

Academia gap myth: women fall behind in their careers because they choose family over work and go into unprofitable fields, study finds

May 21, 2016 | 970 upvotes | by [G_Petronius](#)

tl;dr: the title

<http://www.nature.com/news/why-women-earn-less-just-two-factors-explain-post-phd-pay-gap-1.19950>

To the surprise of no one in the manosphere, it turns out that analyzing data of female careers in academia shows they fall behind not because they suffer actual discrimination, but because they a) prioritize family and b) pick fields that simply pay less.

Of course the article above turns this around into it being the fault of a system that isn't "family-friendly for women" (guess instead it's super family-friendly for men, who notoriously get to take time out of their careers to care for their kids without consequences). Regardless of the spin, the data doesn't lie: women are not discriminated against, they simply have less of a preference for professional success than men do, and thus don't achieve it as much.

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

[deleted] • 149 points • 21 May, 2016 01:50 PM*

An unmarried, childless woman earned — on average — the same annual salary after receiving her doctorate as a man with a PhD in the same field, the researchers found.

No shit Sherlock. When I signed my postdoc contract, I started at the bottom of the salary scale **as established by the university for my position**. A female friend started a similar postdoc a few months later, guess what salary she started at?

That uneducated people believe in the gender pay gap, I can understand. But that educated people believe in it, to me is a mark of their propensity at letting biases obscure their reasoning, aka scientists I do not want to work with

thor_away92 • 53 points • 21 May, 2016 02:45 PM

That uneducated people believe in the gender pay gap, I can understand. But that educated people believe in it, to me is a mark of their propensity at letting biases obscure their reasoning, aka scientists I do not want to work with

I am quoting this because more scientists need to let this sink in.

Hexthorne • 16 points • 21 May, 2016 07:06 PM*

I suggest you go look at the r/Science subreddit post for this article (can't link directly because of brigading rules I suppose) - mods are on top of their shit and not letting trolls (from either side) get into the conversation.

The mod post at the top is really good, as are some of the top comments. The point of the study (linked directly by the mod, no paywall) does not point to a pay gap but rather an *earnings* gap. Women of similar demographic background and experience earn less than men, even if they're paid the same hourly rate for the same work.

This applies only to the scope of the study, which was Ph.D. earnings after graduation, and it looked at correlations between their dissertation topics and what industry they ended up in.

What were the actual conclusions of the study? That having children is correlated with lower earnings for women (but not for men) and the industries that women moved into were not as lucrative. It *did not* say that having children was the cause of lower earnings, or why there are more women in less lucrative industries, just that those correlations exist.

So the problem here is not the science, it's the pseudo-journalism that takes those conclusions and then goes out and shouts about how women with PhDs make 31% less than men and we need to do something about it. The Nature article is actually accurate in stating that earnings are less, but honestly people are going to interpret that snippet of an article however they want.

blob6 • 1 point • 23 May, 2016 12:17 AM

I agree with you that the pseudo-journalism on cultural hot-topics is out of control

52576078 • 1 point • 23 May, 2016 01:47 PM

Looks like the Science subreddit deleted that discussion. I don't suppose there's an archive around?

Hexthorne • 1 point • 28 May, 2016 06:16 PM

This is an alt I don't check much, so sorry for the delay.
archive.is link

squirtingispeeing • -1 points • 22 May, 2016 05:17 AM

That having children is correlated with lower earnings for women (but not for men) and the industries that women moved into were not as lucrative.

And this is not a problem, because....?

[deleted] • 2 points • 22 May, 2016 07:09 AM

because river of tears about being born inferior but being in denial about it.

squirtingispeeing • 1 point • 22 May, 2016 12:02 PM

You think women are inherently inferior?

[deleted] • 1 point • 22 May, 2016 09:12 PM

yes. there is more to success in life than intelligence. i believe that within a certain bound, both men and women are equally intelligent but the two do not have the same personalities. there are certainly more male geniuses but they're rare so let's leave them out. is there anything in life that women outdo men other than child rearing?

squirtingispeeing • 2 points • 22 May, 2016 11:10 PM

I think you need to meet more women.

[deleted] • 1 point • 22 May, 2016 11:54 PM

i don't have to. you on the other hand, should look at 10000 years worth of human history. if your excuse is, men didn't let women do anything then what does that tell you about men and women? lol.

squirtingispeeing • 1 point • 23 May, 2016 03:19 AM

For 10000 years of human history women had very little control over their reproductive choices and were usually too busy being pregnant and popping out babies. Birth control literally emancipated women and it's only been available for the last 50 years.

Its_the_other_tj • 1 point • 22 May, 2016 09:21 AM

Women tend to take lower paying jobs with more flexibility, less dangerous jobs, and tend to leave jobs more (thus having to start over from the bottom). Unless this is a sarcastic post in which /s is useful.

squirtingispeeing • 1 point • 22 May, 2016 12:14 PM

How is it not a problem that having children negatively affects a woman's earnings but not a man's? A woman shouldn't have to choose between her career and having children, especially since it isn't a choice men are forced to make.

verify_account • 1 point • 23 May, 2016 07:14 PM

Men and women are different. We're not equal. I can't have a baby. Women can't make as much money if they CHOSE to raise a child.

squirtingispeeing • 0 points • 23 May, 2016 07:40 PM

Why can't men and women split child rearing 50/50? It's half his genetic material. Why is it only women whose careers suffer if they choose to have a family, not men's?

greatslyfer • 12 points • 21 May, 2016 03:56 PM*

They still let people call themselves "scientists" even when they have clear biases?

edit: for some reason people downvote me even if they agree with my sentiment... reddit wtf

redkick • 20 points • 21 May, 2016 05:21 PM

Uh, have you ever looked into Gender Studies?

Xouilly • 16 points • 21 May, 2016 05:30 PM

Qualified professionals in a field are qualified professionals *in their respective fields*. There is nothing to stop, say, a doctor from believing in communist economics, or a lawyer from being an anti-vaxxer.

[deleted] • 1 point • 22 May, 2016 07:07 AM

nobody who is educated actually believes it. the women who pretend like it's true are the ones who are doing it to get special treatments for women in society. the men who pretend it's true are just garnering favor from them and are too afraid to speak out for fear of being reputation raped by radical feminists. i don't fucking need to look at data. i can see it every fucking day.

TheBlackPhillipShow • 235 points • 21 May, 2016 01:08 PM **[recovered]**

I love to boil this one down to:

"Women don't work as hard"

That pretty much covers it. Softer jobs, fewer hours, 10 year maternity leave, etc. Women don't value hard work, and hard work pays better.

I have yet to hear a good rebuttal of that, and it helps to un-fuck the issue. Too many of these social issues have had the waters muddied and need some reductive language.

kireol • 131 points • 21 May, 2016 02:34 PM **[recovered]**

I hate to say it, but who is smarter?

They work less. We work harder. They get our money. We die earlier.

648262 • 75 points • 21 May, 2016 03:46 PM

The man who owns the company and has a rock solid prenup.

[deleted] • 44 points • 21 May, 2016 05:48 PM

No such thing as a rock solid prenup. The players win the game and the mgtows aren't even playing.

Kalepsis • 83 points • 21 May, 2016 06:09 PM

That's probably the real reason for all those off-the-books accounts in Panama... CEOs aren't hiding their money from tax collectors, they're hiding it from their wives.

tb87670 • 36 points • 21 May, 2016 07:43 PM

That's the fucking truth, taxes are way cheaper than a wife.

[deleted] • 9 points • 21 May, 2016 11:00 PM

there were definitely some accounts that were for that, there was some article on how divorce attorneys for the 'super rich' wives were finding lost money

really makes you wonder though. when youve got the money to do whatever, why the fuck would you jeopardize so much of it?

and then you have retards like Elon Musk who got divorced, lost a bit. married a new girl, got divorced, lost a few million. REMARRIED her, got divorced again and now lost like a billion. good job bro

razormachine • 3 points • 21 May, 2016 11:27 PM

And then you have retards like Elon Musk who got divorced, lost a bit. married a new girl, got divorced, lost a few million. REMARRIED her, got divorced again and now lost like a billion.

He wasn't a retard. First marriage he got divorced and lost a bit. Second marriage he got divorced and lost a few million.

The man said to himself. Well divorce is not that bad. I don't understand what's the big fuss.

Boom... he lost a bilion.

I bet he is not going to gat married any time soon.

[deleted] • 4 points • 22 May, 2016 12:20 AM

given his track record, it's almost a certainty he will... hopefully at least it's a different girl this time lmao

razormachine • 4 points • 22 May, 2016 12:24 AM

Maybe he forgets everything about colonizing Mars and makes a robotic female AI.

He adds "do not divorce" into core programing. :)

[deleted] • 1 point • 24 May, 2016 04:28 AM

"Nah, I'd rather make out with my Monroe-Bot."

beginner_ • 5 points • 22 May, 2016 09:38 AM

You know that Psychopaths can be detect by their failure to learn from previous mistakes and punishment? In tests they tend to stick to what they think is right even if they will get punished again. Combine that with he fact man high ranked managers are known to be Psychopath I agree. Chances are he will repeat the mistake.

[deleted] • 2 points • 23 May, 2016 01:56 PM

Combine that with he fact man high ranked managers are known to be

Psychopath I agree.

this is a made up 'fact' used by poor people to feel better about their place in life

Gawernator • 4 points • 21 May, 2016 08:36 PM

If you aren't playing the game you're basically losing the game

[deleted] • 7 points • 21 May, 2016 08:47 PM

Yeah, I don't really have much respect for Mgtows, since I kinda see it as a cop out. Unless they're asexual then they have sexual urges that need to be satisfied somehow, so they've resigned themselves to a life of jacking off.

Still, it's better than being divorce raped.

[deleted] • 2 points • 21 May, 2016 09:07 PM

there are levels to MTGOW. Spinning plates with no LTR is level 1 one strategy. The Red Pill suggests never getting married, recommends spinning plates. That is by definition MTGOW 1. Most MRA's are usually MTGOW 0.

<http://theobserverwatches.blogspot.com/2012/12/the-four-levels-of-mgtow-betas-shrug.html>

elevul • 1 point • 21 May, 2016 10:30 PM

That blog post is very interesting, but as most of the rest of the MGTOW content it keeps ignoring the effect of automation, the same automation that will wipe off the face of the planet the jobs of everyone, men and women.

Big daddy government will soon have no reason to care of men go MGTOW, because they'll get the majority of their tax money from the companies employing robots/AIs.

Men might not need women (which is debatable, our sexual desire is overpowering), but very soon women won't need men at all either, and this time for real, not only as a statement from a over-eager feminist.

razormachine • 0 points • 21 May, 2016 11:37 PM*

Most of them behave like a bunch of kids who are retreating from society just to spite the woman. They will retreat to the caves and wait for that victorious moment when society crashes because they had left, and woman will drop on their knees admit they were wrong, beg for forgiveness, and an opportunity to make them an sandwich.

In reality, jobs get automated, nobody gives a fuck about them, man who do fuck woman get some extra pussy, some woman do not get married... they had destroyed themselves for pretty much nothing.

Men might not need women (which is debatable, our sexual desire is overpowering), but very soon women won't need men at all either, and this time for real, not only as a statement from a over-eager feminist.

Well on a positive side. Sooner or later they will make an artificial womb. Maybe in a couple of generations straight man will go extinct, and 2-3 generations later

woman will also go extinct. And in a weird twist of fate the world will be ruled by gay man.

Veta321 • 1 point • 22 May, 2016 07:05 AM

Do you think it's impossible to overcome sexuality? You know, like what's required of nearly every religious order across time?

It's not. MGTOW and find something more interesting than what comes out of your dick.

[deleted] • 1 point • 22 May, 2016 08:10 AM

Lol, no I don't. Hence why priests end up being kiddy fiddlers.

ILoveSunflowers • 2 points • 22 May, 2016 03:20 PM

but does that cause kiddy diddling, or do people who are kiddy diddlers choose that profession? No way of knowing for sure.

Veta321 • 1 point • 23 May, 2016 01:12 PM

The latter surely. I went to Notre Dame, several of the guys planning to go into seminary were gay. The ones that weren't were virgins (probably future pedophiles).

_the_shape_ • 1 point • 22 May, 2016 07:34 PM

The man who owns the company and has a rock solid prenup.

Sounds pretty smart, but even smarter (by a fingernail and a few thousand light years) is the guy who dodged marriage altogether.

99639 • -1 points • 21 May, 2016 07:57 PM

Dead at 52 from massive coronary. He is succeeded by his wife, Janice, and their three children, Aiden, 14 Brayden 16 , and Hayden, 31.

I_Need_More_Space_ • 9 points • 21 May, 2016 06:31 PM

"The Manipulated Man." That is all.

4delicioustreats • 3 points • 21 May, 2016 07:30 PM

for new comers. The Manipulated Man is a Book by Esther Vilar. PDF here:

http://clanrossi.org/Wordpress/the_manipulated_man.pdf

wikipedia: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Manipulated_Man its a good read -- Reminds us the context of the book was 1971 feminism and feminism has progressed significantly since then.

Vilar debates a feminist: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=py2b1g73bt4>

elevul • 2 points • 21 May, 2016 10:18 PM

Precisely. They are the ones who do the best choice in this situation, since society allows them to do so.

beginner_ • 2 points • 22 May, 2016 09:44 AM

True. I will mention the Gervais Principle here. You either work hard and move up to top management

and be a millionaire and call the shots or should stay a normal worker and optimize your work-life balance eg. work as little as possible for as much as possible. Dumbest move is middle management because you work your ass off like the top dogs but for much less and you have no power.

So yeah, you should never work too hard. In fact if you are too good, you can't be promoted away and promotions have more to do with your social skills and playing the game than your performance.

What would you rather have? 100k and 40 hrs week or 150k and 60 hrs week?

[deleted] • 1 point • 22 May, 2016 07:12 AM

the difference between a man and a woman is that men get nothing handed to them but they have control over their lives. women get less control but get everything handed to them. a woman only has to not look disgusting, not be too greedy and she'll be loved. it's not so easy for a man. there are tons of guys out there who don't even know how to approach a woman. they're never going to get laid and live miserable lives. a woman can just not look disgusting and stand around in public long enough and someone will come up to her.

kireol • 1 point • 22 May, 2016 12:02 PM

this is true from their 20's-30's.

from 30s on, it flips

ledbed • 1 point • 23 May, 2016 02:43 AM

It's not about being smarter. Historically it is biologically superior to treat women better than men

TheGatherHunter • 58 points • 21 May, 2016 02:16 PM

The best rebuttal I've ever heard was the fact that jobs requiring more hours and less working from home tended to pay better was sexist.

And by best, I mean completely retarded.

I swear, every argument I've ever heard is either using fake statistics (women get more work done while they're there!), or an emotional argument with no logical merit (think of the children!)

cariboo_j • 20 points • 21 May, 2016 04:54 PM

I was debating with a feminist online (bad idea I know) she literally argued for communism.

"Oh women tend to choose jobs that generate less wealth and therefore pay less? The free market is sexist! We need government to decree that all jobs pay the same."

The_DogeWhisperer • 12 points • 21 May, 2016 06:38 PM

In for a penny in for a pound I suppose. Makes sense though, people without ambition love communism.

[deleted] • 4 points • 21 May, 2016 09:11 PM

I had an debate with the gals at the RA desk on wages. They think that ever person should get paid the same. No increases for quality, speed, production, tenure/loyalty. Nothing. So a 10 year employee with a production rate of 100 gets paid the same as a brand new employee that produces at 10. Any differences in pay *could* be the result of -ism and therefore all pay must be equal

[deleted] • 3 points • 21 May, 2016 08:29 PM

Why is this in any sense surprising. Feminism is the most influential form of Cultural Marxism, it grew directly out of it, so of course they would argue for the State to run everything and 'share' people's money (ie, give men's money to women). The early 2nd wavers directly quote Marx and Engels. Hell, the term 'patriarchy', as in Patriarchy Theory, was taken by Greer from a book by Freidrich Engels.

9000sins • 5 points • 21 May, 2016 06:52 PM

Why be a scientist when you get paid the same as dude who works at McDonalds who gets lost looking for the deep fryer?

[deleted] • 7 points • 21 May, 2016 07:37 PM

For the love of science maybe? I'm playing devil's advocate, but if they're doing whatever you're solely for the money, chances are they're not very good at it.

Gawernator • 10 points • 21 May, 2016 08:36 PM

We know many men go into STEM for the money. I mean I'd love to just ride my motorcycle all day but a lifestyle needs to be paid for somehow.

9000sins • 3 points • 21 May, 2016 08:42 PM

True. I guess a more accurate analogy would be a job with a high risk of physical harm.

[deleted] • 1 point • 22 May, 2016 07:41 PM

Yes, much better analogy, however, I think those high risk jobs would be eliminated if everyone was paid the same regardless. They pay well mostly because your chances of getting fucked up are high, and the the people that are more desperate end up taking those jobs.

Extonic • 1 point • 21 May, 2016 09:05 PM

I don't want communism, I want a weekly cage match of the top five wealthiest people on the planet. Only the survivor may leave.

nothere_ • 2 points • 21 May, 2016 11:19 PM

They pit their corporations instead and the people on the last rungs of the ladder are the "survivors"

razormachine • 1 point • 21 May, 2016 11:22 PM

Why work at McDonalds if you can find an even easier job for the same pay.

Since the pay is the same, people would simply flock to the easiest jobs. 10 000 people would apply for a job at the car wash. The doctors position wouldn't get a single application.

cariboo_j • 1 point • 22 May, 2016 05:25 PM

To play devil's advocate I briefly worked at a cardboard mill. Got paid \$25/hr just for bundling stacks of cardboard off the production line. The pay was really good for a job that required no training or skills but *my god* it was boring. Couldn't see myself doing that for the next 30 years. It actually motivated me to go back to school.

razormachine • 1 point • 22 May, 2016 06:48 PM

Well cardboard job wasn't easy because it was boring. It's not easy to endure 8hr's a day of monotonuos job.

Maybe the pay was good because the job was boring?

[deleted] • 1 point • 22 May, 2016 07:20 PM*

Perhaps another way of thinking about it is, the people that took positions as a doctor really cared about medicine and provided great care rather than being concerned only with the money.

You comparing McDonalds to being a doctor is a bit of a poor example for the point you're trying to make.

Sidenote: Have you ever been asked the question, "if money were not object, what would you choose as a profession"? Most people choose the things their passionate about, not what is "easiest".

Edit: Nobody wants to wash cars all day. Realistically, those jobs that are so unappealing and just thrown to the disenfranchised would likely disappear. Most "service" positions would disappear except for the people that really sought them out. I'm not really sure that would be a bad thing.

The big problem when thinking about the society as it is now(if income was universal), is that it would close the class divide. Fewer people thinking their at a lower rung in society and fewer people feeling above the person wiping their wheels or serving them fast food.

[deleted] • 0 points • 22 May, 2016 01:58 AM

i want to be a professional food critic and get paid as much as everyone else. of course, because all jobs pay equal, and i still want to make more money to get *ahead*, i'll take a second job as a professional porn-star blowjob tester.

Surfincloud9 • 1 point • 22 May, 2016 09:14 PM

I get a pretty measly 16 an hour working with live HIV virus and if McDonald's raises their minimum wage to 15 I am going to be so fucking pissed. I put myself into so much debt and worked my ass off and some lazy bum who doesn't take care of himself makes 15. I'd lose my shit

Grasshopper21 • 1 point • 21 May, 2016 08:44 PM

Tbf, true free market just wouldn't have those useless jobs

joh2141 • 13 points • 21 May, 2016 06:05 PM

In respect to this I want to add there are women who are advancing in career. And they are single, no family, and can't maintain a relationship that long. I know plenty of them nearing their wall... and most of them probably will remain single without serious relationship... ever. They look alright. Women just want everything without the downside. They don't realize career success means you compromise in other areas and sacrifice things you want.

[deleted] • 12 points • 21 May, 2016 07:52 PM

I think what you're describing is women being at odds with what they think, and what they feel. Since the two don't align in our society it inspires anger. Directing the anger inward is not realistic so they find a target, the patriarchy.

They also carry a fair bit of contempt when it comes to most men being at peace with what they think, and what they feel. Men for the most part have that pretty ironed out.

And I really don't think women are actively saying to themselves, "I want everything without the downside". I think more realistically, they don't even recognize there is a downside, until they experience it. That's why if you tell a feminist/woman, "you want all the positives and none of the negatives", they'll wholeheartedly disagree, because they actually believe themselves. Solipsism at it's finest. If it's not happening to me, it doesn't exist.

joh2141 • 2 points • 22 May, 2016 05:48 PM

That's a great point I didn't see before but when you tell them what the downside is they don't listen to you. So it wasn't a matter of if they disagree a downside even exists. It is that they don't WANT to listen to it. Feminists that is. As you said if it doesn't happen to them it doesn't exist.

OilyB • 1 point • 22 May, 2016 09:56 AM

"Women being at odds with what they think and what they feel" - "directing the anger inward is not realistic so they find a target"

Very good points. Though I would disagree with the 'directing the anger inward is not realistic' part: a good portion of women *do* direct it inward - that's why there's so much of them on anti-depressants and why so much of them have eating disorders - it's frustration with everything that's outside their immediate influence. And we all know women in general have very low frustration tolerance.

OilyB • 2 points • 22 May, 2016 09:46 AM

"Women just want everything without the downside"

Boom - that's the line I was looking for!

joh2141 • 1 point • 22 May, 2016 04:31 PM*

Yeah like for women they don't understand logic; they only understand the tingles.

IE. When the husband is working late YET AGAIN to secure a client/investor/whatever. Some women might but most women just think "WTF the spark is gone, our love is a sham, blah blah blah." Women are creatures who die without attention (only other thing with same description are babies). I heard this from women so many times it made me realize that all women are just bumbling bimbos seeking attention; they don't care if that person is a serial killer or a rapist or a porn actor or a PIMP or a woman beater.

Another case example of that statement is when men get mugged/raped at night we're told "Should have walked with a buddy, should be able to protect yourself, you pussy." And you are told a list of things you should have done to prevent some threat. Whereas when a woman is told things to prevent mugging or rape, they call you out for being a sexist forgetting all about the muggers and rapists themselves and the person telling them what to do to prevent being a target is all of a sudden the worst human being even than those who commit those crimes. If you walk around dressed like a whore next to someone who's a rapist, chances are the rapist will attack you. Yes we ALL should have the right to walk about without fearing what will happen to us... but that isn't the world we live in. Women live in a fantasy world and can't accept logic or rationale. That's why they follow horoscopes and bullshit to guide their day. For men we have to go out there and SEIZE the day. Obtain our own happiness. Women don't. They don't want to put in the effort to make the day better for themselves, instead they rely on horoscopes or exterior forces to determine how their day went.

There are SOME smart women out there who do understand that men are getting the short end of the "gender equality" movement but again deep down they are still women. They are still full of the same hormones that drive the same bimbo who seeks attention like a child to act just the same way all guys are pigs and our penis does much of the thinking in terms of what we want for the night.

I_Need_More_Space_ • 4 points • 21 May, 2016 06:47 PM

I know a post wall attorney who never married or had kids. She swears she's happy. But, I can see her sadness. Her career is emotionally draining due to the nature of the law she practices. It's almost as if her day to day contribution to society eliminated any space in her soul to have a family of her own. We've had a good bit of convos and she's one of the few women who have actually sacrificed for the better of society.

Funny thing is that I can tell that she used to be smoking hot... A smokin' hot chick with intelligence and selflessness. I think she is a post wall unicorn. She herself told me that she just never met any man that had enough integrity. It' SoCal so masculinity is at zero, and the field is full of Beta's. California literally neuters men from a young age. LOL. Glad I'm not a CA grown mangina. LOL. I'm from the South!

Kind of a sad story. I think I'm on my period. (Tear, Tear). LOL JK JK.

Women of another time. I swear we're only a few generations removed from a more bountiful supply of far better women than the present. Fucking missed the boat in the U.S. Other countries are still ready for cultivation though. That's my future plan. Brazil, Venezuel, or Argentina. Yep. ;)

Peace out American Sluts!

[deleted] • 4 points • 21 May, 2016 08:20 PM

You will find that women are women no matter where you go, awalt. If you bring them back to the states or any modern country that has laws they can exploit and benefit, they got you. Usually when they go to a modern country, often times it changes them, for the worse. The only way I could see you retaining her, is if you moved to those countries. But again do you REALLY want to move to brazil, Venezuela, thailand? Last I heard from expats in china on here, those good women are a myth.

[deleted] • 1 point • 22 May, 2016 07:46 PM

What you are describing is the fluid state of a woman, dependent upon the vessel. Women conform to the environment they exist in. Which is interesting because of the way they are in this modern western society. My genuine thought is because we tolerate and allow them to be this way, or at least the majority of men do.

I_Need_More_Space_ • -3 points • 21 May, 2016 08:37 PM

I don't plan to bring her here. Absolutely not. It will be more of a contract.

All children will require paternity tests. The family will stay in their home country. I'll leave for 6 months at a time to work and save \$. Then I get to essentially have a vacation with them for 6 months when I return to them. She will in return for her loyalty get a monthly check to raise my kids and perform her duties with enthusiasm when I am there with them.

If she can't comply with the agreed upon terms, I bail. Simple. No lawyers needed. And I'm free.

OceanRacoon • 4 points • 21 May, 2016 10:32 PM

She totally won't be banging random guys while you're gone 6 months of *every* year and your kids won't think you're a giant weirdo compared to everyone else's dad. You sound mad.

[deleted] • 1 point • 22 May, 2016 12:08 AM*

If you look around at how men are being raped in court. All the female previlage there is, just saying she was raped and her pointing to a random dude, without evidence, the guy goes to jail? Male suicide at it's high, is this not mad? Are we not living in a "mad" world? The fact that (I need more space), has to think about a situation like this, has to actually think about it this way in order for him to be with a women, speaks volume of the situation we are in. It speaks volumes of how untrusting american women are, these "women" can't be trusted. You need to get real oceanracoon, male hamstering at its best!

This isn't the 1500th century anymore, this isn't 1940's anymore, women are not women anymore, this is our reality as it is now, this is the future, it might even get worse. We must adapt to our new reality, because our reality is not adapting to us, it is against us.

I think kids should ask: "why is daddy doing this?" "Mommy! Why is daddy doing this?"

I_Need_More_Space_ • 0 points • 21 May, 2016 08:42 PM

I won't renounce my citizenship either.

I figure it will be like the hunter gatherer days when men would be gone on long hunts for a large portion of the year. I'll be gone makin' dough. They would get a better life and security. I pass my genes on. And if she's smart, she uses the \$ I send her to buy a house for herself. When she withers with age, and the kids are grown. Then the contract expires. We go our separate ways. Win win for everyone. Life in the U.S. is not that great, so the kids won't be missing out on it. They would get a stable life, and an American role-model to learn from for 1/2 the year. How many traditional families in the U.S. can show that the children get quality time with parents when both parents work and let television raise the kids?

[deleted] • 0 points • 21 May, 2016 10:13 PM

Those are good terms, i think they are solid. The only thing that I would be concerned with is the fact that if you want to have kids, they may be entitled to compensation seeing as some countries have laws that say, that the child is a citizen based upon the country of their parents regardless of were they are born. Your wife, girlfriend may try to file in behave of the child. Although something like that would take ALOT of money. Something she may not have. I think even if she files in her country for compensation, child support, it would pale in comparison to what you would pay in your original country. Pennys I would imagine. I think you might be onto something here! I'm not sure why someone down voted you, seems like a very good option!

I_Need_More_Space_ • 1 point • 22 May, 2016 07:29 AM

Yeah, I don't see an issue with it. This type of international arrangement is pretty much outside the courts as laws of one country don't cross into another. Does anyone believe that if a court in Argentina orders a certain amount of child support out of me that the U.S. govt is gonna throw me in jail if I don't comply? I doubt.

Again, the verbal agreement would be: She has my kids (proven by paternity test), I provide myself as a role model when I'm there (6 months/year), I provide monetary means for them to have a house, and she gets a pretty interesting, bad ass guy to bang for 6 months out of the year. Women don't really care for men too much as long as there financial needs are met. And her and I would never "get old." At some point, I begin to find all the peculiarities of a woman quite boring and even annoying as time goes on. We

would avoid that by my not being there all the fucking time. And if I had boys they would be better off, because they would be spared the feminist programming that begins from youth here in the U.S.A. They would be spared the interaction of growing up with American sluts which are the worst kind of the globe. They hold that title, and they will be holding it for many years to come. They would probably thank me when they grew up and visited the U.S. as adult men.

And, I would be risking MUCH less than trying the traditional route here. FUCK THAT. Ain't gonna happen. I'm way too outside the box for that.

VancouverSucks • 1 point • 21 May, 2016 07:54 PM

Colombia is the promised land.

Fatal_Koala • 6 points • 21 May, 2016 02:55 PM

This was featured on r/science as well (which was honestly a gigantic and positive surprise to me) and someone made a pretty insightful comment that whenever you see this disparity discussed on the media or by the feminist regime, it's always a "gender PAY gap." As in a difference in how much men and women are paid- they're trying to deliver an underlying message that for the same job, hours, education, etc, women get the short end of the stick.

When in reality, what's really going on is a "gender EARNINGS gap." Women are earning less money than men because of their choices, despite programs like affirmative action desperately trying to reverse that.

iagovar • 2 points • 22 May, 2016 11:20 AM

We call it "wage/salary gap" in Spain, which is more intellectually honest IMO.

choomguy • 3 points • 21 May, 2016 05:22 PM

You are the master of unfuckery

pilledwillingly • 2 points • 22 May, 2016 04:33 AM

I've had this discussion numerous times.

Right from first employment, you see a splitting of the genders. McDonald's will put the dudes out the back and the girls on the register. Woolworths will put the dudes in the storeroom/trolleys, and the girls on cleaning/registers. That's fine. But you have to acknowledge that right from the start you're saying 'Males do this, females do that.'

As you get further along the part-time job scale, you see the same thing happening. Men do the driving, the deliveries, the 'outside' components, the lifting, etc and women get the sit down, the phone answering, the talking, the taking of money.

As you move out into the real world of full-time employment, you start being paid for what you bring to the company. The company needs 1 receptionist and 50 factory workers. The workers unionise, and push for better conditions. The men don't get paid *more* but the factory workers do, and by that point the 22 year old women who have never used a box cutter, driven a forklift, or packed a shelf don't want to start, and they dig their own graves.

You want to work in construction for equal pay, pick up concrete bags instead of phones. You want to succeed in academia? You need to push harder than the guy who is trying to leave manual labour behind him. If you're not the breadwinner, you're not as motivated as him because he likely is.

rpreader • 1 point • 26 May, 2016 04:45 PM

I agree, it's fine and makes sense because, well, pretty faces are better for PR and dealing wit customers. Just look at waitstaff, they'll all agree most girls get more in tips just for being girls. What gets me is when they complain about not making as much but they still want to do less work.

TheReformist94 • 10 points • 21 May, 2016 01:48 PM

Women don't work as hard, give up and collectively are a net economic drain society.

cariboo_j • 7 points • 21 May, 2016 04:56 PM

The golden uterus though. At the end of the day we need it to pump out more male worker drones.

GermanDude • 1 point • 21 May, 2016 05:26 PM

Yeah sure, we're not at all totally overpopulated... no man is out of work, no man desperate to work as a construction laborer in the ME under the scorching sun for almost zero pay.

cariboo_j • 3 points • 21 May, 2016 06:25 PM

We subconsciously perceive that we need it, because that's how things were for hundreds of thousands of years. Our subconscious biases haven't caught up to modern technology reality.

GermanDude • 4 points • 21 May, 2016 08:11 PM

Might be. I venture it's because most women insist on having (biological) children and lots of guys can't keep it in their pants, and there we go..

tableman • 1 point • 21 May, 2016 09:11 PM

Overpopulation is a government myth.

killcat • 2 points • 21 May, 2016 10:21 PM

Sarcasm? Because it's definitely not a myth, we are destroying the world ecosystem, I mean if everyone lived at the level of an Indian villager sure, but we don't want to.

tableman • 0 points • 22 May, 2016 12:53 PM

>we are destroying the world ecosystem

99.99% of all species that have existed on this planet have gone extinct and guess what? In the future 99.99% of all currently living species will go extinct.

The planet will adapt as it always has through ice ages and meteor strikes.

People don't need to protect the climate, people need protection from the climate.

There is a reason you are using fossil fuels to change your climate. The climate of your personal dwelling it not natural.

Ever since mass utilization of fossil fuels, climate related death has been reduced by 98%. We are seeing massive population growth, because we are protecting humans from the climate using fossil fuels.

killcat • 1 point • 22 May, 2016 09:56 PM

Once you destabilize the system enough the death toll will be in the billions, from famine, flood, disease and war. Yes we will adapt but it's going to be a shitty period.

tableman • 1 point • 22 May, 2016 10:44 PM

That's what the government wants you to believe.

killcat • 1 point • 23 May, 2016 03:19 AM

Umm no. I believe it because it follows the basic principle that if an organism exceeds the carrying capacity of the environment it dies off, all that varies is how the die off occurs.

EverythingISayIsRight • 2 points • 22 May, 2016 01:56 AM

if you've ever been to shanghai or tokyo you'll fuckin change your mind quickly.

tableman • 1 point • 22 May, 2016 12:43 PM

Overpopulation is only a problem because government exists and the only thing it's good at is siphoning resources from it's people.

TheReformist94 • 1 point • 22 May, 2016 06:45 PM

To correctly put it, in the current western set up, with women working and not producing children, they are a net drain on society. Having women in full time employment is violation of the division of labour.

Hexthorne • 2 points • 21 May, 2016 07:11 PM

A necessary economic drain - the economy doesn't run without more consumers being born.

The net effect of the economic drain of women is by far offset by their birthing of young males, ready to be worked to death for a bit more money that they can spend on their retail pleasures of the moment.

spectrum_92 • 1 point • 22 May, 2016 06:41 AM

Well to be clear, if they don't reproduce, the next generation doesn't exist.

Dollar_thief • 4 points • 21 May, 2016 03:30 PM

The argument I've heard is that women are less less likely to get hired to the higher paying jobs because of institutional sexism.

Sure would be nice to have some data to blow that one out the water, is there any?

TheBlackPhillipShow • 28 points • 21 May, 2016 03:54 PM **[recovered]**

It's not the CEO job that would create disparity in the median wage, it's the millions of welding, oil drilling, sewer inspecting, 80 hour a week sales jobs. Receptionists and 25 year old babysitters bring the female average down. Until women are beating down the doors of Waste Management for that extra \$2/hr, there will be an aggregate pay gap.

What scared me is how long an issue like this can stay relevant, when if you dig an inch down it's clearly frosted political bullshit. Who has opinions that are examined in the age of limitless information?

I_Need_More_Space_ • 8 points • 21 May, 2016 06:50 PM **[recovered]**

The media is controlled not by the govt, but by the vagina dude. The govt. knows that if you control the vagina population, the majority of men (Betas) will follow. There you have the method for population control, because women are dumber than men. The govt. knows this shit. Once again, Eve

is fucking over Adam.

[deleted] • 2 points • 21 May, 2016 07:56 PM

It's an extremely effective method of controlling the masses. It's much easier to control women, and then the men who are beholden to their vagina.

[deleted] • 3 points • 21 May, 2016 05:01 PM

I'm also surprised it took over a decade for anybody to look into it.

The_DogeWhisperer • 2 points • 21 May, 2016 06:43 PM

I had to take sociology in college for my general ed. They should just rename that class socialism 101. Fucking insane how many lies the book presents as fact such as the glass ceiling, white privilege, and describing capitalism as the source for ALL the world problems. Conflict theory in sociology is straight socialism and it's being force fed down the throats of anyone who goes to college today. Psychology isn't much better either. 50% of the book is speculation and fact spinning to fit the left narrative.

Grasshopper21 • 6 points • 21 May, 2016 08:52 PM

The problem is that the American capitalism we have isn't really the way capitalism should be run. The current system has no community based returns and is only about profit to the exclusion of all else. How are we supposed to build a better workforce when everyone is referred to as a drone instead of a human being? What incentive is there to advance?

The_DogeWhisperer • 2 points • 21 May, 2016 09:31 PM

How am I supposed to have any sense of community when women are praised for raising kids on their own and destroying our society generation by generation. I'm almost to the point of welcoming Islam with open arms since western ideals have no strong foundation and everyone whores around. And that's fucking sad to me

Gawernator • 2 points • 21 May, 2016 08:46 PM

Hmm... My sociology Class wasn't like that at all. But I had a good teacher

The_DogeWhisperer • 2 points • 21 May, 2016 09:29 PM

I live in California. That's probably the reason. Liberals everywhere

Gawernator • 1 point • 22 May, 2016 06:51 AM

I do too. Even at an east bay college. But it was a JR. College and the professor was an Army officer in Vietnam...

[deleted] • 4 points • 21 May, 2016 08:05 PM

I don't think the pay gap is an argument that will bare you any fruit especially with a woman indoctrinated into the ideology that promotes the pay gap argument. I would honestly just dismiss it and don't engage.

A little side note. If we look at the arguments put forth by both men and women(for these types of issues) we see they are in competition with each other and generally hostile, on both sides.

They way any government can control a population is by dividing their interests. If you make one side

feel disenfranchised, and a logical fallacy is the main argument, when the main argument is flawed, there will never be a resolution. Same is true for abortion, gun laws etc...

By putting the members of a population at odds with everyone else in the population, you remove the solidarity of the populous, thus decreasing their power in a "democracy".

We might be better off thinking about why we're arguing, rather than what we're arguing about.

[deleted] • 1 point • 21 May, 2016 09:16 PM

BLM. "Why can't I rob a grocer and fight a cop for his gun? Not allowing me is racist"

[deleted] • 1 point • 21 May, 2016 11:58 PM*

Fact. So many examples around of it. I said this in another quota/push a female through stem field/career course no matter what type thread. Mercedes Carrera is one good example.

Once again some people are just too stupid to comprehend things and should never be allowed in real discussions like this. Women truly suck at life and want the easy way out... ALWAYS.

Edit: Fuck can't believe it took me so long to realize the gender pay bullshit is a communist tactic. Nevermind taking genetic dumbshits (WOMEN) and using them to further that agenda... omfg. It ALL makes sense now!

[deleted] • 1 point • 22 May, 2016 07:09 AM

guys dicks dont get hard for women who work hard. that's why. they get hard for big tits and big asses and gentle natures.

yomo86 • 1 point • 22 May, 2016 08:20 AM

Got a friend he snails as a private contractor with his own business toilets and other stinky stuff.

He always tells me how some women want to bargain a cup of coffee in exchange for his free services. Sure bitch 30ct a coffee equals \$ 300 per problem. They dont even appreciate other peoples harc work.

metallica11 • 50 points • 21 May, 2016 01:47 PM

If you normalize for the ability to get your shit done and deliver results, the wage gap magically disappears.

It would be In the best interest of a company to keep and promote someone who delivers results, regardless of gender. If Sally delivers results and still is paid less, she needs to grow some "balls" and ask for a raise. Which brings me to another theory I have: women are less likely to ask for a raise and that is another reason for the age gap

Wha la!

[deleted] • 21 points • 21 May, 2016 04:27 PM

wha la

Voilà

newgrounds • 1 point • 22 May, 2016 07:54 PM

This is actually a hypothesis heavily touted by feminists, hence why they need Empowerment

ponkyol • 59 points • 21 May, 2016 02:07 PM

And don't forget the waste of women going through med school, working a few years and then dropping out to

have a family. Never to use their degrees again.

TRPdoctor • 20 points • 21 May, 2016 05:43 PM

So many women at my dental school are already marrying other dental students. Ask any man about what his plans are after dental school and the response will be something on the lines of "start my own practice" or work 5-6 days a week to aggressively pay down student debt so they can eventually do so. If you ask the women, they are turned off by the idea of opening their own practice and they entered the field "for the flexible schedule". Their plans are one of 2 things: either enter an orthodontic residency so they really don't have to work that much, or work as a general dentist 3 days a week at some shitty dental chain like Aspen. The gender pay gap in dentistry is probably huge due to this reason.

GermanDude • 14 points • 21 May, 2016 05:30 PM

Fully paid by the state no less. Free tuition plus an interest-free loan for living expenses and usually 50% forgiveness on the latter is what you receive in Germany and other North-Western European countries.

I_Need_More_Space_ • 3 points • 21 May, 2016 06:54 PM

This is why socialism doesn't work. People exploit it, and the working citizens must pay the bill.

[deleted] • 9 points • 21 May, 2016 08:09 PM

Versus working citizens paying the bill in every other type of government? Working citizens will pay the bill no matter what. Working citizens bail out every major institution(Banking, Automakers etc...) when they go bust.

GermanDude • 0 points • 21 May, 2016 08:15 PM

Sorry, but almost all "resurrected" banks etc paid back their government guarantee lines and loans (there are no bailout without terms), but how many soccer mums would ever try to or be able to pay back the government?

[deleted] • 6 points • 21 May, 2016 08:20 PM

The banks pay the government, not the working class that provides the money. If the government then adjusted taxes and benefits for the people that fund those bailouts then you might have a case, but that doesn't happen. The money doesn't go back into the pockets of the people that payed for the bailout.

GermanDude • -1 points • 21 May, 2016 08:30 PM

lol, so what does the government do with the money? If it uses the money properly at least in part, I'll go into infrastructure and services, such as medical and police.

[deleted] • 7 points • 21 May, 2016 09:23 PM

You're putting a whole lot of faith in the government.

The "government" put the same people that caused the financial crisis in charge of fixing it. That's not a great exhibit of fiscal responsibility or common sense. I can assume you don't/never have worked in government if you think the government spends money properly.

I'm not going to outline where the money goes for you. With a little reading you can easily conclude that for yourself, but its not put back into the pockets of the people that were forced to pay for the financial crisis.

Money that goes into police and other civic benefits is not related to the money the "working class" coughed up for the bank bailouts. We would have had those benefits anyways.

It's not the nice little cycle you think it is.

Edit: The working class didn't get more/better police/medical benefits/infrastructure by bailing those banks out.

I_Need_More_Space_ • 3 points • 21 May, 2016 08:29 PM

Most governments are blended with socialism. The U.S. is included. Socialism appeals to women who consequently influence men who consequently form a majority in favor of socialist programs. The weak outnumber the strong, so they vote for their interests.

It's really just the evolution of weaker genes finding a way to propagate over the stronger genes. The evolutionary peak of man is in the past, and only the downhill slide of a weaker species will come to pass. The top tier of the world wants this, so they can remove themselves from the rest of the world, and live in a perfect existence of wealth and power. The "god-class" will be created while the rest of humanity slides down the evolutionary totem pole. It will eventually be the end of man.

Crazy talk? Y'all probably think so. I'm ok with that. LOL

GermanDude • 0 points • 21 May, 2016 08:32 PM

I definitely agree with you on the socialism part. But it's not inevitable, i.e. not every government is equally corrupt / handing out goodies for no reason.

I_Need_More_Space_ • 2 points • 21 May, 2016 08:47 PM

Not equally corrupt at this moment in time as different govt.'s are in different stages in their evolution for control of it's populous. All govt's seek control of the people. That's what women and betas want. They want govt. intervention in evolution

I_Need_More_Space_ • 1 point • 21 May, 2016 08:49 PM

By the way, are you from German? I've visited twice for vacation, and both were very good times.

rumovoice • 45 points • 21 May, 2016 04:10 PM

Many females are going through med school not to earn more money, but to secure a male that earns more money

JihadDerp • 27 points • 21 May, 2016 05:06 PM

I don't know why you're getting downvoted. In law school it's a running joke that they're not there to get their JD, but to get their MRS. 80% of them marry a classmate within a year or two of graduation.

cariboo_j • 19 points • 21 May, 2016 04:59 PM

They could just invest in a boob job instead and save themselves and everyone else the hassle.

99639 • 22 points • 21 May, 2016 08:00 PM

It's about social circles. The med students all go out drinking together and end up fucking each other.

It's like any other small group of people, it gets very incestuous.

hamsterbator • 2 points • 23 May, 2016 11:55 PM

to be fair, they aren't doing this intentionally. it's just that they realize how unhappy they are due to the work hours and how much more fulfilling it is to play with the baby.

Mim0hsa • 50 points • 21 May, 2016 03:29 PM **[recovered]**

I know too many women doing this exact thing. One went to Duke Law. She has 4 kids. Do you think she stays late at the firm? No, because she doesn't go to the firm. She doesn't work for a firm. She doesn't work.

Squeezymypenis • 19 points • 21 May, 2016 03:52 PM **[recovered]**

We would fire her if she asked to leave early.

Mim0hsa • 13 points • 21 May, 2016 05:53 PM **[recovered]**

We would fire her if she asked to leave early.

Good! As you should. If she signed a contract knowing that she would be expected to stay until a certain time every day (or that she's getting into a time-intensive field with odd hours), and realizes that she wants to be home with her children in the afternoons, she owes it to the firm to sit them down and either talk about the possibility of part-time, or quit. If you allow yourself to accept the benefits of a full-time staffer without actually working full time, your conscience isn't working and may be infected with a sense of entitlement.

Half-assing a previously promising career to be home with your children for a few extra hours a day is NOT "having it all." It's disrespectful to colleagues, and your kids can smell your stress on you. A person with a law or medical degree should be able to afford childcare or a live-in nanny anyway (if you're thinking ahead, have a steady stream of au pairs so the kids can grow up multilingual). Having children is a decision, and watching people bitch about how hard it is to balance a career and children has me like

And, none of those highly-educated-turned-housewife women think about how they're royally screwing over the few women who may actually be fully dedicated to their careers, because if you're of typical childbearing age; HR would not be wrong to think that you're going to get expensive training, get pregnant, try to "make it work" with a newborn and a full-time job, and subsequently flake. [Edit to add that the aforementioned women, with one foot in a high-heeled pump and the other in a house slipper, probably congratulate themselves on paving the way for younger women.]

steps off soapbox

Squeezymypenis • 3 points • 22 May, 2016 04:50 AM **[recovered]**

No need to step off. My 2 heroes are Henry Kissinger and a blind Venetian. Always do what is practical and good for business. If it doesn't help the firm then cut it.

jiveraffe • 5 points • 21 May, 2016 06:57 PM **[recovered]**

And don't forget the waste of women going through med school, working a few years and then dropping out to have a family. Never to use their degrees again.

This annoys me on principle. That the limited space and resources required to train a medical doctor are squandered on useless bitches that don't utilize it to the full extent as their male colleagues, to the detriment of

us all.

If it was some bullshit degree in Greek history I would care less (preferably as long as I, the taxpayer, aren't footing the bill, but that notwithstanding) as long as the right people were being given the right chances to make the most of the right opportunities.

IIRC the NHS (British medical service) are facing staffing shortages because the female doctors aren't pulling their weight.

But don't worry, shitlords. It's all misogyny that the female quacks are going into maternity, obstetrics and gynecology instead of surgery and oncology.

[deleted] • 2 points • 22 May, 2016 06:21 AM [recovered]

The idea that women go to college just to find potential mates angers me. Not only are precious resources wasted on them, they're taking the spot of a man who could've used that opportunity to drastically improve his life.

RedxDevil • 5 points • 21 May, 2016 05:35 PM

Makes me wonder how much scholarship, grant and stipend money goes towards female graduates that end up practicing for less than 10 years. It'd be an interesting figure to see. And if it's large enough, a mildly infuriating figure.

PlanB_pedofile • 1 point • 22 May, 2016 01:32 AM

They earned a secondry Mrs. Degree.

razormachine • 28 points • 21 May, 2016 04:17 PM

WTF is wrong with these people?

Number of married couples has hit the bottom, yet family is to be blamed for woman earning less?

How about they make a serious study, and provide data for married and single man and woman with and without kids.

I expect that single woman who had spent her 20's having parties and riding cock is going to earn less than a man who had spent his 20's building his career.

[deleted] • 50 points • 21 May, 2016 02:34 PM

Hardly a surprise to the initiated.

Females aren't at work -including academia- to earn money. They're at work for access to high value males.

Money? That's what GUYS are for silly!

The mission statements of why a man and a woman goes to work are totally different .Women CAN advance in a firm by earning their stripes, but it's tactically better if they merely find a powerful guy and get HiM to do the work for her.

As such, women don't have an incentive to chase high salary and high stress jobs. A woman who gets the CEO to be her OneItis despite never graduating college has more power then the chick with the rubber stamped STEM degree working overtime for the big salary.

Besides- a females entire purpose is to have kids. Kids not only cost money, they require time to raise. Women don't want to work -they want to punch out the best kids they can and raise them. The office and college is merely a social sorting table where she can pick and choose suitable mates before cashing out for the luxury SUV and two dot five kids-the latter totally paid for by Mr Betabux.

Topping the salary chart isn't even the point.

I_Need_More_Space_ • 13 points • 21 May, 2016 06:58 PM

"they want to punch out the best kids they can and raise them."

Not true. They just want to have kids. Raising good kids is too much "work." So, they raise snot nosed brats.
#Murica LOL

MattyAnon • 8 points • 21 May, 2016 09:14 PM

Look into the Productivity Gap sometime, and ask yourself why you've never heard of it before :D

deaduponaviral • 16 points • 21 May, 2016 04:17 PM

I work in the oil industry and have never, ever worked side by side with a woman. NEVER. The worst is when they get put into bullshit safety positions and feel the need to justify their jobs. This gives them inflated egos, which they already have, plus the added chip on their shoulder for working in a male dominated industry. They just love to spout off about how they somehow know how to do my job better than the actual workers. I usually just hand them the tool I'm working with. They see it's not useful for making sandwiches and scurry away to bitch and moan about pay inequality in the smoke shack. The idea of being lectured by a woman while holding my tongue and shaking their hand, just so I don't get fired, makes my dick shrivel.

razormachine • 17 points • 21 May, 2016 04:56 PM

I had worked in the firm that had 36 female employees, and there were two of us guys. Same pay for the same position. However since we were man, we got the hardest part of the job, and we were effectively locked into that position, because if we advanced there would be nobody left to do the jobs we did. Gender equality my ass.

I_Need_More_Space_ • 1 point • 21 May, 2016 07:02 PM

Damn. That's harsh, Brotha. That would drive me nuts. How the fuck do you cope with those bitches. Do you club seals on your days off? LOL. JK. I couldn't deal with that situation.

[deleted] • 1 point • 22 May, 2016 01:22 AM

This right here. Women are fucking worthless in life. You literally gave them a representation of hard work and they immediately quit as they all do in life.

Thats the hardest redpill to swallow... realizing their worth, which is nothing to begin with, is artificially inflated

ralphswanson • 6 points • 21 May, 2016 05:53 PM

This actually proves that women are overpaid. Dr. Warren Farrell identifies 25 choices that women make which provide lower income but a higher quality of life. There are likely more. This study shows that after adjusting for two of these, women earn as much as men. Include all 25 and see that men are short changed. Then factor in that women with the same qualifications are preferred two-to-one in hiring in academia.

[deleted] • 6 points • 21 May, 2016 07:52 PM

This is a case where, while it may sound cliché or even ridiculous, you cannot help women without helping men. As long as men are looked down upon when they don't make lots of money and women are not, this will never change. Make whatever laws you want, men will find a way to make more money because making money means getting women.

le_king_falcon • 1 point • 22 May, 2016 05:11 PM

Not going to change when power and money make women wet as opposed to a good dad and perfectly equal partner doing nothing for them sexually.

[deleted] • 12 points • 21 May, 2016 02:10 PM*

Weinberg says that the data cannot identify or tease apart factors that might explain why married women with children earn less — among the possibilities, whether employers assign different responsibilities and salaries to these women, or whether the women spend less time or energy on their careers.

The study is from the **american economic review**, the article is from frickin **nature**. Do you know the level of intelligence and dedication to the scientific method you need to publish in these?! Well apparently just under the amount of intelligence it takes to realise that taking care of young kids and having an academic career are both activities which take the majority of your time awake, and thus are not really compatible. Bunch of idiots..

darkrood • 6 points • 21 May, 2016 03:53 PM

Tsk, this lie has been debunked so many times.

Yet, all this will get set back as soon as another woman get seemingly unjustified treatment.

Feminist on set on changing the current power structure. They are not going to let something petty like stats to Menxplaing the reality

B1tfury • 7 points • 21 May, 2016 05:00 PM

This has already been studied and dismissed for quite some time. His Excellency, Thomas Sowell.

https://youtu.be/G_sGn6PdmIo

RedxDevil • 6 points • 21 May, 2016 06:36 PM

As much as i dislike anecdotal evidence, in the lab im at now we've dealt with a mind boggling amount of maternity leaves and continue to. Half have resulted in them leaving-- Years of experience, education and training vanish with them. But that gap in payment for them and loss of getting raises should they decide to enter the workforce in the future skews the overall female "income" lower.

Furthermore, my experiences make it difficult to see how women in general think there is such severe discrimination against them. I work in chemistry and microbiology labs. Between ones ive interviewed for and ones i've worked in, not one had more men than women. Since ive been in my current one, there have been 8 women hired and 3 men including me. Ive come in second place for a handful of higher paying positions to a female candidate with equivalent resumes. This is all in spite of the risks i mentioned above, i.e., long term or permanent absences, and the loss of experience and training invested. I have a few examples of females being hired before or over male candidates despite lack of experience and education but i already have a small novella here.

TL;DR Seems in my field, employers fall all overthemselves to get a female candidate the job in the first place.

[deleted] • 5 points • 21 May, 2016 05:14 PM

If a chick wants a family friendly lifestyle, she can enroll in welfare or better yet, marry the father of her child and have him support the family instead.

[deleted] • 4 points • 21 May, 2016 06:12 PM

Not surprising, show me a woman who complains about the "pay gap" and I'll show you someone who probably

works a no skill job or a low wage job and expects that she should earn as much as a man like myself supporting critical infrastructure for a \$250M company.

[deleted] • 3 points • 21 May, 2016 06:34 PM

Was engaged to a teacher; her and three of her teacher friends were sitting around talking, so I asked why they chose teaching. All of them agreed: for the short hours and summers off. All of them said they arrived 15 minutes before class began and booked out no later than 15 minutes after the final bell. When I asked "what about all the work you take home with you" they had a good laugh and told me they did all their grading and other work during study halls. None of them had families to take care of.

It ain't about their fucking families; it's all about *them*.

[deleted] • 5 points • 21 May, 2016 08:45 PM

When these studies talk about how much money women 'earn' they take a very narrow definition of 'earn'. The first part is just the academic fields that women prefer, and the sort of jobs they take (ie, generally the easier ones in both cases). Fair enough, they earn less due to their choice of subject/job. This is their own shitty choices.

The second part is where women give up 'earning' money because they get married in order to have children. *This is not blameworthy, having children is what they are supposed to do, and what society relies on if it is to survive.* But staying alive, having a house, clothes, food for her and the children, these things cost money. *Who is paying the money?* This is the crucial point. Because she is not earning a salary the statistics make it out that women are hereby disadvantaged in this situation and men advantaged. But in fact, it is men who pay them to do this, who support them financially while they are not working by *paying them out of their (the men's) wages*. This is money that is counted as being for the man, but is actually for the woman.

Again, that second part is not something that I would 'blame' women for (unlike the first part), but it is something that grossly distorts these statistics and studies, giving a picture that is actually a lie.

Albacorewing • 7 points • 21 May, 2016 06:18 PM [recovered]

It reminds me of a job I had where there was this female employee. She was doing my same job description. She always left early, lied on her time cards, and complained that men on her same pay scale got more money. They worked overtime. She refused to. They worked the graveyard shift. She refused to. Before they laid her off, she was bitterly complaining about her commute and how long it took. Right to my face. And I commuted three times the distance.

icepickjones • 4 points • 21 May, 2016 11:56 PM [recovered]

I can tell you similar stories about shitty male coworkers I've had - at every level. Just saying, this is a specious anecdotal line of thinking.

Albacorewing • 2 points • 22 May, 2016 12:17 AM*

Anecdotal? Yes.

Consistent? Yes.

I have seen this sort of thing much more often with women than with men. It happens with men too, definitely. But as someone pointed out on this thread, women just do not work as hard. In my life, for instance, I have hardly ever seen one do much overtime. And when they do, never as much as men do.

For the individual man, such as myself, personal experience counts much more than someone yelling statistics.

[deleted] • 2 points • 22 May, 2016 06:12 AM

Dude don't even bother with these retards. There's so many of these BP people that comment on my shit that I don't waste my breath responding to them.

We both know damn well if it was a dude they'd be fired in an instant or within due time for LYING on time cards. From the sounds of things this was quite a long due process for a woman.

Don't be surprised at those who ignore facts that are presented in front of their faces. Welcome it because it shows you who to ignore.

asktrpquestion34 • 3 points • 22 May, 2016 04:17 AM

I'm a liberal's liberal, but I've never understood why my peers believe in the wage gap. It's taken as fact. Conversation usually goes like this.

"X study said women make %% less than men."

"That study did very basic math and divided the earnings of men and women by the number of men and women without accounting for variables that influence pay."

"That's true, but even when you account for things like position and education women are still paid significantly less."

"Source?"

"..."

user_7at • 5 points • 21 May, 2016 05:04 PM*

I once had an economic professor use classical theory to answer the wage gap question. That if women were producing the same results as men yet being paid less, the workforce would be predominately **women** because the labor is cheaper for the same output. Therefore they pay men more for their stability and commitment.

Edit: Changed word - in bold

[deleted] • 4 points • 21 May, 2016 08:14 PM

[permanently deleted]

user_7at • 1 point • 21 May, 2016 11:55 PM

Sorry about that, will edit.

maniclurker • 2 points • 21 May, 2016 06:37 PM

Good old Jack sums it up nicely.

RegdarKhrast • 2 points • 21 May, 2016 08:07 PM

Color me *drum roll* not shocked. Funny how widespread this information has gotten but only the hard-headed, intellectually challenged, and mentally challenged, i.e. mainly 3rd-wave feminists and SJW's, can't seem to wrap their mind around this simple, study-proven fact.

SecularNotLiberal • 2 points • 21 May, 2016 08:41 PM

This supports what I've felt all along. Women with children are going to earn less but not women without children. This makes a good case against breeding.

MakeEmSayAyy • 2 points • 21 May, 2016 11:11 PM

Local Man Looks at History Books and Notices Literally Everything Created/Built by Men, Women Still Claim Equality p.24

[deleted] • 2 points • 22 May, 2016 03:17 AM

I feel sorry for the academics who published this, their careers are now shot.

Best line to come out of that thread.

"The pay gap is actually an earnings gap"

I'm going to refer to it as such from now on.

i_know_i_am_right • 2 points • 22 May, 2016 06:44 AM

I think women who prioritize their man and his children are good wives and mothers. Plus being less career oriented they let their male co-workers to have less competition. So I don't see how exactly it is a bad thing for men lol

Ill28 • 3 points • 21 May, 2016 01:13 PM

They don't fall behind at all. They gain via future child support and alimony payments.

[deleted] • 12 points • 21 May, 2016 01:22 PM

They don't fall behind at all.

I said in their careers, not their lives.

bisjac • 1 point • 21 May, 2016 06:57 PM

Well its easy to choose family when the man has no choice but pay for it all.

nuesuh • 1 point • 22 May, 2016 06:58 AM

Being a mom and wife is for "low status women". Mothers and wives aren't getting the respect they deserve anymore...

[deleted] • 1 point • 22 May, 2016 07:02 AM*

i was surprised an article like this could appear in nature then i read that they turned it around and blame society once again. lol. when the fuck are women going to take responsibility for their actions? if women would fuck men who are losers, then men wouldnt worry so much about being losers. so if they want that family friendly society for women, then start fucking losers you stupid fucking bitches. you don't have to get wet, just take responsibility for it and stop crying. you can pretend to like those men.

this article is yet another example of how much in denial women are. everyone is racking their fucking brains trying to come up with a reason why women are losing to men instead of accepting an answer staring at them in the face. it's everything under the sun EXCEPT that women are born inferior to men. women are less ambitious, less able to endure hardship and less creative. you don't have to take my word for it. there is 10000 years worth of human history's worth of proof.

no_face • 1 point • 22 May, 2016 10:46 AM

Game theory wouldn't allow a gender pay gap. If a woman could be paid less than an equivalent male candidate, women would be hired by preference, which would lead to the demand for women to increase which would close the pay gap.

Ragnarr_ck • 1 point • 22 May, 2016 06:16 PM

Maybe asking a dumb question, but the wage gap isn't compared between men and women in the same job?

csqr • 1 point • 26 June, 2016 11:14 AM

As an immigrant working in academia (US) I've seen this first hand over the last few years. There's almost a suicidal (financially) trend amongst women to choose soft humanities subjects in graduate school. People like me making 6 figures teaching more practical subjects (finance) are looked as usurpers. My diagnosis: we have too many left-wing/ feminist professors who chose worthless subjects they were "passionate" about. Instead of acknowledging the limited market value of these subjects to prospective students, they double down on the patriarchy & discrimination explanations when recruiting fresh graduate students. Women simply fall for these explanations more than guys.

Trpdoc • -21 points • 21 May, 2016 01:45 PM

Women take the stupidest jobs and try to make them seem like they are glorious. Nursing for example is a glorified janitor. They pick up poop and can't interpret shit about medicine and work shifts. But they take selfies in white coats for instagram like they are physicians or that being a doctor is something their weak "I'm sick all the time!" Asses could muster.

Eze-Wong • 18 points • 21 May, 2016 02:16 PM

I don't think I agree on that facet. There's quite a lot a nurse needs to know in case of coding, injections and medication. The nurses I've had actually caught my doctor's mistake in over prescribing meds and generally were very helpful to my time in the hospital.

I'm not exactly sure what experiences you've had with nurses but the times I've had were respectful, knowledgeable, and pretty much caring all around.

And I'm speaking to both male and female nurses.

NotUpToAnythingGood • 11 points • 21 May, 2016 02:06 PM

Actually nurses do a whole lot more than what you said. It's a thankless job that helps to ensure the practice of medicine can actually work. If you take nurses out of the equation, the medical field falls apart.

Trpdoc • -4 points • 21 May, 2016 06:51 PM

It's certainly what they want you to think. Physicians are the only people that matter. If you want your nurse to make your complex medical decisions then go ahead and accept that. Nurses are useless, I speak as a highly educated physician

magus678 • 10 points • 21 May, 2016 02:50 PM

The job it sounds like you are talking about is CNA; certified nursing assistant. They get 10 bucks an hour to empty bed pans and do scut work so the RNs can get on with bigger things.

maniclurker • 4 points • 21 May, 2016 06:57 PM

Friend, you're getting downvoted because your comment was blatantly ignorant. And I can personally attest. My mother raised me and my sister solo while holding down 2 part time jobs and getting the training to become an LPN. After she met my dad (adopted me and my sister as his own 20 years ago), they had a combined income of like 36K. They both worked their asses off. 17 years later, she's making 70K running shit at a VA. Tenured doctors rely on her skill, experience, and sound judgement to care for all of those beat up ass vets rolling through vascular department. They could not perform their jobs without people like her on

the floor doing what they do.

Whatever tough bullshit you think you have on your plate, I'm quite positive my mom could eat that shit for brunch and push right on through without stopping.

Trpdoc • 1 point • 21 May, 2016 07:03 PM

Ok it's true nurses if they are good are pretty useful but only the good ones. They do however sit in packs of 6 and crush a young nurses spirit and helpfulness time and time again, especially unionized ones

maniclurker • 4 points • 21 May, 2016 07:11 PM

Your statement can be applied to any job, anywhere. There will always be people that get shit done and make the world go round, and people that slack off and act like shitbags.

Trpdoc • -2 points • 21 May, 2016 07:14 PM

Problem with nursing is that they fall back on the feeling that they are saving humanity. They aren't. They make the hospital run but so does the janitorial staff. Physicians are the only one taking on liability and making decisions.

Jaspr • 6 points • 21 May, 2016 02:23 PM

that's not what a nurse does at all.

If you know a person that claims to be a nurse and all they do is clean up shit then they're not a nurse, they're a care giver.

My mother is a care giver like you described and she tries to play up her job as if she is a nurse.

Nursing schools and a Nursing degree are so hard they are up there with computer science and law school in how hard the curriculum is.

Typical nursing will start off with 200 students and end up with 25 graduates. It ain't no cakewalk.

magus678 • 2 points • 21 May, 2016 02:48 PM

Nursing schools and a Nursing degree are so hard they are up there with computer science and law school in how hard the curriculum is.

Unless you are referencing some kind particular premium tier nursing school I don't know about, this is not the case at all.

I would actually say nursing(RN) is the perfect "medium" degree: it isn't some blow off like business, but it isn't engineering either. The average person is capable of getting through it with a reasonable level of effort.

648262 • 0 points • 21 May, 2016 03:49 PM

I agree, but I put CS and Law there as well to be honest.

magus678 • 1 point • 21 May, 2016 03:56 PM

I couldn't speak for CS but I would agree with Law school for the most part.

Law school requires more of a commitment though, so I would say that at least sets it apart.

Practically anyone who is willing to drop 7 years and a bunch of student loan debt can be an attorney.