stressful. Google already partly does this with its many stress reduction courses and benefits. Women on average look for more work-life balance while men have a higher drive for status on average Unfortunately, as long as tech and leadership remain high status, lucrative careers, men may disproportionately want to be in them. Allowing and truly endorsing (as part of our culture) part time work though can keep more women in tech. The male gender role is currently inflexible Feminism has made great progress in freeing women from the female gender role, but men are still very much tied to the male gender role. If we, as a society, allow men to be more "feminine," then the gender gap will shrink, although probably because men will leave tech and leadership for traditionally feminine roles. Philosophically, I don't think we should do arbitrary social engineering of tech just to make it appealing to equal portions of both men and women. For each of these changes, we need principles reasons for why it helps Google; that is, we should be optimizing for Google—with Google's diversity being a component of that. For example currently those trying to work extra hours or take extra stress will inevitably get ahead and if we try to change that too much, it may have disastrous consequences. Also, when considering the costs and benefits, we should keep in mind that Google's funding is finite so its allocation is more zero-sum than is generally acknowledged.

The Harm of Google's biases

I strongly believe in gender and racial diversity, and I think we should strive for more. However, to achieve a more equal gender and race representation, Google has created several discriminatory practices:

Programs, mentoring, and classes only for people with a certain gender or race [5] A high priority queue and special treatment for "diversity" candidates Hiring practices which can effectively lower the bar for "diversity" candidates by decreasing the false negative rate Reconsidering any set of people if it's not "diverse" enough, but not showing that same scrutiny in the reverse direction (clear confirmation bias) Setting org level OKRs for increased representation which can incentivize illegal discrimination [6] These practices are based on false assumptions generated by our biases and can actually increase race and gender tensions. We're told by senior leadership that what we're doing is both the morally and economically correct thing to do, but without evidence this is just veiled left ideology[7] that can irreparably harm Google.

Why we're blind

We all have biases and use motivated reasoning to dismiss ideas that run counter to our internal values. Just as some on the Right deny science that runs counter to the "God > humans > environment" hierarchy (e.g., evolution and climate change) the Left tends to deny science concerning biological differences between people (e.g., IQ[8] and sex differences). Thankfully, climate scientists and evolutionary biologists generally aren't on the right. Unfortunately, the overwhelming majority of humanities and social scientists learn left (about 95%), which creates enormous confirmation bias, changes what's being studied, and maintains myths like social constructionism and the gender wage gap[9]. Google's left leaning makes us blind to this bias and uncritical of its results, which we're using to justify highly politicized programs.

In addition to the Left's affinity for those it sees as weak, humans are generally biased towards protecting females. As mentioned before, this likely evolved because males are biologically disposable and because women are generally more cooperative and areeable than men. We have extensive government and Google programs, fields of study, and legal and social norms to protect women, but when a man complains about a gender issue issue [sic] affecting men, he's labelled as a misogynist and whiner[10]. Nearly every difference between men and women is interpreted as a form of women's oppression. As with many things in life, gender differences are often a case of "grass being greener on the other side"; unfortunately, taxpayer and Google money is spent to water only one side of the lawn.

The same compassion for those seen as weak creates political correctness[11], which constrains discourse and is complacent to the extremely sensitive PC-authoritarians that use violence and shaming to advance their cause. While Google hasn't harbored the violent leftists protests that we're seeing at universities, the frequent shaming in TGIF and in our culture has created the same silence, psychologically unsafe environment.

Suggestions

I hope it's clear that I'm not saying that diversity is bad, that Google or society is 100% fair, that we shouldn't try to correct for existing biases, or that minorities have the same experience of those in the majority. My larger point is that we have an intolerance for ideas and evidence that don't fit a certain ideology. I'm also not saying that we should restrict people to certain gender roles; I'm advocating for quite the opposite: treat people as individuals, not as just another member of their group (tribalism).

My concrete suggestions are to:

De-moralize diversity.

As soon as we start to moralize an issue, we stop thinking about it in terms of costs and benefits, dismiss anyone that disagrees as immoral, and harshly punish those we see as villains to protect the "victims." Stop alienating conservatives.

Viewpoint diversity is arguably the most important type of diversity and political orientation is one of the most fundamental and significant ways in which people view things differently. In highly progressive environments, conservatives are a minority that feel like they need to stay in the closet to avoid open hostility. We should empower those with different ideologies to be able to express themselves. Alienating conservatives is both non-inclusive and generally bad business because conservatives tend to be higher in conscientiousness, which is require for much of the drudgery and maintenance work characteristic of a mature company. Confront Google's biases.

I've mostly concentrated on how our biases cloud our thinking about diversity and inclusion, but our moral biases are farther reaching than that. I would start by breaking down Googlegeist scores by political orientation and personality to give a fuller picture into how our biases are affecting our culture. Stop

---

restricting programs and classes to certain genders or races.

These discriminatory practices are both unfair and divisive. Instead focus on some of the non-discriminatory practices I outlined. Have an open and honest discussion about the costs and benefits of our diversity programs.

Discriminating just to increase the representation of women in tech is as misguided and biased as mandating increases for women's representation in the homeless, work-related and violent deaths, prisons, and school dropouts. There's currently very little transparency into the extend of our diversity programs which keeps it immune to criticism from those outside its ideological echo chamber. These programs are highly politicized which further alienates non-progressives. I realize that some of our programs may be precautions against government accusations of discrimination, but that can easily backfire since they incentivize illegal discrimination. Focus on psychological safety, not just race/gender diversity.

We should focus on psychological safety, which has shown positive effects and should (hopefully) not lead to unfair discrimination. We need psychological safety and shared values to gain the benefits of diversity Having representative viewpoints is important for those designing and testing our products, but the benefits are less clear for those more removed from UX. De-emphasize empathy.

I've heard several calls for increased empathy on diversity issues. While I strongly support trying to understand how and why people think the way they do, relying on affective empathy—feeling another's pain—causes us to focus on anecdotes, favor individuals similar to us, and harbor other irrational and dangerous biases. Being emotionally unengaged helps us better reason about the facts. Prioritize intention.

Our focus on microaggressions and other unintentional transgressions increases our sensitivity, which is not universally positive: sensitivity increases both our tendency to take offense and our self censorship, leading to authoritarian policies. Speaking up without the fear of being harshly judged is central to psychological safety, but these practices can remove that safety by judging unintentional transgressions. Microaggression training incorrectly and dangerously equates speech with violence and isn't backed by evidence. Be open about the science of human nature.

Once we acknowledge that not all differences are socially constructed or due to discrimination, we open our eyes to a more accurate view of the human condition which is necessary if we actually want to solve problems. Reconsider making Unconscious Bias training mandatory for promo committees.

We haven't been able to measure any effect of our Unconscious Bias training and it has the potential for overcorrecting or backlash, especially if made mandatory. Some of the suggested methods of the current training (v2.3) are likely useful, but the political bias of the presentation is clear from the factual inaccuracies and the examples shown. Spend more time on the many other types of biases besides stereotypes. Stereotypes are much more accurate and responsive to new information than the training suggests (I'm not advocating for using stereotypes, I [sic] just pointing out the factual inaccuracy of what's said in the training). [1] This document is mostly written from the perspective of Google's Mountain View campus, I can't speak about other offices or countries.

[2] Of course, I may be biased and only see evidence that supports my viewpoint. In terms of political biases, I consider myself a classical liberal and strongly value individualism and reason. I'd be very happy to discuss any of the document further and provide more citations.

[3] Throughout the document, by "tech", I mostly mean software engineering.

[4] For heterosexual romantic relationships, men are more strongly judged by status and women by beauty. Again, this has biological origins and is culturally universal.

[5] Stretch, BOLD, CSSI, Engineering Practicum (to an extent), and several other Google funded internal and external programs are for people with a certain gender or race.

[6] Instead set Googlegeist OKRs, potentially for certain demographics. We can increase representation at an org level by either making it a better environment for certain groups (which would be seen in survey scores) or discriminating based on a protected status (which is illegal and I've seen it done). Increased representation OKRs can incentivize the latter and create zero-sum struggles between orgs.

[7] Communism promised to be both morally and economically superior to capitalism, but every attempt became morally corrupt and an economic failure. As it became clear that the working class of the liberal democracies wasn't going to overthrow their "capitalist oppressors," the Marxist intellectuals transitioned from class warfare to gender and race politics. The core oppressor-oppressed dynamics remained, but now the oppressor is the "white, straight, cis-gendered patriarchy."

[8] Ironically, IQ tests were initially championed by the Left when meritocracy meant helping the victims of the aristocracy.

[9] Yes, in a national aggregate, women have lower salaries than men for a variety of reasons. For the same work though, women get paid just as much as men. Considering women spend more money than men and that salary represents how much the employees sacrifices (e.g. more hours, stress, and danger), we really need to rethink our stereotypes around power.

[10] "The traditionalist system of gender does not deal well with the idea of men needing support. Men are expected to be strong, to not complain, and to deal with problems on their own. Men's problems are more often seen as personal failings rather than victimhood,, due to our gendered idea of agency. This discourages men from bringing attention to their issues (whether individual or group-wide issues), for fear of being seen as whiners, complainers, or weak."

[11] Political correctness is defined as "the avoidance of forms of expression or action that are perceived to exclude, marginalize, or insult groups of people who are socially disadvantaged or discriminated against," which makes it clear why it's a phenomenon of the Left and a tool of authoritarians.

Comments

u-r-silly • 616 points • 8 August, 2017 09:26 AM

They didn't wait long to completely prove his point.

[deleted] • 249 points • 8 August, 2017 02:55 PM

lmao this is what's so fundamentally funny about the whole thing. Guy says that feminists are obsessed with taboo and orthodoxy. Feminists condemn piece by calling it taboo. kek.

I hope it blows up because it's actually an incredibly rational and well-reasoned piece and anyone who actually reads it will be blown away at the disparity between descriptions of it and the actual thing.

sickofallofyou • 127 points • 8 August, 2017 06:42 PM

Assange offered him a job. I'd say it's blowing up nicely.

FacingHardships • 7 points • 8 August, 2017 07:31 PM

Where did you see that?

.

[deleted] • 85 points • 8 August, 2017 03:19 PM*

The fact that the guy was fired for the mentally deranged pc reasons he put so eloquently into his essay is the most delicious irony.

Its like Islam's strategy where muslims use terrorist violence against anyone who says that muslims are intolerant or that islam is violent.

The over reaction is pretty much a solid proof that everything in his essay is absolutely right, at least in this organization, and soceity as a whole is harming itself to maintain these wrong, unstable and inconsistent delusions. This guy is falling on his sword in style like socretes.

systemshock8697 points 8 August, 2017 08:35 PM* **[recovered]**

Since I'm so late with this I'll post it here. A new reply to the main post would be buried. I decided to send some search queries about this to see what Google itself fed me and no surprise one of the top results was from the cucks at NPR.

http://archive.is/fohmy

> Google has fired a software engineer who wrote a controversial internal memo that leaked over the weekend. James Damore's memo, called "Google's Ideological Echo Chamber," criticized the company's effort to diversify its workforce. And in doing so, the memo relied on gender stereotypes about women in tech. And let's talk more about this with NPR's Laura Sydell. Hi, Laura.

Let's see what the wymynz have to say about this.

> LAURA SYDELL, BYLINE: Good morning.

> GREENE: So tell us exactly what this memo said.

> SYDELL: Well, among the things that the memo said was that Google was an echo chamber of opinion. And if you criticize the company's efforts at diversity, then you were a bad person. And

> most specifically, though, the memo questioned whether or not women were biologically suited to be engineers. And I think that's what really set off the firestorm within Google.

Off to a good start, this interview is.

> eclectro • 3 points • 9 August, 2017 01:24 AM
>
> I was disappointed in NPR, because it in yesterday's show it really sounded like that they justifying the outrage to what seems like to me a calm, reasoned piece.
>
> It was like they were "giving permission" to google to fire Damore. So google did.
>
> This also seemed like a case of "shoot now, and ask questions later" by google. I hope that the questions make them squirm.
>
> .

> Black_Dragon_King • 3 points • 9 August, 2017 02:21 AM*
>
> > Its like Islam's strategy where muslims use terrorist violence against anyone who says that muslims are intolerant or that islam is violent.
>
> Islam isn't a sentient collective. It's a bunch of different groups fighting each other 99% of the time. You'd be putting the ones who support Assad and those who appose him and the I hate both groups in the same party and that's only 1 country. Times that by every country.
>
> There isn't even a collective agreement in the salafi/sufi/or shia camp.
>
> > [deleted] • 4 points • 9 August, 2017 08:49 PM
> >
> > Most of the Islamic world is Sunni though, thus the terrorism from Wahabi mindsets. Sufi/mystic Islam is rather minor in the grand scheme of things
> >
> > .

Leviathan97 • 38 points • 8 August, 2017 04:23 PM

You've got to figure this dude was thinking a few moves ahead. Google management's completely predictable reaction brought his piece far more attention than had they simply poo-pooed it internally and moved on like he was just some whack job and it was no big deal. By firing him (and I agree that he probably anticipated that, and was already prepared for it), they've lent far more legitimacy to his arguments than he ever could've achieved on his own. (Which I guess also proves another one of his points—all the old white guys in senior management really are more competent regarding systems than people.)

> eclectro • 37 points • 9 August, 2017 01:29 AM
>
> > You've got to figure this dude was thinking a few moves ahead.
>
> Google hires incredibly smart people. He's playing 4D chess with google, and google has already lost.
>
> > itsawomensworld • 3 points • 10 August, 2017 01:35 AM
> >
> > > s what's so fundamentally funny about the whole thing. Guy says that feminists are obsessed with taboo and orthodoxy. Feminists c
> >
> > It's true the leftist management at Google are probably ill prepared for an intelligent engineer.
> >
> > The media literally said that this was the CEO's toughest challenge yet!!! LMAO the guy runs a $700B company and an issue concerning one male employee feeling their policies are bad is their biggest issue.
> >
> > You serious? All the left can think about is race, sex etc. That's all they can logic with or deal with.

In left land you win arguments by how good a person you are. And you're good if you acknowledge that white people suck and oppress everyone else. Also you're good if you're black, or trans etc. The less down on the scale you are the more you need to apologize for who you are. Women have to apologize to black women. Who have to apologize to trans people. The whole thing is fucking hilarious.

40 years from now people will look at this the way we view communism of the 1960's.

productive_monkey • 2 points • 9 August, 2017 03:20 AM

I think Google would have taken a huge hit if they didn't fire him.

> eclectro • 7 points • 9 August, 2017 05:36 AM
>
> > I think Google would have taken a huge hit if they didn't fire him.
>
> From their own employees?? That's the same pathological nonsense that led the administration at Evergreen College to let people chase whites around campus with baseball bats.
>
> In other words, "the inmates are running the asylum."

nninja • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 11:54 PM

The moron posted a 10page rant of the company on the company's message board. Wtf you think will happen? Doesn't matter if he's right or wrong, it's just not acceptable. Google had to fire him.

rp_nc • 911 points • 8 August, 2017 08:42 AM

The 48 laws of power, law 38: "Think as you like, but behave like others".

wanderer779 • 296 points • 8 August, 2017 01:32 PM

Politics are so divisive especially these days that there is really no room to discuss it. It's like the whole world is a college classroom. If you disagree with the professor he's going to get emotional and flunk you. If you want to get a smiley face on your paper so you can get your magic paper that permits you to get the golden shekels, you wait to hear their opinion and then repeat it back to them come test time.

natural_ac • 171 points • 8 August, 2017 01:48 PM

As a former Political Science instructor....I made it a point to play devil's advocate with every possible political opinion. The more people agreed with each other, the harder I pressed a different view.

Your college experience was atypical and bad.

RidlyX • 164 points • 8 August, 2017 02:00 PM

Sadly it's pretty typical for non-political science classrooms

natural_ac • 24 points • 8 August, 2017 02:09 PM

Perhaps it was a social science thing. Psychology and political science made it a point to challenge every ideal you held....right or left. No free thoughts.

RidlyX • 18 points • 8 August, 2017 02:12 PM

My psychology classes were great. Tons of good discussion. My compsci classes... Well, those topics were discouraged in all interactions with classmates, especially if it wasn't completely politically correct. I mean, just look at the Google document incident - the

document is very accurate. It's not that men are "built to dominate women," it's a variety of factors that are biological and cultural and ingrained from a young age. And that culture isn't changed by hiring 50% of each sex - it's changed by telling men to worry about work life balance more and telling women to chase after status more.

natural_ac • 8 points • 8 August, 2017 02:19 PM

I took bio, astronomy, botany, and zoology....not much room there for political and cultural discussions. Same for statistics courses. In those courses you did the work and was as polite as possible to everyone around you. Very similar to corporate America. Do your work and be nice.

RidlyX • 8 points • 8 August, 2017 02:40 PM

Well, in corporate America, you don't have warriors of political correctness pushing their ideas in unrelated classes, while being endorsed implicitly by the teacher.

"Women are underpaid in compsci" - acceptable statement in my compsci classes

"The gender gap exists because women are under-represented in higher-level positions due to a variety of cultural influences" - unacceptable statement, student encouraged to take a break from class

Granted, people pushing ideas tend to be gone by the time you are done with weed-out classes, but they are very much endorsed by the universities on a fairly large scale

isaiahexe 2 points 8 August, 2017 09:50 PM **[recovered]**

I'm not going for CompSci but might be going for IT. I need to know what school you went to so I can avoid applying to it.

RidlyX • 3 points • 9 August, 2017 12:02 AM

From my impression, that's most schools. I hear a lot of similar experiences. It's frustrating, but it's not worth fighting.

[deleted] • 21 points • 8 August, 2017 06:21 PM

As a former college student:. Your class sounds like no class I ever took. The "regurgitate and receive A" was precisely what my college experience was.

wiseprogressivethink • 48 points • 8 August, 2017 02:12 PM

I'd say it was pretty typical and bad.

[deleted] • 12 points • 8 August, 2017 02:51 PM

Sounds like my former philosophy prof. He was not well liked by the slackers looking for an easy A. Thanks for challenging people. I won't name him here, but he's one of two intructors I remember 8 years later.

lrish_Chick • 8 points • 8 August, 2017 03:34 PM

Agree I've been teaching literary theory to first year uni students, including concepts that encompass gender and political theory. I encourage people to have their own point of view - I hate being bored by the same old same old leftist arguments - so the more individual or different your perspective (as long as you argue it well) the better you'll do - in my class anyway.

natural_ac • 6 points • 8 August, 2017 03:39 PM

Now I'm in risk analytics for one of the top 4 banks. Much more politically correct here than on a college campus.

tekhnomancer • 5 points • 8 August, 2017 04:27 PM

The problem is that it's actually good.

Professors are inadvertently teaching you to pander to your employers. Failure to do so could result in being out of a job. Is it right? No. But I'm in an at-will state. I can be fired based on nothing more than capricious vindication.

wanderer779 • 8 points • 8 August, 2017 02:22 PM

Yeah I guess your anecdote trumps my anecdote. Oh well, you can't win 'em all.

vwzwv • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 07:48 PM

~~Well played~~ Smooth move, Law 1: Never Outshine the Master.

[deleted] 8 August, 2017 05:23 PM

[permanently deleted]

natural_ac • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 05:28 PM

Totally agree. I'm in risk management analytics with one of the top 4 banks in the US. If it isn't HR appropriate....keep it to yourself.

Daekar3 • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 05:44 PM

Actually that was about 50 percent of my college classes.

KDXanatos • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 08:02 PM

Your class is the kind I would have looked back on and thought it was money well spent...unlike the other 95% of my entire education.

If only any of my lib arts professors actually tried to teach us to think instead of parroting their own views.

natural_ac • 3 points • 8 August, 2017 08:13 PM

Admittedly, I'm more liberal than conservative...mostly due to my disagreement with a majority of conservative social policies but I was very critical of Obama's Nobel Peace Prize and the Fast & Furious arms failure. I showed views from Fox, Breitbart, Daily Show, CNN, Crooks and Liars, and the Drudge Report.

My personal studies involved political psychology so I discussed bias, group think, message framing, and political socialization.

I feel like the more you know about where your own opinion really comes from...the better you are at dealing with different opinions, cognitive dissonance, and you're less likely to place yourself inside an echo chamber.

People need to stop calling each other snowflakes and have a beer together or go bowling together. Similarities bring us together, differences should make it interesting.

redpillschool • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 02:22 PM

> Politics are so divisive especially these days that there is really no room to discuss it.

Unless you're a democrat, they tend to get a free pass.

ChristopherPoontang • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 05:08 PM

Nah, both sides have their idiotic finger-waggers. On the left you have sjw's and their hyper-pc culture. On the right you have social conservatives who want to lock up adult marijuana smokers (or are ok with certain states making that decision) and theocrats. Neither side can claim a higher ground here.

redpillschool • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 05:16 PM

Old conservative prohibitionists don't get much blow-back, probably because there hasn't been a morality attached to the issue. They're also losing on that front, so they may not even be considered a threat anymore.

But the minute a republican talks about abortion, they're misogynists in our culture.

Meanwhile, the left advocates child abuse and nobody notices.

SirByron • 9 points • 8 August, 2017 08:23 PM

The way for evil to spread is for good men to keep quiet.

[deleted] • 43 points • 8 August, 2017 11:49 AM

So be submissive and live in a snowflake society. Soon we won't be allowed to think as we like

Squats4urmom • 169 points • 8 August, 2017 12:14 PM

No you keep your mouth shut, get paid, get status, and use your resources for influence, play the long game.

rathyAro • 64 points • 8 August, 2017 01:34 PM

You gotta be brave at some point. This guy was a google engineer, he's never going to want for money.

fromthecrypt8 • 5 points • 8 August, 2017 02:14 PM

True. But be brave from a position of "fuck you".

This guy hopefully has (or at least should have) options waiting for him after he sent that memo. Keeping his job at Google should be way less important to him than the attention both the memo and his firing generates in the press/social media. And for that to be the case, he needs option prior to sending out that memo.

Before reaching the fuck you position, one needs to be more quiet and/or deceptive.

Edit: I guess when you are in the fuck you position, it can hardly be called bravery, in which case I disagree that bravery is needed in these kind of cases. Bravery is usually needed on different levels to get to that position though, facing own fears etc.

[deleted] 8 August, 2017 01:39 PM*

[permanently deleted]

KillerTom • 3 points • 8 August, 2017 02:17 PM

I doubt any software engineer makes under say 85k

[deleted] • 8 points • 8 August, 2017 02:43 PM

I doubt any doctor at google is under 140k

.

Yankee_Fever • 2 points • 9 August, 2017 01:03 AM

this! if i owned a company and one of my employees diddnt agree with my politics... then he can start
his own company and go fuck off.

i completely agree with the author of the memo, and i also completely agree with google for firing
him. if you dont like our policies or politics, then go build your own company and kill us.. too many
chiefs not enough indians.

.

vorot9349 points 8 August, 2017 11:51 AM **[recovered]**

Two words: secret societies

HoundDogs • 13 points • 8 August, 2017 01:14 PM

We're getting there. Trouble is you need to analyze people personally as it's too easy to infiltrate
when recruiting online.

.

bestmaleperformance15 points 8 August, 2017 04:15 PM **[recovered]**

I kept my mouth shut for a few years, built a business so big that it can't go away, I could sell it for
millions, and even if I couldn't I have so much cash stacked away my reasonable living expenses are
covered for the rest of my life.

You have to decide if you want an incredible life, or a life of alienation. This is the same thing great
Kings and leaders throughout history have done to maintain their power and do as the please in private.

People laugh at "Hollywood cucks" most of those guys are red pill as fuck, they say what they need to in
order to get millions of dollars and then do what they like in private.

Do you want to bullshit the idiot masses for an hour and live 23 as you like, or do you want to live 24 as
you like and be an outcast?

.

[deleted] • 6 points • 8 August, 2017 02:36 PM

The problem with a lot of this corporate feminism stuff is that's if we don't stand up to it it's just going to get
worse. If all you care about is getting to the top then you can try to play along with the feminist nonsense and
hope you don't get fucked over by the fact that you're a white male. But if you have more self-respect than
that I don't see what's wrong with standing up to stupidity once in a while.

.

eclectro • 2 points • 9 August, 2017 01:33 AM

And why he was ready to depart google. "law 25 Re-Create Yourself

Do not accept the roles that society foists on you. Re-create yourself by forging a new identity, one that
commands attention and never bores the audience. Be the master of your own image rather than letting
others define if for you. Incorporate dramatic devices into your public gestures and actions – your power will
be enhanced and your character will seem larger than life." ― Robert Greene, The 48 Laws of Power

.

LosBomberos2 points 8 August, 2017 02:09 PM **[recovered]**

What are the rest of the 47?

> [deleted] • 3 points • 9 August, 2017 06:58 PM
>
> It's a book, look it up. Good read.
>
> .

Pope_Lucious • 292 points • 8 August, 2017 10:07 AM

Ironically, firing him spread his message far further than he could've ever hoped for. And bolstered the credibility of his argument.

> foot_odor • 63 points • 8 August, 2017 12:17 PM
>
> Exactly, for many he will become a "martyr" of this cause.
>
> > shineoneme • 51 points • 8 August, 2017 05:00 PM
> >
> > Guy has a Phd from Harvard. He can easily find another job.
> >
> > > [deleted] • 11 points • 9 August, 2017 12:16 AM
> > >
> > > Not in Silicon Valley
> > >
> > > .
> > >
> > > mutageno • 5 points • 9 August, 2017 01:52 AM
> > >
> > > Employers would be careful with someone with so much media exposure. Do you think a company like Facebook will hire him? I hope he manages to get something reasonable out of this.
> > >
> > > > Imalostman_6 points 9 August, 2017 05:18 AM **[recovered]**
> > > >
> > > > Brother is worth 650 million. He'll be fine.
> > > >
> > > > .
> > >
> > > eCLADBIro9 • 2 points • 9 August, 2017 10:35 AM
> > >
> > > He doesn't have a PhD
> > >
> > > .

Bloody_Whombat • 32 points • 8 August, 2017 03:37 PM

Talk about calling your shots:

"As soon as we start to moralize an issue, we stop thinking about it in terms of costs and benefits, dismiss anyone that disagrees as immoral, and harshly punish those we see as villains to protect the "victims." Stop alienating conservatives."

> eclectro • 8 points • 9 August, 2017 01:41 AM
>
> Did google execs *even bother to read the memo?!?!?!?*
>
> My thoughts are it's the same thing that happened up at Evergreen College. Where you had a bunch of nuts running the college because the administration didn't want to offend them. Google had to bow to their (probably few) noisy offended employees. It's either that or they have fallen victim to their "monoculture."
>
> There must be some psychological pathology behind this.
>
> .
>
> youkickmyd0g • 2 points • 10 August, 2017 03:10 AM*
>
> California has been weakening non-disparagement as well... I'd love for the flood gates to open. Most fucking white male engineers I know have a fucked up firing story from the big 5 and unicorns (my inner circles). A wish list side project would be to make a public registry like BBB/Yelp/Glassdoor full of

disparaging accounts that name names. Anyone posting would have to use real name and be willing to defend their words in court, but I'd love to see this shit burn. It could be stored on a block chain with massive participation to ensure data integrity and anti-censorship. I know first hand those sites censor that stuff actively (shared investors, board members).

If you've ever been fired, they've reminded you of such terms. If they offer you severance you sign to accept it, basically re-iterating terms in the OG employment contract. I may or may not know the process well...

.

YiffMeAssange • 170 points • 8 August, 2017 08:13 AM

Here is a copy of the "manifesto" with his sources and graphs.

> perplexedm • 101 points • 8 August, 2017 08:57 AM
>
> ^ The original doc is important as gizmodo, vice, motherboard, etc. removed citations and graphics from it.
>
> > [deleted] • 78 points • 8 August, 2017 11:26 AM
> >
> > Lying by omission, pretty much expected.
> >
> > > hot_rats_ • 3 points • 8 August, 2017 03:21 PM
> > >
> > > While I wouldn't put it past them to do such a thing intentionally, at least on that host I can't click on any of what appear to be links to examine the sources.
> > >
> > > Edit: Turns out you have to click the little "Original Document PDF" link on the sidebar to get this. Malice or ignorance, either is possible, but that's a dumb way to host a document where the sources are extremely important.
> > >
> > > > Kinbaku_enthusiast • 2 points • 9 August, 2017 12:23 AM
> > > >
> > > > Doesn't really matter whether it's malice or ignorance, the result is the same, but judging from how they generally deal with bringing this to their attention (like how this guy was dealt with for bringing some things to the attention of his coworkers), it shows that it's more malice than ignorance.
> > > >
> > > > > hot_rats_ • 2 points • 9 August, 2017 01:38 AM
> > > > >
> > > > > Well it's Google's prerogative to can him no matter what he said. That's a risk you take any time you open your mouth at a company. Well written as it is he had to know what the result would be. I'm just saying whoever chose that site as the host made it easy to omit the links.
> > > > >
> > > > > .
> >
> > dr_warlock • 20 points • 8 August, 2017 08:22 PM
> >
> > "I removed your proof therefor you're a butthurt loser."
> >
> > .
>
> Royalwanker • 11 points • 8 August, 2017 09:44 AM
>
> Is there a way of downloading this. Very interesting. Edit: found one in comments. Thanks.
>
> .

redpillbanana • 112 points • 8 August, 2017 10:58 AM

Lesson learned: hire enough feminists/SJWs and they will hold your company hostage. Look at the saga at Github for an example.

Market principle: companies that deny reality will always lose to companies that embrace it.

For an example of a company that embraces reality, look at Protein World's response when they were attacked by fat-acceptance feminists: http://notyourgoodfatty.com/the-10-best-tweets-from-protein-world/

They refused to back down to the feminist attacks and they ended up with increased business and an enthusiastic fanbase.

Edit for archive link: https://archive.fo/Dvb6X

> drallcom313 points 8 August, 2017 11:39 AM* **[recovered]**
>
> It only happens if you let it happen. I don't think Amazon has such issues (it's highly competitive from what I've heard). Also, if those issues arise in your company you're bloody rich by then anyway and don't have to give two fucks about it. Larry Page doesn't give a shit about who's earning him billions and rather faps over old Marissa Mayer photos.
>
> > [deleted] • 19 points • 8 August, 2017 02:42 PM
> >
> > > I don't think Amazon has such issues (it's highly competitive from what I've heard).
> >
> > Amazon is probably the last major Internet business that's not under the control of SJWs. But they're working on it.
> >
> > .
>
> > hot_rats_ • 7 points • 8 August, 2017 03:27 PM
> >
> > Never heard of them but I am definitely buying some protein from them now.
> >
> > .
>
> > TangoZulu • 3 points • 8 August, 2017 03:50 PM
> >
> > Difference here is that Protien World's target audience is by definition people that exercise so their consumers are more likely to fall on the opposite side of the fence as the fat-acceptance movement. Google has much more to lose by pissing off women and SJW's than Protien World had to lose by pissing off fatties.
> >
> > .
>
> > Draaly-Throwaway • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 09:08 PM
> >
> > I realy don't think google is loosing to much of anyone right now
> >
> > > gELSK • 2 points • 20 November, 2017 02:28 AM
> > >
> > > // , Low testosterone men are often highly intelligent.
> > >
> > > .

[deleted] • 580 points • 8 August, 2017 07:43 AM

remember this, and act (and vote) accordingly: be silent when this topic is discussed in the open, and be honest when anonymity is guaranteed.

> leew360 • 238 points • 8 August, 2017 08:21 AM
>
> And more importantly, support whatever enhances anonymity if you can. Tor, bitcoin, etc. Use less Google services and social media as possible.
>
> > RedPillHanSolo • 15 points • 8 August, 2017 02:10 PM
> >
> > Bitcoin is not anonymous: https://bitcoin.org/en/faq#is-bitcoin-anonymous
> >
> > .
>
> > Maltahlgaming51 points 8 August, 2017 10:26 AM **[recovered]**
> >
> > Help Tor by running a relay or donate to organisations which hosts a number of relays. Remember that Tor is not for bad people only.

[deleted] • 82 points • 8 August, 2017 11:20 AM

You should be careful with this one. Don't run a relay unless you know how to do it properly. Many houses were raided due to exit nodes.

Also be super careful who are you donating money to, don't just throw it at the first organization you see.

> nocroc • 11 points • 8 August, 2017 12:19 PM
>
> You can also donate bitcoins directly to the Tor foundation! Best of both worlds!

El_Reconquista • 19 points • 8 August, 2017 10:19 AM

Bitcoin isn't very anonymous, Monero would better suit that purpose.

J-Mosc • 107 points • 8 August, 2017 11:24 AM

I feel like being silent is exactly what got us to this point and will only let it get worse. Why don't reasonable thinking folks shout this PC bullshit down? Why do we let businesses get away with this shit? I think it's sad that we will just roll over and lay down and let SJW be the norm of the new world. In the past we've always fought for our freedom. It cant be too late.

[deleted] • 37 points • 8 August, 2017 11:43 AM

of course we should fight back. but please, do so smartly.

redpillschool • 14 points • 8 August, 2017 02:23 PM

I think there's a place to fight this, and I'm on board with that fight. But for personal safety, the individual has better chances not speaking up. If you want to join the fight, you need to be smart about it.

thebluepool • 36 points • 8 August, 2017 01:25 PM

Because these sjws are supported by brainwashed beta men. On their own they are nothing, but with male support they've grown into the monolithic feminazi culture we see today.

Andramoiennepe • 18 points • 8 August, 2017 06:17 PM

Yes, being silent is horrifically terrible advice. Be in power. It's that simple. That power does not even have to be traditional in nature. Lead. Be a coach, a teacher, a volunteer, a member of a school board, a father, a writer. Find a way to influence people with action and ideas. Do not be silent. That is capitulation. That is weakness. That is surrender.

afkb39sdfb • 2 points • 11 August, 2017 04:39 AM

People are, the presidential election is evidence of this. Trump is not PC.

gELSK • 2 points • 20 November, 2017 02:31 AM

// , Remember, just as a Blue economy is very different than a Red economy, Blue politics are very different from Red politics.

The politics of order, building up, and creating are different from the politics of disorder, tearing down, and destroying. These latter work by attracting as much attention as possible, and use a language of "awareness".

Work in private. Your protests will not get media attention.

Didiathon • 60 points • 8 August, 2017 11:26 AM*

Be strategic, but don't be silent. Win people over to the truth subtley. Make people pushing absurd notions like "women and men are exactly the same" look like prudes. Don't be afraid to get kicked out of clubs or small organizations that don't matter; try to gain a high position and get other people to like you before doing so. If and when you're kicked out, if you're important and well liked, there will either be discussions and arguments that lead to a change in culture, or people who liked you and followed your leadership will get sad/less productive and cause the organization to collapse. Form your own organizations where you can speak freely. Hire lawyers and get good at rhetoric/PR if you establish an organization of a certain size and don't intend on being PC. Make being honest instead of being PC your image.

Don't be 100% silent. Reasonable arguments and non-pc admissions of reality need to re-enter meatspace if we want anything to change.

> Andramoiennepe • 5 points • 8 August, 2017 06:26 PM
>
> Correct. And to effect change only requires a brain. "Men and women are exactly the same" Amused mastery can defeat this one easily enough: [as a guy] "I can't wait to be pregnant! It is going to feel so special to grow a human being in my womb ... wait, what!? I thought you said men and women are the same! Ok. Well, I can't wait for the day that there is just a World Cup team. Men and women are equal. We should have one unified team, both genders ... one team made up of the best players. Any woman can make it on her own merits."
>
> Easy .. and done playfully so as not to be offensive. Engaging anger/emotion is what counts as a lose here. Your role is Socratic irony: you already know the answer. You lead your interlocutor to it by playfully feigning ignorance and advancing through questioning rather than lecturing. Your interlocutor discovers the truth on her own and is therefore convinced.
>
> .

Arnoux • 73 points • 8 August, 2017 10:33 AM

I can be vocal as much I want where I live in eastern eu. Sure we earn less money than western people, but at least not ruled by cucks and women

> [deleted] • 32 points • 8 August, 2017 11:10 AM
>
> are there engineering jobs where you live? not being surrounded by "diversity" might be worth the downgrade in money for me.
>
> > Surf_Or_Die • 34 points • 8 August, 2017 11:16 AM
> >
> > If you already live in the EU you won't even make less money. I met software engineers who lived in the Czech Republic and Bulgaria who made the same amount of money that they did in Germany and Holland except they got away from diversity, feminism and got a WAY higher standard of living since their pay checks were identical but they lived in a country where the average person made much less money. If you're in Europe and you haven't looked for opportunities out east yet - you're wasting your time.
> >
> > > BeBeBeaverBros • 3 points • 8 August, 2017 07:24 PM
> > >
> > > And the women are more beautiful, and there aren't any Muslims to deal with.
> > >
> > > > Surf_Or_Die • 3 points • 8 August, 2017 07:50 PM
> > > >
> > > > I did say "get away from diversity". Does anyone outside of HR use the word "diversity" unironically nowadays?
> > > >
> > > > .

Arnoux • 16 points • 8 August, 2017 11:21 AM

Of course there are. There are every kind of jobs. I am working in finance.

victurchen • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 12:47 PM

What sort of certifications do employers look for finance candidates? Is the CFA the gold standard over there?

Arnoux • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 04:03 PM

Well I am not sure. I work as internal auditor, not with the stock market. Me and my colleagues usually required to have BIG4 experience.

There are a lot of finance positions here, which are not necessarily trading. These don't really require anything special, as there is high supply of jobs currently. I don't think CFA is widely recognized here. Some finance-accountants learn ACCA, but that is also not a real requirement.

Hyrkan • 4 points • 8 August, 2017 02:21 PM

Downgrade would be huge. For example a senior software engineer earns around 2,5-4 k USD/month, so 30-48k USD/yr. Sure, you'll live like a king but your purchasing power for imported goods and investing scope will be more than halved. In terms of building wealth it's not a good idea.

Edit: engineers earn around 40k USD / yr afaik.

Max_Bigly • 3 points • 8 August, 2017 12:15 PM

if you do software engineering you can work remotely for a US company and get the best of both world combined with low cost of living

CHAD_J_THUNDERCOCK • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 07:18 PM

> and be honest when anonymity is guaranteed.

And be suspicious of anyone granting you anonymity

Mildly_Sociopathic • 357 points • 8 August, 2017 08:54 AM*

4 actual scientists responded to this. Incidentally they support the memo.

Who would've thought.

http://quillette.com/2017/08/07/google-memo-four-scientists-respond/

Starter91 • 179 points • 8 August, 2017 09:00 AM

It does not matter if its right or wrong, if it does not fit the current narrative then it is disposable .

belisaurius • 130 points • 8 August, 2017 01:02 PM

It's not about narrative. It's about a professional working environment. You don't throw shit at work, it's that simple.

ColinFeely • 86 points • 8 August, 2017 01:52 PM

Yeah everyone is frothing at the mouth in this thread and OP wrote a fucking novel. Guess what? No employer is going to stand for an employee to put out some memo they didn't ask for. Especially when it is controversial. True or not. Googles firing of this guy doesn't even prove they disagree just

that they aren't idiots who will let an employee do whatever they want.

NSFWIssue • 82 points • 8 August, 2017 02:24 PM

Except he published it for the eyes of a few coworkers on an internal business forum devoted specifically to controversial discussion and ideas, and it was only later shared by someone else (not him) to a larger audience and to news media.

redpillschool • 28 points • 8 August, 2017 02:47 PM

Indeed, if Google fired him because it was inappropriate to air dirty laundry, this would invalidate that. Somebody else leaked it.

In the mean time, California law might actually prohibit terminating him when he put into question whether the practice was legal. Essentially, this might be a protected question for employees.

backtotheocean • 6 points • 8 August, 2017 02:46 PM

I hope he gets over a billion when he sues for wrongful termination.

Archgaull • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 04:14 PM

Welcome to reality. College kids get kicked out for posting jokes on private message boards all the time. He did something stupid and was unprepared for the consequences of his actions.

cards237 • 7 points • 8 August, 2017 06:47 PM

I smell a wrongful termination lawsuit. If the forum was set up by google as a space for discussion among its employees then what did he do wrong here? If you're gonna fire the guy at least fire the leaker too.

TheCrippledLame • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 04:12 PM

Well, if you read the response from google I would argue that they do. Because instead of rebutting his rational, moderate, take on the companies current state. I want to point out that not even in this response did it accurately portray what he wrote in the memo. The memo actually has links to studies/statistics/facts that back his claim. So he was not making a typical "feminism is cancer, men are superior in every way" response, but in my opinion, a reasonable opening line to a dialogue about the internal state of the company itself. That is clearly in line with the protection of the 1st Amendment here in America. In googles response, they did not at all address any of the points or statistics the now fired employee brought up, but instead talked down to the employee along the lines of "sorry you think like that." I argue that the firing of the employee without rebutting any of his points reasonably only goes to prove that he was right. Certainly this led to his firing, but at some point we have to make a stand, and I applaud the man for having the level minded head and courage to stand up for what he believes is right, and supporting it with facts.

cbnyc0 • 20 points • 8 August, 2017 01:30 PM

But he threw a shovel. I guess in a world of shit, a shovel is terrifying.

belisaurius • 44 points • 8 August, 2017 01:31 PM

It doesn't matter what you *feel* like it was. What matters is you don't throw things at work. You show up, you do your job, you get paid. You do not editorialize. You do not do things that make

your colleague uncomfortable.

cbnyc0 • 24 points • 8 August, 2017 02:38 PM

"Just keep your head down" is not a very RP way of thinking though, is it? Editorializing is already going on, this person has been made uncomfortable, and he's pushed back. Hopefully it will lead to stronger resistance.

belisaurius • 4 points • 8 August, 2017 02:41 PM

The only thing it lead to is the loss of his job and a further nationwide giggle at Red Pilling. The point of any successful philosophical movement is to find an avenue to discuss and convince *without* causing the general public to dismiss your ideas. This was not that. It's not brave or courageous to 'push back' in the workplace. It's the sign of someone who completely missed the point of professionalism.

seius • 4 points • 8 August, 2017 05:47 PM

uhm, he was using the appropriate channels that are designed to get input, the fact that this backfiring on google is hilarious, i bet you all the males are talking about how right this guy was, and it opened dialogue.

Throwawayhelper420 • 3 points • 8 August, 2017 07:16 PM

Except that in this case the employee posted his "manifesto" on a work server that is meant for employees to post and discuss controversial work-related ideas such as discrimination.

[deleted] 8 August, 2017 01:46 PM*

[permanently deleted]

natural_ac • 10 points • 8 August, 2017 01:50 PM

Not at a major corporation especially. Take the drama and the heavy opinions to shitty small businesses and mom and pop restaurants.

[deleted] • 2 points • 9 August, 2017 12:04 AM

Not at Google. They WANT you to bring your viewpoints and experiences to work. That's their standard.

seius • 5 points • 8 August, 2017 05:26 PM

> You don't throw shit at work, it's that simple.

tell that to the lunatic SJWs.

[deleted] • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 03:07 PM

> You don't throw shit at work, it's that simple.

His document is the furthest thing from thrown shit you can get. He included numerous links for his beliefs (not that links necessarily make your argument correct), generally had a very neutral language and word choice, and wrote it for Google.

Google's "professional work environment" included restricted programs and classes for genders and races. Gender and identity politics are now apart of higher-end tech companies. And it's pretty

obvious they will fire you if you talk about an opinion which goes against their particular side of politics.

.

redpillschool • 10 points • 8 August, 2017 02:46 PM

Do you have a mirror? I can't access this.

> [deleted] • 5 points • 8 August, 2017 05:49 PM
>
> https://archive.is/VlNfl
>
> i guess it was taken down... hmmm what a *surprise!* (whyyyy would anyone feel pressured to take down an opinion that goes against the leftist mainstream?? I just have no idea...)
>
> .

[deleted] • 30 points • 8 August, 2017 10:35 AM

That was a good read. Dr Debra Soh is a great find, she is like a female Jordan Peterson. I hereby award her an honorary red pill award for being a cool female. She is right up there with Esther Vilar. People like her are our greatest allies in this fight against logic and science.

.

[deleted] • 8 points • 8 August, 2017 11:32 AM

facts don't matter with the current left. Feels do.

> belisaurius • 37 points • 8 August, 2017 01:03 PM
>
> Workplace professionalism is what matters. This isn't your daddy's coal mine.
>
> > [deleted] • 2 points • 9 August, 2017 10:22 AM
> >
> > Pretty much what I was saying. Feels matter and work isn't a place to discuss facts since they seem to trigger SJWs. Workplace is the most politically correct environment, gotta adapt. I'm guessing that Google senior engineer just wanted to GTFO
> >
> > .
> >
> > [deleted] • 5 points • 8 August, 2017 02:03 PM
> >
> > Did you just assume my Mother doesn't work in that coal mine!! So unprofessional. Lol.
> >
> > > [deleted] • 3 points • 8 August, 2017 06:16 PM
> > >
> > > Somebody has to blow the miners.
> > >
> > > .
>
> ChristopherPoontang • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 05:10 PM
>
> Very true, among some on the left. But the right has its share of anti-facts idiots as well. More conservatives than liberals want marijuana to remain illegal, for example. More conservatives than liberals reject the nearly-unanimous finding among climatologists that humans are affecting the climate.
>
> .

JackGetsIt • 27 points • 8 August, 2017 05:20 PM*

I think this debacle demonstrates once and for all that this has nothing to do with misunderstandings of facts. This has everything to do with ideology and power. I read everyword of that paper and it was fact based, respectful. It was the farthest thing from sexism or misogyny and he was still fired.

Remember when talking to strangers, co-workers, friends and family even if you present a redpill argument eloquently and grounded in fact you will be accused of sexism and misogyny and your career and social life will suffer. Unless you have serious star power and fuck you money like Joe Rogan DO NOT TALK ABOUT REDPILL or redpill related ideas.

redpillschool[M] • 199 points • 8 August, 2017 02:19 PM*

I've never seen this many reports on a single post. I'm astounded. Our fake-report rate is actually pretty low, I had assumed trolls gave up on us because our crackerjack mod team is so quick, but it looks like somebody has an agenda today:

user reports:

4: <no reason>

2: Spam

1: inaccurate and misleading title

1: redpill

1: You all really need to get laid. Shame you are all so socially inept.

1: no they didn't you fucking retards

1: no, he was fired for being sexist

1: You guys are insane

1: No moralizing

1: Lol that's not why he was fired you mouthbreathing neanderthals

1: It's targeted harassment at someone else

1: It's rude, vulgar or offensive

1: Threatens, harrasses, or bullies

1: Threatens, harasses, or bullies

> Son0fSun • 97 points • 8 August, 2017 02:25 PM
>
> This is what happens when truth is spread, targeted attempts at silencing it.
>
> > redpillschool • 40 points • 8 August, 2017 02:28 PM
> >
> > > This is what happens when truth is spread, targeted attempts at silencing it.
> >
> > That's got to be what's happening here. Because, who spends time on TRP trying to discredit us? These people are following the story itself trying to discredit it wherever they find it.
> >
> > Good news is that reports won't make this disappear. I expect to see a lot of FUD in the discussions here and elsewhere.
> >
> > > awalt_cupcake • 32 points • 8 August, 2017 02:52 PM
> > >
> > > > who spends time on TRP trying to discredit us?
> > >
> > > Losers have a lot of free time
> > >
> > > .
> > >
> > > systemshock8694 points 8 August, 2017 08:24 PM* **[recovered]**
> > >
> > > Is TRP allowed to hit the front page of reddit? Edit: I didn't realize I replied to you when I tagged your name! lol
> > >
> > > .
>
> redpillbanana • 19 points • 8 August, 2017 03:20 PM
>
> It seems like this particular truth has seriously triggered some folks out there to the point of mounting a campaign to suppress it.
>
> .

[deleted] • 15 points • 8 August, 2017 02:41 PM

Haha .....the quiet majority slowly wakes and the pro equality homos can swallow a truthload

.

newName543456 • 11 points • 8 August, 2017 07:38 PM*

> you fucking retards

> you mouthbreathing neanderthals

I thought TBP sub stands against hate speech :3 Oh, right. It's only hate speech if said by someone they disagree with, otherwise it's "PuTtInG DeRpS iN ThEiR PlAcE"

.

Leumas_J • 21 points • 8 August, 2017 02:22 PM*

Lololol I love that this is at the top, the "you guys need to get laid one" one is definitely gonna hit a few tender spots

> WhorehouseVet 5 points 8 August, 2017 07:18 PM* **[recovered]**
>
> Hmm, that's what TRP is for, getting laid. Neckbeards and manginas are probably crying to their waifus now.

.

Fedor_Gavnyukov • 4 points • 8 August, 2017 07:08 PM

mouth breathing neanderthal checking in

> Bear-With-Bit • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 09:53 PM
>
> so evolved. still breathing out of my ass.

.

123Volvos • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 06:48 PM

Bananaland. All of it. I don't understand and I try very hard to.

.

Draaly-Throwaway • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 08:35 PM

I don't think the immaculate/misleading title one is off though. OP basicly took a complex argument and simplified extensively so it was easier to agree with (just like people do to make arguments easier to be upset at).

He didn't say 'men and women are different' but 'men are biologically more suited to work on tech fields than women'.

.

[deleted] • 89 points • 8 August, 2017 09:38 AM

The Matrix is a system, Neo. That system is our enemy.

But when you're inside, what do you see?

Businessmen, teachers, lawyers, carpenters.

The very minds of the people we are trying to save.

But until we do, these people are a part of that system...

...and that makes them our enemy.

You have to understand...

...most of these people are not ready to be unplugged.

And many of them are so inert...

_____

...so hopelessly dependent on the system...

...that they will fight to protect it.

> BlairResignationJam_27 points 8 August, 2017 01:36 PM **[recovered]**
>
> Reminder that this movie was written by two transgender liberal women lmao
>
> > [deleted] • 29 points • 8 August, 2017 01:58 PM
> >
> > Back then they weren't transgender though. They were called the Wachowski brothers.
> >
> > > Xetios15 points 8 August, 2017 02:15 PM* **[recovered]**
> > >
> > > They changed their genders? Seriously?
> > >
> > > edit: just looked it up. Didn't know that. Surprising.
> > >
> > > > [deleted] • 4 points • 8 August, 2017 06:38 PM
> > > >
> > > > Yeah, some people who can vote weren't even born when the 1st Matrix movie came out - makes me feel old.
> > > >
> > > > .
> > >
> > > PM_ME_UR_TECHNO_GRRL • 2 points • 9 August, 2017 02:08 AM
> > >
> > > I totally missed that! Holy shit lmfao
> > >
> > > .

> Patriarchysaurus • 8 points • 8 August, 2017 02:39 PM*
>
> Now I'm imagining this guy looking up from his laptop and seeing all of his coworkers at Google HQ morphing into Agent Smiths.
>
> They do battle, but there are simply too many Smiths to fight!
>
> Somewhere a telephone rings out, the operator is trying to pull him out, back to the objective laws of the "*real*" machine world!
>
> Instead, he is predictably surrounded (*his "free redpill" manifesto seemed to get their attention*) and pummelled into raspberry jam by a wave of agents before reaching the link. In his dying breath he sputters-- ***"Guess I'm not the One after all"***, just before a prompt deletion from the system.
>
> .

Sepean • 165 points • 8 August, 2017 10:13 AM

There are no economists who take the "gender pay gap" seriously. There are well-documented statistical reasons for most of the difference, and there is no reason to assume that the remaining unexplained difference (3% iirc) has anything to do with sexism - it just means that economists don't have the data to say what that the reason for that difference is.

It's also just common sense that there isn't a gender pay gap. If women really did the same work as men for only 77% of the pay, we'd see companies hiring only women and easily outcompeting the companies that hired men.

> StillNotaWizardYet • 64 points • 8 August, 2017 12:54 PM
>
> This article has NOTHING to do with a gender pay gap... It has everything to do with women being put in positions that they inherently should not be in just to try and balance out the "there are no women in tech" scheme.
>
> > Ahahaha__10 • 16 points • 8 August, 2017 01:28 PM
> >
> > It does actually, women in higher positions is very related to gender pay gap because higher positions =

more money = less pay gap. Also, more women in higher positions = equality = less pay gap.

> StillNotaWizardYet • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 07:36 PM
>
> It doesn't actually. The article is about Googles cultural agenda to appeal to the left. Not to discuss the fucking wage myth. Ipsofacto, you are incorrect to say that this research piece is about wage gap.

>> Ahahaha__10 • 5 points • 8 August, 2017 08:00 PM
>>
>> Well those two things are very tied together and if you can't see that you're just being difficult.

> [deleted] • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 06:22 PM
>
> Diversity in retail made my life so much harder. WOC after WOC would come one board and then not want to learn, not want to discipline their people, not want to work the hours. Most of them didn't last 18 months. And they wouldn't even own the initiatives that were tied to their area.

123Volvos • 4 points • 8 August, 2017 06:43 PM

It's absolutely bananas to me that someone will quote this statistic because they they feel is 100% supporting their conviction and use it to justify downright cartoonish policies.

I just ask them "if a woman can get the same work done for 23% less cost, why would you not hire only women in your workforce?" with a response of "Because they are discriminating against women"

Purely ideological.

SirByron • 36 points • 8 August, 2017 03:23 PM

Damore can and should sue GOOGLE big time as it is possibly an illegal firing.

First, federal labor law bars even non-union employers like Google from punishing an employee for communicating with fellow employees about improving working conditions. The purpose of the memo was to persuade Google to abandon certain diversity-related practices the engineer found objectionable and to convince co-workers to join his cause, or at least discuss the points he raised.

In a reply to the initial outcry over his memo, the engineer added to his memo: "Despite what the public response seems to have been, I've gotten many personal messages from fellow Googlers expressing their gratitude for bringing up **these very important issues which they agree with but would never have the courage to say or defend because of our shaming culture and the possibility of being fired**." The law protects that kind of "concerted activity."

Second, the engineer's memo largely is a statement of his political views as they apply to workplace policies. The memo is styled as a lament to "Google's Ideological Echo Chamber." California law prohibits employers from threatening to fire employees to get them to adopt or refrain from adopting a particular political course of action.

Danielle Brown, Google's newly installed vice president of Diversity, Integrity, & Governance, made it clear that the engineer's memo does not reflect "a viewpoint that I or this company endorses, promotes or encourages."

An employee does not have free reign to engage in political speech that disrupts the workplace, but punishing an employee for deviating from company orthodoxy on a political issue is not allowed either. Brown acknowledged that when she wrote that "**an open, inclusive environment means fostering a culture in which those with alternative views, including different political views, feel safe sharing their opinions.**"

Third, the engineer complained in parts of his memo about company policies that he believes violate employment discrimination laws. Those policies include support programs limited by race or gender and

promotional and hiring scoring policies that consider race and gender. It is unlawful for an employer to discipline an employee for challenging conduct that the employee reasonably believed to be discriminatory, even when a court later determines the conduct was not actually prohibited by the discrimination laws. In other words, the engineer doesn't have to be right that some of Google's diversity initiatives are unlawful, only that he reasonably believes that they are.

> sehns • 12 points • 8 August, 2017 04:57 PM
>
> Yep. I hope he sues the fuck out of them and wins.

disposable_pants • 41 points • 8 August, 2017 05:37 PM

"To learn who rules over you, simply find out who you are not allowed to criticize."

> Draaly-Throwaway • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 08:42 PM
>
> You didn't realize your boss rules over you?
>
> > disposable_pants • 3 points • 9 August, 2017 02:01 PM
> >
> > He didn't get fired for criticism of Google; he got fired for (perceived) criticism of women.
> >
> > Had he written 10 pages on how certain Google products are sub-optimal because of inefficient project management practices, he would have gotten praised for taking initiative, and there's a good chance his ideas would have been seriously considered. The whole purpose of guys like this at companies like this is to find better ways to do things, which by default involves criticizing the current way of doing things. Criticizing his boss is part of his job.
> >
> > The issue was criticizing the feminine imperative; the idea that Women Are Wonderful and society should go out of its way to help them be successful. *That* was a bridge he could not cross.

[deleted] • 29 points • 8 August, 2017 05:21 PM*

Here's The Guardian's title and lead heading on the article:

Title:

> Google's sexist memo has provided the alt-right with a new martyr

Heading:

> James Damore's diatribe against women in tech offers an insight into the male backlash that was an important factor in the rise of Trump.

Just LOL. What an absolute liberal shit-hole the UK is.

> Fedor_Gavnyukov • 9 points • 8 August, 2017 06:54 PM
>
> the UK is a shithole so who cares what they write
>
> LadyXon • 4 points • 9 August, 2017 11:56 AM
>
> It's run by women what you expect?

Sotokun3000 • 77 points • 8 August, 2017 07:41 AM

Both articles on wired and Bloomberg are interesting reads, especially the interpretations by several parties.

Interesting to see that there is an acknowledgement of "free speech" awkwardness and what is allowed and what not.

The battle of free speech and "culture" within tech companies.

Hamster overdrive

IdRatherBeTweeting • 80 points • 8 August, 2017 08:19 AM

There has never been a promise of free speech within a company. There is no First Amendment right to protect you from retribution by and employer. It has always been that way.

RedPillWizard • 15 points • 8 August, 2017 12:57 PM

https://www.cnbc.com/amp/2017/08/07/it-may-be-illegal-for-google-to-punish-engineer-over-anti-diversity-memo-commentary.html

Sotokun3000 • 38 points • 8 August, 2017 08:26 AM

But there is a culture of wanting all voices to be heard and not condemning minority views.

I agree maybe he can't win a case In a lawsuit but->

That's why this case is interesting because it shows selection bias on what is considered an acceptable view.

It shows that in reality a company's culture of openness and inclusion can fall into paradoxical behaviour.

It is one thing to say that a company does not allow different views, and another to say that it values all views as equal but some are more equal than others

IdRatherBeTweeting • 36 points • 8 August, 2017 09:46 AM

> But there is a culture of wanting all voices to be heard and not condemning minority views.

No there is not. Corporate culture is absolutely not a place to share controversial political views. It never has been. You are simply wrong about that.

Rogankenzie1395 • 7 points • 8 August, 2017 01:32 PM

Google did realease a statement saying they want to hear all voices, thus making them liars.

Sotokun3000 • 18 points • 8 August, 2017 09:48 AM

Man it's a statements game. I agree that reality is different but it's the companies themselves that advertise how they value diversity and openness in expression.

Just pick up any company marketing booklet.

[deleted] • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 01:56 PM

When they say "diversity" they mean less whites, it has nothing to do with diversity of opinion.

IdRatherBeTweeting • 8 points • 8 August, 2017 10:01 AM

Listen, if your claim is that it is common for companies to publicly say in "marketing booklets" that they foster environments of free speech and expression of minority views, then it should be extremely easy for you to go onto some company websites (because let's be honest nobody publishes "marketing booklets" any longer) and find examples of what you're claiming.

This is exactly the type of situation where you need to provide a citation for what you're claiming. Since you seem to think that it is so common, that should be easy for you to do. My

bet is that you cannot find even one single example of where a company addresses the issue of free speech in the workplace. Not even one.

cazbot • 21 points • 8 August, 2017 11:19 AM

He's not wrong, but he did a bad job with his citations. Here are better examples.

https://www.google.com/diversity/ https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/diversity/ https://www.apple.com/diversity/

Really just search for any tech company's name and "diversity" and you'll find a flashy page advertising how much they value not only diverse people but diverse opinions.

Sotokun3000 • 16 points • 8 August, 2017 10:07 AM

Here you go : http://www.ucla.edu/about/mission-and-values

Remember the recent riots against trump and milo yanopoulos?

" We value open access to information, free and lively debate conducted with mutual respect for individuals, and freedom from intolerance. "

IdRatherBeTweeting • 11 points • 8 August, 2017 10:17 AM

Oh come on. That is from a pubically funded university, not a corporation. Is that really the best you can do?

Sotokun3000 • 6 points • 8 August, 2017 10:28 AM

It's institutions acting different to their public marketing efforts that im pointing .

Another example:

http://www.bbc.co.uk/careers/why-join-us/values

Remember Recent pay gap debate: "We respect all our colleagues, whoever they are. We're honest, direct and always courteous. We challenge others' ideas but we respect decisions once made. We are ambassadors for our organisation; we speak out if something is not right and deal with it within the BBC."

SovereignSoul76 • 12 points • 8 August, 2017 10:45 AM

...stop wasting your time. This guy is obviously not understanding you or just fucking with you.

IdRatherBeTweeting • 9 points • 8 August, 2017 10:35 AM

The BBC is a publicly-funded organization in the U.K. It is the opposite of a corporation. Try anything from the S&P500. Hell, anything that trades on the stock market even.

wanderer779 • 7 points • 8 August, 2017 01:40 PM

I don't read marketing booklets but the leaders of these companies have definitely made statements that they encourage diversity of opinion.

Everyone who disagrees with them knows this is BS, of course. But they do say it.

[deleted] • 3 points • 8 August, 2017 10:46 AM

> > How is this even controversial?

> > > IdRatherBeTweeting • 5 points • 8 August, 2017 10:48 AM
> > >
> > > Well there is a huge controversy about it currently, so by the very definition of the word it is controversial.
> > >
> > > I don't think we should get into the debate itself here, since this conversation focuses specifically on whether corporations encourage debate on controversial non-workplace related topics or not.
> > >
> > > .

> > tobasoft • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 07:25 PM
> >
> > he can and will absolutely win a wrongful termination suit.
> >
> > source: my boss is a workplace law specialist lawyer
> >
> > .

> max_peenor • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 04:24 PM

Well, except is this speech? It was an unpublished paper, presumably meant for his superiors. If he was fired for that, this reeks of whistleblower retaliation. Which takes me back to what I said before--they probably vested all his options and RSUs, and then traded an NDA for a nice package. I doubt he was curled up in a ball crying it out over the weekend.

.

IdRatherBeTweeting • 45 points • 8 August, 2017 10:10 AM

Corporate culture has always been about the work. You show up, you work, you go home. It is common knowledge that if you bring up religion, politics, or sex you are playing with fire and risk termination. It has never been a place for free speech. There is no "battle for free speech" in the corporate workspace.

If you go to work and send out an email about controversial political / societal issues, you can expect to hear from HR and may lose your job. That's the way it has always been. Corporate email is not a platform you are entitled to use for spreading your personal views on non-work related topics.

> jm51 • 13 points • 8 August, 2017 01:26 PM
>
> The guy must have already known that.
>
> My guess is that he was becoming increasingly unhappy with the way things were going and had a Jerry Maguire moment.
>
> Either that or he did it as a career boosting move.
>
> Either way, I think he'll come out of this ok.
>
> .

> Sotokun3000 • 7 points • 8 August, 2017 10:16 AM
>
> Do you read what I'm typing?
>
> I just argue that what happens in reality is different to what is stated publicly in company marketing efforts.
>
> That's all there is to it. Pointing this fact, nothing more nothing less.

> > IdRatherBeTweeting • 5 points • 8 August, 2017 10:19 AM
> >
> > Where in "company marketing efforts" does it say that you are free to use corporate email to discuss controversial political and societal issues without fear of retribution?

> > > Sotokun3000 • 7 points • 8 August, 2017 10:23 AM

Do you work alone or at a company? In many big companies you are encouraged to discuss issues for example racial discrimination etc.

There are even clubs set up for this within the companies, LGBT clubs etc. All have political content. Open discussions are encouraged.

Therefore I point out the discrimination in allowed political content which is contrarian to the marketing efforts.

I'm off this debate as it may be a waste of my time

> IdRatherBeTweeting • 9 points • 8 August, 2017 10:27 AM
>
> You are quitting this debate because you claimed corporations frequently publish marketing materials that encourage or support free speech but then you failed to find even a single example of this.
>
> You are quitting because you were wrong. The first step towards becoming a reasonable human being is being able to admit when you're wrong. Give it a shot.

>> Sotokun3000 • 4 points • 8 August, 2017 10:30 AM
>>
>> Don't be a troll mate it's bad for your health.
>>
>> I attached another link on one of your comments above.
>>
>> Have a good day

>>> IdRatherBeTweeting • 8 points • 8 August, 2017 10:44 AM
>>>
>>> I am challenging you to provide a source for a dubious claim. That is the opposite of trolling.
>>>
>>> So far you've tried to pawn off a public university in the British broadcasting company as "corporations". since you don't seem to know what a corporation is, just pick any one of the thousands of companies that is publicly traded on the NASDAQ or Dow Jones stock exchanges.

>>>> Sotokun3000 • 6 points • 8 August, 2017 10:49 AM
>>>>
>>>> Lol man quite persistant: there you go, another example that discussions other than work related are encouraged in the work environment.
>>>>
>>>> https://www.home.barclays/about-barclays/diversity-and-inclusion/LGBT.html
>>>>
>>>> " Imagine being worried that people will judge you simply because of the person you love, or the gender you identify with. I can't imagine not being able to come into the office and talk about what I did on the weekend. "

>>>>> IdRatherBeTweeting • 9 points • 8 August, 2017 10:57 AM*
>>>>>
>>>>> That statement is about how the company doesn't discriminate against LGBTQ employees. It says nothing at all about free-speech in the workplace. Try again.

[deleted] • 5 points • 8 August, 2017 11:26 AM

how is it about the work when they force feed you unconscious bias training?

> IdRatherBeTweeting • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 11:59 AM

That's a totally different topic and corporations promoting free-speech with in their workplace.

> [deleted] • 4 points • 8 August, 2017 12:07 PM
>
> Didn't say anything about free speech. I just think it's not all about the work per se, it's also about whatever bullshit they feel like you need to be force fed. I find it very similar with communist propaganda. Granted, as long as it's on company time, I'll do whatever useless training as long as it's not illegal.

wanderer779 • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 01:45 PM

the difference here is that I'd imagine you can circulate all the political memos you want as long the higher ups agree with you. If this guy would have circulated a memo arguing the other side of this issue nothing would have happened to him.

[deleted] • 19 points • 8 August, 2017 12:37 PM

The replies you've received shows how cucked western men are. "Companies are free to do what they want"... statements like these are exactly why feminism has such an entrenched foothold in society and culture. It's cucks like them that allow the left to win the culture wars for 40 years while they go on and on about muh principles and other bullshit. It's not even that you shouldn't be principled, it's these myopic lazy libertarian statements like "companies should be allowed to do what they want" that they miss the big picture... you can disagree with and combat what these companies are doing while still agreeing they should be free to dictate their own corporate culture to their employees.

Google prides itself on openness and equality, it's ridiculous that they can say that and then fire someone for wrongthink. There is something very wrong about what they're doing and they need to be called out. I normally wouldn't care but Google has enormous influence over how the masses think.

Nobody is saying that you have to put your name out there, but you can support the ones fighting against this pervasive post modernist, cultural marxist bullshit that has invaded Silicon Valley. Even something as simple as following Jordan B Peterson on twitter or YouTube helps. Let's say you don't even want to do that. Then speak about issues like this anonymously whenever you can, especially in forums like TRP. Put a stop to this myopic cuckservative "muh principles" crap where you continue to cede territory to blue haired genderfuck feminists who are the reason why TRP needs to exist.

> Sotokun3000 • 17 points • 8 August, 2017 01:03 PM
>
> My argument is simple.
>
> It's a paradox to promote LGBT and racial openness and on the other hand condemn criticism of those. Openness should allow criticism.
>
> It's a paradox to say "people should be allowed to have whatever sex orientation they want and be allowed to talk openly about it and have the right to be offended and vocal about it if criticised
>
> But there is no right to be offended if the source of offence is discrimination in favour of minorities

>> [deleted] • 8 points • 8 August, 2017 01:15 PM
>>
>> I agree and it kills me inside that these hypocrisies exists yet these presumably smart people on the left doesn't see it. They always have excuses, eg straight white males are historically and institutionally privileged so it's okay to marginalize their opinions. No it's not okay. That's racism, something they purport to be against.

>>> TunedtoPerfection • 8 points • 8 August, 2017 01:30 PM

SJW have long proven you can't be racist against the source all that is evil, "a white male."

Newreddawn • 6 points • 8 August, 2017 08:25 PM

It's similar "logic" to why it's impossible to be racist against white people. You can break the logical rules if it's for the purpose of tearing down a power structure. What is really going on is standard hypocrisy. People never wanted justice, they just want to shift the balance of power. Openness and diversity are key words signaling a desire to shift power to people who aren't straight white men. So there was never any real expectation of diversity of opinion. Those announcements were a tongue in cheek way of saying there's a new sheriff in town and xir is looking to go after people with traditional values.

OneRedYear • 3 points • 8 August, 2017 03:00 PM

> Openness should allow criticism.

The sooner you learn that should is a word of the weak the better and clearer your thinking will be. Anytime you use should, you are dreaming and not in reality. I should have my cock smoked by super models. See how that works?

wanderer779 • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 01:35 PM

just started reading the article on bloomberg. about a paragraph in and can already tell they have no intention of giving this guy a fair shake.

The google statement reminds me of the statements from Iraqi officials during the early days of the war when their army was obviously getting trounced and they kept saying they were winning.

"In her initial response to the memo, Brown, who joined from Intel Corp. in June, suggested that Google was open to all hosting "difficult political views," including those in the memo. However, she left open the possibility that Google could penalize the engineer for violating company policies. "But that discourse needs to work alongside the principles of equal employment found in our Code of Conduct, policies, and anti-discrimination laws," she wrote."

In other words, you can say anything you want, as long as you agree with us.

Wh1te_Cr0w • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 10:09 PM

The Atlantic has a stunning example of what total, unmitigated disconnect with reality looks like

herbw • 14 points • 8 August, 2017 07:17 PM

Quoting Mark Twain immortal words: "If you want to stay out of trouble in your lifetime, NEVER speak the whole truth in public."

Still true for the last 3 centuries.

Starter91 • 144 points • 8 August, 2017 08:02 AM

Silicon valley is mentally ill, what else is new?

colovick • 3 points • 8 August, 2017 01:14 PM

They keep creating economic bubbles because a handful of them always manage to convince businesses that things are worth more than they really are

[deleted] • 4 points • 8 August, 2017 02:49 PM

That's only possible because it is so easy for businesses to convince people that things are worth more than they really are

[deleted] • 87 points • 8 August, 2017 07:39 AM

Use the brave browser. Not chrome.

> vorot9326 points 8 August, 2017 12:51 PM **[recovered]**
>
> Chrome (and even Chromium) is evil regardless of Google's social agenda
>
> https://arstechnica.com/information-technology/2015/06/not-ok-google-chromium-voice-extension-pulled-after-spying-concerns/
>
> > [deleted] 8 August, 2017 04:10 PM
> >
> > [permanently deleted]
> >
> > > ThrowingMyslfOutther • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 06:06 PM
> > >
> > > That's a great suggestion if what you are searching for is not important and you can afford to have 20% relevant links missing.

> HasCookies • 4 points • 8 August, 2017 10:53 AM
>
> It's unfortunately missing a lot of extensions that chrome has.
>
> > HoundDogs • 5 points • 8 August, 2017 01:13 PM
> >
> > This is why I stopped using it. I didn't realize just how convenient Crome was until I tried to switch.

> perplexedm • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 09:05 AM
>
> Ironic that there was no need at all for a browser which use payments when free ones existed. But, SJWs caused this to happen.
>
> > cherryCanSuckMyDick • 7 points • 8 August, 2017 12:06 PM
> >
> > Chrome requires payments now?
> >
> > > perplexedm • 13 points • 8 August, 2017 01:18 PM
> > >
> > > Brave browser is created by Brendan Eich who had to leave Mozilla since SJWs went ape shit because of Brendan's donations to some anti-gay charity years back before he got appointed as CEO.
> > >
> > > Due to its advertisements blocking, Brave came out with a system to reward publishers, called Brave Payments. This system allows users to optionally set a budget that they are willing to donate to the websites they visit. Brave will then calculate the percentage assigned to each website through an algorithm and the publisher receives a transfer in bitcoins if it opts into the system.

bsutansalt[M] [score hidden] 8 August, 2017 02:43 PM* stickied comment

Tons of solutions here if you're fed up with Google. I stopped using them for searches and went with Bing ever since they fucked with search results favoring Clinton during the election cycle last fall.

---

h/t /u/genius0o7

For all the pedes trying to avoid google, their main source of income is you. Yes you, pede. You are the data

---

they sell to third party agencies. Your gmail accounts are scrubbed for targeted keywords. Your search history is attached to your ip. Your entire internet presence through (chrome) the internet is being monitored 1984 style to "package" to a bidder.

Words of wisdom to live by - "If a service is free, you are the product"

Avoidance comes in three stages - Desktop, Mobile, and Network Security. I'll tackle each in their respective fields. I am recommending duckduckgo as the search engine but you can substitute any you deem noncucked. Hope this helps everyone out there.

Desktop Browsers:

For most internet activities, you should really secure your browser from Google. I suggest:

Opera -Benefits include built-in ad blocker, battery saver and free VPN. http://www.opera.com/

Sync from Chrome to Opera https://blogs.opera.com/news/2016/04/how-to-sync-bookmarks-faq-opera/

Set duckduckgo to autosearch http://ccm.net/faq/33932-opera-how-to-change-the-default-search-engine

Firefox - Benefits in recent updates includes using less resources (than previous) and privacy with app installation. Also has addons and a vibrant community. https://www.mozilla.org/en-US/firefox/desktop/

Sync from Chrome to Firefox https://support.mozilla.org/en-US/kb/import-bookmarks-google-chrome

Set duckduckgo to autosearch https://support.mozilla.org/en-US/kb/change-your-default-search-settings-firefox

Firefox add-ons http://www.hongkiat.com/blog/firefox-security-plugins/

Vivaldi - Benefits include super lightweight, highly customizable, and quick commands. https://vivaldi.com/?lang=en_US

Sync from Chrome to Vivaldi and Autosearch - Not yet.

Brave - Privacy focused browser https://brave.com/

Sync from Chrome to Brave - Not yet.

Set Duckduckgo to autosearch - requires some file mctrickery, specifically "change the defaultOpenSearchPath in js/constants/config.js from Google to './content/search/duckduckgo.xml', it'll search duckduckgo by default"

Mobile:

Opera and Firefox sync to mobile once logged in. I have a slight gripe with opera mobile - it tends to hang for 2-3 seconds after opening not to mention a million other mobile browsers.

Secure yo' shiiiiiit - Network Security

First - Get a VPN. What is a VPN? Click Here https://www.whatismyip.com/what-is-a-vpn/ There are in-browser apps that do it as well as standalone programs. Most of the good ones that don't keep logs are paid services. The ones that are free tend to sell your data to third parties, much like the Goog'. Here are a few I would recommend:

CyberghostVPN http://www.cyberghostvpn.com/en_us

VyprVPN https://www.goldenfrog.com/vyprvpn

IpVanish https://www.ipvanish.com/

ExpressVPN https://www.expressvpn.com/

Also, these allow you to connect outside the US servers and Torrent http://www.tixati.com/download data

through websites such as Thepiratebay. http://www.thepiratebay.se/ Make sure you don't download any copyright material though, like the new game of thrones episode, as that is illegal copyright infringement.

Pro-pede-tip - Credit to /u/FanOfGusts Create host file https://www.reddit.com/u/FanOfGusts

Email

While I don't have any specific ones i've tried (hotmail user since 1995), there are a few alternatives around the net. Here is a list to get yall started migrating away from Gmail http://thetechreader.com/tech/top-4-free-email-alternatives-to-gmail-that-protect-your-privacy-best-gmail-alternatives-2016/

Facebook

This POS Zuck the Cuck. I know you pedes stay connected to the plebs through FB. No doubt about it it's a necessary evil we'd like to eradicate from our lives. One way of securing it is to go here. https://www.facebook.com/ads/preferences/?entry_product=ad_settings_screen Click the top right corner of all the boxes in each phantom dropdown column for an in-depth look at the datamine FB and Goog' have been collecting on you pedes. Last one. I'm really going to bed this time.

> redpillbanana • 6 points • 8 August, 2017 03:30 PM
>
> Great list, thank you.
>
> > "If a service is free, you are the product"
>
> QFT.
>
> Also: free is great, but let's say Google decides to shut down your Gmail account. What recourse do you have? None...you're not a paying customer.
>
> Fastmail: I've heard great things about Fastmail so it might be worth adding to your list. They take bitcoin and also support U2F. Do you value your email service? Then it's worth paying for.
>
> Protonmail: (on your list already) is great too. They also take bitcoin (and also have a free version), but no U2F yet...hopefully they will support it soon.
>
> Since I'm touting U2F, and we're talking about security, I'll mention that Opera version 40 or later supports U2F. Firefox doesn't seem to yet, though it's been on their buglist for over 3 years. However, it's easy enough to install an add-on that supports it.
>
> If you care about security, you should be using U2F as there's no better widespread solution out there. Get a Yubikey or an Onlykey.
>
> > DanklyNight • 3 points • 8 August, 2017 05:33 PM
> >
> > What if you are a paying customer of Gmail?
>
> [deleted] 8 August, 2017 07:35 PM
>
> [permanently deleted]
>
> > afkb39sdfb • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 10:04 PM
> >
> > Don't forget to delete the apps off your phone, they run silently in the background and farm your info.
>
> afkb39sdfb • 4 points • 8 August, 2017 09:52 PM*

Proton Mail

Free, based in Switzerland and protected by Swiss privacy laws.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Information_privacy_law#Switzerland

Also, GOOGLE TRACKS AND SAVES EVERYTHING YOU DO on your google account. Maps location history, device info, web & app activity, voice & audio activity, YouTube activity. Delete it and turn it off. https://myaccount.google.com/activitycontrols

http://www.wired.co.uk/article/google-history-search-tracking-data-how-to-delete

> growthup2 points 10 August, 2017 11:28 AM **[recovered]**
>
> If you pay for Protonmail you get access to ProtonVPN as well :)
>
> > afkb39sdfb • 2 points • 10 August, 2017 01:00 PM
> >
> > I didn't know that, been meaning to get a VPN.
> >
> > .

Yankee_Fever • 2 points • 9 August, 2017 12:32 AM

bro. not only is every single president exactly the same, but if you boycott google you wont be able to function withing society in a couple years.

android and google are the two most powerful forces, arguably in the world right now

> Reformed653 points 9 August, 2017 02:44 PM* **[recovered]**
>
> Android is powerful because it's well established, cheap and powerful as well as having access to a lot of applications.
>
> But if stop using services like Google search engine and Gmail as our main resource, Google will take a hit, and soon overtaking Android will get easier because as Google gets weaker, so does Android and developers and phone companies will look at other alternatives.
>
> > jerdna-- • 2 points • 11 September, 2017 04:11 AM
> >
> > Bro I'm running android phone without google for maybe 2 years, never had issue with any feature.
> >
> > .

Aan2007 • 4 points • 8 August, 2017 08:31 PM

you know Opera is chinese browser, right?

.

brucewvyne • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 11:08 PM

you have a lot of time on your hands

.

ObviouslyRP • 2 points • 9 August, 2017 01:28 AM

Fuck I've always wanted to stop supporting Google but it's just so much work to unplug from them. Unplugging from the BP delusions. Easy simply requires a paradigm shift. Unplugging from Google requires research and all sorts of effort.

.

OneRedYear • 120 points • 8 August, 2017 07:24 AM

Your version of the truth doesn't matter at work. The company line does. Think as you like, behave as others.

> M_Justice[S] • 59 points • 8 August, 2017 07:29 AM
>
> A true "brave new world" and dystopic future (or present) where trying to insist there are biological

difference between men and women is a crime. A future where all gender differences are genetically modified so we have transgender humans who can only procreate in a controlled laboratory setting to make sure the hormonal output and brain development progresses in a gender neutral fashion

> read_if_gay_ • 27 points • 8 August, 2017 10:02 AM
>
> That legitimately sounds worse than Huxley's Brave New World
>
> .
>
> Schlagv6 points 8 August, 2017 10:41 AM [recovered]
>
> Please, use the word sex differences.
>
> Gender difference is SJW language.
>
> Gender is for words not humans.
>
>> systemshock8696 points 8 August, 2017 11:21 AM* [recovered]
>>
>> No, redefining the word gender is for SJWs. To sane humans ~~there shouldn't be a difference~~ the difference is purely semantic.
>>
>> Edit for clarity
>>
>>> [deleted] • 4 points • 8 August, 2017 11:56 AM
>>>
>>> While you're correct, I think he was making a broader point about it being important not to surrender language ground
>>>
>>>> systemshock8692 points 8 August, 2017 11:58 AM* [recovered]
>>>>
>>>> Which is exactly what you do if you quit using the word gender because a bunch of psychos are trying to redefine it.
>>>>
>>>> .

JoseJimeniz • 29 points • 8 August, 2017 12:11 PM

This. He was fired because his valid, well-reasoned, sourced, essay that he only shared privately with select colleagues, got out - and it was embarrassing to the company.

the headlines weren't "a guy wrote this"
they were "a Google employee wrote this"

It's not what he intended. He didn't do anything wrong. And Google would like to do the right thing all the time but they can't. They would be tied up with for months when there are more important things they can be doing.

> .
>
> Punchpplay • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 01:14 PM
>
> Think as you like but support the death of the Red Pill ..... no thanks
>
>> OneRedYear • 3 points • 8 August, 2017 02:47 PM
>>
>> I need to pay my bills more than I need everyone to know the red pill is the TRUTH (TM).
>>
>> .

[deleted] • 268 points • 8 August, 2017 09:44 AM

A doctorate in STEM from Harvard, and still he's fucking stupid enough to think "yes, circulating this highly provocative memo will be a great professional move".

Wrap up your dick AND your thoughts, lads.

Dr_D1amond • 87 points • 8 August, 2017 09:49 AM

Im not sure he did intend for it to be circulated. But clearly someone in the circle he shared it with thought it wise to distribute

> wristcontrol • 29 points • 8 August, 2017 03:11 PM
>
> He broke the cardinal rule of professional communication: do not write anything in an email that you wouldn't want to see printed on the front page of the national newspaper.
>
> > quotegenerator • 3 points • 9 August, 2017 10:02 AM
> >
> > I would add don't write it down or put it in a computer at all. It's dangerous enough saying it aloud when there might be hot mics around.
> >
> > .
>
> [deleted] • 15 points • 8 August, 2017 10:00 AM
>
> True, no evidence of intent.
>
> On further reflection, be like Yonatan Zungar - he was smart enough to align himself with the righteous faction and earn enormous woke-points by writing a Medium post condemning James. If he doesn't believe what he wrote, so much the better for him.
>
> .

mercuryg90 points 8 August, 2017 11:14 AM* **[recovered]**

From the looks of it, he thought as long as he acts as respectful, diplomatic, and reasonable as possible then people would do the same in return, despite him opposing the established dogmas, this is just naive and bullshit (always has been, not just in todays SJW times). The silver lining though is that this is an important lesson for anyone not yet brainwashed and who takes the time to read the 10 pages, any reasonable person will realize this has got to be the *tamest* controversy text ever, and anyone genuinely offended by it are hypersensitive lunatics. I really expected much worse, but this is the least offensive "offensive" manifesto ever.

> [deleted] • 63 points • 8 August, 2017 12:37 PM
>
> He hedged each sentance in virtue signalling. Half the memo is him saying women are great, diversity is great, and he's a good person.
>
> Didnt matter.
>
> You can see why people stop attempting to be diplomatic. He should have kept his mouth shut thpugh
>
> > belisaurius • 31 points • 8 August, 2017 01:02 PM
> >
> > You can staple as many roses to a log of shit as you want, and people will still smell your shit. The point of diplomacy isn't to 'hide' your ideas, it's to present them in a way that your audience can hear them without being turned off. Finding the right words to express yourself to an audience is just as important as the idea itself.
> >
> > > [deleted] • 41 points • 8 August, 2017 01:20 PM
> > >
> > > That's the point. There was no right way. Emperor wants you to say he looks stylish, period.
> > >
> > > He doesnt want you to see 4 lights
> > >
> > > .
> >
> > FakeGuru • 3 points • 8 August, 2017 01:39 PM
> >
> > Exactly right and it backfired.

Much better to have made a precise allegation.

vwzwv • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 08:30 PM

Signaling like that comes off as having a snaked tongue, and usually means the writer sees the intended readers as dominant, irrational, and pig-headed. Getting out of that kind of writing mindset can be difficult. By doing that he is signaling that others can tear him limb from limb, and that he has lost before the readers have a meeting about it. People are so one dimensional when reasoning with others.

max_peenor • 11 points • 8 August, 2017 03:43 PM

He may have also decided to retire. They probably gave him a spectacular package as long as he signed an NDA. Not doing so would cause them great trouble in court, since this was not published to the public.

RedPillFusion • 24 points • 8 August, 2017 01:11 PM

It might have been done out of stupidity, but it might have also been done out of courage. When you have his level of credentials, perhaps you give less of a fuck about what your employer might do in response. You don't think the author of this "manifesto" was completely lucid and aware of the possible consequences? Nigga please. Man's a fucking hero.

Schlagv45 points 8 August, 2017 10:39 AM **[recovered]**

He probably wanted to leave anyway. I'm sure with the publicity he will easily find a new job in an anti-SJW corporation.

It smells like a purely political move. He couldn't ignore what would happen.

[deleted] • 71 points • 8 August, 2017 11:10 AM

Or maybe some people are dumb enough to really believe in idealistic values like rational discourse of ideas and changing the world to something better by speaking up.

AttackOnKvothe • 29 points • 8 August, 2017 11:22 AM

Thats how Donald Trump got elected, thought.

Many people got tired of the shit which was happening, and voted against the mental illness in their country.

[deleted] • 35 points • 8 August, 2017 12:03 PM

If you analyze it closely, Trump did the exact opposite.

He hired hiw own pollsters to find out what people really wanted and what troubles they really had. Then he kept his thoughts to himself and pandered to what the people were already thinking.

And then he just voiced their thoughts, because you can only teach somebody something that he already knows.

if you remember, he had different talking points in the beginning of the primaries, compared to the end of the race in the general election. He is a true mastermind.

Steelmade58 • 12 points • 8 August, 2017 01:05 PM

Not only that. He also kept on repeating phrases written for him. Every time he got out of the script he fucked up. That's how we know he's not into what he was speaking of.

IShavedMyNutsForThis6 points 8 August, 2017 05:02 PM* **[recovered]**

Voting for Donald Trump is **definitely** not voting *against* mental illness. Trump is about as batshit insane as they come.

[deleted] • 5 points • 9 August, 2017 02:41 AM

Is he actually insane, or is it just a persona he puts on because it works for him? Like Kissinger's mad man hypothesis.

.

beginner_ • 9 points • 8 August, 2017 11:26 AM

Yeah. this naivety more common in highly educated (high IQ?) people than one would assume. You could count be to that group, before TRP.

.

cashmoney_x • 3 points • 8 August, 2017 11:37 AM

Fuck, I'm still sort of stuck in this mode of thinking :(

dum_dum_boy • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 04:34 PM

shhh. shhh. it's ok. just follow the Law of Power #233 that is applicable in every context, and in every situation! NEVER speak up, just behave like all the others! that way nothing ever changes, and the people in power remain in power! now go lift, fuck, and make some widgets for Daddy Rothschild!

.

dum_dum_boy • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 04:29 PM*

yeah, so I guess that would make this entire sub idealistic too. just a sub for dumb, delusional men who think they could change the world.

Those British colonists, man...what idiots! Thinking they could actually run their shit better than ol King George. Har har har. Let's lump those Greeks and Romans in there too. Buncha fuckin delusional, idealistic morons.

.

Vague_Disclosure • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 06:00 PM

He is probably used to rational conversation within his well educated social circle. He got screwed once his ideas got out to the general public who by the standards of a Harvard Phd holder are much less intelligent, lack critical thinking skills, and hold no respect for actual data and statistics.

.

SkyGrl377 • 25 points • 8 August, 2017 10:09 AM

Or maybe he knew he'd get fired and thus receiving a ton more attention for it. In the end he redpilled a ton more people. Could've all been planned, just saying.

[deleted] • 4 points • 8 August, 2017 12:11 PM

I doubt it was any kind of martyrdom.

He's probably got a gig set up somewhere else and just wanted to flash the left's own insanity back at them on his way out.

redpillschool • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 02:34 PM

> He's probably got a gig set up somewhere else and just wanted to flash the left's own insanity back at them on his way out.

> There's a lot to be said for the media attention he's getting. If he was building a brand (a la Milo) this would be a great way to do it.

>> colovick • 5 points • 8 August, 2017 01:16 PM

>> At the very least, Google openly and publicly said they fired him for this letter specifically, so I can sue them over it if he's so inclined

Punchpplay • 22 points • 8 August, 2017 01:11 PM

Yea instead of being a hamster in a cuck filled corporation, he will be a voice for change and sanity and can easily make money off of this publicity ... what a fucking tool, amirite guys?

> [deleted] • 13 points • 8 August, 2017 01:28 PM

> How can he monetise this? Every HR department in the land will have a giant neon sign above his photo saying "do not hire", and he will be no-platformed at every speaking opportunity. He's kryptonite.

>> Punchpplay • 19 points • 8 August, 2017 01:48 PM

>> Every HR that's attached to Politically correct money, which is huge right now but not all encompassing. This guy is a PhD, he can find a new job with a private company very easily, especially with employers who privately agree with him. Or he can create a business of his own based on his ideals, to think that the world has become so cucked that the blue pill establishment can destroy this man is to basically say masculinity and the red pill has lost.

>>> [deleted] • 5 points • 8 August, 2017 01:50 PM

>>> You're right, there are still sensible outfits about who will assess him on his skills. Here's hoping!

>> [deleted] • 7 points • 8 August, 2017 05:02 PM

>> Gab already offered him a job

wendoll • 10 points • 8 August, 2017 11:47 AM

Only express your opinions if they align with the left. If they're on the right then make sure you shut your mouth. - liberals

twy344015 points 8 August, 2017 11:53 AM **[recovered]**

He's an idiot and deserves to be fired for the level of shit that's now raining down on Google; the damage he's done to his own company. yes, I read his manifesto. It was easily, entirely predictable.

Remember folks: The First Amendment does NOT apply to your job unless you work for the government, and even then, not really.

Colin Kapernick is free to express whatever he wants from the cheap seats of an NFL stadium. No one has a Constitutional Right to a job.

> redpillschool • 9 points • 8 August, 2017 02:35 PM

> I mentioned above:

> There's a lot to be said for the media attention he's getting. If he was building a brand (a la Milo) this would be a great way to do it.

>> TheRedThrowAwayPill • 2 points • 9 August, 2017 06:03 AM

> It was easily, entirely predictable.

Absolutely!

He copy pasted the normal shit we've heard on these forums for the past 3-5 years. Standard stuff. Nothing new.

I couldn't believe this guy was dumb enough to email all that shit to anyone. If he was smart he should have just stuck to reverse-discrimination as that is an offense which the company can get sued for, thus HR should be wary of.

The rest was our usual /pol/, TRP, MRA shit which no HR department is gonna spend the time of day to listen to.

However he did do some serious damage to Google. If people start thinking Google is toxic .. they may lose potential new hires. Both male **and** female!

I swear this guy was paid off by Google's competition!

[deleted] • 3 points • 8 August, 2017 02:39 PM

He's made clear to the world that Google is SJW-converged and should therefore be avoided by anyone who isn't an SJW.

I sure as heck wouldn't even think of working there after this.

AttackOnKvothe • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 11:21 AM

Or maybe he had the balls to take the bullet for the rest, so maybe the glorious west can stop being so cucked.

king_james_bible • 290 points • 8 August, 2017 07:38 AM

Consider this a reminder: Do NOT talk about the red pill outside this forum.

The world is too cucked to give this ideology a fair hearing right now, because it doesn't play well with the pro-equality media narrative.

Framefame • 38 points • 8 August, 2017 12:28 PM

I talk about TRP to lots of people, I just phrase it differently and don't use the same terms we do. You'd be surprised how much of TRP the average person agrees with if you just make them think about how relationships work (which most people never do)

[deleted] • 252 points • 8 August, 2017 11:26 AM*

> because it doesn't play well with the pro-equality media narrative

Also because TRP is a place where pseudo-intellectuals and misogynists come to try and justify why they aren't getting any pussy. TRP was originally formed as a response to the dangerous and unhealthy echo chamber that is the blue-pilled world but it has gradually devolved into the blue-pilled world's equal, except it's on the opposite end of the bullshit spectrum. Most people here are eager to judge and figure out everyone around them but they never bother to take a look in the mirror. Let's continue oversimplifying the world like real "alphas" do; we don't sound ridiculous at all.

ThirdLegGuy • 122 points • 8 August, 2017 12:03 PM

Words of truth here. TRP easily became an outlet for incels and all that teen rage, but originally it was a beatiful philosophy of becoming a man you would want see in the mirror tomorrow, free from outdated

societal norms, enjoying his inner happiness and simply viewing women as mere humans, with their life goals, biological imperatives, strengths and weaknesses.

> redpillschool • 31 points • 8 August, 2017 02:38 PM
>
> Everything looks rosy in retrospect.
>
> The forum was full of genetic losers since the beginning. That's why the question was asked "why aren't I getting laid?"
>
> The content here is more or less similar to years ago. There's more filler, but the quality stuff is easy to get to.

> ruok4a6926 points 8 August, 2017 12:13 PM* [recovered]
>
> This happens with every movement that brings a positive message and gathers any sort of following; it's immediately assimilated by knuckleheads.
>
> My favorite recent example is the Tea Party. I won't get political here, but TP was an amazing grassroots movement, and then it wasn't.

>> nocroc • 14 points • 8 August, 2017 12:27 PM
>>
>> Hey, would you mind giving me some info on what happend to the Tea Party? I'm not an american but want to read into it - the tea party sounds really interesting!

>>> colovick • 17 points • 8 August, 2017 01:12 PM
>>>
>>> Essentially a large group of republican voters tried to leave the party and form their own party because they weren't being represented by the party they supported. They started holding town hall meetings and tried to get it off the ground, but had no political expertise, do a few good hearted senators from the republican party "defected" to join the movement and help them formulate ideas and setup a working national party. Only instead of doing that, they slowly changed the narrative to be a more extreme form of conservatism and had them rejoin the republican voting base while retaining the notion that the tea party is definitely still a thing

>>>> nocroc • 6 points • 8 August, 2017 01:52 PM
>>>>
>>>> Ok get it I imagined something like this would have happend. Thanks for the heads up.

>>> hot_rats_ • 5 points • 8 August, 2017 02:50 PM
>>>
>>> Tea Party started as a libertarian movement whose popularity was quickly realized by authoritarian politicians, who then used the term to market themselves in the process killing any meaning it once had.

cherryCanSuckMyDick • 11 points • 8 August, 2017 01:12 PM

> Also because TRP is a place where pseudo-intellectuals and misogynists come to try and justify why they aren't getting any pussy. TRP was originally formed as a response to the dangerous and unhealthy echo chamber that is the blue-pilled world but it has gradually devolved into the blue-pilled world's equal, except it's on the opposite end of the bullshit spectrum. Most people here are eager to judge and figure out everyone around them but they never bother to take a look in the mirror. Let's continue oversimplifying the world like real "alphas" do; we don't sound ridiculous at all.

That is a problem with this place, I cant lie, but dont think it isnt having a major positive effect for men

like me. The last 2-3 months since taking the red pill have been some of the best in memory for me.

We just need to organize the sidebar better with the actually useful stuff that TRP has produced for newbies to read (and there is actually a lot of it, you just have to dig to find it)

> redpillschool • 3 points • 8 August, 2017 02:39 PM
>
> > We just need to organize the sidebar better with the actually useful stuff that TRP has produced for newbies to read (and there is actually a lot of it, you just have to dig to find it)
>
> I would argue that side bar is absolutely full of exactly what you need for your first inoculation. Some of it might be heavy, but taking the pill was never meant to be easy.
>
> .
>
> PEDRO_de_PACAS_ • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 05:42 PM
>
> Agreed, there are some gems but also a lot of retarded shit flying around. Let's talk about fucking girls and less about how we think they should behave and live in today's world.
>
> .
>
> redpillschool • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 02:36 PM
>
> Your dissent invalidates your accusation of an echo chamber.
>
> .
>
> FemtoG • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 08:29 PM
>
> stopped coming here 3 years ago cause of this
>
> well put
>
> .

touristtownwasteland • 8 points • 8 August, 2017 01:50 PM

Or because it's an echo chamber where you'll never be wrong

.

[deleted] • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 02:56 PM

The big issue is that moderates don't pay enough attention to either SJWs or the alt-right because they are too busy not caring. Most people are dumb and they don't think about big important issues because they know that their opinion is uninformed and unhelpful. When some extreme group gets control of the narrative, most people just assume that the extreme group must be correct since that group knows so much more about the topic. This is how extreme groups rise to power.

Moderates need to understand that SJWs are just as destructive to honest debate as the alt-right. SJWs weaken the position of real liberals because they make the left seem like kooks who believe feels=reals.

If you can't hear opposing views, if you can't accept evidence, if you can't change your opinion based on new information, and if you are a fan of a political group, then you are part of the problem.

.

Arnoux • 4 points • 8 August, 2017 10:35 AM

The whole world is not too cucked. The biggest cucks are the western societies.

> samenrofringslikeLBJ 17 points 8 August, 2017 10:59 AM* **[recovered]**
>
> Yeah because the mud huts in Africa and Middle East are so alpha. Fuck off with that nativist bullshit. People at Google are not cucked for firing this guy, they are playing into the stereotype of the cucked in a Machiavellian move. If the SJW's start rioting against Google like they do against other corporations, then Google could be in for a pain.
>
> That said, I think this makes me a bit more worried about high-tech companies as investments. You are playing a dangerous game when u cater to the communists. Nothing is stopping this PhD from taking his

talents to a competing service which doesn't pander to pussys.

> AemonDK • 10 points • 8 August, 2017 11:28 AM
>
> you don't seriously believe that middle easterners live in mudhuts?

>> pilljourney • 15 points • 8 August, 2017 12:05 PM
>>
>> I'm amazed at this as well. For all the shit trp says about reading non fiction and expanding your mind and taking in all information to learn from every source, they're terrible at practicing it.

>>> ruok4a69 • 3 points • 8 August, 2017 12:17 PM
>>>
>>> An overarching problem across all of Reddit is that a small minority (as few as one) can make comments that the majority doesn't agree with, yet are cherry picked and become somehow representative of a subreddit.

>>> [deleted] • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 01:34 PM
>>>
>>> Obviously you both are morons, no not everybody in the middle east live in mud huts, some and a lot do. Wht you are doing is a left wing debating tactic to derail an argument. Nobody thinks a person is being homophobic when they call their friends fags, except for the SJW crowd.

>>>> togro20 • 3 points • 8 August, 2017 02:29 PM
>>>>
>>>> "I don't hate gay people, I just use words that are slurs to them!" Look, you may think that you're not homophobic for using words like that, but you look like you are when you throw slurs around. Saying "I don't hate black people, I just like saying the word nigger!" is the exact same thing; you're using a word that has been a insult for a group of people and trying to convince people that you're still respectful to them while doing it.

>> an_actual_cuck • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 01:36 PM
>>
>> Lol @ SJW riots. Because that's been a prevalent problem for *sure*

>>> [deleted] • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 02:01 PM
>>>
>>> OWS begs to differ, Hamburg G20 begs to differ, the PRIDE parade begs to differ, London riots beg to differ, etc. The key thing here is that consumer behaviour has an influence on Google, a bank like GS could give a fuck what some transgendered bums think about them.

[deleted] • 21 points • 8 August, 2017 01:02 PM

It's important to note:

Most posts on Reddit at the moment are condemning Google for silencing the voice of dissent which is surprising and also encouraging.

I for one was expecting a lot of pitchfork talk.

> [deleted] • 6 points • 8 August, 2017 02:58 PM
>
> It is reddit haha. This place is pretty male and hence has a bias toward free speech.

0xdada • 11 points • 8 August, 2017 04:26 PM

There is something people overlook when they read the memo.

What he talks about is **averages**, and the skew in those averages between men and women.

The Google and SJW position is that the distribution of talent in the sample sets across all women and all men in engineering must have the same kurtosis and skew, for men and for women.

The guy's point is that this is extremely improbable given that if there are ANY differences between men and women (the two sample set groups), making policy based on the assumption that the distribution curves are the same is a bad bet.

If you want to guarantee that you will treat everyone unfairly, just treat them all the same. This diversity bullshit is necessarily about treating everyone unfairly, which is why this guy wrote the memo.

Luce_Bree31 points 8 August, 2017 12:21 PM **[recovered]**

Something tells me this event may have a bigger and more positive impact down the line than we can really perceive right now.

This man's essay and highly public firing occurs at a time when cultural and political lines are being actively discussed and redrawn. Due to Google's sheer size, reach, and influence, along with the highly controversial subject matter, a LOT of people are going to wind up seeing that essay, and I think that many are going to see how reasonable it actually is. And I think that even those who (initially) disagree with Dr. Damore's assessments will look at Google's response and, at least on some level, perceive that he was right.

Furthermore, Google inexplicably doesn't seem to understand how the Streisand Effect works. They have only made a martyr out of Dr. Damore, and his action will be seen as courageous by many (it's already been reported that there are those within Google that agree with Damore; how will THEY react to this?).

I think many people, particularly MEN, are silently watching one of the world's most successful companies prioritise ideological and political "purity" (and really, intellectual cowardice and dishonesty) above potentially growing as a business. These people are witnessing that Google has no issues with sacrificing reasonable, intelligent and forthright men for the sake of hurt feelings.

For me, at least, I can see clearly now that, somewhere down the line, Google will eventually fail because they are more concerned with political correctness than growing their company. Because it's Google, for me that means we will potentially miss out on exciting technology that can benefit humanity down the line. I'm sure I'm not the only person viewing Google negatively due to that realization.

Finally, given the crackdowns on social media and the omnipresent YouTube drama, this was the perfect time for something like this to happen (though the worst time for Google). Issues of free speech and an invigorated hunger for the truth--ironically spurred on by Google's search engine--are hot issues right now, and Google has just very publicly placed themselves on the WRONG side of those issues.

This will turn out to be a very good thing.

> SirByron • 11 points • 8 August, 2017 03:46 PM
>
> You should also mention this is an illegal firing and he can sue big time and win.
>
>> ThePantsThief • 3 points • 8 August, 2017 09:36 PM
>>
>> I would pay to watch that trial
>
> [deleted] • 6 points • 8 August, 2017 02:59 PM
>
> It's so well written that I, for one, have been spreading it around whenever I can.
>
> snoozeflu • 5 points • 8 August, 2017 05:28 PM

> > (it's already been reported that there are those within Google that agree with Damore; how will THEY react to this?).
>
> I'm afraid they wont be allowed to react for fear of losing their jobs if they speak up.

> .

[deleted] • 2 points • 9 August, 2017 02:48 PM

They are fully aware of the Streisand Effect. They are also aware by doing nothing they are gonna take a big hit PR pending other legal cases etc... By firing the guy they picking a what they believe to be the winning or more popular side.

> .

KarmaKill23 • 21 points • 8 August, 2017 01:34 PM*

You forgot the best part. His argument is validated by the very people looking to shut him down.

The following is the response email sent by the VP of Diversity, Integrity & Governance, Danielle Brown:

> Googlers,
>
> I'm Danielle, Google's brand new VP of Diversity, Integrity & Governance. I started just a couple of weeks ago, and I had hoped to take another week or so to get the lay of the land before introducing myself to you all. But given the heated debate we've seen over the past few days, I feel compelled to say a few words.
>
> Many of you have read an internal document shared by someone in our engineering organization, expressing views on the natural abilities and characteristics of different genders, as well as whether one can speak freely of these things at Google. And like many of you, I found that it advanced incorrect assumptions about gender. I'm not going to link to it here as it's not a viewpoint that I or this company endorses, promotes or encourages.
>
> Diversity and inclusion are a fundamental part of our values and the culture we continue to cultivate. We are unequivocal in our belief that diversity and inclusion are critical to our success as a company, and we'll continue to stand for that and be committed to it for the long haul. As Ari Balogh said in his internal G+ post, "Building an open, inclusive environment is core to who we are, and the right thing to do. 'Nuff said. "
>
> Google has taken a strong stand on this issue, by releasing its demographic data and creating a company wide OKR on diversity and inclusion. Strong stands elicit strong reactions. Changing a culture is hard, and it's often uncomfortable. But I firmly believe Google is doing the right thing, and that's why I took this job.
>
> Part of building an open, inclusive environment means fostering a culture in which those with alternative views, including different political views, feel safe sharing their opinions. But that discourse needs to work alongside the principles of equal employment found in our Code of Conduct, policies, and anti-discrimination laws.
>
> I've been in the industry for a long time, and I can tell you that I've never worked at a company that has so many platforms for employees to express themselves—TGIF, Memegen, internal G+, thousands of discussion groups. I know this conversation doesn't end with my email today. I look forward to continuing to hear your thoughts as I settle in and meet with Googlers across the company.
>
> Thanks,
>
> Danielle

Straight from the horse's mouth. Ms. Brown acknowledges that a core point of the manifesto is concern over whether or not people can speak their minds at Google and confirms that NO, views different from the prevailing culture will result in termination.

Draaly-Throwaway • 4 points • 8 August, 2017 08:55 PM

People telling someone to stop talking doesn't validate their view. The view must stand on its own.

> KarmaKill23 • 2 points • 9 August, 2017 02:07 PM
>
> It was bad phrasing to say his argument is validated. Of course the entire paper is not validated.
>
> However, as outlined in the TLDR bullet points, part of the reason this manifesto was written is because Google shames into silence anyone who disagrees with certain "sacred ideas", the one focused on here is their push to get Google to a 50-50 male-female workforce. It's right there in the title "Google's Ideological Echo Chamber".
>
> THAT (the notion that Google is a leftist echo chamber) is validated by the actions Google has taken against him.
>
> .

[deleted] 8 August, 2017 11:16 AM*

[permanently deleted]

.

rp_newdawn • 24 points • 8 August, 2017 10:50 AM

Can we sidebar this post? I want the knowledge of this memo saved for future members to read

> [deleted] 8 August, 2017 11:29 AM
>
> [permanently deleted]
>
> .

darthxaim • 15 points • 8 August, 2017 11:18 AM

Sounds like something Jordan Peterson might say.

> MP-The-Law • 4 points • 8 August, 2017 04:36 PM
>
> I thought the same thing, I'd bet money he listens to Jordan Peterson/Dave Rubin
>
> > phamousTRP • 2 points • 9 August, 2017 04:55 PM
> >
> > He does, at the end of his Jordan Peterson interview, James says he's been a huge fan
> >
> > https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SEDuVF7kiPU
> >
> > .
>
> [deleted] • 2 points • 9 August, 2017 02:45 AM
>
> I can't believe Jordan Peterson hasn't been fired from his position by now.
>
> .

[deleted] • 8 points • 8 August, 2017 07:43 PM

I saw this this morning when I got up at 2:30 am.

There is nothing objectionable about the memo. It's well reasoned and rational and does a good job of avoiding biases.

The video that accompanied the article called this memo "insidious" and bigoted and a lot of other nasty stuff.

I had always thought Google was a pretty okay company, but if this man who wrote this memo, as well thought out and reasoned as it is, is fired because of it then I really don't think this country has any hope left.

We shouldn't be asking our politicians about email servers and their connections with Russia. We should be questioning them on when they plan to start the next civil war. How many Americans they hope to butcher and whether they will have Guantanamo style torture camps or just the run of the mill death camps.

Because when two sides are so implacably at odds with each other and can't see eye to eye on anything and also

___

heavily armed then it's just a matter of time.

And it's not like we haven't already done this once before.

Twice if you count the American Revolution.

Politicians are capitalizing on the division for their own ends and leading us farther apart. We should be pointing out that this is the direction they are taking us. Maybe if they are forced to admit it before the fighting starts we might just avoid it.

clonegreen • 8 points • 8 August, 2017 11:42 PM

I have to go on Facebook due to work and I found this smart programmer(female) who was offended and glad Google "did the right thing".

She admitted in her post that she never read the memo yet was bashing the guy for being sexist and racist. After supposedly skimming through it she said well he's not racist, but still sexist.

I can't understand how people can form a completely emotional argument over a headline. These people get riled up without even knowing their claimed enemy it's really pathetic to see this from supposedly smart people.

0xdada • 16 points • 8 August, 2017 04:01 PM

Cue the orgy of virtue signalling from the press.

They are falling over themselves to cowtow. To have a living breathing straw man is so rare. I think some of them may faint.

[deleted] • 8 points • 8 August, 2017 07:06 PM

To add to his memo, a exerp from a Dr. Jordan Peterson lecture: Basically, he explains that fewer women in powerful positions (or eve ln stem in general) aren't absent because of some unseen cultural bias, but because those positions require a massive amount of investment of time and energy to achieve and maintain. The real question, he says, is how are there a select handful of men so insane, they're willing to work 80 hour work weeks? And when we say 80 hour work weeks, we don't mean working for 2 hours a day, followed by coffee breaks, then a meeting or two, lunch, Facebook break then another hour of work, we mean 15.5 hours a day of hard, focused, massively productive work.

Men have created this level of work ethic due to competition. Competition created and driven essentially by high testosterone levels and ambition. Women, by and large aren't interested in this competition due to obvious biological differences; namely lower testosterone levels.

> biggerbetterjobs • 2 points • 9 August, 2017 05:16 PM
>
> > Men have created this level of work ethic due to competition. Competition created and driven essentially by high testosterone levels and ambition.
>
> Also the natural male role to act as a patriarch and provide for one's family. It feels good for men to do this the same way it feels good for the average woman to hold and nurse a newborn baby.

Magnum256 • 13 points • 8 August, 2017 03:31 PM

I thought it was accepted fact that there was biological difference I mean obviously there's a physical difference in muscle mass, average body fat, height, genitals, etc. There's difference in brain weight, difference in IQ spread/variance (men reach the extremes, lowest IQ and highest IQ where women tend to have a tighter range that doesn't extend as far into the very low or very high). This isn't even controversial this is known by doctors, psychologists, etc.

_____

Loki0230 • 14 points • 8 August, 2017 05:21 PM

SJW types don't believe in science and facts, those are tools of the patriarchy

Dr_D1amond • 38 points • 8 August, 2017 09:51 AM

Regardless of any truth in his manifesto, if it gives the company a bad image and reduces their profits, youre going to get fired.

Starter91 • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 09:55 AM

This happens because society is interfering too much in individual person and his personal space but because most people have crippling self esteem and big egos this pulls through like hot knife through butter. society is going against laws of nature and that will not end well.

Dr_D1amond • 5 points • 8 August, 2017 10:08 AM

I wouldn't disagree that society is trying to ignore our biology, but in this instance he was always going to get fired. Google doesnt give a fuck about your beliefs it cares about its profits.

[deleted] • 3 points • 8 August, 2017 02:41 PM

> Google doesnt give a fuck about your beliefs it cares about its profits.

If it did, it wouldn't be letting SJWs run the place.

DoesNotMatterAnymore • 19 points • 8 August, 2017 09:26 AM

The full doc: https://assets.documentcloud.org/documents/3914586/Googles-Ideological-Echo-Chamber.pdf

[deleted] • 6 points • 8 August, 2017 09:39 PM

In a world where men and women occupy identical jobs with identical success, they in turn have to be identical. I, for one, prefer a world where men and women are allowed to be different...

afkb39sdfb • 6 points • 8 August, 2017 10:02 PM

Proton Mail

Free, based in Switzerland and protected by Swiss privacy laws.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Information_privacy_law#Switzerland

Also, GOOGLE TRACKS AND SAVES EVERYTHING YOU DO on your google account. Maps location history, device info, web & app activity, voice & audio activity, YouTube activity. Delete it and turn it off. https://myaccount.google.com/activitycontrols

http://www.wired.co.uk/article/google-history-search-tracking-data-how-to-delete

(Reposted)

lala_xyyz • 7 points • 8 August, 2017 11:36 PM

Google is a company with a political agenda. Julian Assange wrote an interesting piece on it. In short, Google, Facebook and Twitter are in cahoots with the State Department, intelligence agencies and the feminist/globalist/open borders crowd. Never trust them, and never expose yourself to them. But it's pointless to ignore them since they are so pervasive, and provide services not replicable elsewhere - just make sure you minimize your exposure.

TheOriginalWasBetter • 6 points • 9 August, 2017 05:03 AM

I can see the headlines now. "Google Developer accuses women of being less able to handle stress and more likely to take vacation days, stresses out female coworkers causing them to take a vacation day".

gattaca_ • 10 points • 8 August, 2017 04:38 PM*

Google is being accused of extreme gender discrimination by the U.S. Labor department.

Not firing the employee could provide support for this discrimination case and may be expensive (e.g. half their highly paid work force suing and/or getting a raise).

Termination is the safer bet.

The downsides (massive lawsuit, alienating employees) far outweigh any benefits of letting him stay.

They're just covering their ass and spinning it as a gender equality decision.

TL;DR

```
U.S Labor Department: Google is discriminating against women, let's sue
Employee: Women are not biologically suited to work in tech Google: We need
to fire this moron
```

M_Justice[S] • 7 points • 8 August, 2017 04:40 PM

Very true. That's where I came out on this as well. He sues, get's a couple million, but that's a drop in the bucket compared to the PR nightmare and other litigation exposure they already have.

harsha_hs • 16 points • 8 August, 2017 09:58 AM

Wow, what an article. This is gem of a work and Google should be ashamed to not have such an employee

BlindWoodWander • 17 points • 8 August, 2017 10:59 AM

As a fellow biologist, I am offended by his lack of peer-reviewed references. :P

NaturalSelect1on • 13 points • 8 August, 2017 07:39 AM

I really expected this to happen. These things unfortunately are a taboo in IT industry.

blackedoutfast • 11 points • 8 August, 2017 10:24 AM

good lesson for everyone who takes everything literally and doesn't understand powertalk. the same people constantly talking about acceptance of different viewpoints and the importance of a diversity of ideas are the same people who will want to crucify you if you actually have a different viewpoint. and it doesn't matter how logically sound it is or how many footnotes and citations you use to support your argument. you are not allowed to disagree with SJW dogma.

but there's also a good side. there are guys out the who are realizing they aren't completely alone in thinking these thoughts. guys who have tried to be liberal and accepting who read this "racist screed" and realized the author actually had some good points. and then they saw the reaction to it. some of those guys might start to wake up. now everyone knows that no matter what they say, you can't fix the system by playing by the official rules. if they want a world ruled by tribalism and identity politics, so be it.

_____

when you're at work, walking through through hallways filled with "diversity" and underqualified quota fillers, make sure to give a silent head nod to your fellow brothers. the guys who are there because they are actually good at their job, not because of whats between their legs or the color of their skin. make sure to support those guys whenever you can. give them good reviews. watch their 6. find the guys who get it and put them in positions of actual power. push the quota hires and token women toward roles with fancy titles but no influence.

Liver_Aloan • 9 points • 8 August, 2017 12:47 PM

It's also important to note (honestly I don't know if this post said anything about it because I don't have time right now to read the whole thing) that Gizmodo took all the sources out of his memo to make it look like it was just his opinion. This guy sourced all his claims and still was fired for it. Shame on Google.

RedPillWizard • 8 points • 8 August, 2017 12:58 PM

He apparently may have a lawsuit here:

https://www.cnbc.com/amp/2017/08/07/it-may-be-illegal-for-google-to-punish-engineer-over-anti-diversity-memo-commentary.html

[deleted] 8 August, 2017 03:44 PM

[permanently deleted]

ConsumingImpulse • 9 points • 8 August, 2017 05:41 PM

Nobody should have to lose their livelihood for having the "wrong" opinion, but then this is the ultra-cucked Silicon Valley we're talking about. What does the Google hydra even contribute to society aside from endless new ways of sucking up everyone's autonomy online? Think the guys who engineered the Lunar landings gave a shit if they hurt anyone's feelings along the way? They were too busy being badass and making history. Sad fucking world. "You can do it your own way, if it's done just how I say"...

[deleted] • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 02:55 PM

Saw it coming from miles away. Ever try and get "justice" of any kind in corporate America? Ha. The experience is about as black-pill as you can get. I am sure this engineer guy must be 25 or something.

Maybe at some point Google will fade away like Yahoo. But it'll be a while.

[deleted] • 10 points • 8 August, 2017 02:41 PM

Dr. Damore: We should make decisions based on facts and evidence instead of condemning opinions based on our own preconceived ideas, especially in regard to refusing to listen to alternate views on gender bias.

Google: You're fired.

[deleted] • 17 points • 8 August, 2017 11:34 AM

I'm in the tech industry for years and I have yet to meet a female developer who's something more than average.

cherryCanSuckMyDick • 23 points • 8 August, 2017 12:26 PM

Youre sure? Im really not much more than a script kiddie myself, but I find it hard to believe. Youre sure youre not just deceiving yourself?

mbillion • 5 points • 8 August, 2017 11:41 PM

I will be completely objective here. But he is not fooling. I am a mathematician and a techie working primarily in what is about half development and half deployment.

I wont say I do not find any good female programmers, but they are definitely a dime a dozen. I am making no commentary about the biological imperative therein but industry wide you just do not see a lot of good female devs.

Ive consulted at some of the top workplaces for women, millenials, etc and you still do not see this large female developer contingency. Again, mine is an observational statement of fact, colored in no way.

.

max_potential_ • 3 points • 9 August, 2017 12:41 PM

I disagree. They are pretty rare, but they exist.

Anecdotal example: my coworker was a beautiful Asian girl who was the best employee at our small company. She was an excellent problem solver, always organized, always on time, and was a great leader.

But hey, I'm not even graduated yet, so you probably have a more well-based perspective and likely have a much higher standard for "average".

Just sayin', there's women who make great engineers and men who make great aesthetic designers. It's not common, but it happens.

.

Draaly-Throwaway • 3 points • 8 August, 2017 08:53 PM

Good for you. The best coder, as well as the best project manager I have ever worked with have been female. There is a reason anecdotes aren't taken very seriously in science.

mbillion • 4 points • 8 August, 2017 11:43 PM

project manager =/= developer.

Ive worked with plenty of good women in the workplace. My boss is a woman who's strategy and intuition has taken my career to new heights.

But she isnt a developer.

Project Manager would be more like one step above a Business Analyst and definitely not a developer or a STEM career path, although I have seen lots of STEM people go into project management, myself included

Draaly-Throwaway • 3 points • 8 August, 2017 11:46 PM

She was the head research professor of the floor I worked on. I wasn't sure how to call her (so I went the way I did because I know how much beurocratic bullshit she had to sift through), but you are right that project management isn't quite the same as a developer.

.

APSTNDPhy • 7 points • 8 August, 2017 10:43 AM

I just read his entire memo, the irony is too much.

.

Tommy_407 • 3 points • 8 August, 2017 04:57 PM

That was a long post, but, thanks for taking the time to outline the article and all

I wonder how it would have went down if the person writing the paper was the archetypical Chad, dominating and perhaps plating 7 women in the company....

.

[deleted] • 3 points • 8 August, 2017 05:49 PM

theres a great response article on the site quillette from 4 other scientists talking about the memo. the original was taken down. here's an archived link:

https://archive.is/VlNfl

Sciencetor2 • 3 points • 8 August, 2017 07:05 PM

I do not mind how this memo was approached or worded, but an internal company memo was not the forum for it... Also...

> Punished for exercising their free speech

Anyone who uses this line needs to remember this xkcd: https://xkcd.com/1357/

aced • 3 points • 9 August, 2017 12:45 AM

I hope the google execs are only doing this because they fear the shitstorm of bad PR, rather than actually believing that men and women aren't biologically different...

M_Justice[S] • 3 points • 9 August, 2017 12:59 AM

Yes, that's what it is. Calculated decision to take the risk of reprisal from the firing to keep the feminists and beta's happy, which was a greater fallout and risk for them. Apparently, some women employees did not go to work because they think the "memo" created a hostile work environment.

bigfatjew9_11 • 3 points • 9 August, 2017 04:17 AM

Use protonmail.com for secure email and use for for browsing the internet.

itsawomensworld • 3 points • 10 August, 2017 01:31 AM

I am switching from google for email and possibly search. I don't think big brother has kept to their motto of "do no evil."

Google was one of the first stocks I purchased in 2008 but that company that I knew and loved is now dead with this hateful company who believes in intersectionality. That victimhood makes you good.

The media's reaction to this is even worse than Google. Remember the days when they would run over the entire southern US to find the one person who wouldn't bake a gay person a cake and then go SEE YOU'RE ALL RACISTS!!!!

with stories drying up, they now turn to claiming anything people write is sexist. Now simply saying men and women have biological differences and offering some explanations for them makes you a sexist pig. I think the left needs to take it's head out of its ass if it wants anyone else to jump on board their ship going forward.

Remember when the left used to just be about hating the rich? Why can't all leftists be Bernie sanders (who I dislike but I can at least respect). In stead we are all Elizabeth Warren leftists who hate the rich but also hate men, white people , black people. love Trans. It's all about identity to them.

peebles34514 points 8 August, 2017 01:45 PM **[recovered]**

I know this man intended nothing Ill but it still discourages me. I have so many coworkers telling me women should be homemakers and not in tech every day.(I'm a woman physicist) It's disheartening...

[deleted] • 19 points • 8 August, 2017 02:02 PM

Don't listen to them no matter who you are you should do what you love, at the end of the day that's all that matters.

[deleted] • 2 points • 9 August, 2017 01:55 AM

Just a warning, stating your sex as a part of your argument is not allowed here.

.

[deleted] • 6 points • 8 August, 2017 12:27 PM

There is an all out effort in progress to neuter and feminize men in western society. Tin foil hat aside...there is an engineered, slow boil weakening and total confusion of society designed to weaken and pussify men into being subservient and submissive to the powers that be when the shit hits the fan.

Google is an evil entity. It is the censorship of what is correct and wholesome for a natural healthy society.

> BlairResignationJam_ • 3 points • 8 August, 2017 01:47 PM
>
> You believe 9/11 is fake, Clinton is a murderer and there is a Jewish conspiracy to "pussify" men in order to make them submissive when [scary future event] happens
>
> Have you considered seeking therapy?
>
> > [deleted] • 5 points • 8 August, 2017 05:56 PM
> >
> > Wow...what an intelligent come back. You must have learned that completely unoriginal canned response at a liberal university somewhere. So manly and red pill...unless you're a woman, which would make more sense.
> >
> > .

fragglerockerpoo_22 • 7 points • 8 August, 2017 10:01 PM

Why Dr. Damore's memo adds profundity to the dialectic and why it doesn't matter

Dr. Damore's piece was one of the most well thought out arguments for deconstructionist thought around modern rhetoric in recent memory. His eloquent and succinct piece underscores much of the mindless debate revolving around gender issues that are the very core of many of our identities. He embraced the constructionist model, stoic beliefs, and rational thinking while attempting to mitigate cognitive dissonance at the same time. However, as he is arguing against rhetoric and cognitive bias, none of this matters.

The enigmatic field of cognitive bias mitigation is just that: enigmatic. Until medical science has a more thorough understanding of the complex chemical and electrical systems that comprise our neurobiology, we're all operating with a fully empirical approach. Some methods work for some people while others do not. There is no true codex (as of yet) for deciphering each individuals mode of bias and how to overcome it. And until that happens, everything is a shot in the dark.

However, working in the trenches to revolutionize the pervasive attitude towards cognitive bias means that each and every one of us is responsible for not letting our own biases fool us into thinking we are acting rationally. That means we must all seek to understand…both sides. Danielle Brown, the heart of Google's response to Dr. Damore's memo, also has points that we must seek to understand through a deconstructionist lens. Why is Danielle and Google reacting this way, what is behind it, how can we use this understanding of their view points to better understand our own?

It is very easy to dismiss opposing viewpoints on both sides. Dr. Damore himself points out that he too may be biased in his approach: for male rights, for conservative rights, for rational thinking. The ability to embrace emotional thinking as a path towards empathy is a view point that many hold, and although you may personally disagree with this, as Dr. Damore does, we cannot dismiss this thought as the tool of authoritarians attempting to correct a situation they perceive as oppression. We must seek to understand this viewpoint by taking the component pieces apart and putting them back together. In this way we can better understand those around us, as well as our own views on the world. Emotional thinking is not amoral thinking, it is only biased thinking. Philosophy, our philosophy, becomes the argument against emotional thought while psychology becomes the argument for it. We make un-apologetic pleas with the world to help temper their emotions, while at the same time seeking to elucidate their necessity in the human experience. As Alan Watts put it: "There is an uncanny wisdom in the spontaneous and natural reactions of our organism to the course of events. The extraordinary

capacity to feel an event inwardly [emotionally], as distinct from bursting into precipitate action to avoid the tension of feeling—this capacity is in fact a wonderful power of adaptation to life… " The rub, and Dr. Damore's most critical point, is our reaction to our biases. Do we allow them to engulf our actions, or disallow external manifestation from taking over and affecting those around us?

As a group seeking to mitigate bias, we too are guilty of allowing our passions towards this cause overwhelm us. The core tenant of a stoic philosophy is to endure without complaint, to accept our nature as part of who we are thereby not allowing it to effect who we want to be.

Hegel's Dialectic has been nearly proven true. The accuracy in which he describes our sociological manifestations of an action-reaction culture is on the nose. We're doomed to move from one side of the Dialectic to the other, a pendulum constantly swinging from reactionary to liberalizing. We can only hope, in our collective actions and reactions, to dampen that swing each time it passes.

In truth, the heart of this matter is the impermanent-permanent dynamic of online commenting. Our passions drive us to the desire to change, to fulfill an actualization we need to be human. When we perceive injustice we strive to rectify it, if only in word. An online comment is often the same as a passing tempest of exasperation, a fuck you to the cabinet you just hit your head on. It means very little but its lasting impacts to others can be far reaching. No more is that fuck you uttered into the void of the cabinet space to disappear. It will remain, forever, online.

Tl;Dr

You can't find cognitive bias with anything but pathos.

Stech_ • 5 points • 8 August, 2017 01:30 PM

"Nature doesn't arrange itself so that everything it presents to us is in keeping with what we would like to be true politically." - Jordan Peterson

curiouslyengaged • 4 points • 8 August, 2017 02:24 PM

> De-emphasize empathy.While I strongly support trying to understand how and why people think the way they do, relying on affective empathy—feeling another's pain—causes us to focus on anecdotes, favor individuals similar to us, and harbor other irrational and dangerous biases. Being emotionally unengaged helps us better reason about the facts. Prioritize intention.

This - this is the crux of the issue. Liberals are justifying their amoral decision based on empathy. Empathy overrides morality and objectivity.

Nergaal • 11 points • 8 August, 2017 09:59 AM

First rule of TRP: never talk about TRP

Second rule of TRP: never EVER talk about TRP

[deleted] • 22 points • 8 August, 2017 12:01 PM

He got fired because he made a public statement that reflects directly on Google. Not because of what's in there.

DeadJacuzzi • 15 points • 8 August, 2017 01:35 PM

It was a memo within the company that got out. Not a public statement.

NeoreactionSafe • 9 points • 8 August, 2017 11:06 AM

> We can make software engineering more people-oriented with pair programming and more collaboration.

Translation:

"We will pair up a male and a female. The male will do all the work and the female will take the credit when it's a success and direct all blame to her male partner if there is a problem."

.

Messin-About 11 points 8 August, 2017 12:59 PM* **[recovered]**

> men and women differ in many ways

well yeah I agree

> pay gap is because of how women "are"

Lost me there

> trplurker • 11 points • 8 August, 2017 06:14 PM
>
> > Lost me there
>
> He's correct. Men have 12~14x higher testosterone then women, testosterone is responsible for aggressive, competitive high risk behaviors like ambition and the desire to be better then everyone else in a field. Those are the traits required to make it to highly competitive executive positions, they are also the traits that can cause burn out, homelessness, prison time and other socially negative situations. The women who do make it into those highly competitive positions on merit do it by compensating for lack of testosterone with pure ruthlessness. Then we have differences in the neuropathing inside the brain, male and female brains are wired differently, the cause of which seems to be the presence of testosterone during fetal development.
>
> This is a biological fact. You can hate it all you want, wont' change how nature specialized the human genders for specific biological advantages that enhanced the survival rate of homo-sapiens.
>
> .
>
> [deleted] • 3 points • 9 August, 2017 01:58 AM
>
> Women prefer intangible benefits in a job like time off, reduced hours etc.
>
> Men have sexual pressures to earn as much as possible and thus compete to earn more, despite the consequences, as though their genetic lineage depends on it.
>
> .
>
> TaxFreeNFL • 3 points • 8 August, 2017 05:52 PM
>
> I can barely see you way up there on that high road.
>
> I bet it takes you forever to boil an egg.
>
> .

grewapair • 4 points • 8 August, 2017 02:17 PM

Google makes money when you click on their ads.

Stop clicking on the actual ads. Do the search and copy the link on the ad and paste it into your browser. Google won't make a cent.

Stop supporting this bullshit.

.

[deleted] • 4 points • 8 August, 2017 07:23 PM

Your essay is sound, but you should remove the "exercising their free speech" phrase. Free speech does not apply within a employer/employee relationship, especially when the document was written as an internal memo, written on company time.

.

[deleted] • 6 points • 8 August, 2017 10:33 AM

proving further that feminism is a shit test... when presented with a shit test, you never explain, defend, or supplicate. this guy did all 3.

you agree/amplify or mock the notion that the question is asked at all.

> duruga • 3 points • 8 August, 2017 10:55 AM
>
> Agree and amplify does not work either when they have political over you.
>
> Feminists are influencing policy. You have to comply with the feminist laws. You can agree and amplify all you want, you still have to comply. Your kids will be subjected to strong feminist indoctrination through all their education, you can agree and amplify all you want. Its still going to happen.
>
> .

bretw • 5 points • 8 August, 2017 11:41 AM

lol yeah dude, *thats* the part of his memo he was fired for /s

.

Carp8DM • 3 points • 8 August, 2017 02:20 PM

Play stupid games, win stupid prizes.

.

markog1999 • 3 points • 8 August, 2017 02:33 PM

It's not the most well-reasoned or articulated memo I'vee ever read but I don't think it's grounds to fire a dude. Some of what he says about monoculture rings very true; and while his tangents about castrated babys and "left vs right" might be weird, none of this seems malicious. It's just a dude trying to get a word in on the debate. Whether "correct" or not, the guy was well intentioned, and obviously attempting to start a reasonable discussion of the issue, rather than publish a manifesto. But what would i know?

.

juusukun • 7 points • 8 August, 2017 11:26 AM

The thing about free speeches, you are allowed to express it in the appropriate place. I'm pretty sure the ex-employee could have voiced his opinions using a method other than a company-wide memo where he worked at a company that is making efforts towards equality, when less than a century ago there was huge discrimination against women

Sometimes people seem to forget that things have changed very drastically in a short amount of time.

> mbillion • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 11:35 PM
>
> Im firmly convinced that many of these people have no idea what working at a corporation is like. You arent sovereign when you are under contract to toe the company line.
>
> For better or worse, he was fired because he did something against the companies stated message, their work in equality etc etc etc.
>
> HR doesnt care if your publishing is scientifically accurate, you hurt their stock price or open them up to lawsuit you are out
>
> .

[deleted] 8 August, 2017 01:19 PM

_____

[permanently deleted]

> [deleted] • 9 points • 8 August, 2017 02:38 PM
>
> Substantiate your opinion with facts and support. I want to hear this.

jupiter6666 • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 07:31 PM

This guy guillotined himself.

[deleted] • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 08:05 PM

For all his credentials Dr. James Damore needed to learn Law 38 Believe what you line behave as others do.

Entrefut • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 11:18 PM

Dude this is incredible. Opened up Reddit for a quick casual read through the news and found this, thank you so much. There are a lot of viewpoints and ideas that I haven't thought about before and I'm very grateful you brought them to my attention.

[deleted] • 2 points • 9 August, 2017 12:04 AM

> Discriminating just to increase the representation of women in tech is as misguided and biased as mandating increases for women's representation in the homeless, work-related and violent deaths, prisons, and school dropouts.

This is a flawed simile because the goal of equal representation is to reach a desirable state. A fair comparison would be measures that aim to reduce the levels of male homelessness, deaths, prison time and dropout rates down to the level of females (and supposedly by means that are comparable to discrimination).

DOWNVOTE_IF_BUTTMAD • 2 points • 9 August, 2017 02:08 AM

women really are desperate to be wage cucks

pabbseven • 2 points • 9 August, 2017 03:26 AM

Why google. What the fuck are you doing Jesus christ.

SAPPHIREAURA • 2 points • 9 August, 2017 04:42 AM

I read this story and the memo earlier and I couldn't help but think the whole time this guy has taken the red pill. LOL Also, I find it absolutely putrid that women feel like there should be an exact 50/50 representation of them in any industry SOLELY because they're women. It's scary where feminism is taking western society in 2017.

[deleted] • 2 points • 9 August, 2017 12:28 PM

Congrats on the most upvoted post in TRP history!!

slapgentle • 2 points • 9 August, 2017 03:26 PM*

Jordan B Peterson just did an interview with the guy who wrote the memo: https://youtu.be/SEDuVF7kiPU Edit: changed the url

phamousTRP • 2 points • 9 August, 2017 04:56 PM

James Damore reached out to Jordan Peterson and they have an hour long video interview here:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SEDuVF7kiPU

-ATLAS-_ • 2 points • 10 August, 2017 05:42 AM

I shouldn't be surprised, but what's worrisome is that he's talking about statistics, NOT ideology, and yet it devolved into name calling so fast it's ridiculous. It's like today's version of McCarthyism and calling someone a communist, or the 2000's version of questioning war in Iraq and people being afraid of not being a patriot or saying you "support terrorism".

It's just so obvious there's political agendas involved once it gets to these points, so the only question left is "who's political agenda, and why?" History looks so obvious after the fact, but while it's happening everybody just joins the social masses in not questioning any statistics and just getting in line to avoid any social stigma.

> M_Justice[S] • 2 points • 10 August, 2017 04:10 PM
>
> You are right. We are living in a new political age where targeting communists has now been replaced by targeting men. I wrote an article about this era of post-liberal democracy where the only thing left in modern western politics was for people to turn on each other for their personal beliefs and differences when not in conformity with the masses.
>
> http://menslaws.com/index.php/2016/10/04/last-man/
>
> > -ATLAS-_ • 3 points • 11 August, 2017 09:58 AM*
> >
> > Here's my view. The most proven weapon for ruling over people is "divide & conquer". Historically it works better than any other tool for controlling a population of people.
> >
> > We've seen a huge shift since 2012 take place on the interne. One year google is saying "never use your real name or information online" and the next they're *FORCING* everyone's real name and information and accounts and trying to tie it all together with your phone number. The shift in reddit literally shutting down certain subreddits and the changes in moderation (and the loss of Aaron Schwartz along with the Pao controversy)... The crackdown on certain hacker groups. The changes in many sites privacy policy settings (how many of those have we all had to click to agree with). The disturbing changes in Windows ten vs. windows seven's privacy policy... These things that happened during the same shift make you have to look back and go "ok, but what happened right before that." And my best guess is all the 1% rallies against wall street that were happening. Look at reddit front page one year and it was literally leading to policy changes and rallies on the front page that had huge policy shifts and literally rallies across the nation, and the next year it went through a huge shift in separate groups and the rise of the moderators (and the other founder of reddit just so happened to get a nice little book tour during the same time). Literally the movement was front page one year day after day, and the next it was gone.
> >
> > A lot of things happened during that time that broke up "the 99%". Just look even online at the two biggest "hashtag movements" since that time, and you see really clearly the shift away from being "99% vs 1%" and into "men vs. women" and "white vs. black". Gamergate, and BlackLivesMatter. Literally those two were turned into "men vs. women" and "black vs. white". So if you had 99% of the population, divide it in half and you have men vs. women. The next biggest difference is literally the color of skin.
> >
> > Divide & Conquer. You don't have to face a mob if you can get them to fight each other, and the 1% rallies practically disappeared without a trace in a very short time frame. Again, I'm not saying that's concretely what happened...honestly I have no idea. But looking at the biggest differences in one year to the next and everything that's happened since then, it's hard to not see the "biggest issues" politically during that time and avoid pairing it with how we see people treating each other today. A lot of the differences can't even be talked about even statistically, it just goes straight to name calling and "us vs. them" mentality right away.
> >
> > .

---

rhys5584 • 2 points • 25 August, 2017 05:23 AM

Just say your a female on your applications, everyone will give you extra support for being a trans.

managarza • 2 points • 27 January, 2018 10:59 PM

Not to bash in women but this made me look at them as lesser, to boost my confidence

TrollsTellTheTruth • 6 points • 8 August, 2017 12:10 PM

Marissa Meyer was a VP at Google. It seems they like putting brainless whores in positions of responsibility.

sokratesz • 4 points • 8 August, 2017 01:24 PM

I can't believe I'm agreeing (mostly) with a TRP post.

ejpusa • 5 points • 8 August, 2017 09:32 PM

More of an intelligence test? Who would be dumb enough to post this?

Exactly how many Nobel prizes did Madam Curie win? Work with women software developers everyday, many of them are better then the "guys" I work with. Far better actually.

To generalize like this is just dumb. Like saying "ALL WHITE PEOPLE ARE RACISTS", because my uncle Louie is.

nninja • 2 points • 10 August, 2017 03:24 PM

I'm not really surprised. I assume the women who go into software eng are really keen about it, whereas men will go in it because it leads to a good job and they're mostly mediocre.

mbillion • 4 points • 8 August, 2017 11:28 PM

So here is the long story short for those of you not in the career world, or for those of you who do not understand how things work.

(1) HR protects the companies interests. Not yours. Them telling that they got your back is a lie. HR exists to protect the company from lawsuits.

(2) Being openly critical of your employer publicly does not fly in the career world. You just do not do it. This includes publishing articles contrary to the companies stated, goals, directives, and missions.

What does the mean for the redpill.

SEPERATE IT FROM YOUR WORK LIFE. You will be chewed up and spit out for being redpill at work. Doesnt matter if its true or not. Doesnt matter if its published in a peer reviewed journal.

If there is a hint of you as a senior employee playing gender favorites you will be out on your ass so fast.

If there is a hint of you publishing material that challenges your companies public image you will be out on your ass.

Seriously, The Red Pill is about personal improvement, stop trying to change other peoples perceptions. Its about you. This community isnt successful because we yell at people and evangelize. Especially in work, just keep your fucking mouth shut.

thebluepool • 5 points • 8 August, 2017 01:34 PM

We all need to do whatever we can to end Google's monopoly of the search and browser market. They'll most likely start using them to spread feminist and pc ideology.

Start using a different browser, firefox/tor etc. Start using duckduckgo, disconnect search, etc. Start using the

term 'Google' as a synonym for 'search' as often as possible to turn it into a generic trademark.

Do your part.

Smelle • 3 points • 8 August, 2017 01:53 PM

Facts don't care about your feels, but get paid first.

DobroHobo • 4 points • 8 August, 2017 02:26 PM

Well... as much as I agree with the article title, apparently the reason he was fired was for sending it to something like 50,000 people. So yeah I kinda get that now

Hjalmbere • 3 points • 8 August, 2017 03:54 PM

Goodthink^{TM} vs The Truth: 1-0.

Fuck Google.

Ipoopbabiez • 3 points • 8 August, 2017 04:02 PM

I kind of took Google's decision as not really being about the argument itself. The argument was reasonable and did make good points. What made Google fire him, however, was having the company (presumably unwillingly) represent a controversial stance. You cannot deny that discussing biological differences between men and women is bound to be controversial, and holding the stance that they are is not good for the company. As such, I would not get pissed off at Google, but more at society itself

[deleted] • 5 points • 8 August, 2017 05:02 PM

It's a tough one but considering all the publicity, this was likely the best business decision on behalf of Google. It seems like the lesser of evils and that letter really isn't consistent with their own culture. I agree with most of what he said in the letter and I also agree with the move to term the guy.

lookitsgordo8 points 8 August, 2017 01:04 PM **[recovered]**

I just got a new phone and I had a hard time figuring out which subreddits I needed to block.

Thanks for the reminder, guys.

> w0ffen21 points 8 August, 2017 05:05 PM **[recovered]**
>
> ...and nothing of value was lost.
>
> TaxFreeNFL • 4 points • 8 August, 2017 05:57 PM
>
> Holy Shit, the signal seen around the world.
>
> EpicLevelCheater[M] • 6 points • 9 August, 2017 06:35 AM
>
> Rule Zero violation. Banned.

[deleted] • 6 points • 8 August, 2017 02:00 PM

Here's an analysis of why the person would be fired written by a former Google employee
https://medium.com/@yonatanzunger/so-about-this-googlers-manifesto-1e3773ed1788

biggerbetterjobs • 6 points • 8 August, 2017 01:43 PM*

As much as I agree with him. It's a bit socially stupid to just be so crass and tasteless about it.. Or even bringing

_____

it up in the first place (What you think google is going to fire all their female employees or "diversity" approach because joe schmoh software engineer wrote a bitchy letter?) Especially considering the common SJW themes these "official" work offices seem to have with their HR departments. I agree that men are more predisposed to work in tech/computers or some other technical occupation. However that's not to say women can't do those jobs just as well as men or should be barred from entering those environments.

It's relative to an italian guy saying to his boss at the pasta company "Italians are more predisposed at making pasta than a swede." Sure they may be.. But that doesn't mean a swede can't get just as good at making pasta as an italian with time. It also doesn't constitute a swede receiving a lower wage than an italian to work a basic entry level position. To not hire the swede or pay him less than the italian (same job position) would be unlawful discrimination.

Some hire level official at google probably saw how socially stupid this guy was, deemed that he might be a future problem in the workplace and pulled a power move on his ass because software engineers are easily replaceable these days-especially for companies like google. For some super smart coder guy who went to a really good college, this guy is awfully naive. This also exposes the need for liberal arts in cultivating ones' mind in developing rational judgement. If all you spend your whole education on technology and technical fields you'll turn out as spergish as google guy.

> Emma_Watsons_Panties • 3 points • 8 August, 2017 07:43 PM
>
>> It's relative to an italian guy saying to his boss at the pasta company "Italians are more predisposed at making pasta than a swede." Sure they may be.. But that doesn't mean a swede can't get just as good at making pasta as an italian with time. It also doesn't constitute a swede receiving a lower wage than an italian to work a basic entry level position. To not hire the swede or pay him less than the italian (same job position) would be unlawful discrimination.
>
> You clearly didn't read the memo nor any of the articles about the memo. Maybe you skimmed a few comments before deciding you were ready to bless the world with a few hundred words of irrelevant, pseudo-pseudo-intellectual nonsense (I use pseudo twice because nobody thought this was an intelligent comment except you).
>
> You really think the internet would be interested in the memo at all if it was simply advocating for the 'not hiring or paying less' of women? You're playing checkers while everyone else is playing chess.
>
> Equally hilarious is your belief that liberal arts degrees create well-rounded and rational individuals.
>
> As the great Brennan Huff once said: *Shush up for one second. Shut your mouth. Wait. Shut your mouth. You're just coming off stupid.*

Entropy-7 • 4 points • 8 August, 2017 12:45 PM

There are no "free speech" guarantees at the workplace, particularly at a private company. However, I'm not sure if that is a firing offense, although I don't really know about American employment law and the particulars of his employment contract. Apparently, Google has no concept of the idea of "progressive discipline".

Is there more context about who he circulated the "memo" to and under what circumstances?

[deleted] • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 01:35 PM

... does he have a PhD? I searched the libraries and don't find even an embargoed thesis. His program's alumni list shows theses and graduation years, but all it says for him is "Software Engineer, Google". His advisor's CV lists his other student's theses but doesn't mention him.

Doubtful he was even ABD.

wyng369 • 3 points • 8 August, 2017 02:01 PM

I dont see any difference between my boobs and girls boobs. (am an obese man)

wiseprogressivethink • 4 points • 8 August, 2017 02:11 PM

The act of stating undeniable facts is a fireable offense in the Current Year.

In fact, it's been that way for a long time.

SkunkMonkey • 3 points • 8 August, 2017 02:35 PM

You had me up until you brought up Freedom of Speech. This has *nothing* to do with that since it only applies to the government. Once you pulled that out, you lost all credibility.

Sullibang • 4 points • 8 August, 2017 10:44 AM

Yeah but he also said women can't do computers? So?

> osamasbigbro • 16 points • 8 August, 2017 01:05 PM
>
> He said that men and women have different preferences for work. On average women work computers less well than men. On average women are less suitable to the high stress work of being a CEO. On average men aim for positions of power and high wages, and women on average aim for happiness, for social interactions. Hence over time this leads to different distributions of genders in each field. Obviously there would be more men in software development/engineering if women prefer social interaction jobs, and men are on average more mathematically minded.
>
>> BlairResignationJam_ • 6 points • 8 August, 2017 01:43 PM
>>
>> Computer programming used to be a female dominated job for decades...
>>
>>> osamasbigbro • 4 points • 8 August, 2017 02:14 PM
>>>
>>> If that is true than the job must have changed overtime to suit the average man over the average woman. Otherwise the average woman would still find the job appealing and would apply for it.
>>>
>>> [deleted] 8 August, 2017 04:18 PM
>>>
>>> [permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 8 points • 8 August, 2017 11:14 AM

he didnt say it with this absoluteness. he only made claims about averages. of course there are good female computer scientists.

> Sullibang • 5 points • 8 August, 2017 11:20 AM
>
> Yeah but I mean when your questioning a companies integrity based on wholistic averages then of course you're gonna get fired? We work in autocracies, not democracies.

Starter91 • 5 points • 8 August, 2017 10:49 AM

Some women can but, i have had connection with women who cant format text in word document. Yet there are shitload of women like that working in HR all around the world.

> Sullibang • 26 points • 8 August, 2017 11:13 AM
>
> I mean yeah and also there are men who can't do that either.

> biggerbetterjobs • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 01:55 PM
>
> This is a very sophomoric statement.

The-Peter-Principle • 4 points • 8 August, 2017 09:56 AM

The guy never cited academic papers to back up his claims, so the whole thing COULD be portrayed as "an unstable rant by an evil cis-patriarch".

"If he goes to this much length to make our female staff feel hurt and bullied just imagine what he's like when the spotlight is off him, to the chopping block with him post haste...."

Argumentation without evidence may dismissed without evidence. Which is what it seems google did.

> [deleted] • 20 points • 8 August, 2017 10:30 AM
>
> nah, larry summers, former president of harvard basically said the same things, with tons of academic proof of why, and he was crucified for it and forced to resign.
>
> these people don't want logic or facts. logic and facts destroy their narrative. the average man crushes the average woman on the math SATs by an average of 30 points. instead of looking at "average" people (because google doesn't hire "average" people), and you switch to the top 1%, 0.1%, or 0.01% of math skill/aptitude, it becomes increasingly male to the point where hits hundreds of males to a single female. this is the case even in kindergarten.
>
> studies and facts and logic don't matter to them. it is a shit test and this guy just failed.
>
> > raziusro • 13 points • 8 August, 2017 12:00 PM
> >
> > He did, they got removed.
> >
> > "The text of the post is reproduced in full below, with some minor formatting modifications. Two charts and several hyperlinks are also omitted."

[deleted] • 3 points • 8 August, 2017 04:32 PM

Congratulations! Not a fucking *one* of you actually read the "manifesto" in question.

Because if you did, and you still managed to arrive at that pants-on-head conclusion, I've got some bad news about your chromosome count.

pedal2000 • 5 points • 8 August, 2017 02:12 PM

Ok... but he basically implied any woman dealing with stress poorly (which happens regularly to both sexes) is "Neuroticism (higher anxiety, lower stress tolerance)."

I don't think he would ever treat women equally or fairly in the workplace if he was interviewing them, in charge of them or dealing with them. An outburst from a woman VS the same outburst from a man would be rationalized away as 'biological differences' that 'she couldn't control'.

His point was lost when he showed he couldn't possibly treat women and men similarly in the workplace.

> [deleted] • 13 points • 8 August, 2017 02:55 PM
>
> Yeah... he has a phd in systems biology from Harvard. His point that men and woman are different is correct.
>
> He's using the word neuroticism in a purely scientific sense. You are interpreting it from an offensive, non-pragmatic sense. That's why you're slightly offended and believe *this* is grounds for dismissal.
>
> His point was 100% confirmed when he was fired for thinking differently.

pedal2000 • 3 points • 9 August, 2017 02:48 AM

Ok, but do you understand why having someone in management who believes that anytime a woman freaks out it is because of biological imperatives that they can't control & therefore are inherently less reliable (but not individually necessarily so) might be an issue for a company trying to hire on merit?

He's basically saying "Women generally are X therefore all women should be treated as though they are Y."

epistemic_humility • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 11:14 AM

For those of you that would like an alternative to Google for searching the web please do try duckduckgo.com its a great search engine and maintains more of your privacy.

DraugrMurderboss • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 01:16 PM

The biggest concern we should have is when all the technically smart people leave Google and the only people that are left are the ones who dogmatically pursue people who do not think correctly.

Keep in mind Google has all the information from whenever you use their products, including if you logged onto your email once, all associated traffic from that computer is also connected to the profile they have on you as a user.

[deleted] • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 02:31 PM

From the company's perspective they were right to fire him since he didn't fit the company's new image. In fact, they have a right to fire whoever they want if that person doesn't fit the mold according to what the company wants. So I won't fault the company for firing him since business is business and he should have kept his head down unless he has another job lined up. He could have been more anonymous when making this email.

From my perspective, diversity is going to be the deathknell of any industry. With this invading STEM not STEAM and various entertainment industries the quality of the products will suffer as a result. So I will place my hopes on the free market and pray that those men who are discarded for merely having differing viewpoints can create an alternative that will encompass google. In any case, this is what happens when we let diversity of color rather than diversity of thought take over an industry.

Antiquus • 2 points • 8 August, 2017 04:03 PM

No matter if your arguments are fair, reasoned and insightful, you are an at-will employee and if you piss off the boss, say goodbye.

nninja • 2 points • 9 August, 2017 12:00 AM

You guys are still on this?? It's not complicated, don't bite the hand that feeds you. He posted his fuckin 10 page manifesto bashing the company, and questioning the competency and merit of a whole group of people, on the fuckin company message board. If you think that won't get you fired you're retarded. I would've done the same thing, regardless of what his points were or if he was right. He's the reason for this big nonsense with Google going on right now, he was a senior employee and Google has peer reviews for promotions - you think it's hard to later claim he has a bias towards certain people after?? Jesus use your brains.

bm75 • 1 point • 8 August, 2017 02:48 PM

No, he was fired because he is a whinny little faggot who should be doing his fucking job instead of sending a 10 page manifesto to 50+ thousand other employees who don't want to hear the snowflake cry about how he's being oppressed by the mean women and gays.

You fucking conservatives queers like to project that you're all tough and competitive and authoritarian and lack any and all empathy but you certainly do behave like little melting snowflakes who have such fragile little egos when people who have actually been oppressed for, well, EVER stand up and get in your fascist faggot faces and say, "FUCK OFF!"

> [deleted] • 22 points • 8 August, 2017 04:08 PM
>
> Whoaaah ... slow down there princess. You starting to sound like a whinny little faggot.
>
> WhereIsTheEvidence1 • 3 points • 9 August, 2017 03:19 PM
>
> To everyone reading this message, look at how angry this clown had to be the write that.

[deleted] • 4 points • 8 August, 2017 09:16 AM

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=M6JRD-ubxR4

Resistance. We live in such an enrironment, we must behave like in continuous resistance, if we just use good sense, and reason, and a bit of healthy tradition.

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 August, 2017 04:02 PM

I hope he gets some sweet wrongful termination lawsuit shekels.

The best he can hope for now is to get hired on the down low at an all male non SJW second rate startup.

Nobody in the super PC bay area will go near him otherwise for the next couple years.

_____