

Intel Finds No Pay Gap Between Men and Women - Uses REAL Statistics

February 8, 2016 | 1138 upvotes | by [\[deleted\]](#)

Summary:

This is a link I found elsewhere on Reddit. Providing a short commentary and opening up the floor for discussion.

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/on-leadership/wp/2016/02/03/intel-says-there-is-no-pay-gap-between-men-and-women-at-the-chipmaker/>

archive.is -- <http://archive.is/uzov5>

My Commentary:

Here is a great illustration of how we can take raw data and use it to completely destroy a feminist argument. When I saw this link, I immediately thought of this sub, and wanted to share it here.

So should there be a pay gap? Honestly, in most cases, probably not. *Unless a man is actually doing more or higher quality work*, pay grades should probably be one area that remains gender neutral. And these days, in most cases, **it is**. This is just another article to add to our list of facts and data we can cite to the ugly (or unfortunately attractive) feminists who tell us to 'check our privilege,' among numerous other bullshit irrational arguments.

In other words:

"WHAT FUCKING PRIVILEGE, BITCH??"

And that's really all I have to say about it. What do you guys think?

Conclusion:

This is just another useful link for us as we fight the war on feminism. Bravo to Intel for actually doing the statistics. I hope other companies will follow.

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

TattedGuyser • 340 points • 8 February, 2016 03:11 AM

"I am calling BS. Take all the women in the company, add up their compensation and divide by the number of women. Do the same for men and compare the two numbers. If they are materially the same, I will agree with Intel. I bet they don't have the guts to do this. But if they did, guess what? Women would be shown to make about 85% of what men make. Likely less if highest paid employees are mostly men."

This one comment just screams the stupidity that is found among feminists. Of course engineer, lawyer and financial staff should make just as much as an assistant or secretary. Holy fucking stupid.

MakeEmSayAyy • 139 points • 8 February, 2016 07:00 AM

yes but it feeeeeellls like women are paid less, so they HAVEE to be

stillbatting1000 • 87 points • 8 February, 2016 08:09 AM

Feminists *want* victimhood. It alleviates them from personal responsibility

ColdEiric • 6 points • 8 February, 2016 02:04 PM

Men understand that with choices between cookies and ice-cream, they have to say no to one of them.

hotsweetleather1 • 27 points • 8 February, 2016 09:21 AM

THE DEAD RED IS HERE

When the classical Marxists, the communists, took over a country like Russia, they expropriated the bourgeoisie, they took away their property.

Similarly, when the cultural Marxists take over a university campus, they expropriate through things like quotas for admissions. When a white student with superior qualifications is denied admittance to a college in favor of a black or Hispanic who isn't as well qualified, the white student is expropriated. And indeed, affirmative action, in our whole society today, is a system of expropriation.

White owned companies don't get a contract because the contract is reserved for a company owned by, say, Hispanics or women. So expropriation is a principle tool for both forms of Marxism.

wanderer779 • 13 points • 8 February, 2016 02:54 PM

the strange thing is that whites volunteered to do this. I don't know of any other country where the dominant group has discriminated against itself.

The basic problem in any economy is finding a compromise between incentivizing production and having equality. Obviously by hiring based on anything other than merit, your company becomes less productive. It seems to me it would be better to just hire the best engineers and try to even it out through the tax code than to just throw away talent like this.

Imagine a primitive society that implements a policy of having equal numbers of women and men on hunting trips. Then you have less meat for everybody. The women gain nothing by it, unless they have some strange preference for chasing down animals instead of eating them. We are also getting less "meat" in our tribe but it isn't noticed because we have so much to begin with. Basically when you get rich enough a whole lot of stupid ideas are propped up.

I say if you do away with quotas and it's all asians at the elite universities, let it happen. We're just

holding back the progress of the human race by not allowing the smartest and best reach their potential, because we don't want to hurt people's feelings.

hotsweetleather1 • 5 points • 8 February, 2016 06:15 PM

Marxist theory said that when the general European war came (as it did come in Europe in 1914), the working class throughout Europe would rise up and overthrow their governments – the bourgeois governments – because the workers had more in common with each other across the national boundaries than they had in common with the bourgeoisie and the ruling class in their own country. Well, 1914 came and it didn't happen. Throughout Europe, workers rallied to their flag and happily marched off to fight each other. The Kaiser shook hands with the leaders of the Marxist Social Democratic Party in Germany and said there are no parties now, there are only Germans. And this happened in every country in Europe. So something was wrong.

Lukacs, who was considered the most brilliant Marxist theorist since Marx himself, said in 1919, "Who will save us from Western Civilization?" He also theorized that the great obstacle to the creation of a Marxist paradise was the culture: Western civilization itself.

In 1923 in Germany, a think-tank is established that takes on the role of translating Marxism from economic into cultural terms, that creates Political Correctness as we know it today, and essentially it has created the basis for it by the end of the 1930s.

This comes about because the very wealthy young son of a millionaire German trader by the name of Felix Weil has become a Marxist and has lots of money to spend.

. He endows an institute, associated with Frankfurt University, established in 1923, that was originally supposed to be known as the Institute for Marxism. But the people behind it decided at the beginning that it was not to their advantage to be openly identified as Marxist.

The last thing Political Correctness wants is for people to figure out it's a form of Marxism. So instead they decide to name it the Institute for Social Research.

What the Frankfurt School essentially does is draw on both Marx and Freud in the 1930s to create this theory called Critical Theory. The term is ingenious because you're tempted to ask, "What is the theory?" The theory is to criticize.

The stuff we've been hearing about this morning – the radical feminism, the women's studies departments, the gay studies departments, the black studies departments – all these things are branches of Critical Theory.

Now this stuff is being pumped into the heads of students in various liberal universities.

and later these people occupy media jobs banks political offices. And then we have

"the strange thing is that whites volunteered to do this. I don't know of any other country where the dominant group has discriminated against itself."

reglinsk • 1 point • 9 February, 2016 10:20 PM

the strange thing is that whites volunteered to do this. I don't know of any other country where the dominant group has discriminated against itself.

You don't have the right notion of groups.

Trigger warning: If you need trigger warnings, this will trigger you.

Malcolm X explains the situation in 1963:

In this deceitful American game of power politics, the Negroes (i.e., the race problem, the

integration and civil rights issues) are nothing but tools, used by one group of whites called Liberals against another group of whites called Conservatives, either to get into power or to remain in power. Among whites here in America, the political teams are no longer divided into Democrats and Republicans. The whites who are now struggling for control of the American political throne are divided into "liberal" and "conservative" camps. The white liberals from both parties cross party lines to work together toward the same goal, and white conservatives from both parties do likewise.

The white liberal differs from the white conservative only in one way: the liberal is more deceitful than the conservative. The liberal is more hypocritical than the conservative. Both want power, but the white liberal is the one who has perfected the art of posing as the Negro's friend and benefactor; and by winning the friendship, allegiance, and support of the Negro, the white liberal is able to use the Negro as a pawn or tool in this political "football game" that is constantly raging between the white liberals and white conservatives.

SharK3D • 0 points • 8 February, 2016 06:54 PM

What about people that bloom at a later age in life? How do elite universities help those people? Or people for whom the classic education system does not work?

I believe that one needs to think differently if they want the human race to progress at the greatest rate possible. There are billions of people who still do not have access to the internet or the leisure to spend much time absorbing its contents - the greatest trove of information in the history of humanity, and doubling at an accelerating pace. Young boys and men across the globe, lost like many of us once were, without access to TRP. I think a lot of potential is wasted that way.

Then there is the case of people gifted with a drastically different consciousness or plagued with mental illness, depending on the case and your perception. In a world where this is still a big taboo subject, and in which the supposedly most affluent countries are also plagued by the highest suicide rates, how do you guarantee that the next Nikola Tesla doesn't end up in a mental institution, drugged out of his brilliant mind? Or dead, especially considering the fact that the suicides are predominantly committed by young men.

I'm not saying its wrong for humanity to nurture its best seeds, but I do think we need to reevaluate how we assess the worth of those seeds, and make sure we reach as many of them as possible.

Cheers

boscoist • 2 points • 8 February, 2016 09:11 PM

Too bad for them. Its always been a game of numbers and you can never accommodate everyone. the true geniuses will find a way to excell regardless. Yea its cruel, but thats how life has always been.

hotsweetleather1 • 1 point • 9 February, 2016 06:10 AM

Economic Marxism says that all of history is determined by ownership of means of production.

Thus EVIL WHITE MEN who is seen as EVIL CAPITALIST.

Cultural Marxism, or Political Correctness, says that all history is determined by power, by which groups defined in terms of race, sex, etc., have power over which other groups.

Thus systematic expropriation is a principle tool for both forms of Marxism.

The main Aim is to sink down the white middle class.

Fuck_shadow_bans • 50 points • 8 February, 2016 05:46 AM

85% would be shocking to me. It's probably more like 60%....*FOR MEN*.

Meaning that for *EQUAL* amount of work output, men probably only make about 60% that women do. Men do way more than 25% more work than women at any company I've ever worked at.

hotsweetleather1 • 14 points • 8 February, 2016 09:22 AM

the cultural Marxism of Political Correctness, like economic Marxism, has a single factor explanation of history.

Economic Marxism says that all of history is determined by ownership of means of production. Cultural Marxism, or Political Correctness, says that all history is determined by power, by which groups defined in terms of race, sex, etc., have power over which other groups. Nothing else matters.

All literature, indeed, is about that. Everything in the past is about that one thing.

scottwalkerfan • 27 points • 8 February, 2016 08:55 AM

all gender pay gap arguments can be won by linking this article.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Simpson's_paradox

a good read if you are interested in the rigorous statistics behind why comparing overall averages of diverse groups is a bad idea.

TattedGuyser • 10 points • 8 February, 2016 04:47 PM

How is that going to win you an argument? Most are way too stupid to understand what's going on in that wiki article. They'll just say something mansplaining or some shit.

TRPhd • 3 points • 8 February, 2016 08:49 PM

It's simple, you start with something they can relate to:

"Did you know waitresses make more money than waiters, but restaurant managers make more if they are men?" I have no idea whether that's true, but it moves the frame of the conversation from "all women" to "waitresses", i.e., women of a certain job. Bam, you just explained Simpson's paradox. Throw in an ass-kissing compliment ("women care more about things other than money") and you won the argument. Of course she's always going to stand up for "womankind" when challenged directly, but like so much of what we know about women based on TRP, she won't let it affect her actions (watch what they do, not what they say).

Too many men are obsessed with being acknowledged as the victor instead of staying focused on just getting what they want.

mrrooftops • 2 points • 8 February, 2016 11:18 AM

It's a kind of reverse gerrymandering.

hotsweetleather1 • 1 point • 9 February, 2016 05:54 AM

In classical economic Marxism certain groups, i.e. workers and peasants, are a good, and other groups, capital owners, are evil.

In the cultural Marxism of Political Correctness certain groups are good – feminist women, (only

feminist women, non-feminist women are deemed not to exist) blacks, Hispanics, homosexuals.

These groups are determined to be “victims,” and therefore automatically good regardless of what any of them do.

Similarly, white males are determined automatically to be evil, thereby becoming the equivalent of the bourgeoisie in economic Marxism.

Puffy_Vulva • 9 points • 8 February, 2016 07:11 AM

85%

I just love how their number is NEVER and I mean **NEVER** consistent. It's in the 60-80% range is all they know. Also I like how people from different countries will use the same number. That would throw me off if I believed in that garbage. Just how likely do you think it is that women in different countries are being paid the EXACT amount less than men? I find that extremely unlikely.

hotsweetleather1 • 3 points • 8 February, 2016 09:22 AM

in classical economic Marxism certain groups, i.e. workers and peasants, are a priori good, and other groups, i.e., the bourgeoisie and capital owners, are evil.

In the cultural Marxism of Political Correctness certain groups are good – feminist women, (only feminist women, non-feminist women are deemed not to exist) blacks, Hispanics, homosexuals.

These groups are determined to be “victims,” and therefore automatically good regardless of what any of them do. Similarly, white males are determined automatically to be evil, thereby becoming the equivalent of the bourgeoisie in economic Marxism.

[deleted] • 1 points • 9 February, 2016 05:12 AM

[permanently deleted]

hotsweetleather1 • 1 point • 9 February, 2016 05:29 AM

The stuff we've been hearing about this morning – the radical feminism, the women's studies departments, the gay studies departments, the black studies departments – all these things are branches of Critical Theory.

and guess what all this produced anger will be directed towards the EVIL WHITE MEN. Since he is the worse than nazi.

That is nonsense. Their main agenda is to bring down the CAPITALIST state.

[deleted] • 9 points • 8 February, 2016 10:08 AM

You forgot about maternity leave, raising children by taking time off, and more flexible work hours.

If you work less, you're getting paid less.

FlushableHandle • 9 points • 8 February, 2016 02:25 PM

This is something I honestly just don't get.

A gender pay gap can only be a concern if a company is paying female employees, with *identical background and experience and identical jobs* less than males. Why do feminists have such a hard time understanding this?

You can't just bitch that women with lower skill jobs like preschool teachers or secretary are being

"discriminated against" by making less money than a male petroleum engineer.

tylamarre • 1 point • 9 February, 2016 05:26 AM

This is just so fucking obvious yet it is consistently overlooked. It's not even profitable from a business standpoint to overlook qualifications because of gender.

3xtheredcomet • 6 points • 8 February, 2016 12:50 PM

It's just fucking hopeless with these people. The premise of feminism is that other than genitals, there is absolutely no difference between the sexes. So, based on that, as long as there is *any* quantifiable difference, they can only logically conclude that outside forces will always be to blame, i.e. their argumentative boogeyman, "the patriarchy".

As long as they hold onto that erroneous premise, no argument is ever going to convince them that sexism doesn't exist or isn't as pervasive as they claim it to be.

Of course, this assumes that they're being rational and open to argument in the first place, which obviously has been shown to be otherwise.

ABC_Florida • 4 points • 8 February, 2016 04:24 PM

Feminism is socialism in panties.

satanicpriest13 • 19 points • 8 February, 2016 04:11 AM

Sounds like goddamn communism if you ask me. No wonder Bernie has SJW support. It's his socialist ideals. I say we send these bastards to Iraq to fight ISIS for a dose of equality. Don't worry they'll get paid as much as male soldiers.

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 February, 2016 07:15 PM

You don't know what you're talking about. Communism was never this bad.

hotsweetleather1 • 0 points • 9 February, 2016 06:12 AM

If we look at it analytically, if we look at it historically, we quickly find out exactly what it is. Political Correctness is cultural Marxism.

he totalitarian nature of Political Correctness is revealed nowhere more clearly than on college campuses, many of which at this point are small ivy covered North Koreas, where the student or faculty member who dares to cross any of the lines set up by the gender feminist or the homosexual-rights activists, or the local black or Hispanic group, or any of the other sainted "victims" groups that PC revolves around, quickly find themselves in judicial trouble.

[deleted] • 2 points • 9 February, 2016 03:32 PM

[permanently deleted]

hotsweetleather1 • 1 point • 9 February, 2016 04:47 PM

Yes becuase we are still doing nothing about it.

Our fathers kept quiet during the FREE LOVE era now look what we achieved.

and in a few years...we could be put in jail just for saying the wrong thing.

hotsweetleather1 • 0 points • 9 February, 2016 06:13 AM

he cultural Marxism of Political Correctness, like economic Marxism, has a single factor

explanation of history.

Everything in the past is about that one thing.

just as in classical economic Marxism certain groups, i.e. workers and peasants, are a priori good, and other groups, i.e., the bourgeoisie and capital owners, are evil. In the cultural Marxism of Political Correctness certain groups are good – feminist women, (only feminist women, non-feminist women are deemed not to exist) blacks, Hispanics, homosexuals.

These groups are determined to be “victims,” and therefore automatically good regardless of what any of them do. Similarly, white males are determined automatically to be evil, thereby becoming the equivalent of the bourgeoisie in economic Marxism.

[deleted] • 1 point • 9 February, 2016 03:57 PM

You are drawing similarities between things that have almost nothing in common. Comparing души to some american campus feminists by saying they are both "victims" is borderline retarded. I.e. eating the rich when one is starving to death is not the same as complaining about manspreading and patriarchy.

hotsweetleather1 • 1 point • 9 February, 2016 04:47 PM

NO. my point is FEMINISM is COMMUNISM.

[deleted] • 1 point • 9 February, 2016 08:27 PM

I understand it's what you see as communism but things rarely are that black and white. Communism made a broke feudal nation into a space faring superpower in 40 years. They got shit done. They literally didn't give a flying fuck about peoples feelz. I don't see the parallel to feminism. I don't see how you could have had a feminist revolution transform some backwards country like Nigeria into a nuclear age industrialized society, no matter how much time you gave them.

hotsweetleather1 • 1 point • 8 February, 2016 08:30 AM

YES THE DEAD RED IS HERE.

– Company diversity policies don’t help minorities or women, and they psychologically discriminate against White men.

<https://hbr.org/2016/01/diversity-policies-dont-help-women-or-minorities-and-they-make-white-men-feel-threatened>

[deleted] • -2 points • 8 February, 2016 03:52 PM

[permanently deleted]

RegularJerk • -20 points • 8 February, 2016 07:07 AM

So you're voting for Trump?

satanicpriest13 • 3 points • 8 February, 2016 12:33 PM

Well it's Jeb cuck time innit.

limitless_ai • 14 points • 8 February, 2016 08:27 AM [recovered]

Yes, most of us are. You got a problem with that ?

hotsweetleather1 • 12 points • 8 February, 2016 09:25 AM **[recovered]**

where does it come from? For the first time in our history, Americans have to be fearful of what they say, of what they write, and of what they think. They have to be afraid of using the wrong word, a word denounced as offensive or insensitive, or racist, sexist, or homophobic.

We call it "Political Correctness." The name originated as something of a joke, literally in a comic strip, and we tend still to think of it as only half-serious.

If we look at it analytically, if we look at it historically, we quickly find out exactly what it is. Political Correctness is cultural Marxism. It is Marxism translated from economic into cultural terms.

[deleted] • -17 points • 8 February, 2016 09:09 AM

[permanently deleted]

oxicide • 16 points • 8 February, 2016 02:25 PM

That tactic doesn't work here... We don't care about your name calling.

[deleted] • 7 points • 8 February, 2016 05:10 PM*

There is literally nothing wrong with being racist.

Edit; he deleted his comment but it was along the lines of "so you're a brain dead racist piece of shit then?" Clearly a massive faggot if he/she can't even stand by their own views and take the down votes.

Natural_RP • 3 points • 8 February, 2016 05:09 PM*

See that's the funny part. I had always assumed blindly that women actually thought job to job they were payed less. Nope, some of these feminazis go so far as to say: "Jobs predominantly held by women pay less." As if they pay those people less because they women not because the job is easier. These people are so stupid they shouldn't be allowed to talk out loud.

Oh so you think a secretary should be paid as much as a lawyer? Sorry to break it to you sugar tits you're not a feminist, you're a communist.

cashmoney_x • 2 points • 8 February, 2016 04:23 PM

Likely less if highest paid employees are mostly men."

Wow, this person has no idea how stupid this is.

Adolf_ghandi • 1 point • 8 February, 2016 11:59 AM

Cough cough fucking Marxist trashlords want money without actually working for it. As always.

Or the commenter is actually stupid enough to not see the flaw in his argument

TRPhd • 2 points • 8 February, 2016 08:53 PM

Everyone wants money without working for it. The difference is that these shrill harpies are actually pissed when we don't give it to them.

I buy Powerball tickets when the jackpot is \$200M+, but I don't shit in the governor's drainpipe when I lose...

hotsweetleather1 • 1 point • 9 February, 2016 06:19 AM

Wilhelm Reich and Sexual Liberation. The father of the modern sexual revolution in the U.S. was dissident psychoanalyst Wilhelm Reich.

He founded character analysis, an entirely new field of psychoanalytic study that analyzed neurotic characters, not neurotic symptoms, meaning that it viewed certain types of human beings as ill.

what he actually means is those who do not agree with him.

The fascist possessed "a sado-masochistic character" and, fearing his own political freedom—and pleasure—turned to dictatorial tyrants. The United States, he asserted, was not far behind Nazi Germany.

Thus we HAVE modern feminist yelling racist fascist and all that nonsense.

In this utopia, the patriarchal family, which represses sexuality, is replaced by the "natural family," which liberates its members from sexual constraints and cultivates that which is pleasurable.

Thus we have the bad daddy concept. If he says something against his daughters' desires.

To destroy capitalism, Reich posited that the old socialists' logical arguments about economic exploitation were insufficient.

one must destroy the moral habits upon which capitalism is founded, such as self-restraint, industry, frugality, and punctuality.

Adolf_ghandi • 1 point • 9 February, 2016 10:37 AM

Thanks for my workout fuel.

hotsweetleather1 • -1 points • 8 February, 2016 09:23 AM

The totalitarian nature of Political Correctness is revealed nowhere more clearly than on college campuses, many of which at this point are small ivy covered North Koreas,

where the student or faculty member who dares to cross any of the lines set up by the gender feminist or the homosexual-rights activists, or the local black or Hispanic group, or any of the other sainted "victims" groups that PC revolves around,

quickly find themselves in judicial trouble. Within the small legal system of the college, they face formal charges – some star-chamber proceeding – and punishment. That is a little look into the future that Political Correctness intends for the nation as a whole.

hotsweetleather1 • -7 points • 8 February, 2016 08:49 AM

Eros and Civilization was reissued as an inexpensive paperback in 1961, and ran through several editions; in the preface to the 1966 edition, Marcuse added that the new slogan, "Make Love, Not War," was exactly what he was talking about: "The fight for eros is a political fight [emphasis in original]."

In 1969, he noted that even the New Left's obsessive use of obscenities in its manifestoes was part of the Great Refusal, calling it "a systematic linguistic rebellion, which smashes the ideological context in which the words are employed and defined." Marcuse was aided by psychoanalyst Norman O. Brown, his OSS protege, who contributed Life Against Death in 1959, and Love's Body in 1966—calling for man to shed his reasonable, "armored" ego, and replace it with a "Dionysian body ego," that would embrace the instinctual reality of polymorphous perversity, and bring man back into "union with nature."

The books of Reich, who had claimed that Nazism was caused by monogamy, were re-issued. Reich had died in an American prison, jailed for taking money on the claim that cancer could be cured by rechanneling "orgone energy." Primary education became dominated by Reich's leading follower,

A.S. Neill, a Theosophical cult member of the 1930's and militant atheist, whose educational theories demanded that students be taught to rebel against teachers who are, by nature, authoritarian. Neill's book *Summerhill* sold 24,000 copies in 1960, rising to 100,000 in 1968, and 2 million in 1970; by 1970, it was required reading in 600 university courses, making it one of the most influential education texts of the period, and still a benchmark for recent writers on the subject. Marcuse led the way for the complete revival of the rest of the Frankfurt School theorists, re-introducing the long-forgotten Lukacs to America. Marcuse himself became the lightning rod for attacks on the counterculture, and was regularly attacked by such sources as the Soviet daily *Pravda*, and then-California Governor Ronald Reagan. The only critique of any merit at the time, however, was one by Pope Paul VI, who in 1969 named Marcuse (an extraordinary step, as the Vatican usually refrains from formal denunciations of living individuals), along with Freud, for their justification of "disgusting and unbridled expressions of eroticism";

and called Marcuse's theory of liberation, "the theory which opens the way for license cloaked as liberty ... an aberration of instinct." The eroticism of the counterculture meant much more than free love and a violent attack on the nuclear family. It also meant the legitimization of philosophical eros. People were trained to see themselves as objects, determined by their "natures."

The importance of the individual as a person gifted with the divine spark of creativity, and capable of acting upon all human civilization, was replaced by the idea that the person is important because he or she is black, or a woman, or feels homosexual impulses.

This explains the deformation of the civil rights movement into a "black power" movement, and the transformation of the legitimate issue of civil rights for women into feminism. Discussion of women's civil rights was forced into being just another "liberation cult," complete with bra-burning and other, sometimes openly Astarte-style, rituals; a review of Kate Millet's *Sexual Politics* (1970) and Germaine Greer's *The Female Eunuch* (1971), demonstrates their complete reliance on Marcuse, Fromm, Reich, and other Freudian extremists.

TRPhd • 2 points • 8 February, 2016 08:55 PM

This gives the impression of a copy-paste. I for one would prefer your own take on it.

hotsweetleather1 • 0 points • 8 February, 2016 09:10 PM

yes cause this posts are long. SO...i try to modify them with every new information and post them.

i would gladly love to share my opinion. please tell me the question.

hotsweetleather1 • -1 points • 8 February, 2016 09:26 PM

Reich was the first to combine Freud and Marx in a new revolutionary dialectic. He believed that conventional morality, as a "plague," had become so dangerous politically in fascism and state capitalism that it threatened human existence.

To protect those living the healthy pleasurable existence and to preserve humanity from the sadism of morality, he constructed a utopian political program called "natural work democracy" to attack morality at its core.

In this utopia, the patriarchal family, which represses sexuality, is replaced by the "natural family," which liberates its members from sexual constraints and cultivates that which is pleasurable.

These sexually liberated citizens would demand new "genital rights," among which were the abolition of laws against abortion and homosexuality, the reform of marriage and divorce laws, free birth control advice and contraception, and the abolition of laws preventing sex education.

To this Reich added other teachings, such as instruction in masturbation, the right to "extramarital

sexual intercourse,” and the “right of the unmarried woman to have a partner.”

Toolman890 • 76 points • 8 February, 2016 02:01 AM

"For one, it publicly discloses its diversity goals -- such as the percentage of new hires that should be women or under-represented minorities."

"Danielle Brown, Intel's chief diversity and inclusion officer"

Lol. Can't believe this crap is becoming reality and getting worse every year.

[deleted] • 47 points • 8 February, 2016 04:20 AM

Well, when you force women into companies like Intel, they need *something* to do..

Appleseed12333 • 31 points • 8 February, 2016 04:31 AM

That's the real kicker. It would be cheaper to pay them to sit around and do nothing than it is for them to do their 'job'.

_the_jews_did_911 • 4 points • 8 February, 2016 02:47 PM

You mean get carried by the other male engineers? Roger that.

There are women in tech jobs that are very good at their job, have masters and doctorates. Then there are those that just got carried through their degree.

max_peenor • 6 points • 8 February, 2016 06:59 PM

Ironically, these men often get their revenge. They will leave, get funded by some rich guys and build a product that either damages the original company or forces them to buy it. The share/bond holders watch their value get diluted, which is largely held by funds in the middle class (i.e. the 401k that diversity VP has). And then the big company has a RIF, taking out more useless proles. Those original engineers? They go surfing in Cancun...

Feminism is self destructive.

_the_jews_did_911 • 2 points • 8 February, 2016 09:32 PM

And so they join another company.

Revenge is a blue pill wet dream.

RP-on-AF1 • 2 points • 8 February, 2016 02:50 PM

For writing software, this is absolutely true. One bad programmer can poison the well. People will be dealing with that shit for years and years.

grubek • 1 point • 8 February, 2016 11:23 AM

Isn't that what they are already doing?

ITS_JUST_A_WANK_BRO • 13 points • 8 February, 2016 12:26 PM

You **HAVE** to see this presentation slide by the VP of diversity at Github:

<https://static2.businessinsider.com/image/56b3d2462e526543008b5049-705-529/nicole%20sanchez-diversity-training2.png>

[deleted] • 9 points • 8 February, 2016 04:35 PM

Intel's chief diversity and inclusion officer

No god no, the 4chan dystopian copypastas are becoming real

I NEED AN ADULT

hotsweetleather1 • 0 points • 8 February, 2016 08:31 AM

In 1923 in Germany, a think-tank is established that takes on the role of translating Marxism from economic into cultural terms, that creates Political Correctness as we know it today, and essentially it has created the basis for it by the end of the 1930s.

This comes about because the very wealthy young son of a millionaire German trader by the name of Felix Weil has become a Marxist and has lots of money to spend.

He is disturbed by the divisions among the Marxists, so he sponsors something called the First Marxist Work Week, where he brings Lukacs and many of the key German thinkers together for a week, working on the differences of Marxism.

hotsweetleather1 • -4 points • 8 February, 2016 09:23 AM

Indeed, all ideologies are totalitarian because the essence of an ideology (I would note that conservatism correctly understood is not an ideology) is to take some philosophy and say on the basis of this philosophy certain things must be true –

such as the whole of the history of our culture is the history of the oppression of women. Since reality contradicts that, reality must be forbidden. It must become forbidden to acknowledge the reality of our history. People must be forced to live a lie, and since people are naturally reluctant to live a lie, they naturally use their ears and eyes to look out and say,

“Wait a minute. This isn’t true. I can see it isn’t true,” the power of the state must be put behind the demand to live a lie. That is why ideology invariably creates a totalitarian state.

hotsweetleather1 • -6 points • 8 February, 2016 09:24 AM

THIS IS THE DEAD RED. COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA.

Eugenics2015 • 162 points • 8 February, 2016 01:42 AM

It was disproved in the 70's... its been over 40 years and bitches still believe it.

The myth is here to stay.

InscrutablePUA • 76 points • 8 February, 2016 03:26 AM

too much to lose by giving up the mantle of victimhood

hotsweetleather1 • 8 points • 8 February, 2016 08:34 AM

Despite its unprovable central thesis of "psychoanalytic types," the interpretive survey methodology of the Frankfurt School became dominant in the social sciences, and essentially remains so today. In fact, the adoption of these new, supposedly scientific techniques in the 1930's brought about an explosion in public-opinion survey use, much of it funded by Madison Avenue. The major pollsters of today—A.C. Neilsen, George Gallup, Elmo Roper—started in the mid-1930's, and began using the I.S.R. methods, especially given the success of the Stanton-Lazersfeld Program Analyzer. By 1936, polling activity had become sufficiently widespread to justify a trade association, the American Academy of Public Opinion Research at Princeton, headed by Lazarsfeld; at the same time, the University of Chicago created the National Opinion Research Center.

In 1940, the Office of Radio Research was turned into the Bureau of Applied Social Research, a division of Columbia University, with the indefatigable Lazarsfeld as director.

After World War II, Lazarsfeld especially pioneered the use of surveys to psychoanalyze American voting behavior, and by the 1952 Presidential election, Madison Avenue advertising agencies were firmly in control of Dwight Eisenhower's campaign, utilizing Lazarsfeld's work.

Nineteen fifty-two was also the first election under the influence of television, which, as Adorno had predicted eight years earlier, had grown to incredible influence in a very short time. Batten, Barton, Durstine & Osborne — the fabled "BBD&O" ad agency—designed Ike's campaign appearances entirely for the TV cameras, and as carefully as Hitler's Nuremberg rallies; one-minute "spot" advertisements were pioneered to cater to the survey-determined needs of the voters.

This snowball has not stopped rolling since.

The entire development of television and advertising in the 1950's and 1960's was pioneered by men and women who were trained in the Frankfurt School's techniques of mass alienation. Frank Stanton went directly from the Radio Project to become the single most-important leader of modern television. Stanton's chief rival in the formative period of TV was NBC's Sylvester "Pat" Weaver;

after a Ph.D. in "listening behavior," Weaver worked with the Program Analyzer in the late 1930's, before becoming a Young & Rubicam vice-president, then NBC's director of programming, and ultimately the network's president. Stanton and Weaver's stories are typical.

Today, the men and women who run the networks, the ad agencies, and the polling organizations, even if they have never heard of Theodor Adorno, firmly believe in Adorno's theory that the media can, and should, turn all they touch into "football." Coverage of the 1991 Gulf War should make that clear.

The technique of mass media and advertising developed by the Frankfurt School now effectively controls American political campaigning.

Campaigns are no longer based on political programs, but actually on alienation. Petty gripes and irrational fears are identified by psychoanalytic survey, to be transmogrified into "issues" to be catered to; the "Willy Horton" ads of the 1988 Presidential campaign, and the "flag-burning amendment," are but two recent examples.

Issues that will determine the future of our civilization, are scrupulously reduced to photo opportunities and audio bites—like Ed Murrow's original 1930's radio reports—where the dramatic effect is maximized, and the idea content is zero.

kokvlad • 3 points • 8 February, 2016 08:59 AM

Is there a book on this? The history of media seems very interesting

hotsweetleather1 • -3 points • 8 February, 2016 09:14 AM

no...i am trying to post whatever i collect and connect THE DEAD RED IS HERE..

the first victims will be the WHITE MALE.. the WHITE MALE will be systematicaly oppressed..

The witchhunt on today's campuses is merely the implementation of Marcuse's concept of "repressive toleration"—"tolerance for movements from the left, but intolerance for movements from the right"—enforced by the students of the Frankfurt School, now become the professors of women's studies and Afro-American studies. The most erudite spokesman for Afro-American studies, for instance, Professor Cornell West of Princeton, publicly states that his theories are derived from Georg Lukacs. At the same time, the ugliness so carefully nurtured by the Frankfurt School pessimists, has corrupted our highest cultural endeavors.

One can hardly find a performance of a Mozart opera, which has not been utterly deformed by a director who, following Benjamin and the I.S.R., wants to "liberate the erotic subtext." You cannot ask an orchestra to perform Schönberg and Beethoven on the same program, and maintain its integrity for the latter. And, when our highest culture becomes impotent, popular culture becomes openly bestial. One final image: American and European children daily watch films like *Nightmare on Elm Street* and *Total Recall*, or television shows comparable to them. A typical scene in one of these will have a figure emerge from a television set; the skin of his face will realistically peel away to reveal a hideously deformed man with razor-blade fingers, fingers which start growing to several feet in length, and—suddenly—the victim is slashed to bloody ribbons. This is not entertainment.

This is the deeply paranoid hallucination of the LSD acid head. The worst of what happened in the 1960's is now daily fare. Owing to the Frankfurt School and its co-conspirators, the West is on a "bad trip" from which it is not being allowed to come down.

The principles through which Western Judeo-Christian civilization was built, are now no longer dominant in our society; they exist only as a kind of underground resistance movement. If that resistance is ultimately submerged, then the civilization will not survive—and, in our era of incurable pandemic disease and nuclear weapons, the collapse of Western civilization will very likely take the rest of the world with it to Hell.

The way out is to create a Renaissance. If that sounds grandiose, it is nonetheless what is needed.

A renaissance means, to start again; to discard the evil, and inhuman, and just plain stupid, and to go back, hundreds or thousands of years, to the ideas which allow humanity to grow in freedom and goodness. Once we have identified those core beliefs, we can start to rebuild civilization.

Ultimately, a new Renaissance will rely on scientists, artists, and composers, but in the first moment, it depends on seemingly ordinary people who will defend the divine spark of reason in themselves, and tolerate no less in others. Given the successes of the Frankfurt School and its New Dark Age sponsors, these ordinary individuals, with their belief in reason and the difference between right and wrong, will be "unpopular." But, no really good idea was ever popular, in the beginning.

hotsweetleather1 • -4 points • 8 February, 2016 09:15 AM

The Aristotelian Eros: Marcuse and the CIA's Drug Counterculture

In 1989, Hans-Georg Gadamer, a protégé of Martin Heidegger and the last of the original Frankfurt School generation, was asked to provide an appreciation of his own work for the German newspaper, *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*. He wrote,

One has to conceive of Aristotle's ethics as a true fulfillment of the Socratic challenge, which Plato had placed at the center of his dialogues on the Socratic question of the good.... Plato described the idea of the good ... as the ultimate and highest idea, which is supposedly the highest principle of being for the universe, the state, and the human soul.

Against this Aristotle opposed a decisive critique, under the famous formula, "Plato is my friend, but the truth is my friend even more." He denied that one could consider the idea of the good as a universal principle of being, which is supposed to hold in the same way for theoretical knowledge as for practical knowledge and human activity.

This statement not only succinctly states the underlying philosophy of the Frankfurt School, it also suggests an inflection point around which we can order much of the philosophical combat of the last two millennia. In the simplest terms, the Aristotelian correction of Plato sunders physics from metaphysics, relegating the Good to a mere object of speculation about which "our knowledge remains only a hypothesis," in the words of Wilhelm Dilthey, the Frankfurt School's

favorite philosopher.

Our knowledge of the "real world," as Dilthey, Nietzsche, and other precursors of the Frankfurt School were wont to emphasize, becomes erotic, in the broadest sense of that term, as object fixation. The universe becomes a collection of things which each operate on the basis of their own natures (that is, genetically), and through interaction between themselves (that is, mechanistically). Science becomes the deduction of the appropriate categories of these natures and interactions. Since the human mind is merely a sensorium, waiting for the Newtonian apple to jar it into deduction, humanity's relationship to the world (and vice versa) becomes an erotic attachment to objects. The comprehension of the universal—the mind's seeking to be the living image of the living God—is therefore illusory.

That universal either does not exist, or it exists incomprehensibly as a *deus ex machina*; that is, the Divine exists as a superaddition to the physical universe — God is really Zeus, flinging thunderbolts into the world from some outside location. (Or, perhaps more appropriately: God is really Cupid, letting loose golden arrows to make objects attract, and leaden arrows to make objects repel.) The key to the entire Frankfurt School program, from originator Lukacs on, is the "liberation" of Aristotelian eros, to make individual feeling states psychologically primary. When the I.S.R. leaders arrived in the United States in the mid-1930's, they exulted that here was a place which had no adequate philosophical defenses against their brand of *Kulturpessimismus* [cultural pessimism]. However, although the Frankfurt School made major inroads in American intellectual life before World War II,

that influence was largely confined to academia and to radio; and radio, although important, did not yet have the overwhelming influence on social life that it would acquire during the war. Furthermore, America's mobilization for the war, and the victory against fascism, sidetracked the Frankfurt School schedule; America in 1945 was almost sublimely optimistic, with a population firmly convinced that a mobilized republic, backed by science and technology, could do just about anything. The fifteen years after the war, however, saw the domination of family life by the radio and television shaped by the Frankfurt School, in a period of political erosion in which the great positive potential of America degenerated to a purely negative posture against the real and, oftentimes manipulated, threat of the Soviet Union.

At the same time, hundreds of thousands of the young generation—the so-called baby boomers—were entering college and being exposed to the Frankfurt School's poison, either directly or indirectly. It is illustrative, that by 1960, sociology had become the most popular course of study in American universities. Indeed, when one looks at the first stirrings of the student rebellion at the beginning of the 1960's, like the speeches of the Berkeley Free Speech Movement or the Port Huron Statement which founded the Students for a Democratic Society, one is struck with how devoid of actual content these discussions were. There is much anxiety about being made to conform to the system—"I am a human being; do not fold, spindle, or mutilate" went an early Berkeley slogan—but it is clear that the "problems" cited derive much more from required sociology textbooks, than from the real needs of the society.

MortalSisyphus • 56 points • 8 February, 2016 02:16 AM **[recovered]**

US Department of Labor: "This study leads to the unambiguous conclusion that the differences in the compensation of men and women are the result of a multitude of factors and that the raw wage gap should not be used as the basis to justify corrective action. Indeed, there may be nothing to correct. The differences in raw wages may be almost entirely the result of the individual choices being made by both male and female workers."

<http://www.consad.com/content/reports/Gender%20Wage%20Gap%20Final%20Report.pdf>

"women are more highly represented in the lower-paying jobs [...] only 7 percent of female professionals were employed in the relatively high paying computer and engineering fields compared to 38 percent of male professionals." https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/rss_viewer/Women_in_America.pdf

Pay Gap Myth: <http://www.cbsnews.com/news/the-gender-pay-gap-is-a-complete-myth/>

<http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424052748704415104576250672504707048>

Single Women Earn More Than Men:

<http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424052748704421104575463790770831192>

Women have a 2-to-1 hiring advantage in STEM fields.

<http://www.cnn.com/2015/04/13/opinions/williams-ceci-women-in-science/>

Domestic Violence Myth: <http://web.csulb.edu/~mfiebert/assault.htm>

http://pubpages.unh.edu/~mas2/V71-Straus_Thirty-Years-Denying-Evidence-PV_10.pdf

1 in 4(5) Myth:

<http://communityvoices.post-gazette.com/opinion/the-radical-middle/27667--one-in-one-thousand-eight-hundred-seventy-seven>

<http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/rsavcat9513.pdf>

[deleted] • -2 points • 8 February, 2016 04:08 AM

[permanently deleted]

i_got_the_clearance • 22 points • 8 February, 2016 04:49 AM [recovered]

All of these studies present both an adjusted and unadjusted gap. When adjusted for tenure, effort, experience, hours, education, etc, the adjusted gap is pretty small. In this study, the adjusted gap was 2.7%. Since this part of the gap is unexplained, it's usually attributed, without evidence, to discrimination. I've looked for studies that show widespread discrimination, but there don't seem to be any. Problem is, to eliminate the mystery 2%+ gap, the Democrats want to pass laws that eliminate the whole thing. These could have the effect, of outlawing pay differentials based on experience, tenure, even hours worked. So, Bob who has been with the company for 10 years, might be forced to accept the same pay as newly hired Sally

RedMoonAscendant • 7 points • 8 February, 2016 05:16 AM

Thanks for taking the time to write up a calm and fact-based response to the troll. Trolls provide us with the opportunity to go through this sort of exercise.

bowie747 • -2 points • 8 February, 2016 08:48 AM

I don't agree with what you said, but I'll fight to the death for your right not to get downvoted for it

Wolf_A • 62 points • 8 February, 2016 01:01 AM*

Many sane people have been raising valid arguments against the pay gap myth

(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vDb7jJO_yyo). But feminazis don't "feel" those kind of arguments. And you actually require a research study to prove such rubbish rhetoric to be, you know, rubbish.

It's as if they have a free pass to question and claim anything they please to be otherwise without proper documentation and in some cases their points can be quite absurd. Moreover they get people to qualify to them. The society has failed a massive shit-test in form of feminism.

tb87670 • 24 points • 8 February, 2016 01:58 AM

I made another post how feminism is a giant cultural shit-test, and the few men that are still masculine in these anti-masculine times are the ones all women want (the the top 10-20%) even though they bitch how those guys are the 'problem'.

QuantumDeath666 • 11 points • 8 February, 2016 02:35 AM

That's obvious to us. I actually managed to turn a guy pretending to be alpha into a cuck by publicly betting he was just a sleazeball in it for the sex. He totally fell for it and turned into a nice guy. I honestly couldn't believe my eyes. The girl I was gaming knew what was going on too so that sealed the deal.

Rathadin • 4 points • 8 February, 2016 09:07 AM

You should write up a post about this.

[deleted] • 4 points • 8 February, 2016 05:15 AM*

[deleted]

What is this?

Strong4t • 8 points • 8 February, 2016 06:20 AM

You're getting downvotes but no one is rebutting you which is unfair.

Domestic male to female assault happens for a variety of different reasons and shouldn't be simplified to "women stay in these relationships because x".

Your hypothesis - *women go back to me that abuse them because they enjoy it* - why would this be the case? Why would women be designed to seek out pain and suffering that directly threatens the safety of their children and their ability to survive reproduce?

Sure - women will enjoy a dominant aggressive mate as part of their strategy to maximise the genetic quality of their offspring - that makes sense. But why would they enjoy a high risk abusive relationship? Wouldnt fear rather than joy be a stronger factor in such cases?

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 February, 2016 06:29 AM*

[deleted]

What is this?

killcat • 9 points • 8 February, 2016 07:03 AM

Now now, she'd marry the rich foot licker and FUCK the black gang member, priorities my friend priorities.

ThePacketSlinger • 2 points • 8 February, 2016 05:00 PM

People who are abused, usually early on in life, tend to put themselves in situations where they can re-live and re-experience that trauma. This is a human thing, meaning that men exhibit this type of behavior as well.

I'm from Chicago so I've listened to a ton of Dr. Drew / Loveline and this gets brought up pretty much every episode.

[deleted] • 2 points • 8 February, 2016 05:01 PM*

[deleted]

What is this?

ThePacketSlinger • 2 points • 8 February, 2016 05:14 PM

Haha not all of them IMO but I do understand what you're saying. Guess I'm sort of in the natural but no chems camp.

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 February, 2016 05:34 PM*

[deleted]

What is this?

ThePacketSlinger • 1 point • 8 February, 2016 05:56 PM

There's never been a proven case of it happening with LSD. I think that's mostly because people who are on it are almost ALWAYS on other more dangerous stuff. Still, not for me.

This isn't really a friendly place to be talking about this kind of thing so casually. I think it would be extremely interesting to see a post on how psychedelics can be leveraged to expose and address weaknesses through an RP lens.

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 February, 2016 06:07 PM*

[deleted]

What is this?

redkick • 1 point • 8 February, 2016 11:18 AM

I personally don't think that these women really want to get hurt, but they crave a dominant partner, and violence is a very effective way to express dominance.

I have settled to just lifting women around like they're made of air. This also demonstrates physical dominance without hurting anyone.

[deleted] • 7 points • 8 February, 2016 01:39 AM*

[deleted]

What is this?

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 February, 2016 04:57 AM

The issue is TRP solutions to shit test are not a one size fits all rules.

While the shit test guides on TRP are very useful, it's largely a toolbox. Sometimes you can get away with using a screwdriver as a chisel or a socket wrench as a hammer but most of the times you can't. The application of which tool for which job is largely based on tone, body language and word choice by those shit testing. When dealing with a larger group the more accurate the tool needs to be.

The issue is which a huge group the number of solutions vary because the tone is not from a single voice but many. No single tool works and using multiple tools doesn't work either.

The only way to solve the large scale shit test problem is to eliminate them at the small scale by not

allowing the voice to become omnipresent.

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 February, 2016 05:02 AM*

[deleted]

What is this?

Kayak_Fisherduke • 4 points • 8 February, 2016 04:05 AM

She interrupts him before he says three words and then calls him out saying for interrupting her... I turned it off after that.

QuantumDeath666 • 2 points • 8 February, 2016 02:33 AM

So we should come up with arguments based on feelings.

deeman010 • 1 point • 8 February, 2016 03:04 AM

Well... it's just like the poor and improvements to the economy. The government/ President/ Media can say all they want on how the economy is improving but, if they don't feel shit (as they usually don't), they'll continue hating on the current gov.

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 February, 2016 05:42 AM

What pisses me off the most about the video you posted is how literally the first 1:30 is just Maddows reacting to the fact that her guest has the opposing viewpoint. Not countering it or arguing against it, just exclaiming over it.

wakethfkupneo • 1 point • 8 February, 2016 08:01 AM

Also Maddox: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BDj_bN0L8XM

Sergnb • 1 point • 8 February, 2016 10:48 AM

I dont understand why skeptics are the one that have to provide studies and research. Doesnt the burden of proof typically fall on the accusing party? "You committed murder. Prove you are innocent or get life in prison". Well shit, whatever happened to "no, you prove i am guilty, not the other way around"

miraistreak • 19 points • 8 February, 2016 02:35 AM

Maddox from The Best Page in the Universe and it's companion podcast did some research into the wage gap using academic research for his statistics and concluded it was appx 3-7% when all major variables are eliminated, and nearly all of that gap was believed to be because men tend to ask for more raises than women do. I'm willing to believe there may be some discrimination on promotions or wage in some companies, but it's no longer widespread because of the threat of lawsuits

[deleted] • 9 points • 8 February, 2016 03:15 AM

http://thebestpageintheuniverse.net/c.cgi?u=hire_women

Maddox's article about the wage gap for anyone who wants to read it.

[deleted] • 5 points • 8 February, 2016 02:40 AM*

[deleted]

What is this?

miraistreak • 1 point • 8 February, 2016 03:54 AM

I don't remember I'll be honest

[deleted] • -3 points • 8 February, 2016 06:17 AM

Shit I would take the 90000, keep me in the lower tax bracket.

HAESisAMyth • 9 points • 8 February, 2016 07:37 AM

You'd rather get paid less money to get taxed less to have less money overall instead of being paid more, *paying higher taxes on a fraction of your income*, and having more total money?

Taltor • -9 points • 8 February, 2016 08:28 AM [recovered]

US taxes are fucked, it's better to sit just below the bracket because the moment you go over the tax % increases and you now have less total money than you did when you were earning less. US tax is tiered not proportional.

HAESisAMyth • 8 points • 8 February, 2016 08:35 AM [recovered]

You pay the \$37,650-91,150 rate (25%) on all income you have between 37,650-91,150, regardless of how much more money you make.

If your salary is \$91,250, you only pay the \$91,151-190,150 rate (28%) on 100 dollars, so someone making 91,250 vs 91,150 pays 28 dollars more tax, but keeps the other 72 dollars.

Does this make sense?

Taltor • 2 points • 8 February, 2016 09:53 AM [recovered]

Yeah I just looked it up, makes sense.

HAESisAMyth • 1 point • 8 February, 2016 09:57 AM [recovered]

It was very surprising to me that as infrequently as you comment, this somehow compelled you.

choikwa • 3 points • 8 February, 2016 10:12 AM

yea.. that's not how it works. You are only taxed additional % (ie. increase from 28% to 33%) on the amount you earn over previous tier.

LifeMedic • 2 points • 8 February, 2016 04:24 PM

Earning more is earning more is true as a general rule.

The tax bracket argument when it comes to wages is primarily useful if you are using it as a measure of \$\$ to time cost. Such as, figuring out if a raise with added work time is worth accepting. You can generate an hourly rate from that number and taxes should figure into that.

[deleted] • 20 points • 8 February, 2016 03:51 AM

Not mentioned; the wage gap called the "Beta Supervisor Pussy Pass".

I'm not personally offended by this -cause I'd take the money too if the roles were switched- but I've seen so many cases where women are promoted sequentially over better qualified men because their bosses are beta pansies.

[deleted] • 6 points • 8 February, 2016 03:53 AM*

[deleted]

What is this?

Overkillengine • 12 points • 8 February, 2016 04:24 AM

Or are afraid of getting accused of propositioning them if they don't get promoted.

HR departments have not historically been the best at fact checking.

[deleted] • 6 points • 8 February, 2016 04:25 AM

Does it ever occur to you, that maybe those girls deserved the promotion?

I'm kidding, if they did they wouldn't need fucking campaigning all over schools/businesses, pushed by laws, to get themselves hired.

[deleted] • 3 points • 8 February, 2016 04:30 AM*

[deleted]

What is this?

[deleted] • 9 points • 8 February, 2016 04:44 AM

I find it interesting how even at TRP, we are called sexists and a whole array of insults, yet we still believe women should receive the promotion if they deserve it over some spiteful personal desire.

guitarjob • 13 points • 8 February, 2016 05:14 AM

Women and beta are destroying millennial men. Millennial men make less than women. Women are twice as likely to get a job over a man. Older men need to create small companies where they only hire men.

AFPJ • 2 points • 8 February, 2016 12:15 PM*

Older men need to create small companies where they only hire men.

The good thing about not being (as) young is that you don't *need* to do *anything* - but that's what we're doing anyways, because it's how you make money: by hiring people who move up by contributing to your bottom line instead of those who ~~move up~~ *try to* by massaging your company's social matrix. Personally, if I see a leech get promoted, their manager takes their old position. HR tells me it's bad form but people who deserve shit get it

[deleted] • 10 points • 8 February, 2016 04:01 AM

Intel, the same company who gave hundreds of millions of dollars for diversity something or other?

hotsweetleather1 • -5 points • 8 February, 2016 08:32 AM

THE DEAD RED IS HERE

Frankfurt University, established in 1923, that was originally supposed to be known as the Institute for Marxism. But the people behind it decided at the beginning that it was not to their advantage to be openly identified as Marxist.

The last thing Political Correctness wants is for people to figure out it's a form of Marxism. So instead they

decide to name it the Institute for Social Research.

White_Phillip • 10 points • 8 February, 2016 04:51 AM

Showing a feminist data to convince them there's no pay gap is like convincing your girlfriend to swallow because a study said semen is healthy.

[deleted] • 3 points • 8 February, 2016 04:56 AM*

[deleted]

What is this?

BradPill • 2 points • 8 February, 2016 08:33 AM

Actually...

- <http://www.sheknows.com/love-and-sex/articles/1079514/health-benefits-of-sperm>

- <http://www.news-medical.net/health/Swallowing-Semen.aspx>

grewapair • 8 points • 8 February, 2016 04:35 AM

Note that this is just one company, with a big HR department to make sure they were paying equally. They probably released the stats because they knew they had been focusing on it for years. So it doesn't necessarily prove anything.

What proves this is plain old common sense. I run small businesses and I want the best employee for the money. If a big company doesn't want to pay a group of people the same, I'm happy to hire them. I've hired women, men, old, young, black, white, Asian, Hispanic, I don't give a shit. So if someone is discriminating against one group, there are 10,000 companies like mine who are going to step in and fill the void to hire someone equally competent for the same money the companies are paying white men.

The whole concept of a gender disparity never made any sense to me. It's the easiest one for small businesses to blow through.

BradPill • 2 points • 8 February, 2016 08:46 AM*

1: if (big) companies would enforce/have some pay-gap, there would be class-action suits all over - have those feminists chip in the money for counsel, as they will win (guaranteed!) and get filthy rich?

2: HR departments are mainly run by women (surprise surprise) - they are actively working on paying their sisters less?

3: women being (so much) cheaper, companies would hire them more than men - it's basic economics (like older people get replaced by cheaper young ones)

Squeezymypenis • 15 points • 8 February, 2016 01:14 AM

The whole argument was destroyed by salary negotiation anyway. Women are terrible at that. I make more than my coworkers yet i do the same job.

LifeMedic • 3 points • 8 February, 2016 04:28 PM

Women are frequently horrible at it because they bring drama and ultimatums to the table. I've terminated the employ of many women simply because of this and 99% of the time, they start backpedaling to try to retain their jobs. I don't cave and my offices tend to have much less drama than other work environments I've seen.

[deleted] • 5 points • 8 February, 2016 06:11 AM

Lol, the gender pay myth will never cease to exist, even if God himself came down from Heaven and live streamed himself tattooing "THE GENDER PAY GAP DOESN'T FUCKING EXIST YOU DUMB CUNTS" on Anita Sarkeesian's left ass cheek.

[deleted] • 2 points • 8 February, 2016 06:14 AM*

[deleted]

What is this?

[deleted] • 3 points • 8 February, 2016 02:04 AM

Feminists have lost so much credibility that in my experience, it's not even stigmatized to mention it anymore, in at least the truly appalling cases. You can of course ruin it by being too into what you're saying, but I think the general populace looks at feminism with a degree of suspicion.

FourNominalCents • 4 points • 8 February, 2016 03:48 AM

Intel is gonna try for pay parity for "minorities?" Aren't they one of the major H1B culprits? *starts making popcorn*

[deleted] • 4 points • 8 February, 2016 03:52 AM*

[deleted]

What is this?

Josewasframed • 5 points • 8 February, 2016 04:31 AM

The moment our workforce concerns itself more with becoming diverse rather than hiring the best candidates, that's when it starts to fail.

guitarjob • 1 point • 8 February, 2016 05:32 AM

Men are always the best candidate unless you're running a sweat shop.

[deleted] • 4 points • 8 February, 2016 02:35 PM

For all the trolls who still push the wage gap lie:

http://www.slate.com/articles/double_x/doublex/2013/08/gender_pay_gap_the_familiar_line_that_women_make_77_cents_to_every_man_s.html

<http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/harvard-prof.-takes-down-gender-wage-gap-myth/article/2580405>

<http://www.wsj.com/articles/the-wage-gap-myth-that-wont-die-1443654408>

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/fact-checker/wp/2014/04/09/president-obamas-persistent-77-cent-claim-on-the-wage-gap-gets-a-new-pinocchio-rating/>

<http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2014/02/01/no-women-don-t-make-less-money-than-men.html>

After you read that go look up who gets hurt or killed on the job more often, who works longer hours and who's dying on the front lines.

MattyAnon • 7 points • 8 February, 2016 01:34 AM

Thanks for sharing - appreciate the confirmation once again that the wage gap is a myth.

Still, it won't stop them going on about it

[deleted] • 5 points • 8 February, 2016 03:17 AM

And it won't stop politicians like Barack Obama from going on about it, either.

[deleted] • 3 points • 8 February, 2016 04:34 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 2 points • 8 February, 2016 04:39 AM*

[deleted]

What is this?

[deleted] • 3 points • 8 February, 2016 01:38 PM

News story in five years: "Fortune 500 company refuses to release salary information. When subpoenaed, women found to be making 12% more for same work."

TurduckenII • 2 points • 8 February, 2016 04:49 AM

The wage gap theory has a lot of problems with it, but this study proves nothing. If you're trying to disprove the idea that "as a nation of workers, women receive less money for the same job as men", and you reply with "yeah but it's not a problem at one company called Intel", that does not disprove the first point!

Again, I'm not a fan of the wage gap idea but I think lots of other resources debunk it better than a SINGLE COMPANY'S REPORT. It's a shame to see such a lack of critical thinking on a subreddit that prides itself on seeing deeper and reflecting on truth.

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 February, 2016 04:58 AM*

[deleted]

What is this?

CallMeJamarcus • 2 points • 8 February, 2016 07:02 AM*

This comment has been overwritten by an open source script to protect this user's privacy. It was created to help protect users from doxing, stalking, harassment, and profiling for the purposes of censorship.

If you would also like to protect yourself, add the Chrome extension TamperMonkey, or the Firefox extension GreaseMonkey and add this open source script.

Then simply click on your username on Reddit, go to the comments tab, scroll down as far as possible (hint:use RES), and hit the new OVERWRITE button at the top.

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 February, 2016 07:05 AM*

[deleted]

What is this?

BradPill • 2 points • 8 February, 2016 08:16 AM

I've posted it before - this is a woman (!) explaining women might make less - by their own choice! And she teaches at Harvard (meaning she's not some backwater scientist - risking her career):

<http://archive.is/ED3tl>

(<http://freakonomics.com/2016/01/07/the-true-story-of-the-gender-pay-gap-a-new-freakonomics-radio-podcast/>)

beginner_ • 2 points • 8 February, 2016 08:36 AM

So should there be a pay gap? Honestly, in most cases, probably not.

In fact I think there actually should be a wage gap. At least for young women. Why? Because they are likely to have at least 1 child and hence the company must either find a permanent or temporary replacement. Finding a replacement usually costs about 1 years salary. Then there are other potential differences between genders. Are men or women more often sick? Who stays home when child is sick, mommy or daddy? etc. If you are an insurance company selling insurance women would be more expensive for you. Hence they should have to pay more or in case of employment earn less.

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 February, 2016 12:57 PM*

[deleted]

What is this?

Digital_Yar • 2 points • 8 February, 2016 10:37 AM

Today i read a comment on the subject under a youtube video, which i think strikes quite a good point, i'll quote it here:

So you know the whole "God in the gaps" phenomenon? People used to think the gods lived on the top of mountains, like Mt. Olympus, until people climbed those mountains and didn't find Zeus. OK then maybe God lives in the clouds, until we figured out how clouds actually worked. Well then maybe God is in the stars? Then we found out what space is like and now God has to live somewhere else. So now in 2016 we aren't sure what happened before the big bang and we haven't gotten a good grasp of quantum mechanics yet, so maybe that's where God lives.

This entire video was basically "Sexism in the gaps". We start out with the whole 77 cents on the dollar and everyone shouting about how that \$0.23 is all sexism. And then we correct for hours worked and the pay gap shrinks to 16 cents, which are now by the way totally sexism you guys... this time for real seriously, patriarchy! And then we correct for education, job experience, and career choice then the pay gap shrinks to 4 cents. And then NOW you guys ... this time, it's sexism

OK. could it not be possible (and very probable based on the way this argument has been going for decades) that if we were to take a closer look at that 4% we'd find more totally not sexist reasons that men and women are paid differently. Maybe men and women negotiate for raises in different ways, maybe men and women enjoy different types of jobs.

Or maybe it's disingenuous to claim that any wage gap that cannot be explained must therefore be explained as sexism.

MakeEmSayAyy • 1 point • 9 February, 2016 01:14 AM

At some point it comes down to the fact that men work harder.

Yes the gender who doesn't have everything handed to them their entire lives works harder. Shocking, I know.

[deleted] • 8 points • 8 February, 2016 02:17 AM

This is good news? Fuck that. Actively do everything in your power to bring about the mythological wage gap every college/career cunt fingers herself to at night. Pay your fucking interns more than any bitch with a title or degree. Fuck them. Give them what they've been begging for at the top of their shrill little lungs for years now.

QuantumDeath666 • -2 points • 8 February, 2016 02:37 AM

Yeah, they want misogyny we'll fucking bring it lol.

[deleted] • 2 points • 8 February, 2016 04:44 AM

Women under 40 actually make more than their male counterparts.

Men make more because of a higher variety of jobs in scarcer fields and more jobs inside stem fields which pay more.

This isn't complicated.

hotsweetleather1 • 3 points • 8 February, 2016 09:27 AM

Marxist theory said that when the general European war came (as it did come in Europe in 1914), the working class throughout Europe would rise up and overthrow their governments – the bourgeois governments – because the workers had more in common with each other across the national boundaries than they had in common with the bourgeoisie and the ruling class in their own country. Well, 1914 came and it didn't happen.

So the Marxists' had a problem. And two Marxist theorists went to work on it: Antonio Gramsci in Italy and Georg Lukacs in Hungary. Gramsci said the workers will never see their true class interests, as defined by Marxism, until they are freed from Western culture, and particularly from the Christian religion – that they are blinded by culture and religion to their true class interests. Lukacs, who was considered the most brilliant Marxist theorist since Marx himself, said in 1919, "Who will save us from Western Civilization?" He also theorized that the great obstacle to the creation of a Marxist paradise was the culture: Western civilization itself.

In 1923 in Germany, a think-tank is established that takes on the role of translating Marxism from economic into cultural terms, that creates Political Correctness as we know it today, and essentially it has created the basis for it by the end of the 1930s. This comes about because the very wealthy young son of a millionaire German trader by the name of Felix Weil has become a Marxist and has lots of money to spend. He is disturbed by the divisions among the Marxists, so he sponsors something called the First Marxist Work Week, where he brings Lukacs and many of the key German thinkers together for a week, working on the differences of Marxism.

And he says, "What we need is a think-tank." Washington is full of think tanks and we think of them as very modern. In fact they go back quite a ways. He endows an institute, associated with Frankfurt University, established in 1923, that was originally supposed to be known as the Institute for Marxism. But the people behind it decided at the beginning that it was not to their advantage to be openly identified as Marxist. The last thing Political Correctness wants is for people to figure out it's a form of Marxism. So instead they decide to name it the Institute for Social Research.

Mildly_Sociopathic • 2 points • 8 February, 2016 01:11 AM*

Seems strange. Aren't they working with Sarkeesian?

JedYorks • 1 point • 8 February, 2016 05:36 AM

liberals want illegals to come so they could work for dollars less than minimum wage doing "jobs no one else wants to do"

liberals cry sexism because they THINK women are not getting paid enough

Liberalism is the bluepill

Polar1zing • 1 point • 8 February, 2016 11:14 AM

Intel doing the research is no alarm bell to you?

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 February, 2016 01:42 PM

If no evidence is required to form a belief then no evidence can dissuade that belief.

People believe the wage gap because they want to. Just like the rape studies people believe it without ever having looked at the studies first hand.

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 February, 2016 01:46 PM*

[deleted]

What is this?

yGTWgtNrco • 1 point • 8 February, 2016 04:36 PM

Sure, there should be a paygap. Ought somebody coming out with a degree in (e.g.) Computational Chemistry and multiple job offers from financial institutions be paid more than somebody coming out of college with a psychology degree and one job offer from a therapist? Definitely, the chemist ought to be paid more. That is the pay gap and it inevitably exists. At issue is whether anything is to be done about it.

Nevertheless, pretending all work should be paid equally is living in cloud-cuckoo land.

redpill_kurious • 1 point • 26 February, 2016 04:50 AM

Young women in big cities make more than their male counterparts, at least the married and childless (aka full-time, more likely to be college-educated). Source

That's the future. The old will die. Urbanization will increase. Fertility rate will go down. In a generation there probably won't be any pay gap at all.

Moldy_Gecko • -3 points • 8 February, 2016 03:25 AM

Why did you think of this sub and not the MensRights sub? This is a MensRights issue, not a TRP issue. We don't care if they want to say there is a pay gap, we know the truth.

[deleted] • 6 points • 8 February, 2016 03:33 AM*

[deleted]

What is this?

Moldy_Gecko • -2 points • 8 February, 2016 03:42 AM

I know many are, but I feel that the Men's Rights bandwagon is completely contrary to TRP. We typically don't associate with the MRM. Not sure when or why they even added that flair.

[deleted] • 4 points • 8 February, 2016 03:48 AM*

[deleted]

What is this?

Moldy_Gecko • 1 point • 8 February, 2016 04:10 AM*

I initially was going to post something about this, but decided to wait for you to pull it out. Where are the links in the sidebar relating to Men's Rights. I'm talking like, fighting for Men's Rights type shit. Not stuff like "The Misandry Bubble" which is actually a synopsis of the world we live in; something to help us know the truth and adapt to it. A sidebar note with a real concern for Men's Rights.

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 February, 2016 04:20 AM*

[deleted]

What is this?

Moldy_Gecko • 1 point • 8 February, 2016 05:29 AM

but sulking around like the feminists and shouting 'We're oppressed!' doesn't accomplish anything. Real men don't complain, brag, and sulk about it

That's exactly what posts like this and every single other feminism post that has sprung up recently sounds like. Your post is essentially a "Brag". "Oh, look feminists, there is no wage gap, haha, told you so". What's the point of that, we already knew it.

These posts are "Whiny Activist" posts. Everytime I read these I just imagine a Steve Urkel (or Screech) writing it. We don't want to be Stever Urkel, we are Stefan Urquelle. He wouldn't give two shits about feminism. He'd still be smooth and a lady killer, regardless of the world we live in.

Adapt and overcome, that's what TRP is about. Not fight the good fight. That's for MRAs.

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 February, 2016 05:31 AM*

[deleted]

What is this?

Moldy_Gecko • 1 point • 8 February, 2016 05:40 AM

And THAT's the problem. So many new people here that TRP has lost sight of it's original direction. These upvotes doesn't mean it's TRP worthy or quality. It just is something that newbies that don't know any better can latch on to. In that case, I always suggest they go to a sub dedicated to these exact types of posts...

/MensRights

And I'm not saying this because I'm not concerned. I was a semi-active member there. And I do agree with MensRights. But I don't bring that shit in here, because wtf does it have to do with sexual strategy?

Welcome to the Red Pill

The Red Pill: Discussion of **sexual strategy** in a culture increasingly lacking a positive identity for men.

Now, if a post had some insight on the sexual strategy while using a anti-feminist argument or FR or some shit, then it would be worthwhile. But "*No Wage Gap*" (which we already know) has no benefit to the discussion.

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 February, 2016 06:03 AM*

[deleted]

What is this?

[deleted] • 0 points • 8 February, 2016 12:50 AM

[permanently deleted]

RedPill4LYF • 0 points • 8 February, 2016 07:34 PM

Can I just say that I am simultaneously pleased and not surprised at all that when Intel did the math they discovered *-gasp-* zero disparities between male and female pay grades when the math accounts for levels of employment? Yay equality!

linkto1960sequalpayact.jpeg

My only issue with this good news is that it shouldn't be an issue in the first place and really only serves to complicate the larger discussions that need to be taking place within the realm of politics.

WhisperingPotato • -3 points • 8 February, 2016 06:18 AM

Intel found no pay gap AT INTEL. Read the article and don't go spreading around an inductive argument as blanket truth. I have taken a lot of what this sub has posted to heart but misinformation I most certainly will not. Pay equality isn't a feminist argument any of us should be concerned about. Paying a women the same as a man to do the same job is about basic fucking humanity. Jesus, sometimes this sub goes too far.

Sepean • 2 points • 8 February, 2016 09:36 AM

The wage gap is a myth (or perhaps more precisely feminist propaganda). Economists don't even take it remotely seriously. There are good explanations that reduce the "wage gap" to 5%, but that doesn't mean that there is a 5% wage gap. It could just as easily mean that economists don't have the data to explain the last 5%, and economists believe that this is most likely the case. In a competitive market it would be very surprising to find an option to cut wage cost by 5% (hire women instead of men) that savvy businesses haven't exploited.

If you think pay equality is an actual issue then you've bought into feminist propaganda instead of looking at the science. Unfortunately that is very common so any result like the findings at Intel is relevant to share.

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 February, 2016 06:21 AM*

[deleted]

What is this?

ohgr4213 • 1 point • 8 February, 2016 09:04 AM*

I think you reference the key element which is the crux of this argument.

Paying a women the same as a man to do the same job is about basic fucking humanity.

Part of what OP is trying to say, and many economists have pointed out, is that the statistics thrown around are fundamentally misleading say the 76% figure precisely because they do NOT account for equal work. Women are much more likely to work in the https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tertiary_sector_of_the_economy etc.

The 76% figure once controlled for difference in type of jobs, time off due to pregnancy, working less (more likely to work less hours/be in a segment of the economy that works less hours in general.) and a few other relatively straight forward factors like locale, negotiation, # children, unpaid leave, turns into something closer to a 2-7% difference, depending on your data set. With the actual explanation of that remaining differential being contentious.

It's also important to note its not "JUST" women that have these semi subtle qualities in the income statistics, depending on the specific cultural background south east asian emigrants can either perform much higher

than average or much worse than average, while the greater population can't tell the two groups apart. So the word of the day is discernment.

hotsweetleather1 • -1 points • 8 February, 2016 08:23 AM

[From "The Naked Communist," by Cleon Skousen]

1. U.S. acceptance of coexistence as the only alternative to atomic war.
2. U.S. willingness to capitulate in preference to engaging in atomic war.
3. Develop the illusion that total disarmament [by] the United States would be a demonstration of moral strength.
4. Permit free trade between all nations regardless of Communist affiliation and regardless of whether or not items could be used for war.
5. Extension of long-term loans to Russia and Soviet satellites.
6. Provide American aid to all nations regardless of Communist domination.
7. Grant recognition of Red China. Admission of Red China to the U.N.
8. Set up East and West Germany as separate states in spite of Khrushchev's promise in 1955 to settle the German question by free elections under supervision of the U.N.
9. Prolong the conferences to ban atomic tests because the United States has agreed to suspend tests as long as negotiations are in progress.
10. Allow all Soviet satellites individual representation in the U.N.
11. Promote the U.N. as the only hope for mankind. If its charter is rewritten, demand that it be set up as a one-world government with its own independent armed forces. (Some Communist leaders believe the world can be taken over as easily by the U.N. as by Moscow. Sometimes these two centers compete with each other as they are now doing in the Congo.)
12. Resist any attempt to outlaw the Communist Party.
13. Do away with all loyalty oaths.
14. Continue giving Russia access to the U.S. Patent Office.
15. Capture one or both of the political parties in the United States.
16. Use technical decisions of the courts to weaken basic American institutions by claiming their activities violate civil rights.
17. Get control of the schools. Use them as transmission belts for socialism and current Communist propaganda. Soften the curriculum. Get control of teachers' associations. Put the party line in textbooks.
18. Gain control of all student newspapers.
19. Use student riots to foment public protests against programs or organizations which are under Communist attack.
20. Infiltrate the press. Get control of book-review assignments, editorial writing, policy-making positions.
21. Gain control of key positions in radio, TV, and motion pictures.

22. Continue discrediting American culture by degrading all forms of artistic expression. An American Communist cell was told to "eliminate all good sculpture from parks and buildings, substitute shapeless, awkward and meaningless forms."
23. Control art critics and directors of art museums. "Our plan is to promote ugliness, repulsive, meaningless art."
24. Eliminate all laws governing obscenity by calling them "censorship" and a violation of free speech and free press.
25. Break down cultural standards of morality by promoting pornography and obscenity in books, magazines, motion pictures, radio, and TV.
26. Present homosexuality, degeneracy and promiscuity as "normal, natural, healthy."
27. Infiltrate the churches and replace revealed religion with "social" religion. Discredit the Bible and emphasize the need for intellectual maturity, which does not need a "religious crutch."
28. Eliminate prayer or any phase of religious expression in the schools on the ground that it violates the principle of "separation of church and state."
29. Discredit the American Constitution by calling it inadequate, old-fashioned, out of step with modern needs, a hindrance to cooperation between nations on a worldwide basis.
30. Discredit the American Founding Fathers. Present them as selfish aristocrats who had no concern for the "common man."
31. Belittle all forms of American culture and discourage the teaching of American history on the ground that it was only a minor part of the "big picture." Give more emphasis to Russian history since the Communists took over.
32. Support any socialist movement to give centralized control over any part of the culture--education, social agencies, welfare programs, mental health clinics, etc.
33. Eliminate all laws or procedures which interfere with the operation of the Communist apparatus.
34. Eliminate the House Committee on Un-American Activities.
35. Discredit and eventually dismantle the FBI.
36. Infiltrate and gain control of more unions.
37. Infiltrate and gain control of big business.
38. Transfer some of the powers of arrest from the police to social agencies. Treat all behavioral problems as psychiatric disorders which no one but psychiatrists can understand [or treat].
39. Dominate the psychiatric profession and use mental health laws as a means of gaining coercive control over those who oppose Communist goals.
40. Discredit the family as an institution. Encourage promiscuity and easy divorce.
41. Emphasize the need to raise children away from the negative influence of parents. Attribute prejudices, mental blocks and retarding of children to suppressive influence of parents.
42. Create the impression that violence and insurrection are legitimate aspects of the American tradition; that students and special-interest groups should rise up and use [""]united force[""] to solve economic, political

or social problems.

43. Overthrow all colonial governments before native populations are ready for self-government.
44. Internationalize the Panama Canal.
45. Repeal the Connally reservation so the United States cannot prevent the World Court from seizing jurisdiction [over domestic problems. Give the World Court jurisdiction] over nations and individuals alike.

imtruwidit • -6 points • 8 February, 2016 06:18 AM

Good job. You found one company that treats men and women equally.

benyadigg • -2 points • 8 February, 2016 02:39 PM

GEEEEET REEEEEKT ROASTIESSSSSS REEEEEEEEEEEEEEE

[deleted] • -28 points • 8 February, 2016 12:59 AM

[permanently deleted]

RedPillTheorist • 5 points • 8 February, 2016 02:10 AM

The wage-gap thing started from a deliberately misinterpreted study. I've never seen gender-based pay gap in my job sector. Have you? Instead i've seen how three quarters of my old highschool women classmates are working in "social" works or basic jobs like cashiers, and part of the last quarter is unemployed. Probably my wage is higher than all of theirs combined, and it's just because of the work i've chosen. My female work colleagues have around the same base salary as me.

[deleted] • 8 points • 8 February, 2016 01:23 AM

Everywhere I've worked has paid entry level men and women the exact same wage. Where differences in pay for two people of different genders occur is always the result of productivity. More productive people get paid more, regardless of gender. Usually the higher paid person is a man though. Cause you know how we are. Always pushing the limits...

[deleted] • 4 points • 8 February, 2016 01:28 AM*

[deleted]

What is this?

[deleted] • -6 points • 8 February, 2016 01:07 AM*

[deleted]

What is this?

Mr_Donnerhuhn • 6 points • 8 February, 2016 01:21 AM

global warming or not, women certainly aren't getting any hotter.

[deleted] • 2 points • 8 February, 2016 01:25 AM*

[deleted]

What is this?

choikwa • 1 point • 8 February, 2016 10:16 AM

they seem to be colder than ever!

Samantha_Cruz • 1 point • 8 February, 2016 01:27 AM

I have no idea if global warming is real or not; it is clearly not an area of science i have a clue about. however one thing that disturbs me a lot is that debate/opposing views are not tolerated at all. -

"consensus - the science is settled, al gore made a movie it MUST be true!!!" Throw anyone that disagrees in jail!!! - anyone that even asks questions is vilified, insulted and censored. that isn't how science is supposed to work; it IS however the standard method of liberal politics (which certainly includes feminist politics).

How dare you present studies and evidence that questions my princess entitlement!!! you MUST be a misogynist!!!

[deleted] • -5 points • 8 February, 2016 12:43 PM

So, ONE company goes out in the open and proves there is no gender pay gap inside their company and suddenly you want to dismiss the whole gender pay gap issue for every single company in the world?

The fuck is wrong with your brains, son?

That's like saying all women are worthless whores who are after your money and want to divorce rape you, just because you happened to have dated/fell in love with a slut/prostitute once or fucked up your marriage...

Oh, wait... That's exactly how you guys think. Never mind...

[deleted] • 3 points • 8 February, 2016 12:51 PM*

[deleted]

What is this?

[deleted] • 2 points • 8 February, 2016 02:31 PM

the wage gap myth has been thoroughly debunked several times, the fuck is wrong with your brains?