

# The real gender gap: the tax gap

889 upvotes | 21 September, 2016 | by G\_Petronius

---

For every 100 dollars a man makes, 77 articles are published on bullshit statistics showing how women are oh so underpaid. If you've spent any time around TRP at all, you must have seen a dozen threads about it.

What you probably don't know, because there's a veritable dearth of articles published on it, is that there is actually a gender gap: the tax gap. Men, you'll be *shocked* to know, pay a massively disproportionate amount of taxes compared to women. But more than that, men pay a massively disproportionate amount of taxes *compared to what they get back in government spending*.

The data I'll use comes from a [New Zealand study](#) [PDF warning]. That's not because I'm a Kiwi but because, very unsurprisingly, gender tax gap studies are very hard to come by, due to how incredibly un-PC their conclusions are. I could find the raw data for the United States and my home country, but no elaboration as thorough as the one I'm going to present. I invite you to be as skeptical as you feel like and verify these conclusions for your country if you like.

So, first item:

## **For all age groups, men pay much more tax per capita**

This graph is pretty self-explanatory: at every point in his life, the average man will pay more tax than the average woman of the same age. In fact, from age 24 until age 65 (i.e. during the average graduate's working lifetime), the average man will pay more tax than the average woman in *any* age group. Only before beginning to work and after retirement are men surpassed in tax paid, and only by working women.

On to the next:

## **For nearly all age groups, men pay more tax than they receive in public spending, while the opposite is true for women**

As you can see, once men hit graduate working age they pay more into the system than they get back, and only revert to taking out more when they hit retirement. Women, on the other hand, take out more than they put in all their lives, except for the 45-65 period (i.e. after they've stopped having and caring for young children and before retirement). Also, the net contributions by men are much larger than those by women: a 30-year-old man will on average give an average annual net contribution higher than a typical woman in any age group.

And for item three:

## **Women never repay what the state spends on them, while men do so unless they live past 85**

Those two decades of net positive contributions by women mentioned above do not come close to repaying all the tax money spent on a woman: on average, there's no point in a Kiwi woman's life when she'll be in the black towards her country. The average man, instead, pays his dues by age 40, and stays in

the black unless he lives to be 85+, in which case he will be a little in the red. Still, even those men will cost a net cumulative loss of about \$10,000; by the same age, a woman will have cost state coffers *fifteen times as much*.

## Conclusions

- Men, on aggregate, are the ones keeping the lights on. Countries depend on taxing male income.
- The tax and welfare systems result in a large net transfer of income from men to women.
- The disproportion is so severe as to constitute a *real* gender tax gap, as opposed to the overhyped and largely imaginary gender pay gap.

I'll note that this was probably always the case throughout modern history; the difference between now and 50 years ago is that today men are no longer socially and institutionally recognized and rewarded for their larger role in sustaining the community, and are in fact berated and accused of discrimination even though they work more and contribute more than women.

---

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

---

## Comments

---

EpicLevelCheater[M] [score hidden] 21 September, 2016 07:31 PM stickied comment

Posts such as this inform, enlighten, and provoke constructive conversations within the community. Thank you for your consistent, quality contributions to this subreddit, /u/G\_Petronius.

I am hereby endorsing you.

[deleted] • 23 points • 21 September, 2016 09:44 PM

mfw

[deleted] • 2 points • 22 September, 2016 01:16 AM

A Nimble Centipede and TRP Endorsed.

Damn Son.

madhatter393 • 4 points • 22 September, 2016 12:01 AM

Congrats on the endorsement!

GayLubeOil • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 08:29 AM

Awwwwww snaps!

[deleted] 22 September, 2016 05:12 AM\*

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 8 points • 22 September, 2016 05:58 AM

Did you even read the post? He is talking about New Zealand. Not about USA. He linked a New Zealand study. Why are you linking an IRS study?

RealRational • 0 points • 22 September, 2016 06:19 AM

As for why I posted IRS stats, "very unsurprisingly, gender tax gap studies are very hard to come by, due to how incredibly un-PC their conclusions are. I could find the raw data for the United States and my home country". That's from his post.

He implies that the same holds true for the USA. So I provided the numbers, proving that it really doesn't.

Women are definitely still favored by the system, but his implication that "a woman making 50k pays less taxes than a man making 50k" is straight up false.

--Visionary-- • 1 point • 24 September, 2016 11:06 PM\*

He implies that the same holds true for the USA. So I provided the numbers, proving that it really doesn't.

So...using your data, men pay 1.72 dollars for every 1 dollar women pay in tax. They pay 72 percent more in tax. In the US. This somehow disproves a NZ/USA similarity?

I'd be willing to bet that despite that, women receive more in social spending that comes FROM those taxes. In fact, let's see. The two biggest domestic spending programs in the US are

Medicare/Medicaid and Social Security.

Here's medicare expenditures. Women receive 23 percent MORE in per-capita health spending. They receive 55 percent of ALL medicare spending (which is, ratio-wise, again, 23 percent MORE than men).

Here's social security, also here. You'll note that a quarter of women receive DUAL entitlement (dead husband and their own), while the majority (55 percent) of all people that receive social security are women. In other words, it's likely that, given both of those, a good estimate is that women receive about 55 percent of all benefits (given dual and overall plurality of receipts). In other words, again, women are about 23 percent more likely to receive *this* benefit over men. Note that this data is exceedingly difficult to come by, and requires utter inference because the US *does not* publish overall SS payouts by gender -- or if they do, they make it hard to find.

So, given that, men pay 1.72 dollars for every 1 dollar women *pay* in taxes, but receive about 81 cents for every 1 dollar women *get* in social services for those taxes.

**That basically comes out to men paying 2.11 dollars to get 1 dollar back. This is precisely because, alternatively, women get to pay 47 cents and get 1 dollar back. Substantially more than double.**

To me, it's totally *possible* that the NZ data jives with US data -- and I'm even using *your* data to conclude it.

Edit: By the way, I didn't include some of the other domestic programs, but I'd be willing to bet that they're even *more* female dominated in terms of payout than the big two above. To wit, I'm almost certain Housing and Child Care overwhelmingly go to women. So my estimate of female domination in this area might be an *underestimate*.

Edit 2: Just to head off another inane argument, women control the majority of wealth in the US. So no, they're not "poorer" because they make less in wages. They're more wealthy than men AND receive more social services for each dollar they spend in taxes WHILE working fewer hours. Coincidentally, they ALSO control the voting electorate. Pretty good (and unethical) deal, I'd say.

Monsterpiece42 • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 06:37 AM

Even as American, I don't think he implied anything he didn't say. You inferred that.

corsega • 3 points • 22 September, 2016 06:38 AM

I think it's pretty clear he's implying that this is a worldwide phenomenon.

EpicLevelCheater[M] • 8 points • 22 September, 2016 07:09 AM

You should be ashamed of yourself. These are just random charts with no source. For all you know he just made them himself. Seriously, you should have higher standards.

We are interested in posts that promote discussion here. /u/G\_Petronius's post does just that.

Your own IRS link also provided an excellent springboard for discussion, except for your petulant need to use feminist-inspired shaming tactics. That does not fly here.

You have earned-yourself a 7-day ban. Do it again and your ban will be permanent.

stay\_anon\_stay\_safe • 2 points • 23 September, 2016 09:00 AM

So banter is now a "feministic tactic" worthy of a ban? you are not even gonna let the man defend

himself? That's the equivalent of dismissing a valid argument and yelling "AD HOMINEM!" like a little bitch just because the poster added "suck a dick" at end of his comment. Pathetic.

[deleted] • 3 points • 22 September, 2016 07:53 AM

You have earned-yourself a 7-day ban. Do it again and your ban will be permanent.

?!!!

"You should be ashamed of yourself" is a feminist-inspired shaming tactic???

RedSovereign[M] • 7 points • 22 September, 2016 01:48 PM

Using social shame to suppress discussion is precisely a feminist-inspired shaming tactic. That's literally all it is.

TheSp4rk • 3 points • 22 September, 2016 07:59 AM

It is, now quit your bitching and go have a life: you can either complain about your problems, or work towards a solution.

[deleted] • -1 points • 22 September, 2016 08:01 AM

you can either complain about your problems, or work towards a solution.

Or both. Both is always good too.

EpicLevelCheater • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 02:42 PM

"You should be ashamed of yourself" is not a reason.

TheSp4rk • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 08:14 AM

... Think: Get out of your desire to be right, and think about what complaining would add to ANY situation. It will not be "good" to add complains if you are already working on a solution. Complaining, is akin to asking for the listener's pity. Don't play into manipulation, else you'll just be an empty shell. Mean what you say, be what you mean.

[deleted] • 183 points • 21 September, 2016 03:50 PM

it always seems like men suffer, and don't even get recognized for it, while women don't suffer and take all the sympathy that they can get.

gtypoDD22 • 91 points • 22 September, 2016 02:29 AM

2nd wave feminism called men 'privileged' in an era were 300 18 year old boys were dying every single day in Vietnam.

We are not dealing with rationality, feminism is humanity's biggest delusion.

[deleted] • 7 points • 22 September, 2016 10:17 PM

Wow, never really thought of it like that, makes me hate feminists even more.

And it's also a shining example of how women don't see the bottom 80-90%. I'm sure life was good in the 70s for the top 10% male, so to them that means life is good for all men.

PantsonFire1234 • 16 points • 22 September, 2016 01:07 AM

No shit, that's the way it's always been. There's a certain ancient culture that is well known to make men suffer in every possible way in the name of the state. These men were militarily drilled from the age of 7, they had to walk barefoot, eat horrible food, wear nothing but a cloak throughout all seasons and risked their lives every single day of their lives.

And their women still took part of the credit for all their suffering whilst doing almost nothing in comparison. Still more than modern women though.

[deleted] • 9 points • 22 September, 2016 11:37 AM

There's a certain ancient culture that is well known to make men suffer in every possible way in the name of the state. These men were militarily drilled from the age of 7, they had to walk barefoot, eat horrible food, wear nothing but a cloak throughout all seasons and risked their lives every single day of their lives.

In return though, the spartiates were the only social class with political rights, and controlled the state. They had a place of honor, in fact the premiere place on honor, in Spartan society, precisely as a balance to all that was required of them.

PantsonFire1234 • 3 points • 22 September, 2016 12:48 PM

Of course, they were privileged Alpha males. It's just that woman who didn't have to make equal sacrifices still felt compelled to boast about their own abilities. They were living in a society with the most Alpha of Alpha males and they still thought they were equal or better.

[deleted] • 3 points • 22 September, 2016 01:15 AM

In this existence masculine is limited and disposed, feminine is preserved and rewarded.

Not just female and male species, because some species it might be opposite, but I am talking about the duality.

ScottyBrown • 15 points • 21 September, 2016 05:12 PM

You gotta be more alpha and despise your fellow man as weak. Women fight for women and they now have all the political power.

gtypoDD22 • 14 points • 22 September, 2016 02:25 AM

I dont fight for men because men fight ME for fighting for them. Fuck men, 99% of them can burn.

I only care about myself and the 1% of TRPers, MGTOWs and MRMs, who arent simply reformed betas.

[deleted] • 3 points • 23 September, 2016 12:29 AM

The best way to fight for man is to become a successful selfish asshole. The more successful selfish assholes there is, the more betas will reform or go MGOTW.

That means less beta's who are paying for this circus.

HeadingRed • 3 points • 22 September, 2016 03:30 PM

Women fight with each other more.

awalt\_cupcake • 2 points • 22 September, 2016 03:14 PM

women dont fight for women. they fight for themselves under the guise of moral superiority

\_the\_shape\_ • 27 points • 21 September, 2016 04:38 PM

The good news is that you have options.

You can join the pity-party (MRA), you can schlepp it back to blue-town, or you can get some broader shoulders.

[deleted] • 27 points • 21 September, 2016 04:51 PM

I am not pitying, I am simply telling you reality (the most possible thing).

\_the\_shape\_ • 29 points • 21 September, 2016 08:54 PM

I too am telling reality.

Men struggle, women have it easy - what now?

Once a man reaches this point, he must choose how to proceed.

One choice is to remain on that plateau and continue repeating the same observation ad nauseam: "men have it hard and nobody sees it, women have it easy and (still) everyone rushes to their aid!", over and over and over like some street bum passerbys tune out all day and night - the defeatist approach.

Another choice is the if you can't beat 'em, join 'em route. Try to cause as few ripples as possible. Rush to m'lady's side when she needs attention. Accept it as reality, but let it *beat you into submission*. Also for the defeatist.

Or accept it as reality, but understand that this is but one more line separating the men from the boys. Look at it as a challenge to *not* be like the two aforementioned above, as an impetus to elevate yourself above the "life is haaaard" or "life isn't fair" crowd.

This is what is meant by the pill going down *slowly* - you have to keep making choices ('digesting') as you continue to come across new (and often harsh) revelations.

[deleted] • 13 points • 21 September, 2016 08:57 PM

I'm not sulking or crying about it. But it's there if I do so or not.

vengefully\_yours • 2 points • 22 September, 2016 06:41 PM

My perspective on it.

Life is hard. So fucking what. I don't have what Joe has, so fucking what. I have to work for everything, and I'm still berated for it and called privileged, so fucking what.

It's hard because I'm a man. I can handle it because I'm a man. I'm strong, resilient, creative, and I build. I earned what I get. Because I'm a man, that earning and building gives me satisfaction and pride. I fucking did this despite all the bullshit and people taking my hard earned resources from me, too give to those who can't earn it. I can handle it because I'm a man. Sure it sucks, but not everyone is strong or capable, or even smart.

They need our protection, without it they die, even if they don't appreciate it, I can do it for them. I can and do because I evolved to do it.

[deleted] • 4 points • 21 September, 2016 08:57 PM

Whatever you do doesn't change it.

\_the\_shape\_ • 2 points • 21 September, 2016 08:59 PM

What's your point then? That you'd want to change it?

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

Why does there have to be a point? I just want the fact to be there, like an obstacle, in which you acknowledge and humbly accept. Only then can you truly go around it.

\_the\_shape\_ • 2 points • 21 September, 2016 09:29 PM

You still have to choose what you do with that reality, otherwise we have a "water is wet" situation

[deleted] • 3 points • 21 September, 2016 09:36 PM

also most people have been told "water is dry"

\_the\_shape\_ • 4 points • 21 September, 2016 09:42 PM

You just continue to impress.

[deleted] • 1 point • 21 September, 2016 09:36 PM

if you think about it, "you" don't really choose anything, you just follow whatever thoughts or emotions you are having.

\_the\_shape\_ • 8 points • 21 September, 2016 09:41 PM

Amazing. That's incredibly deep man.

Thank you.

good\_guy\_submitter • 2 points • 22 September, 2016 04:04 AM

This is 100% correct. Free will is mostly an illusion. I make a big post on this.

deeman010 • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 07:46 AM

It is my hope one day that someone powerful enough will be able to break through the obstacle instead of having to walk around it. Doesn't seem like it'll be me but it won't stop me from trying.

[deleted] • 3 points • 21 September, 2016 04:50 PM

Neither will help you. There is nothing you can do. There is no hope.

Demonspawn • 4 points • 22 September, 2016 03:04 AM

Revolt, Expat, or Turtle.

Choice is yours. Choose wisely.

vengefully\_yours • 2 points • 22 September, 2016 06:53 PM

They need to tell themselves how amazing they are every day because they aren't. They want to be, but will not sacrifice and work to be amazing. It takes far more for the weak to overcome than it does for the strong. They're inherently weak, girls are slight, not robust. Deal with it if you're a man, whine about it if you're a girl. They want what they can't have, so they tell themselves how great they are hoping it will be so. They have the opportunity, but fail to utilize them effectively.... Because it requires working yourself half to death. Men can be great, we can be amazing, we will sacrifice and work ourselves to death to become amazing. We don't have to tell ourselves we are great, we know other men have done shit we haven't, but we know we



could get there if we put in the work and had some opportunities. We have the potential for the capability, they don't and they know it. Ask any medal of Honor recipient if they are a hero, they'll tell you no, they aren't. A girl who can bench 200lbs is a hero for girls. 200 messy pounds that any one of you could achieve in three months at the gym.

Don't pity girls, they're just weak, they can still be dangerous and fuck you up. Legally no less. They evolved to do things we don't. So while it's hard for us, most of life is simply impossible for girls. Yeah it's hard, so fucking what, it's still possible for you.

[\\_penseroso\\_](#) • 110 points • 21 September, 2016 02:50 PM

Holy shit. I mean I knew this from being a TRP reader but this is the first time I've seen it described and proven so well.

[deleted] • 79 points • 21 September, 2016 03:04 PM

Saved for future wage gap debates.

[deleted] • 28 points • 21 September, 2016 06:39 PM

How about Car insurance - I know when I was in high school guys paid more to be insured - and it was the girls crashing their cars left and right.

[TheRedChemist](#) • 40 points • 21 September, 2016 07:03 PM

The normal argument I've heard with that is that women have a higher number of accidents on average but they're inconsequential light fender benders, whereas guys have fewer accidents but the ones they have tend to be the huge ones where the car ends up sliding through a bus stop upside down and on fire in a 30mph zone.

[AmlanceJockey](#) • 29 points • 21 September, 2016 10:07 PM

A bunch more reasons I have always suspected:

Men drive more hazardous miles. Women have the types of jobs where if the weather is bad they can stay home. A man is more likely to have a job where he is "essential" and have to come in anyway. If a man and woman are together when hazardous driving must be done, who do you think drives?

Women know they are bad drivers. That combined with a natural inclination to be risk averse means they are not CAPABLE of certain types of risky driving. Nascar drivers get into more wrecks than my wife, but that doesn't mean my wife is a better driver than them.

Women drive less miles period. One of the reasons women get paid less is because they are less willing to travel further to work. One of the reasons women get paid less is they take jobs that don't involve a ton of driving. We know women tend to drive less.

Women drive cheap sub compact cars. Women don't have the pressure on them to signal their status with fancy cars. Without a man or a male work corporate position, many are not able to afford a nice car even if they wanted one. Cheap car, cheap accidents, cheap premiums.

Women get pussy passes. I had a girlfriend that couldn't drive for shit. She would get pulled over constantly for failing to maintain her lane, not obeying traffic control devices and the like. She had a big rack and could cry on command. She never got a ticket. I also knew a woman who hit a pedestrian during a rainstorm. Where I would have got a ride for wreckless driving resulting in serious injury, she got driving to fast for conditions. Women get passes and thus have cleaner records giving them lower premiums.

Short-changedChad • 12 points • 22 September, 2016 03:15 AM\*

N"Women are better drivers."- I've heard this rhetoric since the day I got my driver's license 15 years ago, this has remained largely true that, yes, they are 'safer' for the reasons you have presented. However all of this is changing.

Everywhere I drive I see inattentive women driving whilst texting and persistently checking their phones as often as they need a dopamine hit of validation from social media. Sure you see a lot of guys doing this too, but it is predominately women. They may as well be junkies. Will we see a change to the statistics and rhetoric we hear, or even insurance 'equality' in the coming years as accidents that would not have happened were mobile phones not connected to the Internet increase? I think not.

Edit: a word.

Rommel0502 • 7 points • 22 September, 2016 06:21 AM

True. Difference if is the actuarial models start to yield that women should pay more in insurance, there will be a media furor, non-withstanding the fact that men have been doing it for decades.

When you remove preferential treatment, equality feels like oppression.

[deleted] • 3 points • 22 September, 2016 01:23 AM

I agree, but

Women have the types of jobs where if the weather is bad they can stay home.

I'm not sure about this. Many Worker, Supporter or managing jobs can rather be done from home if circumstances require you to. This is not true for teachers, secretaries, nurses and the likes.

(You could argue that the definition of "bad weather" is subjective to genders, but this doesn't really make your sentence sound better).

AmlanceJockey • 4 points • 22 September, 2016 04:00 AM

By bad weather I mean weather that shuts down most businesses. Snow storms are the most frequent example. On those days secretaries, waitresses, government make work positions and teachers would not be expected to show up for work. Nurses would be expected to show up. However, in my area hospitals send out drivers to pick up the nurses in the event of a snowstorm. Cops, firefighters, air traffic controllers, etc are expected to be at work during a blizzard.

[deleted] • 2 points • 22 September, 2016 12:52 AM

Not much difference between a teenage boy and a teenage girl in terms of driving. 25 is a decent age where it evens out, but I would definitely (normally) trust my life with a male driver over 30 over a female counterpart.

[deleted] • 2 points • 22 September, 2016 05:00 PM

Men are better drivers in terms of skill. Multiple studies have confirmed that men are better at parallel parking. Men have evolved better hand eye coordination and have better spatial processing capabilities; men have larger areas of their brain devoted to this. Likely this is due to men having to fight and hunt. Much of these characteristics are mediated by higher testosterone levels.

But because men are more skilled and naturally more aggressive and risk taking, they are far more likely to have serious accidents. For example, how many women are into drag racing? How many are going to

be carving up windy roads in their sports coupes? Observe how most women will merge onto a busy road; almost all of them will wait until there is a big window.

This is why men's car insurance premiums are higher. Interestingly, women are much more likely to consume more healthcare resources than men. They go to the doctor more frequently, they get pregnant, they live longer and have more medical problems in general. But under ObamaCare, insurers can't charge women higher premiums. In other words, men must subsidize women.

22squash • 3 points • 21 September, 2016 10:37 PM

In the EU gender discrimination laws exist to prevent this... the loophole being that (of course there is one) insurers can adjust policies based on a persons job.

makeshift98 • 3 points • 22 September, 2016 06:59 AM

John drives 10,000 miles in a year and Jane drives 1,000. John gets in 3 accidents averaging 1 accident every 3.3k miles, where as Jane gets in 2 accidents, averaging one every 500 miles. John got in more accidents causing the insurance company more money but Jane is statistically a far worse driver.

awalt\_cupcake • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 03:18 PM

women cherry pick. If you compare ALL the facts, everyone would see stastically women are the worst driver.

Instead they focus on the facts that make things look good. " $3 > 2$ , therefor John is the worst".

[deleted] • 2 points • 22 September, 2016 02:10 AM

I wouldn't question much about the insurance. That's determined by actuaries and they don't give a fuck about gender, just the bottom line for their companies. If the current cost of insurance between genders weren't as cost-effective as possible for a company, why on earth would they continue that practice?

Sip\_py • 2 points • 22 September, 2016 10:51 AM

Yeah, insurance companies don't have some gender bias. It's pure numbers. Forget car insurance look at the difference between insuring a fraternity vs a sorority. For girls, they never throw parties (apparently) so nothing bad every happens. They cost like \$20 per girl to insure. That's because the risk is transferred to fraternities. Insurance for a fraternity member is roughly \$180 per guy....

Fun fact: hardest things to insure in the United States are nuclear power plants and fraternities.

Tough\_Luv • 2 points • 28 September, 2016 02:48 PM

Actuary here. No agenda in insurance pricing. Just raw data analysis. We are charged directly in proportion to our expected loss costs.

Like someone mentioned the main driver for higher male costs is higher accident SEVERITY not frequency.

[deleted] • 1 point • 28 September, 2016 07:20 PM

Thanks for clearing that up - clearly I was off on my assumption

[deleted] • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 04:53 PM

lol, you have a preconceived notion and vision that females some how incur higher claims than males but are given a "break" on insurance premiums. The premiums are based on piles of data and statistics, not some joe blow's opinion in bum fuck nowhere USA.

Five\_Decades • 23 points • 21 September, 2016 07:34 PM\*

Another factor to remember is women get about 30% more health care spending over their lives compared to men. So whatever money they do not earn is in part made up for with extra health care they did not have to pay for.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1361028/>

In 2000 dollars, men get \$268,700 in health care over a lifetime, women get \$361,000.

Keep in mind Healthcare is at least twice as expensive now, so women probably get \$200k in more health care. And because they pay less in taxes or insurance premiums (due to men paying more in premiums), it costs them less.

It isn't nearly as one dimensional an issue as advocates of equal pay would like you to believe. Women earn less money, but they get more services.

[deleted] • 8 points • 21 September, 2016 11:38 PM

Here is a question I have to ask for the transparency and validity of outrage - **Does male and female healthcare cost comparably?** I imagine that if let's say vagina cancer treatment was 3x more expensive than testicle cancer treatment, then the numbers would make natural sense.

Five\_Decades • 4 points • 21 September, 2016 11:40 PM

No idea, the only mention is this.

Per capita lifetime expenditure is \$316,600, a third higher for females (\$361,200) than males (\$268,700). Two-fifths of this difference owes to women's longer life expectancy.

This article may have more info.

<http://www.mdedge.com/jfponline/article/60747/gender-differences-utilization-health-care-services>

--Visionary-- • 1 point • 24 September, 2016 11:18 PM

No, it's because men die earlier and don't use healthcare nearly as much -- which we don't mind (we don't even have a men's department of health while we have numerous federal programs for women) because, heck, dead men who weren't being productive don't cost anything and are a net benefit if they're dead.

Source: I'm a physician, and yea, I can show you the stats on male healthcare costing nearly as much, and yes, you could easily find this data on your own.

VasiliyZaitzev • 79 points • 21 September, 2016 04:34 PM

Men, on aggregate, are the ones keeping the lights on.

This is not only figuratively true, it's *literally* true.

Women have no idea how fucked they would be if men stopped doing what we do. If women didn't show up to work, we'd take some short term hits in nursing, teaching and daycare, but that's about it.

If men stopped showing up to work? Everyone would be well and truly fucked.

Q: "How many women does it take to change a light bulb?"

A: "Two, but they don't actually change the bulb, they just sit in the dark and bitch."

qiang\_shi • 45 points • 21 September, 2016 08:03 PM

Nuclear power plants would stop running within three days

Super markets would run out of food the next day

Sewerage would back up in one day

The World is literally several hot dinners away from collapse

[deleted] • 22 points • 21 September, 2016 06:14 PM

Well, ask any woman how a light-bulb works and enjoy the look in their faces.

newgrounds • 5 points • 22 September, 2016 01:03 AM

Well, that doesn't really matter. Most men are bluepill. So they will keep the lights on regardless because to not do so would require 1) systemic cohesion and 2) a reason (this isn't good reason for men). I know you don't mean it literally, but men have no chance at ever achieving parity with women during even our childrens' lives.

Kalepsis • 3 points • 22 September, 2016 05:53 AM

It would be a very interesting socioeconomic experiment if every man in the country agreed to strike for 72 hours. I'd like to see the outcome.

sir\_wankalot\_here • 2 points • 22 September, 2016 07:55 AM

Women have no idea how fucked they would be if men stopped doing what we do.

Just because I say I am a duck, doesn't mean I think I am a duck. Women instinctively know this, that is why they attack Jap herbivore and MTGOW.

Both groups are men dropping out. For the majority of men, buddy living in his mom's basement won't affect him. You could say it helps other men since it creates a surplus of pussy.

It hurt women, since buddy in basement doesn't pay much tax and women count on these taxes. Hence the feminist hate against MGTOW.

DisgruntledWolverine33 points 21 September, 2016 03:15 PM [recovered]

Boom, goes the dynamite...

I'd like to see this adjusted for the US statistics...

[deleted] • 8 points • 22 September, 2016 12:42 AM

The IRS hates all people equally, if there was a discrepancy it's probably because less women work and earn as much on average compared to men from what little I know about it.

MarinTaranu • 2 points • 22 September, 2016 09:05 AM

In this case, the IRS is only half of the equation. But, nevertheless, in the case of the IRS, the Earned Income Credit is basically, a pussy credit designed for mommies on welfare. Must have underage dependents, must have some piddly income, whoa, boom ...\$4,000 just because you're pretty.

[deleted] • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 12:20 PM

I've never seen someone attractive on welfare, not that I can recall at least. Usually your average stupid and or lazy person and the occasional person who hit a bad run of luck for a while but gets off of it quickly or never even applies while eligible.

How does this difference come to exist?

I don't doubt the truth of it, but on paper there is a tax figure based on earnings regardless of gender. Is it due to men earning higher wages for most of their lives, for example?

Auvergnat • 49 points • 21 September, 2016 03:45 PM\*

Yes. The more you earn the more you are taxed obviously, and men are paid more on average.

That's the famous gender wage gap "**on average** women earn .7 of what men earn" which is a factual observation except that feminists distort it in "for the same job and same experience, a woman earns .70 of what a man earns" which is patently bullshit but serves the "patriarchy/discrimination" narrative. The real, factual causes are that women **on average** choose less-risky less-stressful less-paid jobs, are not as good at negotiations and choose to interrupt their career or slow down their career advancement (eg part time) by choice to focus on family.

OP's analysis on the factual tax gap is the obvious consequence of the factual wage gap, except that it also includes the factual government-aid gap.

In the end, like the real causes of the wage gap, nobody will ever talk about it because it goes against the victimisation narrative.

Auvergnat • 18 points • 21 September, 2016 04:51 PM

After reflexion, that sounds like a great way to troll wage-gapers when they bring on the topic, for ex "you know I did look up some info on the wage gap and it sickened me: women do make 77c on the dollar on average! So much so that men end up being taxed twice the amount of women! We need to do something about that wage gap ASAP and until it disappears completely we should actively campaign to pay women more and give men a 50% tax break".

MattyAnon • 20 points • 21 September, 2016 04:27 PM

men are paid more on average

We are paid more because we DO more. Women take more time out ~~to be supported by a man~~ to raise children.

disposable\_me\_0001 • 9 points • 21 September, 2016 08:59 PM

Yep, OP has made a some what BS point IMHO. This is nothing more than a direct effect of progressive taxation of income, which is very much a good thing, and we should have more. You can make very good arguments for other things such as not enough being done for male deaths and lack of social services. Taxation is a sub-optimal hill to make a stand on.

[deleted] • 6 points • 21 September, 2016 11:48 PM

Since you're calling it "somewhat bullshit", do point out where I've made a mistake reading the data or drawing conclusions. Saying "this is progressive taxation in action" doesn't counter anything I said.

[deleted] • 8 points • 22 September, 2016 12:33 AM\*

the reason why your post is "somewhat bullshit" is because you claim that it's a valid counter to the gender wage gap argument, when, in fact, it actually supports the gender wage gap. The reason why women receive more tax benefits than men, is because women raise children. A single woman with children is much more likely to live in poverty than a single man without children.

I don't see anything in your post where the study controls for raising children.

Temperfuelmma • 8 points • 22 September, 2016 02:28 AM\*

the reason why your post is "somewhat bullshit" is because you claim that it's a valid counter to the gender wage gap argument, when, in fact, it actually supports the gender wage gap.

There is no such thing as a wage gap. It's called an earnings gap and it is not caused by gender.

The reason why women receive more tax benefits than men, is because women raise children

Now that's some next level stupid. So a mom raise the children so what does the father do? Kill children? It's a partnership and it's equal. Man bring the resources, woman allocate the resources.

A single woman with children is much more likely to live in poverty than a single man without children.

The answer is obvious. Men should pay for the poor decisions of women. So should men at least have a say in the decision making of women? Don't be stupid! That's sexist. Well then what about men that made bad decisions? Well, they're men, they have like balls and a penis or something, they don't *really* need our help.

[deleted] • 3 points • 22 September, 2016 04:01 AM

Can you quote where I'm supposed to claim my data is a "counter" to the gender pay gap? I use that as an introduction and comparison, but whether that gap exists or not depends on its own data and I don't see where I make claims to the opposite.

[deleted] • 2 points • 22 September, 2016 10:59 AM

For every 100 dollars a man makes, 77 articles are published on bullshit statistics showing how women are oh so underpaid. If you've spent any time around TRP at all, you must have seen a dozen threads about it. What you probably don't know, because there's a veritable dearth of articles published on it, is that there is actually a gender gap: the tax gap. Men, you'll be shocked to know, pay a massively disproportionate amount of taxes compared to women.

In the first paragraph you claim that the traditional gender wage gap is based on bullshit statistics. I agree with you.

But, in the second paragraph you say there is "an actual gender wage gap: the tax gap". I disagree with you.

You don't actually state that the latter is a counter to the former, but that's the unstated conclusion of your post based on the way you've structured your argument. You're clearly using the second statistic as a rejoinder to the first statistic.

Oh, BTW, there is a gender wage gap. Men do earn more than females on average, but there are justifications for that which have been discussed ad nauseum at TRP. Both stats that you cite, the wage gap and the tax gap are bullshit stats because they're more nuanced than just saying "look at how unfair this is!!!!!!"



[deleted] • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 11:13 AM

but that's the unstated conclusion of your post based on the way you've structured your argument

I have stated my conclusions pretty explicitly, with bullet points even. Whatever you tack on is your reading and you must challenge yourself on it.

Oh, BTW, there is a gender wage gap.

No, there isn't. There's a gender income gap. Wages for the same labour are the same, by virtue of both law and market dynamics. This might sound like a semantic argument, but by accepting to call it "gender wage gap" we give strength to the false notion that women are paid less for equal work.

they're more nuanced than just saying "look at how unfair this is!!!111"

My conclusions explicitly point out that the issue is not "look at how unfair this is", but that this situation used to be balanced by granting men a greater role in the management of the communities they supported, whereas now we've switched to berating and condemning them. I don't have a problem with men earning the most income and paying the most tax; I have a problem with men doing that and still being attacked, vilified and blamed for not doing more and not giving more to women.

I suggest you read the post for what it says, without trying to steer it into a different argument. There's no point in us discussing it if we can't start from a shared textual basis.

[deleted] • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 11:23 AM\*

You're being pedantic and sophomoric, and I think you know it. You are comparing and contrasting two separate ideas: a gender wage gap and a tax gap. You chose to present your argument in this fashion. Are you honestly telling me, as a man, the the purpose of your post is not to use the tax gap as a rebuttal or rejoinder to the gender wage gap? If that wasn't your intent, you are a terrible writer and communicator.

No, there isn't. There's a gender income gap. Wages for the same labour are the same, by virtue of both law and market dynamics. This might sound like a semantic argument, but by accepting to call it "gender wage gap" we give strength to the false notion that women are paid less for equal work.

It's not just a semantic argument. It's a wrong argument. The words "income" and "wages" are synonymous when referring to money that is paid for work. You're probably smart enough to realize that, but again, you're purposefully being pedantic about this.

I don't have a problem with men earning the most income and paying the most tax; I have a problem with men doing that and still being attacked, vilified and blamed for not doing more and not giving more to women.

But, you're doing the same thing they are. You're trying to simplify complex statistics with many variables and causes in order to make an emotional appeal. Everybody knows that that the gender wage gap is bullshit. People continue to use



that statistic because it supports their agenda. You are doing the exact same thing. Your tax gap is no different than the gender wage gap. There are legitimate reasons why men make more than women, on average, just like there are legitimate reasons why men pay more taxes and receive fewer benefits than women on average. But, you're not interested in discussing the actual reasons for the disparity. You're just karma whoring on TRP. And, it pains me that so many guys on this subreddit can't see it for what it is.

How's this argument. In order for our economy to expand, we need more labor and more consumers. Thus, we need more people. Women disproportionately bear the cost of producing children. Producing children is an economically productive activity. Thus, women shouldn't be penalized for removing themselves from the workforce in order to have children, they should be rewarded. I don't think that anybody would consider welfare, foodstamps, and the EITC as a "reward" for having children.

[deleted] • 4 points • 22 September, 2016 11:30 AM

If that wasn't your intent, you are a terrible writer and communicator.

About a hundred and fifty commenters seem to have gotten my meaning, whereas you and a couple of other guys didn't. That's a good enough statistic for me; if you find that unacceptable and think it qualified me as a terrible writer etc, I'll have to live with that thought I guess.

[deleted] • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 01:28 AM

The "earnings gap" is stated that Men earn more than Women, but what that essentially boils down to is "Senior people earn more than Junior people"

It sounds ridiculous when you put it like that.

Because it is ridiculous.

TheRedStoic • 29 points • 21 September, 2016 03:21 PM

Research the productivity gap. Men are about 25 to 30 percent more productive on the hour as to women.

This is where the gender pay gap never breaches data. They refuse to accept that there is an underlying fact, **men produce more per hour**

stemgang • 15 points • 21 September, 2016 06:43 PM

Exactly. Men are paid more because they produce more.

If men and women were equally productive, then it would never make sense to hire a man, because he gets more money.

It's a simple but inevitable tautology: if the wage gap did not represent a value gap, then no one would hire men, ever.

guifawkes • 8 points • 21 September, 2016 03:36 PM

I also listened to a podcast that talked about maternity leave as well. Typically, once women have children, the amount of time spent working decreases significantly. When the "expert" accounted for maternity leave, the "gap" was almost entirely gone.

MarinTaranu • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 09:10 AM

Indeed. If anyone argues, I will send my wife over to their house, so they can personally measure her productivity. She claims she would like to do painting jobs (no, we don't need the extra money). I've seen my wife work. She is slow as molasses and unfocused on the important parts of the job. You tell her to do one thing, she does the exact opposite, no joke, it makes me pull out my hair.

feminists\_are\_dumb • 10 points • 21 September, 2016 06:40 PM

The difference has always existed. Men are more productive than women. That's what marriage was up until the 1950's: men trading excess productivity to women in exchange for sexual access and children.

NeckbeardVirgin69 • 0 points • 21 September, 2016 06:22 PM

I always go into a bullshit TRP post and upvote the person who cuts through it.

This time, it happens to be you. Congrats.

[deleted] • 31 points • 21 September, 2016 02:58 PM

Also another thing to think about is maternity leave and how much time women can get off for it. I'm not saying pregnancy is a cakewalk, but it is a choice women make.

[deleted] • 10 points • 21 September, 2016 06:58 PM

Exactly. If we're giving woman the right to choice over having children (pro choice) through abortion and contraception, then they are no longer entitled to receive paid leave.

ether\_reddit • 12 points • 21 September, 2016 08:22 PM

Fathers should be entitled to equal amounts of (paid) leave to raise their children as women.

Skiffbug • 5 points • 22 September, 2016 01:03 AM

Definitely with you there, over the concept of no parental leave.

There is a lot of studies showing the benefits of children staying with their parent in the first one or two years of life, so I support the concept of the government incentivising this for the common good. It just needs to cut both ways, and not just for women.

d6x1 • 18 points • 21 September, 2016 04:02 PM

Don't forget also that the system depends heavily on male labor itself to keep the lights on, not just the taxable income.

[deleted] • 8 points • 21 September, 2016 06:16 PM

I've seen women in many poles, but a street light pole wasn't one of them.

[deleted] • 8 points • 21 September, 2016 08:46 PM

So every working man is an indirect Beta provider who invests a fucking ton of money all his life in shitty women and gets absolutely nothing positive in return. Damn, it's so good to be a woman nowadays.

feminists\_are\_dumb • 5 points • 21 September, 2016 06:39 PM

That chart on page 22 is all you need to prove that feminism can only exist in an already overly affluent society.

gokurakumaru • 6 points • 22 September, 2016 06:15 AM

This is not a "tax gap" any more than it is when a rich person pays more in tax than a poor person. You're still better off being the rich guy.

Auvergnat • 8 points • 21 September, 2016 04:45 PM

OP you need to come up with one catchy figure to sum it up: "the tax gap: on average, for every 100 dollars spent by women in taxes, men spend 1XX dollars"

Skiffbug • 4 points • 22 September, 2016 01:07 AM

I like the concept of your study, but as said elsewhere in the comments, this is just a function of average wages, in which there is an uncontrolled 23% gender gap.

So you should consider doing the same as the gender wage gap studies and control for level of income or hours worked.

If those results have a pronounced gender gap, you have a story. Otherwise you will quickly lose the argument due to the uncontrolled gender wage gap.

phx-au • 4 points • 22 September, 2016 03:55 AM

Taking a step back, this looks like an almost direct result of:

- 1) The gender wage disparity (which exists if you only aggregate by age)
- 2) The obvious result that higher wages mean more taxes paid
- 3) The tendency of the state to spend a reasonably fixed proportion of it's tax receipts on social security
- 4) Social security typically being paid to demographics on a lower income

When reading this, keep in mind that this is the *expected result* of any system with proportional tax + social security when sliced by any demographic.

You could, for example, take this - and notice a similar trend where atheists and agnostics fund other religious people.

Nobody should be surprised here. Being a part of a society with safety nets for bad luck and disaster also means you will be supporting people with poor life choices and deliberate underachievement. The state makes cucks out of anyone productive, it's an unfortunate and deliberate effect of the system.

RealRational • 4 points • 22 September, 2016 05:09 AM

This is misleading.

Men pay more in taxes because they work longer hours, earning more. High income brackets have higher tax rates. So it's not untrue, but a man earning 50k and a woman earning 50k pay the same tax rate.

With that said women claim far more government benefits than men do.

I'm actually going to source some things, unlike OP.

Can't believe this was deemed "endorsable" despite the only sources being some graphs, that are completely out of context and not sourced or backed up by anything.

Here's the actual IRS stats, for anyone interested in facts and not just a witch hunt.

[deleted] • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 08:11 AM

My source is linked in the post, what exactly do you think is unsourced?

As for the "misleading" part, could you point out how exactly it's misleading? I stated my conclusions

explicitly and it doesn't to me that any one of them runs contrary to what you point out, in fact they seem to describe the same things from two different viewpoints.

long\_black\_road • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 11:40 AM

Came here to say this. The feminist response will be something like, "Of course men pay more in taxes - they earn more because of the wage gap." The emphasis needs to be on the benefits-received disparity.

[deleted] • 4 points • 22 September, 2016 07:49 AM

Not to rain on the parade here, but tax gaps are a reflection of income gaps. Poor people contribute less to tax and cost the state over their lifetimes. Society is indeed propped up by the higher income brackets (as well as the other 2/3 of tax take).

This isn't actually about gender at all, it's simply reflective of different income levels.

KV-n • 22 points • 21 September, 2016 03:11 PM

taxes are to men what rape is to women

haxurmind • 6 points • 22 September, 2016 04:42 AM

taxes are to men what rape is to women

Good point.

For those new to the sub; taxes take away from a man's commitment (time -> money, lost to taxation [unless you're a registered corporation in Ireland] ) just as rape devalues sex with a woman.

By rape I mean those genuine cases that cause women to break down and become withdrawn from society (broken and beyond redemption for a long term relationship with most men), not those that abuse the law with false rape accusations for personal gain (after sex reputation/anti slut defense, attention seeking behavior or just the scorched earth policy of a scorned woman).

[deleted] • 2 points • 22 September, 2016 04:54 PM

this is the dumbest thing I've ever seen on this sub, and I've seen some shit.

long\_black\_road • 0 points • 22 September, 2016 11:37 AM

Ok - no. This is a stupid analogy. Go work with a rape survivors group and then go down to the local IRS office. You'll see two different things. No comparison.

AcrossHallowedGround • 7 points • 21 September, 2016 04:34 PM\*

What a quality post. Not often you see a post on here with hard numbers. What's the deal with the variation in the first graph? The zigzag at the top of the curve is surprising for any significant sample size.

That's not because I'm a Kiwi but because, very unsurprisingly, gender tax gap studies are very hard to come by, due to how incredibly un-PC their conclusions are.

Somehow this still surprises me. They expect their narrative to be taken as fact, and stifle research that says otherwise. That's absolutely tyrannical behavior. As with anything else in life, if you want to know who's 'right' just see who allows the opposition to speak freely, and who doesn't.

MOCKxTHExCROSS9 points 21 September, 2016 03:22 PM\* **[recovered]**

So what's the plan for the vast swaths of the male population doing MGTOW who work dead end jobs, and sit at

home playing games and eating doritos? Can't see them contributing as much as typical men of past ages.

NewestHouse • 19 points • 21 September, 2016 04:27 PM

Women are going to become the big earners, and therefor the big tax group, it will shift from men to women, as the policies continue to favor women in all job sectors, it will only get worse. The plan is to get women having all the money, because they already do almost all of the spending, as for men, the plan for them is to be left destitute and dependent, with no jobs.

reph • 18 points • 21 September, 2016 07:21 PM\*

The wealthy old men in charge have more or less decided that they do not want to support younger rival males, at least not locally; for obvious reasons they prefer every first-world employee to be an attractive, young, compliant female. Lately they even seem to prefer unattractive females over most males - the main exception being top male producers in highly competitive fields who cannot be easily outsourced or replaced. But even they're under some pressure, e.g. Google's "Get Teen Girls To Code" initiative.

NewestHouse • 8 points • 21 September, 2016 08:12 PM

"Get Teen Girls To Code" is a good example of what I meant when I said it will only get worse. More and more of these kinds of tax payer funded bullshit programs and charities will get started year after year until every good job is held by women, they will let us keep garbage jobs (literally), being septic tank cleaners, coal miners, and any life shortening, smelly, shitty job really.

Tuga\_Lissabon • 8 points • 21 September, 2016 08:32 PM

Let them code and engineer at will.

1 - they do not like it.

2 - its EXPENSIVE to repair shit that was badly done, and needs REAL experts. So more work for us.

The males in easily-replaceable jobs are fucked, though. In case of doubt, head towards higher complexity tech. They can't follow there.

JohnnyRaz3 points 21 September, 2016 09:48 PM [recovered]

The "old boys club" is now exclusively Jewish and if youre not a Jew than you dont get to join the club. Jews only make up a small percentage of the country yet possess up to 90% of its wealth. They own the media, the huge corporations, politicians , and high profile jobs like Lawyers and Doctors, etc. The wealth distribution will never go back now that they have a complete monopolization.

Zonoro14 • 2 points • 22 September, 2016 12:20 AM

Jew here, I don't own shit.

JohnnyRaz3 points 22 September, 2016 12:56 AM [recovered]

Sorry, I should have specified its mostly Zionist Jews

Zonoro14 • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 01:43 AM

lmao my parents sent me to a Jewish camp in New York when i was 14, it was filled with zionists, the majority of Jews are zionist after all. Obviously a lot had rich parents but they were just normal people, biased of course but not malicious. Zionism is a vague and varied ideology, from most Jews (who feel generally positive about the existence of Israel) to lobbyists trying to get the USA to send more money over. The average Jewish person is

more "powerful" than the average person simply because the average Jewish person is richer than the average person. That's it. We don't control 90% of the country's wealth (where on earth did you get that number?) and we aren't an organized group, we merely share ancestry.

SafeWordIsCommitment • 4 points • 22 September, 2016 02:51 AM

You do realize we are on average wealthier because the poorer Jews keep getting killed off? Those who could afford it fled Germany during WW2. The poor Jews stayed and died.

It is selection bias due to this effect.

Zonoro14 • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 03:02 AM

That's a depressing point of view...

I guess it is a factor. The explanation I've always heard is the whole moneylender thing. But that's what led to anti-Semitism in the first place, and thus the Holocaust.

SafeWordIsCommitment • 2 points • 22 September, 2016 03:22 AM

All the Persian Jews I know are doctors because the non-doctors were poor and died during the shah's fall.

If every Chinese person who wasn't Jack Chan disappeared, you would naturally assume all Chinese were kung fu masters.

[deleted] • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 01:31 AM

How do I convert to Judaism then?

MarinTaranu • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 09:20 AM

Didn't you get that there are also poor Jews, and they die? If you were not rich before, you still won't be rich after converting to Judaism. Unless you marry into a rich family. But usually, rich marries rich.

[deleted] • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 06:46 AM

One redpill at a time thanks :D

[deleted] • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 11:46 AM

Fifty years from now on all the old women in charge decide not to support their younger rival females - they prefer everyone on around below their level to be a real beefcake.

Our time shall come!

[deleted] • 6 points • 21 September, 2016 06:04 PM

I'm fairly MGTOW. But I'm grinding for more income and financial independence. Maybe more men are doing that? Or maybe very few are.

curunir • 2 points • 22 September, 2016 02:07 AM

That's not happening in New Zealand. The men are out there with the sheep.

Short-changedChad • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 03:30 AM

Makes sense. Most men are sheep.

[deleted] • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 01:30 AM

I would expect the Suicide gap to close within a generation as Women kill themselves in large masses after having to shoulder the burden for decades.

2012Aceman • 3 points • 21 September, 2016 05:07 PM

Using their own argument against them, if men DO indeed get paid more, they would logically pay more taxes. And since men HAVE been paid more in the past, most of the money in the treasury is there due to male productivity. Since the majority of public services are intended to help women and children they would never be able to "get back out" what they "put in". Especially when you take into account men's shorter life spans.

BabyFaceElephant • 3 points • 21 September, 2016 09:58 PM

Actually on page 29 it does show the US, and it's scary as fuck. Unfortunately the paper referenced is in JSTOR and I don't have access anymore, but I'll try to pull some favors if nobody else nabs it.

CHAD\_J\_THUNDERCOCK • 5 points • 22 September, 2016 12:52 AM

You can get any academic paper you want with sci-hub. Their URL changes all the time so check their twitter but this works atm: <https://moscow.sci-hub.ac/>

MarinTaranu • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 09:24 AM

Finally, learning to read in Russian pays off.

[deleted] • 2 points • 22 September, 2016 01:06 AM

Do you all see why the blue pill indoctrination is so important to our society? It keeps men in line and more than willing to carry the load for the rest of society. Break the conditioning and you break the slave drivers control over you.

[deleted] • 2 points • 22 September, 2016 02:08 AM

Stephen Molyneux's, "The truth about white male privledge" on youtube is a 2 hour presentation loaded with statistics similiar to this. Really helps put the "equality" into perspective.

Rommel0502 • 2 points • 22 September, 2016 06:19 AM

If you're under 40, you will never get back what you're going to spend in taxes. SS/Medicare/Medicaid is not going to survive the next two, three decades tops.

[deleted] • 2 points • 22 September, 2016 12:28 PM

Breaking News: Higher income earners pay more tax.

While I do agree that the gender pay gap disappears once you control for productivity, hours worked, experience etc. All you are doing in this post is confirming two things. Firstly that men have higher incomes on average, and second, that most countries have a progressive tax system.

poorimagination • 2 points • 22 September, 2016 12:39 PM

This is an important point.

Men pay the bulk of the taxes and we're partially enslaved, if you want to use that word, so roads get built and so



that the welfare state can pay single mothers and their alpha brood.

What do we get for our sacrifice? We get to be marginalized and abused.

A lot of women treat us like we're crap while taking money from our pockets. No joke!

We should press our disproportionate contribution to society and the abuse we receive for it a lot more.

ThomasHobbesROK • 2 points • 22 September, 2016 01:46 PM

Gentlemen, our policy statement should be simple.

As men, we do not want any of our money, particularly the tax-dollars the government forcefully takes from us, to go to supporting any women we are not currently fucking.

[deleted] • 3 points • 22 September, 2016 12:28 AM\*

the reason why women receive a disproportionate amount of tax dollars is because they are the ones who typically raise children. The most expensive tax subsidies (like food stamps, school tax credits, EITC, and government subsidized healthcare) generally go towards raising children. Also, men tend to earn more money than women, especially if the woman left the workforce for a period of time to raise children.

Thus, a single 35 year old man is going to pay more money into the system and receive fewer benefits than a 35 year old woman who had two children under the age of 18.

So, essentially, this post says that modern, industrialized countries have progressive taxation, and they spend their tax dollars on keeping children healthy and out of poverty. I don't have a problem with any of that.

consider this. Suppose you have two adults, a 35 Yr old male and a 35 yr old female. The male is single and has no dependents. The female is single with two dependents. Suppose they both make \$25K a year. The male is probably not entitled to very many tax benefits because he is above the poverty level. The female, with her two dependents is probably under the poverty level, so she'll get more tax benefits. The tax benefits go to her, on behalf of her children. Do any of you have a problem with this? Do you think it's unfair? If you're not man enough to pay for your own children, everybody else has to pay for them.

Demonspawn • 2 points • 22 September, 2016 03:17 AM

So, essentially, this post says that modern, industrialized countries have progressive taxation, and they spend their tax dollars on keeping children healthy and out of poverty. I don't have a problem with any of that.

I've got one word for you: Bureaugamy.

Look it up and understand it. Without Bureaugamy, TRP would likely not even exist.... it wouldn't need to.

--Visionary-- • 1 point • 24 September, 2016 11:23 PM

the reason why women receive a disproportionate amount of tax dollars is because they are the ones who typically raise children.

And also don't die. Medicare and Social Security don't go to children, last I checked. We're *really* ok with men dying. We're not ok with women dying.

[deleted] • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 05:54 PM\*

It is unfair because the man that fucked that baby into her womb should be the one paying for it, not me. If women actually had to suffer for their poor mating choices, perhaps they would be more careful.



lmicro70 • 1 point • 25 September, 2016 05:35 AM

Oh.. BTW: Child support is after tax with no deductions. Mom takes her tax free money (tax you already paid) and does what she wants with it.

[deleted] • 0 points • 22 September, 2016 08:39 PM

It is unfair because the man that fucked that baby into her womb should be the one paying for it, not me.

I agree with you, but I'm not ready to let babies starve in the streets because of the sins of their parents.

Schrodingersdawg • 0 points • 23 September, 2016 04:08 AM

So if you can't pay for the kid, CPS takes it and the man is forced to do public works manual labor while the woman works in a government-run brothel to cover the costs. GG.

faprmstrong • 3 points • 21 September, 2016 03:33 PM

I can't read the whole study cause i currently study for my exams tomorrow but i want to ask someone who read it or seen it somewhere. Is anywhere a classification for income, ages and taxes, i mean that the first picture alone can become boomerang. "We earn less than you, we pay less than you" they could say again the wage gap is real and all the crap..., the pictures that can be shown without doubt are the ones with the fiscal impact. So maybe if inside the study there's a picture with incomes, ages and taxes that shows that a female with about the same income and age as a male pays less, that would be gold!!

Auvergnat • -1 points • 21 September, 2016 03:59 PM

There is no study. OP just "did the maths" and the pictures. Here's to hope he could actually write it up and publish it in an economics journal

faprmstrong • 4 points • 21 September, 2016 04:10 PM

"The data I'll use comes from a New Zealand study [PDF warning]. "

Baervan[ ] • 1 point • 21 September, 2016 11:21 PM

Does this sort of study was taken in any other country as well?

[deleted] • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 01:24 AM

This is one of those bullshit needlessly academic papers isn't it?

This paper examines the age and gender dimensions of income distribution and **fiscal incidence**

WTF is a "Fiscal incidence"?

a non-behavioural micro-simulation model.

I sure hope they explain what that is in the rest of the paper.

Nevertheless, considerable heterogeneity of fiscal incidence

The only thing that sentence was missing was the word "Synergy"

What a shitty abstract.

It's nice to see actual hard evidence of truths.

In times gone by Men were respected for this, looking back I don't know whether this was a good thing or a bad

thing.

On the positive side, Men were respected for doing the hard lifting and running society.

On the negative side, Men did all of this and all they got in return was a non physical "respect" I've never been able to pay a bill with the respect of my peers before.

gtypoDD22 • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 02:24 AM

This is why I (legally) tax evade my taxes to zero. Quite easy to do in the U.S if you have a business.

no\_face • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 03:27 AM

For every 100 dollars a man makes, 77 articles are published on bullshit statistics

Great opening line. Better than many TED talks

[deleted] • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 03:31 AM

I'm not surprised, to be honest. This just confirmed my gut feeling.

IIIIIIII • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 03:35 AM

Is this study purely from kiwi land? Cuz then it's irrelevant. There are cities in Canada that have a larger population than new Zealand.

AtlasKlein • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 06:53 AM

This has probably more to do with the fact that men choose occupations that make more money and thus pay more taxes. Still enlightening. As a man you have to accept the way society treats you because in the end society will beg for you to come back to keep the lights on if you choose to leave.

awalt\_cupcake • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 03:11 PM

why whore step sister popped out a baby at 18 to some druggy. The government **gave her** \$3k+ in tax returns. Meanwhile I'm starting a business, paying back school loans, paying taxes and I get no help.

She spent it on bullshit btw. And probably drugs. The kid got nothing new from her.

[deleted] • 1 point • 23 September, 2016 12:58 PM

This is an excellent post as usual and something I've been reflecting on for some time.

When I have political discussions, I often think about how their view would possibly change if they actually calculated how much they've paid into the social system (white knights). It's absolutely insane, and I'm not that old.

Let alone - It's impossible to have a coherent conversation on this topic with anyone that takes more than they give (hint - they want more).

tolerantman • 1 point • 23 September, 2016 03:26 PM

Women are literally using the State to cuck men into paying them.

[deleted] • 1 point • 24 September, 2016 05:47 PM

Taxes are the state taking from men and giving to women.

It's why post sexual revolution women reject religion and marriage then constantly demand more government.

The state is their new husband.

But the only resources the state has it took from men. So basically men are still paying for women to live, just now without the benefit of monogamous sex.

Run\_Che • 1 point • 13 October, 2016 04:08 PM

But if men earn more, isn't it logical that they contribute more to taxes?

GetrichonIMP1 points 21 September, 2016 07:37 PM [recovered]

Here's another wage gap: Public sector compared to the private sector. Interesting how politicians distract us with gender pay gaps, hrmmmm...

There is a 37% difference between government employees compared to private in Canada and isn't it interesting that Justin Trudeau has mandated 50/50 male female policies.

<http://www.ctvnews.ca/canada/private-sector-workers-earn-less-work-more-report-1.2292650>

Planner\_Hammish • 1 point • 21 September, 2016 10:09 PM

This likely is due to most public sector being unionized whereas private sector is not.

S\_Ibuki1 points 22 September, 2016 05:04 PM [recovered]

Men earn, on average, more than women.

Thus, it is only logical that they pay more taxes, since rich people are more taxed and pay more money than poor people.

An obvious corollary to the above is that they need less government aid, since they are, on average, richer.

Or, to reword your post : poor people benefit more from government handouts than rich people, despite those rich people paying for those handouts.

stay\_anon\_stay\_safe • 2 points • 23 September, 2016 09:03 AM

**This**, not one comment throughout the top voted ones made a mention of this. This is nothing but a victimhood circlejerk, no better than what they are so ready to denounce in women, fucking gross.

--Visionary-- • 1 point • 24 September, 2016 11:26 PM

An obvious corollary to the above is that they need less government aid, since they are, on average, richer.

Based on the fact that women control the majority wealth in this country?

Weird definition of "poor", eh?

S\_Ibuki1 points 27 September, 2016 07:19 PM [recovered]

This article says that woman make up to ~50% of the millionaire, and project that they may go up to 66% in 2030, so not exactly right now. Also keep in mind that it's 50% of a really small population, not really relevant when we look at how many people pay more than they receive on a State level.

To add on those woman being statistical aberration: You don't need to be a millionaire to lose most of the state handout, the cutoff is much much lower. What really matters is how many men are in the "middle class +" or above vs how many women, and we win at that game, which is usually nice except when it comes to taxes.

--Visionary-- • 1 point • 27 September, 2016 10:31 PM

The article specifically cites an HBR study that says that women control 51.3 percent of wealth in

[illegible]

stay\_anon\_stay\_safe • 0 points • 23 September, 2016 09:08 AM

lol this is fucking stupid, blame the system not the players, this could have been a reasonable ancap shill but no, you gotta make this about le evil womynz xD

men make more money so they pay more taxes, it's fucking simple, and you are pathetic for using this as a pivot towards your self victimization.

Atavisionary • -1 points • 21 September, 2016 09:46 PM

I detail this study and a few more in more detail in my book, "smart and sexy." This book is mostly about sex differences in intelligence, but I cover a few related subjects as well, this being one of them. You can read a review of the book [here](#).. Just earlier today I posted an excerpt from the book on what causes autism in *r* [tardtales](#) if you would like to get an idea about the tone and writing style. (I can't link directly, but you will see it if you go there, or if you go through my submission history). In the near future [righton.net](#) should be making the excerpt about this subject specifically available on their website (its my publisher's website). If anyone is interested, can link to that [here](#) when it comes out.

I have a few more graphs related to this subject, and also try to make a comparison to what little data is available from the US. You are right it is no where near as detailed, probably because of political correctness. And there are ways our system is set up so certain taxes aren't categorized as such. Health insurance is a tax, basically, but since it doesn't exactly go through government it isn't counted as such.