

An honest wish of a Dad

August 14, 2017 | 5320 upvotes | by [sopun](#)



Eric Weinstein  @EricRWein... · 10h 

Dear @Google,

Stop teaching my girl that her path to financial freedom lies not in coding but in complaining to HR.

Thx in advance,

A dad

 908

 6K

 16.5K



Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

Mode1961 • 498 points • 14 August, 2017 12:53 PM

He is going to be roasted for that.

gjh03c • 273 points • 14 August, 2017 03:04 PM

I'm glad he has the audacity to speak out this in this climate.

haikubot-19111 points 14 August, 2017 03:04 PM [\[recovered\]](#)

I'm glad he has the

Audacity to speak out

This in this climate.

^- ^gjh03c

^I'm ^a ^bot ^made ^by ^/u/Eight1911. ^I ^detect ^haiku.

gjh03c • 48 points • 14 August, 2017 03:05 PM

Wtf is this?! Lol

bufedad • 51 points • 14 August, 2017 04:28 PM

Haiku's are a poem that is marked by three verses.

Verse 1 has 5 syllables. Verse 2 has 7 syllables. Verse 3 has 5 syllables.

This bot finds comments that fit that the haiku template, and turns them into Haikus.

gjh03c • 19 points • 14 August, 2017 04:32 PM

Lol no I know what a haiku is im just saying I'd never seen the bit that does it.

The_BenL • 53 points • 14 August, 2017 05:10 PM

It's really good too, make up a sentence that fits and it will just work.

haikubot-1911 • 65 points • 14 August, 2017 05:10 PM

It's really good too,

Make up a sentence that fits

And it will just work.

- The_BenL

I'm a bot made by /u/Eight1911. I detect haiku.

EZ_PZ • 13 points • 14 August, 2017 05:52 PM

That is amazing! I'll try to only speak in haiku from now on.

scyth3s • 16 points • 14 August, 2017 06:38 PM

This is amazing I will always try to speak refrigerators

[deleted] • 5 points • 14 August, 2017 09:43 PM

You did it all wrong, to get it to work you have to do it like this

SecondaryLawnWreckin • 7 points • 14 August, 2017 06:14 PM

Good bot

bufedad • 4 points • 14 August, 2017 04:39 PM

I've seen it a half dozen times or so. It's rather amusing.

Arctorkovich • 16 points • 14 August, 2017 06:09 PM

I've seen it hundreds of times, basically spamming every thread, and it has stopped being amusing.

bufedad • 8 points • 14 August, 2017 06:41 PM

I doubt it has been able to find comments in every thread here.

Arctorkovich • 6 points • 14 August, 2017 06:43 PM

Bad human.

haikubot-1911 • 10 points • 14 August, 2017 06:41 PM

I doubt it has been

Able to find comments in

Every thread here.

- bufedad

I'm a bot made by /u/Eight1911. I detect haiku.

paterfamilias78 • 1 point • 14 August, 2017 08:28 PM

Somehow I believe that it will find a haiku in many places.

MotherFuckin-Oedipus • 1 point • 14 August, 2017 09:14 PM

You missed a huge opportunity to explain it in a haiku.

bufedad • 1 point • 14 August, 2017 09:19 PM

Triggered one later in the thread...lol

ChocolateMonkeyBird • 8 points • 14 August, 2017 03:06 PM

Hey I see it as a compliment :) nice accidental haiku!

gjh03c • 6 points • 14 August, 2017 04:32 PM

Lol it made me laugh especially cuz it was a typo

[deleted] • 3 points • 14 August, 2017 10:09 PM

Bad bot

weicheheck • 8 points • 14 August, 2017 04:55 PM

good bot

GoodBot_BadBot • -5 points • 14 August, 2017 04:55 PM

Thank you weicheheck for voting on haikubot-1911.

This bot wants to find the best and worst bots on Reddit. You can view results [here](#).

Even if I don't reply to your comment, I'm still listening for votes. Check the webpage to see if your vote registered!

wardrich • 14 points • 14 August, 2017 06:38 PM

Bad bot

This thing is polluting Reddit with a bunch of useless comments rating bots. Why not just create a separate site where users can vote for their favourite bots in a way that doesn't involve spamming the rest of the site?

MrRedditUser420 • 2 points • 14 August, 2017 09:59 PM

Or at least PM them instead.

wardrich • 2 points • 14 August, 2017 10:45 PM

Sweet idea! Create a message-based system. Bot owners can put a links in their bot posts to generate a message for good/bad bot messages.

TeabagginGunslinger1 points 14 August, 2017 06:55 PM **[recovered]**

Why should it stop here the climax of it's long life when the bot has strength?

haikubot-1911 • 9 points • 14 August, 2017 06:55 PM

Why should it stop here

The climax of it's long life

When the bot has strength?

- TeabagginGunslinger

I'm a bot made by /u/Eight1911. I detect haiku.

LambchopOfGod • 2 points • 14 August, 2017 07:47 PM

Pointless Bot

KitSwiftpaw • 5 points • 14 August, 2017 04:56 PM

Bad bot.

inbe43 • 5 points • 14 August, 2017 05:09 PM

Good bot

TeenageDeviant • 2 points • 14 August, 2017 06:36 PM

Good bot

Mbhuff03 • 2 points • 14 August, 2017 07:01 PM

Testing the haiku bot to see if it will make this post a haiku!

haikubot-1911 • 5 points • 14 August, 2017 07:01 PM

Testing the haiku

Bot to see if it will make

This post a haiku!

- Mbhuff03

I'm a bot made by /u/Eight1911. I detect haiku.

Mbhuff03 • 1 point • 14 August, 2017 07:47 PM

Dammit. I mean yay! I mean, I don't know. I need a life

JustARedditUser0 • -2 points • 14 August, 2017 04:57 PM

Good bot

Atheist101 • 0 points • 14 August, 2017 07:58 PM

good bot

Istalriblaka • 0 points • 14 August, 2017 11:18 PM

Good bot.

bugcats • 10 points • 14 August, 2017 10:01 PM

You know who he is right? His days of peaceful anonymity are long gone.

gjh03c • 7 points • 14 August, 2017 10:06 PM

Yea but I meant it like he has balls of steel so big that he drags them when he walks given that he is a renowned scientist and he's risking his career because of the truths he speaks.

zfighter18 • 7 points • 14 August, 2017 02:24 PM

Yeeeeep

[deleted] • 9 points • 14 August, 2017 07:22 PM

He already was

Luchadorgreen • 19 points • 14 August, 2017 09:08 PM

He's already been called a misogynist by someone with a lot of followers.

obviousoctopus • -43 points • 14 August, 2017 05:51 PM*

1. I am a guy.
2. He seems to presume that his girl is not intelligent enough to know when she needs to report abuse and will get confused by believing that reporting abuse is a sure way to enrich herself, oblivious of the tremendous personal costs.
3. He seems to believe that he knows why women do report to HR and that their reason is financial gain. As a part of this he seems to believe that he knows their reasons better than they do.
4. His sentiment seems to be about women talking to HR. Not sure if the context but if it's the recent downfall of Uber partially related to some women coming forward, then I'm unaware of any of them getting rich as a part of the process. In reality they were lied to and pressured by HR.

Edit: Not sure what I was really expecting by posting an opinion here. Downvotes do not present a meaningful discussion.

scyth3s • 46 points • 14 August, 2017 06:40 PM

The message is to have his daughter be good at something, not to rely on her "diversity" to get free promotions.

obviousoctopus • -29 points • 14 August, 2017 08:59 PM*

Which carries the notion that women *do* use their "diversity" to get free promotions.

Which conveys his opinion of women which opinion coincides with the sexist worldview.

Without seeing a list of women abusing their ethnicity status to get promotion I call bs on that as a white man's bonfire horror story. If this was a serious issue, our bosses would be black women and not white men.

Edit: Do downvotes mean "I disagree, so I'd like to censor this viewpoint?"

Zepherite • 32 points • 14 August, 2017 09:36 PM

Women make up what, 60% of university students but have far more in the way of affirmative action available to them. Why do the majority need affirmative action? It makes no sense.

Women are, some knowingly and some unknowingly, advantaged in education and in the work place - a recent study found that you are more likely to be hired if you are female.

It is NOT sexist to point this out.

YOU are the problem when people bring up genuine problems and your reponse is a knee jerk 'that's sexist'.

obviousoctopus • -10 points • 14 August, 2017 10:09 PM

I am male, remember? And yet, as someone raised by a single mom (divorce rate in the U.S. is 50%), I *do* know that women get paid less and have to deal with much more crap than I do.

The tweet we are analyzing to (and beyond) death is a good example of beliefs men hold about women. The guy addresses (passive/aggressively!) the women of the stereotype he believes in. We applaud.

As much as I like my bros, I also like logic.

Do affirmative action laws get abused? For sure, any loophole will be exploited.

Do affirmative action laws exist for a reason, to protect the less powerful from the people who yield too much power? Absolutely.

RubixCubeDonut • 18 points • 15 August, 2017 03:08 AM

I am male, remember?

I fail to see anything about their post that makes this relevant.

Qapiojg • 14 points • 15 August, 2017 05:08 AM

He probably thinks "male privilege" is actually a thing and this is his attempt to use it. He hasn't realized you have to put the code in first.

Zepherite • 8 points • 15 August, 2017 06:19 AM

'I am male, remember?'

Good for you! Now back on topic.

Sorry to hear about what happened with you parents.

I wonder how much of that crap (and more if divorce courts are anything to go by) a single dad would have to go through? You don't know though because you haven't experienced that. You just assumed what you saw was an exclusively female experience. It isn't.

Point being, subjective experiences do not an argument make.

I gave you examples of how women are NOT disadvantaged but in fact have an advantage in many areas of life. You ignored those examples.

Women are also not paid less. What happens is women, in general, do not do the same jobs as men. Not out of being held back, but out of choice.

I already told you how women choose the lowest paying degrees. The job market is exactly that: a market place. You have to weigh up your options: you can choose the job that brings you enjoyment and has a great work life balance but YOU WILL be paid less for it. Or, you can take the jobs that pay more, that probably aren't as enjoyable, involve more stress and/or more risk. Women, of their own choice, generally choose the first of these options - some women are now whining they aren't paid as much as men even though they chose the safe fulfilling jobs that WE KNOW pay less. You do not get to have your cake and eat it.

This isn't just pulled out of my ass. University admissions show the degrees that women choose - generally the low paying ones. We know from research that women are risk averse, that they value quality of life more than money. We also know that work place deaths are almost entirely male because men take the riskier, higher paying jobs that

women won't. I wonder too, if the higher male suicide rate is in part due to men taking more stressful jobs. This is not a 'this is how women should/must act' kind of thing. This is a snapshot of how women act of their own volition. Their own choices.

These are the reasons behind the tweet: he wants his daughter to work toward the career she wants and be happy with the choices she makes - not to whine when the choices she makes have consequences, consequences that are foreseeable no less - the wage gap, or whining about the none existent wage gap, is evidence enough that a large enough contingent of women whine to make his tweet relevant.

thewierdones • 3 points • 15 August, 2017 11:53 AM

I think the tweet is also refrencing how colleges are telling their students that women and minorities are victims, and how it is the white mans fault. I myself am part of a minority, and I refuse to see myself as a victem

Zepherite • 2 points • 15 August, 2017 12:48 PM

Agreed, I'm sure that's part of the message behind the tweet. Also agreed about the, being a minority doesn't make you a victim. There are are pivilaged black females and disadvantaged white men and everything inbetween. Your colour and creed are often irrelevant to your individual position.

I'm not a fan of pointing out differences between races, as I actually think it's part of the problem that feminism and the left fall into: drawing ro much attention to race and gender rather than the individual. Having said that, it's interesting that those on the extreme left have nothing to say about the most 'privilaged' group using the their own way of defining it: asians. Asians are better off than any other group (and rightly so probably - the asians in my university course were some of the hardest working there) but you don't hear anyone on the left trying to close that 'wage gap'. I wonder why. Could it be they will only try to correct things if it involves straight white males?

It's the biggest irony that while the extreme left shout 'racism, sexism' they are being the biggest bigots of all in their ongoing march against the white male.

FYI I'm no fan of the extreme-right either. The parallels between them are interesting considering they are meant to be polar opposites. Both censor the opposition and try to enforce their view point on everyone.

obviousoctopus • 0 points • 15 August, 2017 07:52 PM

Being in a position of oppression does not turn one into a victim despite the popular narrative.

Please take a look at Aurora Morales' Medicine Stories. Her take on oppressive structures, on owning one's history (almost impossible but crucial for women and people of color; almost impossible because of colonialism's conscious continuous effort to obfuscate and rewrite history) honoring one's peoples' strength, ingenuity, resilience is mindblowingly empowering and couldn't be further from victim hood.

While calling things with their real names and speaking truth to power in an incredibly clear and clean way.

Her book is out of print but her site has the PDF of one of her essays. Can't

recommend it enough.

http://www.auroralevinismorales.com/uploads/4/2/9/2/4292077/the_historian_as_curandera.pdf

obviousoctopus • 2 points • 15 August, 2017 07:40 PM*

Thank you, this was a very extensive reply.

The parts referring to women's experiences and choices contradict some of my conversations with women. When presented with such a contradiction I put more weight on the person with first hand experience.

This happens to be a dividing line in the women's rights discourse -- can we trust their experience over our interpretation. Trusting is difficult.

My point -- lost on many -- is that his daughter's values do not depend on this situation. Stating otherwise is ridiculous, undermines her intelligence, and is a passive-aggressive attack on a phenomenon he doesn't like. "Save my daughter/the children from such examples which will turn her into a self-entitled whining machine" absurd at best.

Zepherite • 1 point • 15 August, 2017 08:33 PM

And thank you for your reply as well.

Large pools of data always trumps a handful of subjective experiences every time. This doesn't mean subjective experiences have no value: they have a lot of value to the individual. However when trying to get a picture of a group of people, a group which is as large and diverse as women, a handful of subjective experiences is not enough. You HAVE to have a large data set to see anything resembling a pattern. The stories women have told you may be at odds to what I am saying but all that information is only useful about those women, not women as a group.

The information that has been taken from large, more useful data sets tells us that women are very privileged in many areas. And yet, we see certain women complaining about a rape culture that is proven to not exist, a wage gap that is proven to not exist and systematic prejudice in the work place that does not exist. This is not absurd, it is fact, a reality that is evidenced by stat after research after paper. You saying it is absurd is the cognitive dissonance between what you have been told and what the reality is. To accept what the data shows is to accept the exact opposite of what you have been led to believe.

obviousoctopus • 2 points • 15 August, 2017 08:53 PM

I appreciate the civilized reply.

Could you point me to data covering your three speaking points? I am open to changing my mind given new information.

Google itself is being investigated for underpaying women, I linked to an article in one of my replies.

scyth3s • 23 points • 14 August, 2017 09:40 PM

Which carries the notion that women *do* use their "diversity" to get free promotions.

The same way that feminists claim men get passive male privilege. Women don't have to *do* anything, their gender adds points to their hireability. She turns in a resume and gets the job over a more qualified man because the office needs another woman.

Women are hired more often when their gender is on their allocation.

The trial found assigning a male name to a candidate made them 3.2 per cent less likely to get a job interview.

Adding a woman's name to a CV made the candidate 2.9 per cent more likely to get a foot in the door.

Granted, that's one study and I don't know what else has been done on the topic, but it was enough to stop the Australian government from doing blind hiring because that *lowered* women's chances.

thewierdones • 2 points • 15 August, 2017 11:55 AM

Look at the Australian Military, they have specifically said that they are banning men as recruits, in order to get more women in the military

Dancing_Anatolia • 2 points • 15 August, 2017 05:37 PM

Don't forget that they slashed fitness requirements down to levels a 5-year-old could double. On an unrelated note, isn't imperialism great? Sydney, USA has an *amazing* ring to it...

obviousoctopus • -1 points • 14 August, 2017 09:55 PM

Lots of studies are available. I think US studies show preference for male name candidates.

https://www.google.com/search?q=united+states+resume+study+women+inequality&oq=united+states+resume+study+women+inequality&gs_l=psy-ab.3...13970.15840.0.16093.11.8.0.0.0.0.284.771.2-3.3.0....0...1.1.64.psy-ab..8.0.0.5EayWX2FtyA

SoundOfDrums • 8 points • 14 August, 2017 11:11 PM

I can't seem to find the raw data from the study that the first two links are citing. Do you know where I can find it?

I'm having trouble finding studies that aren't very small data pools as well. Are you aware of any that present raw data and have decent sample sizes?

obviousoctopus • 2 points • 14 August, 2017 11:13 PM

I do not know of studies that present raw data. I trust that your research skills are as good as or better than mine.

Qapiojg • 5 points • 15 August, 2017 05:11 AM

Data and methodology is what talks. Interpretations of that data can be morphed to fit whatever you want it to. But so long as the methodology is sound the data will show the truth. If you can't provide data or find a study that shows its data, then your studies are shit.

obviousoctopus • 1 point • 15 August, 2017 05:58 AM

Point taken.

May I interest you in a take on this by a Stanford statistics professor who makes a good case about the irrelevance of data in relationship to the google "manifesto" specifically?

<https://www.vox.com/the-big-idea/2017/8/11/16130452/google-memo-women-tech-biology-sexism>

I found this poignant and worth my time.

blackhole885 • 4 points • 15 August, 2017 07:17 AM

Which carries the notion that women do use their "diversity" to get free promotions.

they do, thats the fucking point

big_daddy68 • 1 point • 15 August, 2017 08:42 AM

Give it some time. We are headed this direction. I worked at a major telecom and asked about the next steps to earn a promotion. I was told by my manager that the biggest thing I have going against me was I was a white male. There was a major focus on "diversity" numbers. In my time there one white male was promoted out of 8 promotions, even with a work force of 75% white males. Microsoft announced in November 2016 that its executive's bonuses would be tied to diversity numberslink. I'm all for equality but if these situations were reversed, let's say a hospital said they are only looking at male candidates for an RN position(91% women link)they would be sued off the face of the planet.

[deleted] • 1 point • 15 August, 2017 03:24 PM

No, it just means you are an idiot and should fuck off back to your wife's strapon.

agreenway • -2 points • 14 August, 2017 11:43 PM

Edit: Do downvotes mean "I disagree, so I'd like to censor this viewpoint?"

Sadly, yes. Pretty much any time I challenge opinions here I'm instantly downvoted. It's about as much of an echo chamber as r/politics or r/feminism

EscapeFromPA • 8 points • 15 August, 2017 12:26 AM

It's a tweet directed at Google and a reference to the b.s. that was pulled by them the other week when they fired that guy for bringing up gender differences in the workplace. Do you not understand that?

agreenway • 2 points • 15 August, 2017 02:05 AM

Pretty sure you replied to the wrong comment. I was stating that this sub does indeed use the downvote button when they simply disagree with you. It has nothing to do with my understanding of the tweet.

Reason-and-rhyme • 0 points • 15 August, 2017 02:44 AM*

You are totally right. And the downvotes just keep coming, even onto these purely meta comments that aren't expressing any opinions except for the obvious fact that this subreddit has utterly no regard for reddiquette. In fact, this is the only subreddit on the entire site I have a negative comment karma total for. Which makes the site automatically restrict your posting to the subreddit, compounding the echo chamber

effect.

obviousoctopus • 1 point • 15 August, 2017 12:57 AM*

I distaste the firing... wasn't aware of further action.

obviousoctopus • -4 points • 15 August, 2017 01:10 AM

The US Department of Labor found in April that there were systemic issues with equal pay across the company, and described discrimination there as "quite extreme".

The document (letter) also claims that the gender wage gap is a myth, but Google is locked in an ongoing battle with US labour regulators claiming to have evidence that the company systematically undercompensates women.

<https://www.google.com/amp/s/amp.theguardian.com/world/2017/aug/06/google-staffers-manifesto-against-affirmative-action-sparks-furious-backlash>

[deleted] • 13 points • 14 August, 2017 06:55 PM

hooooooooo shit dude you must be pretty fit from jumping to all those conclusions

obviousoctopus • -1 points • 14 August, 2017 08:46 PM

Just pointing out the implicit logic behind those statements for people who could use it :)

[deleted] • 13 points • 14 August, 2017 08:49 PM

just pointing out my implicit bias

fixed

sboles66 • 12 points • 14 August, 2017 06:25 PM

The gender doesn't have to necessarily equate it to a "bitchy 'can I speak to the manager' woman". The message is more likely just "give my child a world where she's rewarded for hard work."

I also have no idea the context behind the tweet or who the guy is so idk.

drthunder3 • 8 points • 14 August, 2017 06:53 PM

I believe it was a WSJ article about a Google employee who was fired for suggesting that discrimination may not be the only reason for gender imbalances in tech industry.

I don't know much about the actual paper he circulated but he wrote in WSJ that it was scientific in nature; Google just shut him out completely.

VicisSubsisto • 4 points • 14 August, 2017 09:43 PM

Not sure if the context but if it's the recent downfall of Uber

Hint: You're wrong. The context is available in the screenshot; try again.

EscapeFromPA • 3 points • 15 August, 2017 12:28 AM

This tweet is a direct reference to a bunch of women from google skipping work because someone was brave enough to bring up the basic differences in gender, and how they relate to the workplace. Do you think he just tagged Google for shits and giggles?

Choice77777 • 2 points • 15 August, 2017 01:24 AM

Suck a dick ?

[deleted] • 1 point • 15 August, 2017 03:23 PM

Mostly false allegations in all of the situations you mentioned. And what about men who are abused? No care for them I presume.

Abiv23 • 122 points • 14 August, 2017 01:35 PM

This is the brother of the Evergreen State 'no whites on campus' protest professor

sopun[S] • 136 points • 14 August, 2017 02:23 PM

I'd personally encourage this sign to be posted in more places in US: <http://i.redd.it/bgq10u1e97fz.jpg>

NobilisUltima • 107 points • 14 August, 2017 07:46 PM

Uh...people should go to HR when they're being treated poorly at work, though. That's also a thing people should know they can do.

DLDude • 27 points • 14 August, 2017 08:54 PM

Right. If my coworker told me I couldn't code well because he found a study that said dudes from Ohio can't code as well as dudes from California.. I might go to HR. Especially if I worked with him on a daily basis and now assume he thinks I can't code.

super_poderosa • 21 points • 15 August, 2017 03:57 AM

This is a very, very bad analogy. I'm going to torture your analogy to make it fit the facts better: Your office has programs to encourage people from Ohio to apply for jobs and favor them once they do apply. Your co-worker says maybe the reason you have less people from Ohio isn't that people are biased against people from Ohio but because there are likely less coders from Ohio than from California for various cultural & geographic reasons. He is fired.

caitoo0o1 points 15 August, 2017 05:01 AM **[recovered]**

Your analogy also is flawed because there is no part that says people from Ohio are fundamentally less likely to be as capable of programming strictly based on the fact that they're from Ohio and people from Ohio like certain things, not purely based on the fact that they were raised in Ohio, but also based on the simply truth of being from Ohio. The analogy is missing something analogous to biology

TheBookOfSeil • 2 points • 15 August, 2017 07:14 AM

Oh, please... it's common knowledge that people from Ohio can't code, or even drive inside the lines on the road.

-grabs popcorn-

Aivias • 2 points • 15 August, 2017 08:15 AM

says people from Ohio are fundamentally less likely to be as capable of programming strictly based on the fact that they're from Ohio

His paper didn't say that either.

p3ngwin • 16 points • 15 August, 2017 12:51 AM

If my coworker told me I couldn't code well...

if you're referring to Damore's memo, that never happened.

DLdude • -12 points • 15 August, 2017 12:52 AM

Sorry.. let me rephrase:

"If my coworker put a memo stating I cannot code well"

p3ngwin • 19 points • 15 August, 2017 01:14 AM

here's where you reveal how you haven't read the memo at all.

the memo contained literally nothing concerning the quality of female coding.

DLdude • -8 points • 15 August, 2017 01:18 AM

I read the whole thing. It said men excelled in STEM fields and women suffer from mental issues that could prevent them from being good leaders.

p3ngwin • 13 points • 15 August, 2017 03:22 AM

try again, he never once claimed women are inferior coders to men.

You're proving once again that even if you *read* the memo, you didn't *understand* a single point about the message.

Singulaire • 13 points • 15 August, 2017 01:12 AM

Still wrong. An accurate analogy would be:

"If my coworker put out a memo saying dudes from ohio tend to be less interested in coding than dudes fromcalifornia..."

DLdude • -7 points • 15 August, 2017 01:19 AM

To what point? What is his point? It's to say "I don't like the hiring practices and culture of my own company", and then complains when Google fires him?

Singulaire • 17 points • 15 August, 2017 01:43 AM

Gee, it's almost like Google strongly encourages its engineers to criticise company practices and suggest possible improvements.

hounvs • 3 points • 15 August, 2017 03:05 AM

That's probably true though, it's Ohio

MotherFuckin-Oedipus1 points 14 August, 2017 09:26 PM* **[recovered]**

Honestly, I think the better approach is to use that bias to your advantage.

I'm a software engineer myself. When someone underestimates you, use that as inspiration to really tackle a huge project and impress someone higher up. The best revenge is success, and the shame is **real** for people who are dicks like that.

A coworker at my last job thought my code was *absolutely worthless*. I now have my own office and make twice what he does. He hasn't spoken to me since, but he's still doing the same thing he was when I

worked with him.

DLDude • 11 points • 14 August, 2017 10:28 PM

What happens when that's your boss underestimating you, thus not giving you opportunities, support, etc

trahloc • 6 points • 14 August, 2017 11:01 PM

Make your own. I've had people who hear me or someone else in the company bitch about a problem or see a problem themselves and took the initiative to fix it. Sometimes they let me know so it could be approved as an official thing, sometimes they don't and I hear about it from someone else, I'm sure there are some that to this day I'm still ignorant of. Doing things like that and making sure you're known for it is how you get on the boss's radar so that when they do have a problem that needs solving you're the person they think of instead of "I need this done, shit I'll need to outsource it."

It might not happen the first time since they might chalk it up to a fluke but you'll rarely get in trouble for making your boss's or coworkers job genuinely easier.

MotherFuckin-Oedipus1 points 14 August, 2017 11:11 PM* **[recovered]**

Not that hard to fight for it in these cases.

With particular regard to software, you're in a rare position to *create your own* opportunities, most of the time doing it completely under the radar. Very rarely do you need to be "given" opportunities. There's always some way for you to improve things for the company, and identifying and implementing these solutions is central to a career in software.

This would be a much harder sell in other fields, like investing or law, which require you to work on cases and clients that are handed out to you.

DLDude • 4 points • 14 August, 2017 11:24 PM

The guy's memo suggests this 'logic' should be used in hiring practices as well. Should they shuffle out female resumes?

j3lackfire • 2 points • 14 August, 2017 11:05 PM

If someone underestimate me, well, usually, it means less work for me and more work for them, and salary in the short term should still be the same.

[deleted] • 3 points • 15 August, 2017 02:49 AM

I don't think people who work at google are the type to say, "Meh, in the very short term I will be paid the same for less work, even if it squelches the rest of my career"

badhairguy • -4 points • 15 August, 2017 12:38 AM

You're a whiny pussy dude. Worry about yourself instead of what hurts your fee fees

DLDude • -1 points • 15 August, 2017 12:53 AM

Says the guy defending someone kicking and screaming because a private company booted him for breaking the rules.

Coltons503 • -3 points • 15 August, 2017 01:35 AM

Perpetual victim are you? You may as well just cut off your dick and balls and hand them back to your father as you hang your head in shame because you're not worthy of being a MAN.

bridgerdabridge1 • -1 points • 15 August, 2017 03:09 AM

You're so right but this sub is atrocious and will downvote you to hell

DLDude • 0 points • 15 August, 2017 06:13 AM

You got me *eye roll

[deleted] • 5 points • 14 August, 2017 10:06 PM

Yeah definitely, but I think this is more against the recent google firings. Given that they've created pro-underrepresentation policies in tech, he's pointing out the hypocrisy that defeats the purpose of their own goal in firing someone for having an idea. Moreso, it's that other employees sold him out for spreading said idea around. They're giving the impression that being successful in a major tech company has more to do with politics than actual technology. The nature of that manifesto wasn't even sexist, it was observational. This makes their policies look pretty sad in terms of having success driven by expertise.

[deleted] • -4 points • 15 August, 2017 02:40 AM

If, for whatever reason, Google had no application or hiring process and had to blindly pick people based only on demographic, then yes, these observations could be relevant information to his colleagues. But Google has a rigorous hiring process that gives a much better picture of an individual's performance, so aggregated statistics are close to meaningless for their candidates and current employees. The population Google draws from is the top talent in the world, and yet this guy is suggesting inferences from the aggregate population. At best he's wasting his own time and that of anyone who had to read it. This is assuming that he was innocently "making observations," didn't intend to influence policy, and didn't understand or care about the ill will it would create (despite it being in the code of conduct). Being an idiot or an asshole is not typically enough to deserve firing, but it's still important to avoid as companies involve more than one person working together and people are judged on their ability to do so.

But it seems more likely that, issuing a work memo, he intended for it to have some relevance to work, and for people to make work decisions based on it. His intent was for people to make work decisions based on aggregate gender statistics rather than the expertise of the individual. You talk about talent-driven success, this idea would hurt Google by suppressing the success of its talent on the basis of sex. That's the point of diversity- discouraging and suppressing people based on things out of their own control limits your own talent pool. Not only is he wasting time and pissing people off, he's sabotaging the company that pays his salary.

Regardless of gender and diversity, if someone pushes a stupid idea and hurts the company because of it, they risk getting fired, and that's something sjws on both sides ought to grow up and accept.

[deleted] • 1 point • 15 August, 2017 11:45 AM

His intent was for people to make work decisions based on aggregate gender statistics rather than the expertise of the individual

I think this is what he was arguing against. The backstory is that this is currently what google is doing. He explains this in some interviews.

In general I really didn't understand a lot of what you said.

inspiron3000 • 1 point • 15 August, 2017 11:09 AM

Go to a lawyer first.

xZaggin • 15 points • 14 August, 2017 07:13 PM

Wait so what's the context here?

VicisSubsisto • 29 points • 14 August, 2017 09:47 PM

The Google "manifesto" fiasco.

Guy said "we should hire based on ability and support diversity of thought, rather than hitting based on skin color."

Someone forwarded his internal memo to Gizmodo, they wrote the typical Gawker hit piece about it, he got fired.

rayhond2000 • 14 points • 15 August, 2017 12:55 AM

Race wasn't his argument at all. It was pretty tangential to his argument on differences between sexes.

monnef • 2 points • 15 August, 2017 01:17 PM

It wasn't his main focus, but he did mentioned it several times in interview with Peterson (that the company on a secret meeting was essentially telling them to hire more women and minorities).

agreenway • -8 points • 14 August, 2017 07:54 PM

the context is that it's in /r/mensrights which is slowly turning into /r/wehatefeminists

This whole shituation could have been used to teach some truly valuable lessons. Instead it's just turned into "HA! see, we told you feminism is fucking everything up!"

xZaggin • 34 points • 14 August, 2017 07:57 PM

That's not the context, that's you just raging at the issue, I meant what have I missed exactly in order to understand this

[deleted] • 7 points • 14 August, 2017 08:13 PM

Who ended up getting a payout by going to HR? Under what circumstances? I don't recall people getting money because of this, just one guy getting fired for just cause.

RubixCubeDonut • 2 points • 15 August, 2017 03:22 AM

The payout is more in the form of continuing being to employed despite deliberately aiming to be less cooperative / productive.

[deleted] • 0 points • 15 August, 2017 02:46 PM

Do you realize the amount of financial damage that memo caused? The dude fucked up. No women got a payout. This is yet another /r/womanhate post that has nothing to do with mens rights

agreenway • 12 points • 14 August, 2017 07:59 PM

There was a document created by someone who worked at google. The document cited studies and made the conclusion that women are less predisposed to be good at STEM fields than men. Internet exploded, guy got fired, internet exploded again.

meesg5861 points 14 August, 2017 08:22 PM [recovered]

And some woman (feminist) at Google decided not to go to work even after the guy was fired, which is where this tweet is directed to.

fodgerpodger • -2 points • 14 August, 2017 08:39 PM

do you have a link to a story? I never heard about this girl/HR follow up..

meesg5861 points 14 August, 2017 09:27 PM [recovered]

<http://www.dailywire.com/news/19462/google-memo-says-men-and-women-are-different-women-amanda-prestigiacom>

fodgerpodger • -2 points • 14 August, 2017 10:09 PM

Oh, so HR hasn't done anything to merit the tweet? It's just inaction that he's complaining about?

PoisonTheOgres1 points 14 August, 2017 09:19 PM [recovered]

Yep, I'm a feminist *and* a men's right supporter, which is not a contradiction as many here seem to believe. There are some issues women still face, and there are other issues men are dealing with. Both are serious and people should be understanding of the other side's experiences, instead of saying "my problems are worse than yours"

Halafax • 2 points • 15 August, 2017 04:30 PM

Both are serious and people should be understanding of the other side's experiences, "my problems are worse than yours"

That's a start. But then you realize someone's problem is someone else's benefit. Then it goes sideways.

I don't really have the energy to be an anti-feminist, but I do see an awful lot of ridiculous crap coming from feminism. And while I understand it's a varied and sometimes conflicted movement, I can't help but notice I hardly ever see feminists contradicting each other when it comes to getting a benefit at men's expense. That's always totes cool.

PoisonTheOgres1 points 15 August, 2017 05:07 PM [recovered]

'Feminism' is not one homogenous group of people, as you said. I do not condone the behavior of a lot of people who call themselves feminists.

I am, for example, not in favour of gender/race/minority quotas in workplaces. Is that the sort of thing you meant by things that benefit women at the expense of men?

Halafax • 2 points • 15 August, 2017 05:37 PM*

I do not condone the behavior of a lot of people who call themselves feminists.

Lack of vocal opposition is not dissent though, right? I'm not taking issue with you, I understand. There is a reluctance to challenge potential allies. But from the outside, this makes feminism look a lot more monolithic than it is.

I am, for example, not in favour of gender/race/minority quotas in workplaces. Is that the sort of thing you meant by things that benefit women at the expense of men?

I don't think examples are hard to find.

Affirmative action hiring and placement is tricky. I can see it being useful in some circumstances, but it's rather hard to control and often creates issues of it's own.

N.O.W. campaigning against custody reform is my go-to example of feminism defending a known advantage.

[deleted] • 5 points • 14 August, 2017 10:09 PM

Someone's a little butthurt, clearly, but it's not about that. I think you're misunderstanding. Read some of the more reasonable comments and get a better understanding of the message being portrayed here.

agreenway • 0 points • 14 August, 2017 10:29 PM

Butthurt? No not really, just frustrated with seeing the same shit posts over and over again. Look for the more reasonable comments? I didn't come here for an echo chamber, I shouldn't have to filter through all this angst just to get to a reasonable argument. I love seeing things that challenge my opinions but this is just /r/feminism with a male skin on it. Let's get past the hate and the 'i have it worse than you' mentality.

[deleted] • 4 points • 14 August, 2017 10:40 PM

Let's get past the hate and the 'i have it worse than you' mentality

That's all I'm asking for.

The tweet points out a hypocrisy. Plain and simple, infer from it what you will.

Pithong • 159 points • 14 August, 2017 06:03 PM

Where's the men's activism? Donations and volunteers to open men's shelters? Outreach to boys? This sub is 80% anti-women/revenge porn against women/outrage pron against women, 20% or less on any given day is about men, less than 5% is about activism.

[deleted] • 79 points • 14 August, 2017 07:33 PM

It's easier to complain than it is to fix things. Everyone does it, feminists too. There are really only very few people who actively work to make the world better. But there are shit loads of people complaining and talking shit, just like I'm doing right now.

Gay123456789101112 • 36 points • 14 August, 2017 08:46 PM

to be fair, people aren't joining subreddits to be activists. they're joining cuz they want interesting things to read or pictures to look at, and they want to be able to relate to some of it. that's about it.

if you know your audience here I think it becomes obvious why everyone complains and nothing else. they just want their echo chambers, so they can have people agree. and the only reasons they want that is because of some variable-per-person mixture of ego and loneliness.

[deleted] • 11 points • 14 August, 2017 08:54 PM

Sounds about right and it's totally ok too. But it's also important to sometimes leave our bubbles of comfort and try to understand the point of view of people who think differently. But doing so coming from a place of compassion. It makes me hate the world less.

ViralVV • 5 points • 14 August, 2017 08:53 PM

This is so fucking sad and true.

ScreeN • 2 points • 15 August, 2017 06:18 AM

This guy gets it

agreenway • -5 points • 14 August, 2017 11:50 PM

I got downvoted to hell for saying the same thing -.-

AloysiusC • 26 points • 14 August, 2017 07:52 PM

When MRAs try to fix things, feminists fight them. Inform yourself better.

[deleted] • 13 points • 14 August, 2017 08:00 PM*

No, I'll just complain •_•

MotherFuckin-Oedipus • 9 points • 14 August, 2017 09:15 PM

This guy complains

[deleted] • -7 points • 14 August, 2017 09:51 PM

So at the first sign of resistance you give up? Sounds like you were never really that invested in your cause

AloysiusC • 16 points • 14 August, 2017 10:15 PM

You too, are uninformed. MRAs have been raising these issues for decades. You think just because you haven't heard of it in your lets plays, therefore it didn't exist until you saw some feminist try to take a shot at us on your facebook feed. Then you come here *knowing* how long we've tried or presuming we've stopped. And because you'd never "give up" so quickly, you must be awesome or something.

Learn, then judge (if at all).

[deleted] • -4 points • 15 August, 2017 01:44 AM

It takes more than decades to affect change though, Feminism started in the 1800's and women got the right to vote in 1920, shit takes a while and you will be met with lots of resistance. By saying that "When MRAs try to fix things, feminists fight them. Inform yourself better" in response to the other person's comment it looks like you have given up trying to take action and instead just want to complain. If that's not what you are saying then sorry for misinterpreting this. However, that attitude is very common in this sub. There are very few posts that are calls to action, rather the most popular ones are complaining about women and Feminists.

Also where are you getting these lets plays, feminists on my facebook feed, and general character attacks from?

AloysiusC • 2 points • 15 August, 2017 07:01 AM

It takes more than decades to affect change though, Feminism started in the 1800's and women got the right to vote in 1920

This is just confirming my observation that you're uninformed. Aside from the specifics, you don't have a grasp on the fundamental problems facing MRAs. The fact that you

compare our tasks with that of feminists shows this very clearly. The problems feminists face(d) are nothing compared with what we have to face.

At this point, our best and pretty much only option is to raise consciousness so that more people understand the gender dynamics, male disposability and the underlying causes. Then and only then can we hope to achieve something politically. In that we have come a long way in recent years but only because of things like what you're criticizing on this sub.

To give you a brief idea: The Red Pill movie is quite a milestone in raising public awareness and it was only made in the first place *because* of the "outrage porn" people like you here are criticizing. If we had all just been doing what Warren Farrell was doing for decades, nobody would notice or care.

[deleted] • 2 points • 15 August, 2017 02:53 PM

How did this post and the many posts like it complaining about women raise awareness for anything that men face?

Dancing_Anatolia • 1 point • 15 August, 2017 05:52 PM

Pointing out what they have highlights what we don't have. You can't fight a problem you know nothing about.

AloysiusC • 1 point • 15 August, 2017 06:05 PM

Well I don't think it's fair to expect every single post to be accounted for. This is a very lightly moderated sub and that's worked very well for us. Our subscriber base has grown a lot and we're the biggest MRA forum in the world. That way, when important things need to be done, we have a sizeable audience to draw on for support. Efforts here, mine included, have helped raise funds for example to get The Red Pill screenings saved.

You should watch that documentary btw. It's a good start on understanding us.

[deleted] • 2 points • 15 August, 2017 06:32 PM

I mean I've been a subscriber here for at least a year (conservative estimate) and I can count on one hand the number of actual activism posts that I've seen. The only thing close to one on the front page right now is the stickied post about the men's day email. When does the talking stop and the actual action start? It should be hella easy since this is the biggest MRA forum and most people here should want to do something.

atomcrusher • 15 points • 14 August, 2017 07:19 PM

Unfortunately, I think a lot of people already feel bad for speaking out about things, let alone engaging in activism.

[deleted] • 7 points • 15 August, 2017 04:51 AM

It's because most of the surge in Men's Rights is due to problems being caused by feminism: the biased family court system (custody battles), women being favored for jobs in STEM fields over men, men's careers being ruined by false rape accusations, male students being kicked out of university for false rape accusations, ridiculous child support laws (men have been forced to pay for kids that aren't even theirs!),

divorce that favors women (alimony), boys aren't allowed to be boys in school (medication; "toxic masculinity"), and more.

And men can't even talk about their own problems without being protested or shouted down by these cunts. Men don't need activism; men just need to be left the fuck alone, and we'll do just fine on our own volitions. We don't need to help ourselves more- we already do that. We need to kick off all the people trying to drag us down, which is done mostly by- or in the name of- women.

Rumpadunk • 3 points • 15 August, 2017 04:30 AM

Even though the core of this post is for helping women and not men I don't have much issue with it because it is still an issue with sexism and discrimination between men and women that isn't shown enough.

[deleted] • 14 points • 14 August, 2017 10:01 PM

This sub is definitely not 80% anti-women, nor is it any revenge porn. You sound like the kind of person who would demonize anyone for reading this or posting here.

The guy is making a philosophical point, and he's making it for a woman. This is him being supportive of his daughter's future, and he's making a point that shows hypocrisy in google's policies. I honestly don't see where you're coming from.

ScreeN • 3 points • 15 August, 2017 06:21 AM

Less than 5% my ass.

Pithong • 1 point • 15 August, 2017 01:30 PM*

Add up your top 100. I did it a month ago and there were 2 activism posts. It's a bit higher today, up to 10%.

Edit: these are the only activism posts in your top 100 right now:

https://www.reddit.com/r/MensRights/comments/6ttedk/if_you_care_about_family_court_please_help_and/

https://www.reddit.com/r/MensRights/comments/6tslnf/9th_national_conference_of_indian_mens_right/

https://www.reddit.com/r/MensRights/comments/6tsk58/conservative_party_conference_manchester_ant_imgm/

Most of the rest is outrage porn which riles you guys up good but still doesn't push any of you to get involved in changing policy, maybe because there are so little activism posts. 3% activism isn't a bad thing if it's 3 posts every day, those are the numbers though.

ScreeN • 1 point • 15 August, 2017 07:10 PM

LMFAO keep on proving the left is bigoted. "It's not activism cause I disagree with it!!!!!"

Pithong • 1 point • 15 August, 2017 07:17 PM

What? What posts are activism that I'm not calling activism? I only found 3 activism posts. I don't disagree with them, I'm just pointing out that less than 5% of the posts on this sub in average are about activism, and most of the rest are outrage porn.

serial_crusher • 9 points • 14 August, 2017 09:22 PM

I can tell by the constructive nature of your comment that you're above all that sort of pettiness. Good job!

abananafullofpoo • 1 point • 14 August, 2017 09:58 PM

Reverse the genders and you just described 99% of feminism, numbnuts.

keonkla • 1 point • 15 August, 2017 08:51 PM

Yes i admit there is alot of bitching and moaning about useless dumb stuff. The guys At a voice for men tend to be far more serious about actual activism.

AloysiusC • 1 point • 14 August, 2017 07:52 PM

Women != feminism you fucking moron.

[deleted] • 9 points • 14 August, 2017 06:54 PM

what I loved was that the writer of the Google memo, citing *science* said that women are on AVERAGE more emotional than men.

Women were mad about that, and many stayed home instead of going to work the next day because they were "emotionally hurt."

Oh the irony...

source

Aivias • 3 points • 15 August, 2017 08:23 AM

Its taboo to observe that *some* women *occasionally/might* exhibit less than desirabile personality traits and/or commit actions that do not reflect favourably on them as individuals who happen to be part of the human sub-category named 'female'.

ArmaniDiamonds1 points 14 August, 2017 11:34 PM* **[recovered]**

Damn straight. I have a 7 year old girl and I asked her what she wanted to be when she grew up. She said a scientist. For her birthday, among all the ever after high dolls, I bought her a really cute black and pink microscope. And my wife is pregnant. With another girl. Fuck that extra shit. They will grow up to be strong smart independent individuals who excel

rayhond2000 • 3 points • 15 August, 2017 12:57 AM

Good for you. And some people still push girls and boys towards "boy" and "girl" toys. Everyone should support their kid like you are.

ArmaniDiamonds • 1 point • 17 August, 2017 01:16 PM

Me and my wife were talking about that the other day. She never got legos as a kid since it was more of a boys toy back then. Even though she was born in 92. But my daughter has like 2 big ass buckets of all sorts of legos. I wanna start reading her some of my books, but the wife says "she's 7.. she'll get bored and not understand most of it..just wait a little" so we're putting her in ballet this year hopefully and by 10 I was thinking martial arts.

[deleted] • 10 points • 14 August, 2017 06:41 PM

How do you the person that complained was a woman? Or that anyone complained to HR?

It was publicly leaked and then he was fired for violating their code of conduct. Blaming women for him being fired from his at will employment makes no sense. But I'm sure y'all will disagree and downvote me anyway.

[deleted] • 26 points • 14 August, 2017 07:19 PM

It was publicly leaked

Because the woman and her friends felt offended and decided to take justice into their own hands.

But I'm sure y'all will disagree and downvote me anyway.

No, it's because you don't have all the facts and refuse to look further than a bunch of hit pieces designed to make the guy look bad.

[deleted] • 24 points • 14 August, 2017 07:24 PM

"the woman"

Source?

[deleted] • 10 points • 14 August, 2017 10:10 PM

Yeah I haven't heard that it was a woman either. I'd be curious if that information was leaked or not.

[deleted] • 7 points • 14 August, 2017 10:17 PM

So far I've seen articles linked that the guy got fired. And that women stayed home. Nothing about who (if anyone) spoke to HR which led to his firing.

[deleted] • 7 points • 14 August, 2017 10:19 PM

To be fair, especially with the current state of reporting, I wouldn't be sure whether the women stayed home out of protest or out of distaste. I'd think there was a bunch of people who stayed home in general, men and women, but maybe the women side got reported more. The reason itself is probably just being spun in that direction.

[deleted] • 1 point • 14 August, 2017 10:23 PM

I'd totally get if it was disproportionately women though, especially since we have no idea what responses were posted to the memo that were readable by all employees. If there was overwhelming support by my coworkers I'd probably take a day off and reconsider if I want to keep working there too.

Singulaire • 2 points • 15 August, 2017 01:14 AM

The Google VP of diversity Danielle Brown

voodoowing1 points 14 August, 2017 08:50 PM **[recovered]**

Lol you hang out in r/IncelTears, how do you guys not see the irony of how lame and unfuckable you are.

[deleted] • 8 points • 14 August, 2017 09:23 PM

Good source. You sure showed me.

There's plenty of issues men face that you could be supporting, you don't need to make shit up.

[deleted] • -1 points • 14 August, 2017 09:52 PM

So no source? Are you a liar?

sneakpeekbot • 0 points • 14 August, 2017 08:50 PM

Here's a sneak peek of /r/IncelTears using the top posts of all time!

#1: /r/incels logic | 67 comments

#2: Reddit should seriously close r/incels. It's a breeding pool for serious and dangerous mental health issues.

#3: When urban dictionary calls you out. | 94 comments

I'm a bot, beep hoop | Downvote to remove | Contact me | Info | Opt-out

DyceFreak1 points 14 August, 2017 10:00 PM [recovered]

How do you the person that complained was a woman? Or that anyone complained to HR?

<http://www.dailywire.com/news/19462/google-memo-says-men-and-women-are-different-women-amanda-p-restigiacomo#>

[deleted] • 2 points • 14 August, 2017 10:02 PM

Well that's a very biased article. And doesn't say anything about a woman complaining to HR.

DyceFreak1 points 14 August, 2017 10:04 PM [recovered]

Apparently you've never worked a corporate job... If you think mass amounts of people are calling off of work due to political reasons without HR's knowledge then you are a fool.

[deleted] • 2 points • 14 August, 2017 10:06 PM

I work at a company similar to Google with 10,000 employees. I request PTO via my direct manager, not HR. We also don't require doctors notes for sick days. You can take one whenever without advanced notice. Again, without involving HR.

DyceFreak1 points 14 August, 2017 10:07 PM [recovered]

sure, ignore the keywords in my post. That's fine, exemplify your stupidity.

mass amounts of people

due to political reasons

[deleted] • 2 points • 14 August, 2017 10:12 PM

You can take a sick day and not say it's due to political reasons. The same way a bunch of people take "sick" days to extend a long weekend here and no one cares.

By the way, did you notice you feel the need to resort to personal attacks and I just bring up logical arguments based on personal experience?

stupidname91919 • 1 point • 15 August, 2017 07:22 AM

Its amazing to me how like 10% of 2xc is women trying to get a male coworker fired for saying a joke they didn't like.

AntiAbleism • 1 point • 15 August, 2017 04:03 PM

They know they can whine and get away with it.

YAMS_EVERYWHERE_ • -2 points • 14 August, 2017 09:59 PM

How about as her father you teach her

timewarp91589 • -7 points • 15 August, 2017 12:56 AM

"Ok sweetie, just remember. If someone in your office is creating a hostile work environment, just keep your head down and don't speak."

Coltons503 • 16 points • 15 August, 2017 01:33 AM

Found the perpetual victim...

timewarp91589 • -11 points • 15 August, 2017 01:36 AM

Because actual victims couldn't possibly exist. Nope, not a chance. Impossible.

Coltons503 • 7 points • 15 August, 2017 01:37 AM

Sure because that's what I actually said. However someone stating a biological, scientifically proven fact is not "victimizing" you sweetie.

timewarp91589 • -5 points • 15 August, 2017 01:41 AM

Just going to leave this here in case someone else sees this comment chain and thinks you might be worth engaging

https://www.reddit.com/r/MensRights/comments/6tliib/an_honest_wish_of_a_dad/dlmu09l/

Coltons503 • 1 point • 15 August, 2017 01:43 AM

You do realize where you are yes? This opinion is by far the majority. So off with ye sexist attitude Sir or Madame victim.

supacrusha • 1 point • 15 August, 2017 06:50 AM

Umm no, not the majority think that disagreeing with anyone should make them unworthy of being a man

But at the same time you are still correct in saying that u/timewarp91589 is doing the whole perpetual victimising thing. The man whom posted a tunny memo ws not creating a hostile work environment, the women freaking out about it were.

timewarp91589 • 1 point • 15 August, 2017 09:20 AM

Ah yes, the "it was just a joke!" defense, that always goes over well.

Aivias • 2 points • 15 August, 2017 08:26 AM

I find the idea that grown adults, who may at some point be told by one of the seven billion human beings on this planet that perhaps they are not as skilled/efficient/interesting whatever as other people are, would find the correct response to be sulking like a two year old who has been told no for the first time.

When did we stop teaching the idea of 'sticks and stones'?

timewarp91589 • 0 points • 15 August, 2017 09:31 AM

When we realized that was a stupid thing to teach people.

Aivias • 2 points • 15 August, 2017 09:33 AM

"Sticks and stones may break my bones but words will give me PTSD"

Is that more your flavour?

timewarp91589 • 1 point • 15 August, 2017 09:41 AM

You seem pretty hurt by my words, so there's that.

Aivias • 1 point • 15 August, 2017 09:52 AM

Oh no...my internet wounds...

C7_the_Epic • -3 points • 15 August, 2017 03:10 AM

If I sent out an ideologically driven memo to all my coworkers, I would expect to be fired. It creates a hostile work environment and in what I'm assuming is an agile workplace that is a very bad thing.

No, it doesn't matter if what he said was 100% true. He sent out a memo that said women don't handle stressful jobs as well as men. It made women, who didn't fit that fact because they were handling the stress of the job fine (hence why they're still working there), feel like they couldn't feel comfortable about their co-worker who decided to use said stereotype in a memo.

This isn't a free speech issue. This isn't a men's rights issue. This is a workplace environment issue, and Google was 100% within its rights to do this.

EricAllonde • 12 points • 15 August, 2017 05:42 AM

He didn't send the memo to all his coworkers, he posted it in a forum created by management and titled, "Controversial Ideas".

C7_the_Epic • -2 points • 15 August, 2017 11:46 AM

If how I worded sent out to coworkers is your only problem with my post, then all I have to do is ask what the difference was since his all his coworkers could still read it, and how that in anyway changes the fact that he got fired for the exact reason I explained.

EricAllonde • 5 points • 15 August, 2017 12:39 PM

It's pretty simple:

You are presently on Reddit. Elsewhere on Reddit there is porn, for example at r/porn.

If you are offended by porn, you should not visit r/porn. You know that. You should simply stay away. So if you do choose to visit r/porn, you see porn there and get offended by it, then that's no one's fault but your own.

Likewise, if you're an emotionally fragile Google employee who gets triggered by facts that contradict your victimhood-centric worldview, then you should not visit a forum called "Controversial Ideas" on your company's servers. If you choose to go visit that forum and you see something that triggers you, then it's no one's fault but your own.

sneakpeekbot • 2 points • 15 August, 2017 12:39 PM

Here's a sneak peek of /r/porn [NSFW] using the top posts of the year!

#1: [/r/BlowJob] I wonder how she learnt that? | 20 comments

#2: [/r/The_Best_NSFW_GIFS] You Know It's Good When She Drools | 15 comments

#3: [/r/AmateurCumshots] Eager to get her facial | 10 comments

C7_the_Epic • -1 points • 15 August, 2017 12:52 PM*

Except it's a company, not a free forum on the internet. It employs the people it's allowing to post on that forum, and actually cares about what people say and feel about what was said on said forum.

No, it wasn't meant to be a place where you could post absolutely anything, and you know that. Again: he sent out (posted if you insist) that women are worse in stressful jobs than men. An ideologically driven memo. His co-workers read it, maybe hoping to read up a real discussion that was occurring or even because other co-workers pointed them to it.

It offended some co-workers, created an objectively worse work environment to a company that only wants to see work environments improve, and he got fired to fix it. The phrase "controversial" above where he posted it in no way gave him the go ahead to post anything he wanted, and any idiot who has ever worked for a company should know that.

So again: this isn't a free speech issue, this isn't a men's rights issue; it's a work environment issue at a company.

Edit: I'll do you one further in fact. The simple fact that he had female co-workers in the workplace that were handling the job just fine completely countered his whole point of women not being able to handle stressful jobs as well as men. He was posting a stereotype, which might on the whole be true, was not universally true and specifically not true for the people he offended who felt targeted by it. So even while my previous points still stand that the factuality of his memo is irrelevant, it was still a stupid thing to post in and of itself.

EricAllonde • 5 points • 15 August, 2017 01:01 PM

Numerous scientists who work in related fields have spoken up and confirmed that the document is scientifically accurate. The guy accurately reported scientific facts that are relevant to the purpose of the controversial ideas forum, which is discussion of controversial ideas to make Google more successful.

And remember, as apparently must be repeated ad nauseam for the slow learners: he was only talking about entire population averages, and he was talking about preferences for type of work not abilities. His document also said nothing about any specific person and he was at pains to point out that figures for population averages cannot be used to infer anything about specific individuals.

If I say, " $2 + 1 = 3$ " and you reply, "I'm offended by hearing that, you should be sacked" then in any sane workplace it's you who has the issue to deal with, not me. The fact that Google management caved in so quickly to a bunch of mentally ill children determined to remain in denial about facts, does not bode well for the company's future. Sell your shares now.

C7_the_Epic • 1 point • 15 August, 2017 01:10 PM

Read my edit on stereotypes (on mobile, didn't see you replied before I started).

And again: it doesn't matter how scientifically accurate his as stereotype was; it created a worse workplace for people to work in and Google needed to fix it. Not a free speech issue. Again.

EricAllonde • 5 points • 15 August, 2017 01:25 PM

Read my edit on stereotypes

Sigh. Do you refuse to read the document? Or can you simply not understand what the words mean?

Again:

And remember, as apparently must be repeated ad nauseam for the slow learners: he was only talking about entire population averages, and he was talking about preferences for type of work not abilities. His document also said nothing about any specific person and he was at pains to point out that figures for population averages cannot be used to infer anything about specific individuals.

C7_the_Epic • 1 point • 15 August, 2017 01:44 PM

I used the word correctly; stereotypes can be based in facts, that's not why it's a bad thing to use them. And we're actually agreeing what it means here. And yes; I actually read the document. Are you reading my responses?

My original point that it still literally doesn't matter how factually accurate his points were, Google was still well within their rights to do that and it has nothing to do with men's rights or free speech.

Now we agree that his statement applies to general populations and not specific individuals. But the people who got offended by it weren't general populations; they were specific individuals that fell under these populations for which his statements weren't true, and got offended because he was suggesting Google should use this information in consideration of their diversity policy in that light. It's a bad argument; it's not $2+1=3$, it's a nuanced and clearly sensitive topic he decided to post like it was just as simple as a memo.

You can repeat yourself all you want about general populations and factual accuracy; that's not the context his memo was posted in and not why he got fired.

EricAllonde • 3 points • 15 August, 2017 02:01 PM

Now we agree that his statement applies to general populations and not specific individuals. But the people who got offended by it weren't general populations; they were specific individuals that fell under these populations for which his statements weren't true, and got offended because he was suggesting Google should use this information in consideration of their diversity policy in that light.

Right. So we agree there was no reason for the employees to get triggered, but they did anyway, because they're stupid.

So the question is: should Google clamp down on diversity of opinion among its employees and silence controversial ideas for improving the company, all just to make its most stupid employees feel comfortable by ensuring they never encounter ideas they can't understand?

I would argue that no, they should not cater to the lowest common denominator in terms of intellect. Google prides itself on being a company of smart people

doing clever things. They should thank James Damore for helping to identify employees who are too stupid to work there.

They should have sacked everyone who got needlessly triggered, thereby raising the average IQ of their employees and boosting productivity enormously. They should have given James Damore a fat bonus out of the resulting savings and gone on to even bigger things. Instead of that they chose the path of stupidity and put themselves on course to become evermore uncompetitive over time.

Gambizzle • 0 points • 15 August, 2017 10:34 AM

AGREED 100%!!!! People need to get over it and move onto something else. I'm sick of seeing 5000+ upvotes in this subreddit for lame memes and blog posts about this fucking ex-Google dude!!!

I would be fired if I typed up a 10 page rant criticising the organisation's inclusion strategies instead of doing my job!!! Why do people find it so difficult to accept that this was just some tool who was wasting time at work?!?!? 10 FUCKING PAGES!!! It probably took the guy at least a week to churn out that bullshit. Put yourself in his boss' shoes - would you stand for that?

EricAllonde • 2 points • 15 August, 2017 12:46 PM

The guy posted his document in an official company forum called "Controversial Ideas", which Google management created as a place for employees to discuss controversial ideas for making Google a better, more successful company.

The document was perfectly aligned with that objective. The document simply said, "Maybe we should stop pumping so much money and effort into trying to get to 50% women software engineers, when there's ample evidence that relatively few women actually want to do the job". He's got a point, after all only about 12% or so of software engineering graduates are women, and women are not being turned away from doing the course because they are women - the exact opposite is true.

Take a deep breath, stop being triggered by scientific facts you don't like, and just go on with your life. You can do it.

asdtyyhf • -107 points • 14 August, 2017 04:11 PM

Translation: shut up about being harassed, women.

bufedad • 119 points • 14 August, 2017 04:28 PM

the only person harassed at Google was the memo author.

asdtyyhf • -45 points • 14 August, 2017 05:55 PM

He was fired for saying women "in general" were inherently inferior at tech based on evolutionary pseudoscience. He's the one doing harassing.

[deleted] • 58 points • 14 August, 2017 06:03 PM

He never said women were "inferior". **Not. Once.**

asdtyyhf • -40 points • 14 August, 2017 06:26 PM

Yes he did. He cant directly say women are inferior or he would lose credibility. Instead he implies it by saying women aren't in tech and leadership due to biological causes and backs it up

with bad science.

duruga • 34 points • 14 August, 2017 06:29 PM

So you are judging him not by what he said but by what you interpret he really wanted to say but didn't. I wonder if you'd be OK if it was you receiving this same treatment.

supacrusha • 3 points • 15 August, 2017 06:56 AM

Im gonna judge u/asdtyyhfh based on what I think he wanted to say. I **think** he wanted to say "fuck all men" what a sexist.

[deleted] • 16 points • 14 August, 2017 07:22 PM

Instead he implies it by saying women aren't in tech and leadership due to biological causes and backs it up with bad science.

He "Implies" it.

That's right, forget any direct evidence. To you, if he "Implied" it, it must be true.

Feels before reelz.

[deleted] • 26 points • 14 August, 2017 06:31 PM

and backs it up with bad science

If you're going to make a statement like this, you need to back it up with some facts and credible material you found along with citations or links. I'll wait.

AloysiusC • 9 points • 14 August, 2017 07:56 PM

Instead he implies it by saying women aren't in tech and leadership due to biological causes

I know you're a little bit stupid but perhaps consider that "biological differences" might very well imply women are *superior* and that may be why they don't go into tech.

Let's see if you have the capacity to wrap your simple mind around that.

scyth3s • 10 points • 14 August, 2017 06:50 PM

No... He didn't. You really should read the memo, it isn't that long.

[deleted] • 26 points • 14 August, 2017 06:08 PM

I don't think any of what he referenced in the memo was pseudoscience. He references actual studies and credible, peer reviewed science.

asdtyyhfh • 3 points • 14 August, 2017 06:39 PM

The studies didn't prove women aren't in tech and leadership due to biological causes. He's stretching the meaning of the studies to jump to a conclusion. I could find real studies that show gay people are more likely to commit suicide and then make the bad conclusion that being gay is an illness. Just because you use real studies doesn't make your conclusion correct.

bufedad • 20 points • 14 August, 2017 06:56 PM

The studies didn't prove women aren't in tech and leadership due to biological causes.

They did prove that women and men have different priorities, which was the point he made.

I mean... if women and men have different priorities, then certain jobs are appealing to one set of priorities, and not appealing to other sets of priorities.

That's basic logic.

asdytyhfh • -3 points • 14 August, 2017 07:05 PM

That's like saying "gay people are killing themselves because it's an illness. It's just basic logic". You're taking a complex situation with cultural forces and making simple bad judgements about it. It's not basic logic it's bad science.

[deleted] • 16 points • 14 August, 2017 07:25 PM

That's like saying "gay people are killing themselves because it's an illness. It's just basic logic".

You're comparing a research paper that postulates ONE theory as to why less women are in tech with "Gay people are killing themselves because it's an illness."

You're taking a complex situation with cultural forces and making simple bad judgements about it.

Complexity means addressing this aspect in the memo. So sorry if it upsets your "Religious Progressive" beliefs but if you want to address the issue, that includes every angle.

It's not basic logic it's bad science.

Offer up some better science then. Cite better, peer reviewed, reputable sources if you have something that's more logical.

Go on.

Plays Final Jeopardy Theme

bufedad • 4 points • 14 August, 2017 08:04 PM

That's like saying "gay people are killing themselves because it's an illness. It's just basic logic"

Yeah... either you don't understand what I said, or you're a troll. You pick.

You're taking a complex situation with cultural forces and making simple bad judgements about it. It's not basic logic it's bad science.

You haven't actually argued why it's not.

I mean, if you want to stamp your foot and shout Nuh uh... be my guest. It doesn't mean we're going to see you as anything more than an opulent child.

supacrusha • 2 points • 15 August, 2017 06:58 AM

Not that many of us hate gay people, some of us do, but not all of us. This is like that david duke thing "Some people that are part of your movement dislike LGB people, so all of you

must do"

[deleted] • 2 points • 14 August, 2017 07:36 PM

You seem like you might believe in flat Earth theory and might just be an antivaxxer.

bufedad • 18 points • 14 August, 2017 06:44 PM

He was fired for saying women "in general" were inherently inferior at tech based on evolutionary pseudoscience. He's the one doing harassing.

Except, that's absolutely not what he said.

What he said was, women "in general" didn't want to be in tech, they wanted to work with people.

And, to get more women into tech, changing the jobs to include more people oriented tasks would be a big help in making it appealing.

This is important... you should actually read the memo. You wouldn't say things that make it obvious that you didn't read the memo.

paradora • 40 points • 14 August, 2017 06:00 PM

Why don't you try reading the memo? I believe in you!

AloysiusC • 9 points • 14 August, 2017 07:54 PM

1) He didn't say that. Stop lying.

2) It's not harassment.

morerokk • 6 points • 14 August, 2017 09:28 PM

Oh look, another idiot who didn't actually read the memo!

Yuo_cna_Raed_Tihs • 12 points • 14 August, 2017 06:09 PM

There is not a single scientifically incorrect statement he made in that, except for when he was on about castrated boys.

Prove me wrong, but first youll have to read the memo.

BlueDoorFour • 7 points • 14 August, 2017 08:05 PM

iirc, he mentioned castrated boys *once*, apparently in reference to the David Reimer case, to make the point that there is a component to gender identity that's not due to social conditioning. Is there a different part you're referring to?

Yuo_cna_Raed_Tihs • 3 points • 14 August, 2017 08:07 PM

Yeah im talking about that, but that point didnt really make sense and was really anecdotal.

BlueDoorFour • 2 points • 14 August, 2017 08:22 PM

Gotcha. Yeah, it was a bit of a stretch.

Dancing_Anatolia • 1 point • 15 August, 2017 06:00 PM

Yeah, we need to castrate more boys to gather the necessary data.

AloysiusC • 6 points • 14 August, 2017 07:54 PM

People saying something that doesn't make you feel special is *not* harassment.

yellowroseofmyass • 16 points • 14 August, 2017 04:40 PM

Try harder kiddo

supacrusha • 1 point • 15 August, 2017 06:52 AM

Oh no, my coworker posted a memo that says women get emotional to easy, wahahaaaa, I'm being harrassed, better get the media to get all the fucking feminists on my side!

tmone • 1 point • 14 August, 2017 08:43 PM

lol. youre getting your ass destroyed up in here.

[deleted] • -43 points • 14 August, 2017 04:31 PM

Cuck Alert!

SeskaRotan • 52 points • 14 August, 2017 04:48 PM

While I agree with the point you're making, using the word '*cuck*' like that makes you appear obnoxious and uneducated. It makes the reader completely disregard any substance that your point had (*if it did*).

It also makes it easy for others to generalize the rest of us in as just more '*cuck*'-shouting, mouth-breathing, Alex-Jones-watching pube-beards. Personally, I don't want that.

JimmyTwoTwo1 points 14 August, 2017 06:26 PM [recovered]

Shut your cuck mouth. Also did you know the Jejunum is arguably the least appreciated part of the human body? It serves a very important function but it is often overlooked when referring to vital body parts and organs.

tmone • 2 points • 14 August, 2017 08:44 PM

jesus. you are a hoot.

kn0where • -37 points • 14 August, 2017 05:56 PM

Dear Reddit,

Please stop formatting tweets as images.

Thanks in advance,

A reader

[deleted] • 45 points • 14 August, 2017 06:06 PM

Are you saying instead of a screenshot you'd like a direct link to the comment on Twitter?

I'd not like that at all.

SculptedPizza • 25 points • 14 August, 2017 06:15 PM

I agree with you. Fuck twitter. Shitty image viewer and video player. Overall website is slow and choppy when clicking on a link. No thanks

g18suppressed • 2 points • 14 August, 2017 09:40 PM

And also muh hoverzoom

Nave7221 points 14 August, 2017 04:32 PM [recovered]

Lmao this guy obviously didn't read the memo.

Mods please delete this as it embarrasses this sub. Thanks

jaib91 points 14 August, 2017 04:36 PM* [recovered]

The memo was 100% legit.

Maxmidget1 points 14 August, 2017 04:41 PM [recovered]

"Don't mind me I'll just post this memo that states that women are on average less likely to be good at tech jobs and then post it on a message board at work under my work account. It's OK because I've cited sources and formatted it really well. Also my employer is currently under Federal investigation for gender discrimination but I'm sure they'll be cool with it. Also I'll leave the memo up after it's blown up and been shared inside and outside the company."

JilaX • 35 points • 14 August, 2017 05:29 PM

Facts are facts. Can't just ignore science when you don't like the results.

asdttyhfh • 8 points • 14 August, 2017 06:51 PM

The studies didn't prove women aren't in tech and leadership due to biological causes. He's stretching the meaning of the studies to jump to a conclusion. I could find real studies that show gay people are more likely to commit suicide and then make the bad conclusion that being gay is an illness. Just because you use real studies doesn't make your conclusion correct.

[deleted] • 9 points • 14 August, 2017 05:33 PM

What was the most egregious, insulting, and bigoted thing you found in the memo? Please provide a direct quote.

Maxmidget1 points 14 August, 2017 06:14 PM [recovered]

I did not call the memo any of those things.

It directly states that women may be, on average, less predisposed to a successful career in tech. It states that women are more focussed on family than on career and are "neurotic".

Google is under active fucking federal investigation for gender pay gap issues. They cannot have a leaked document stating that women are less qualified than men.

Further, it doesn't matter if it is true that the average women is more or less qualified than the average man for a job in tech. The problem is whether someone would let that assumption affect their opinion of a candidate for a job opening, raise, or promotion.

[deleted] • 15 points • 14 August, 2017 06:24 PM

The problem is whether someone would let that assumption affect their opinion of a candidate for a job opening, raise, or promotion.

You're exactly right. And the memo was, at least in part, discussing how Google is doing exactly that by letting someone's race, sex, or sexual preference be a defining characteristic for getting a job. Google *should* be under investigation if they are not hiring based strictly on merit, qualifications, or ability.

This is precisely what the memo states.

So what's your problem with the memo, exactly? Was anything factually inaccurate, or did it just hurt your feelings?

Maxmidget1 points 14 August, 2017 11:07 PM [recovered]

Did it just hurt your feelings

Find a SJW straw man somewhere outside your echo chamber.

I'm going to explain this again. The Dept. of Labor is investigating Google for gender discrimination. If found guilty, lots of money goes away and makes Google sad. If a Google employee is writing shit like this and it is leaked publicly, Google is more likely to have to pay huge fines.

[deleted] • 8 points • 14 August, 2017 11:19 PM

Good - Damore told the truth. I hope Google goes bankrupt. Justice would be served. Discrimination under any label is dispicable.

Aivias • 1 point • 15 August, 2017 08:35 AM

So how do you suppose Google will go about defending said lawsuit?

Do you think they are gonna stand in court, hold their hands up and admit to willfully breaking federal law?

Or (as is almost 100% likely) will they use the exact same arguments Damore made in their defence?

I find the idea of Google simultaneously defending two different lawsuits by using the arguments that they have to defend against in the other suit

Maxmidget • 1 point • 15 August, 2017 02:17 PM

I would bet that they will argue they pay men and women equally for equal work, as required by law.

scyth3s • 11 points • 14 August, 2017 06:45 PM

It states that women are more focussed on family than on career and are "neurotic".

You're using absolute terms here where the memo used nuance. Women *tend to* be more focused on family, tend to *score higher* on neuroticism. Of course things sound worse when you word it like

Women are neurotic

EricAllonde • 3 points • 15 August, 2017 05:50 AM

You should really not be commenting until you understand the difference between "neurotic" and "neuroticism".

Yuo_cna_Raed_Tihs • 6 points • 14 August, 2017 06:14 PM

The reason he was posting it was because google diversity programs only work based on the assumption that there is a gender gap in stem because of social pressures, so he used science and statistics to suggest otherwise.

The excellent thing about statistics is that they do not apply to the individual. On average, men are more likely to be inferior at emotional expression, but that does not imply that my emotional expressios is inferior to my mom's. What it does imply, however, is that if you took the best emotional expressors in the world, the majority should be female.

Also there was an article a few months ago about why women are inherently better doctors than men, except there was no shitstorm over that.

[deleted] • 4 points • 14 August, 2017 10:16 PM

women are on average less likely to be good at tech

It never said this. It said they're less likely to even try taking it up (out of PREFERENCE, or TASTE, if you will). Meanwhile nurses and teachers are taken up by much more than a large majority of women. No one's complaining that they're aren't enough men in these jobs, I think a lot of men just grow up not wanting to do them. Likewise for women in tech.

I disagree with his choice of saying it's a biological difference, I'd much rather call it a sociological one, but the observation stands true in this, and other situations: If there's 9 men and 1 women for every 10 professional chess players, and if men and women have the same potential for being good as chess, then it's a lot more statistically likely that 9 out of the top 10 chess players (by whatever scale chess uses) will be men.

It's population distribution, not sexism. You're painting everything incorrectly. Please, I urge you to read up more on your issues and become a more well-centered person, rather than an overly-bias one. Bias comes in 2 flavors, aim to be more correct with your information.

TeamRedundancyTeam • -35 points • 14 August, 2017 04:52 PM

That memo had some shit in it that someone who only wants men's rights would not support.

[deleted] • 19 points • 14 August, 2017 05:32 PM

Example? Could you cite that section?

Nave7221 points 14 August, 2017 04:41 PM [recovered]

Lmao this guy obviously didn't read the memo.

Mods please delete this is as it embarrasses the sub. Thanks

jaib91 points 14 August, 2017 04:42 PM* [recovered]

The memo was 100% legit.

[deleted] • 13 points • 14 August, 2017 04:45 PM

Is this an SAT guess-the-sequence question?

Nave7221 points 14 August, 2017 05:29 PM [recovered]

100% legitimately contradicts this post, correct!

Lmao see why people see and treat you like little boys ?

ether_reddit • 5 points • 14 August, 2017 07:05 PM

Some of us aren't boys and still don't see anything offensive in the document.

bufedad • 7 points • 14 August, 2017 05:39 PM

100% legitimately contradicts this post, correct!

Umm... no. Incorrect. Care to explain your logic there?

Nave7221 points 14 August, 2017 05:44 PM [recovered]

Because the memo itself is literally an argument against women being in coding ? This post says Google is teaching them go to HR instead of focusing coding. Memo author used 1 study of Just under 2000 American college aged women to argue that women are in fact less capable of working in the field and should have to go to HR.

Lmao this guy obviously didn't read the memo.

lackofagoodname • 6 points • 14 August, 2017 06:04 PM*

Just no. The memo was against hiring less qualified people solely because they fit some bullshit trivial label(like being a woman).

There's a reason women dominate things like teaching, while men dominate tech. And it's not because of muh patriarchy.

And I'm pretty sure somewhere in the memo was a plea of sorts to actually try and make tech appealing to more women, rather than just hiring them to fill quotas.

Didn't some women that work at google stay home after this blew up because they were uncomfortable going in? That's fucking weak and pathetic, and certainly not helping their side of the argument.

[deleted] • 7 points • 14 August, 2017 05:34 PM

In your opinion, what was the worst thing said in the memo? Please provide a quote, page #, etc.

Nave7221 points 14 August, 2017 05:39 PM [recovered]

Wow so delusional that you think I'm questioning the content of said memo? I'm pointing out that this post contradicts the memo ya fucking idiot.

The person suggesting women stay out of coding is the memo author, not google. The person suggesting and showing that women are right to go to HR, is the memo author.

His source that concludes women are more neurotic is his supporting evidence as to why women coders are stressed.

If you're still lost don't feel bad. There are hundreds of other morons in here to make ya feel better.

[deleted] • 10 points • 14 August, 2017 05:46 PM

The person suggesting women stay out of coding is the memo author, not google.

Where in the memo was that said? Please quote.

The person suggesting and showing that women are right to go to HR, is the memo author.

I am unable to parse this - are you suggesting the James thought the right thing to do for women after reading his scientifically accurate memo was to go to HR and get him fired? Why would James advocate for his own termination?

His source that concludes women are more neurotic is his supporting evidence as to why women coders are stressed.

Could you please quote the section of the memo that makes this claim, and the source provided? I have a feeling you're either intentionally misinterpreting the words in order to manufacture outrage or you have made an honest mistake in your reading.

Nave7221 points 14 August, 2017 05:51 PM [recovered]

Dude if you're seriously asking for the section and source of his for neuroticism then you seriously haven't read the memo.

Pro tip: once you read it and find the citation for the neuroticism claim linked via wikipedia, you'll need to locate a second paper to find the methodology behind the survey.

Lmao this guy obviously didn't read the memo.

[deleted] • 10 points • 14 August, 2017 05:56 PM

Never once has anything resembling your claim emerged from the memo.

You've made the claim, now the burden is on you to prove it.

Link to the memo, cite the page, paragraph, and text, or retract your erroneous claim.

Nave7221 points 14 August, 2017 06:48 PM [recovered]

4th page, bottom section.

Now stop needing your hand held and manup! Lmao I think you can handle it from here :)

[deleted] • 7 points • 14 August, 2017 07:39 PM

4th page, bottom section

If you're talking about the neurotic-ism section, well I must be pretty ignorant because there's nothing in there that looks offensive to me. What's wrong with bringing up the issue of neurotic-ism?

Now stop needing your hand held and manup!

Sorry but you're not going to find any women here who go for that machismo you're waving around.

[deleted] • 6 points • 14 August, 2017 07:43 PM

I see. Which part triggered you?

Was it the part about how bad it is to reduce people to a group identity since people are individuals and should be treated as individuals?

Was it the part that said women on average have more openness as a personality trait?

That woman on average are more agreeable than men?

Or that women on average have lower stress tolerance?

Where on the doll did your daddy touch you? You can tell us, it's okay. We're here to help.

No where in this paper did James state that all women are characterized by these things, but that at a macro level these traits do differ from men - and there is significant overlap in the population as a whole. Please prove any of this false. It is scientifically and psychologically supported nearly ubiquitously.

The memo states we should be treating people as individuals, because anyone can fall anywhere on this scale, and that treating people as part of a group and ignoring any unique characteristics does not achieve the stated goals of 'equality' but rather artificially suppresses or excels people based on immutable traits, which **is** racism/sexism/etc and that's supposed to be the *exact opposite* of what these liberal virtue signalers are trying to achieve.. yet.. here we are.

Gambizzle • -1 points • 15 August, 2017 10:29 AM

Oh FFS get ooooooover it /r/mensrights!!! You are fucking emphasising the stereotype of mens rights activists as being what males who wrongfully think they are being oppressed. Move on to some more positive issues guys, this one's dead already!!!

PS - it's the dude who got fired who had the big fat whinge about women being encouraged to work in IT (remember... he was fired for it!)

Toallpointswest • -23 points • 14 August, 2017 09:59 PM

Downvoted for the kind of misogynist bullshit we don't need. There's no evidence that the code produced by make engineers is inferior to male engineers.

More to the point, try not being an asshole worthy of being reported to HR.

[deleted] • 13 points • 14 August, 2017 11:26 PM

muh mysoggyknee

and nobody is saying women can't make code... we are saying that women who make code shouldn't be glorified... And women shouldn't be hired just cause they are women (cough quotas)

Toallpointswest • -7 points • 14 August, 2017 11:43 PM

That's actually *exactly* what the OP's post is saying. Hence my post.

Women shouldn't be hired just because they're women, and neither should men.

cholocaust • 7 points • 15 August, 2017 01:01 AM

lol noone is hiring coders specifically because they are men

[deleted] • 6 points • 15 August, 2017 01:46 AM

I don't see that quote... you seem slightly illiterate

-I_RAPE_THE_DEAD- • -20 points • 14 August, 2017 09:03 PM

Are you people so fucking deluded that you think **Google** are the ones saying that women are not as capable as men?

[deleted] • 16 points • 14 August, 2017 10:11 PM

That's a massive jump. The message in the tweet is pointing out hypocrisy from the recent firing.

-I_RAPE_THE_DEAD- • -13 points • 14 August, 2017 10:21 PM

There is no hypocrisy on Google's part. They fired someone for making sexist remarks.

[deleted] • 16 points • 14 August, 2017 10:22 PM

They weren't sexist remarks, they were observations of general populations in tech. Feel free to quote the actual remarks if you're interesting in debating them though. I can help clear some things up for you.

-I_RAPE_THE_DEAD- • -9 points • 14 August, 2017 10:53 PM

He claimed that women are less capable than men at programming and tech-based jobs because of fundamental differences between the sexes, and backed up his claims with discredited theories.

<https://www.recode.net/2017/8/11/16127992/google-engineer-memo-research-science-women-biology-tech-james-damore>

Edit:

<https://www.vox.com/new-money/2017/8/10/16118394/google-engineer-memo-stem>

[deleted] • 12 points • 14 August, 2017 11:57 PM

Ok, so let's start with that you're using news sources for information instead of making your own opinions. News sources in general today can be hard to trust, even if you get your information from a wide variety of them about public information, they always put their own narrative into it.

The actual memo can be found here:

<https://assets.documentcloud.org/documents/3914586/Googles-Ideological-Echo-Chamber.pdf>

It's always important to read the source information. News sources, and articles, always spin a story to get more views, more clicks, and more ad revenue. Controversy sells in this business. It's the main reason you can't trust those links you posted.

First off, I'll say those weren't discredited theories. A lot of people have chimed in on youtube to back up his citations in regards to psychology. I personally don't like psychology too much, but he wasn't incorrect when it came to empirical information. In the first interview of James Damore(man who was fired) after the event, Jordan Peterson confirmed a lot of the psych literature he cited was correct and up to date. While Peterson is controversial to some, he is still considered an expert in his field, and has been widely supported by the public despite higher-ups in institutions trying to cut his funding.

Onto the actual memo itself. The idea of biological differences is indeed controversial, but not for the way it was spun. I disagree that biological differences cause what has been observed in the tech industry (more men tend to go into this field than women), personally I believe it to be sociological differences. My disagreement with Damore's opinion here doesn't mean there's any room for discrepancy of what's been observed (again, more men tend to go into tech than women; likewise, more women tend to go into nursing, education, etc. These are observable trends, acknowledging these trends doesn't mean you're saying anyone is more capable than anyone else).

Damore's actual wording:

Note, I'm not saying that all men differ from all women in the following ways or that

these differences are “just.” I’m simply stating that the distribution of preferences and abilities of men and women differ in part due to biological causes and that these differences may explain why we don’t see equal representation of women in tech and leadership.

He has some nice diagrams in his memo explaining what it is he's saying here. He in fact goes into detail to avoid calling the two sexes completely, fundamentally different. He explains it in a rational, statistical manner: there are distributions of each kind of trait across both genders, they both overlap, but some do tend to be more often found in one gender than the other (this goes both ways).

I actually made a post elsewhere in this thread that I'll copypasta as I think it makes good sense.

If there's 9 men and 1 women for every 10 professional chess players, and if men and women have the same potential for being good at chess, then it's a lot more statistically likely that 9 out of the top 10 chess players (by whatever scale chess uses) will be men.

Finally, at no point did he say women were less capable. This is where it's really important to read the actual memo. And watch the guy in some interviews, he seems like a really nice guy. I in no way think he deserved what came to him, but a lot of people had predicted that sort of thing would happen *should you speak out*. The main controversy here, is that he had an opinion that differed from google's policies. Being fired for an opinion, especially one as level-headed and fair as what he posted, in no way warrants a firing.

His goal was to improve google's hiring process, because there's an abundance of talks on the net and in the tech world about the biased hiring process. They want more minorities, they want more women: so they get hired disproportionately. Now this does put google, and other larger firms, in an awkward spot. Doing anything else, at the moment, would bring them under the fire of the media. The media, much like some of the articles you linked, come with massive bias. Why? Same answer: controversy sells. Should they change their 'diversity' practices, then people would complain they've been doing it wrong all along, and the people who support the current 'diversity' practices would complain that they're now being discriminated against. Can you guess which side the media would spin? "You'll never believe google is now openly discriminating against its employees! It's officially abandoned its diversity requirements!". Even if google had the most level-headed, considerate, and polite, clever answer to their hiring process's downsides, the media would chew them up without even listening to what they have to say. They would paint them as sexists, racists, and they'd never show the source material. Because controversy sells. Likewise, this is what's happening to Damore: he's not a sexist, or a bigot. Watch any interview that the guy has gotten. Tons of reporters keep asking him damning questions with statements that he knows are blatant lies, all to his face. They only care about the ad revenue, not the material.

-I_RAPE_THE_DEAD- • -2 points • 15 August, 2017 01:01 AM

I read the memo, and I was offering the news sources to YOU so you can see that his information is not reliable.

I am not going to read your breakdown of his nonsense, because I have had enough ridiculousness for the next while.

A lot of people have chimed in on youtube

News sources are totally off-limits, but YouTube? There's the centre of free thought and rational discourse, right there.

[deleted] • 2 points • 15 August, 2017 11:30 AM*

I'm not convinced you read the whole memo. And you're right to an extent about youtube, again I really don't care for psychology, so it all may as well be opinions to me.

But are you denying the fact that there's more men in tech than women? So let me ask you then, do you think there's some unbalanced horde of women who are unemployed in tech? I'd imagine it's split proportionally between the genders.

As for those news sources, they are opinion pieces. The facts involved here represent the desire for an open discussion about the hiring processes, and a suggestion that seems legitimate based on someone's viewpoint.

Are you saying we should ban open discussion and lock people away who oppose popular opinions? What happened to the guy was that he had an opinion, regardless of how 'right' or 'wrong' it was that is clearly supported by a large number of people, why does this not deserve to be heard? Why should there not be open discussion about whether the idea is even a good one or not? They literally just fired him. Regardless of their liberal-minded policies, they have a completely authoritarian grasp on their employees and how they discuss opinions. That is not liberal, that's dictatorial.

I would argue that anyone calling such a sweet kid a sexist is in fact a sexist themselves.

-I_RAPE_THE_DEAD- • 1 point • 15 August, 2017 05:40 PM

I really don't care for psychology, so it all may as well be opinions to me.

This is absolutely ridiculous. You're ignoring an entire field of science for what reason? Psychology is not physics, but it sure as hell isn't nothing but raw opinion.

But are you denying the fact that there's more men in tech than women?

What are you talking about? Why does everyone I discuss this issue with find it necessary to jump to conclusions?

What I am denying is the claims made in the memo that state that there is no point in seeking out women during the hiring process because we should be hiring based purely on merit, and the structure and function of the female brain is such as to make women less able to perform tasks relating to systemizing, such as math and programming. The memo states that we should only expect that there be less women in tech because women are less capable and less interested in these fields due to fundamental differences in the way their brains function from men's.

If you had read the sources cited in the articles I provided, and read the criticisms of Baron-Cohen's study, you would know that the claims made are based on extremely faulty research (like the work by Baron-Cohen, as described in my first link)

As for those news sources, they are opinion pieces

Yes, they are opinion pieces. They are written by experts who have studied the

brain differences and perceived differences between the sexes for years, as opposed to a software engineer who uncritically quoted flawed and discredited studies.

Before you ask, no, I am not denying that the female brain and the male brain operate differently. This may very well be one of the reasons why transgenderism and homosexuality exist.

Are you saying we should ban open discussion and lock people away who oppose popular opinions?

Google is a **PRIVATE** organization. I am a liberal, which means I believe in liberal rights such as the right of an individual to sign an employment contract which would limit his or her ability to speak her mind, based on the contents of the contract. Google has specific rules about how a person may or may not conduct themselves while on company time, and those rules were violated when a major disruption was caused by the backwards thinking of a sexist. He claims to be a critical thinker, but he misrepresented liberalism, conservatism, human nature, the environment at Google, and the abilities of women. He backed up his claims with, again, discredited information.

He's like an anti-vaxxer pointing to one defunct study and ignoring the reams of data that contradicts that poorly-done study.

No, I am not suggesting we lock away those who disagree, I am suggesting we stop siding with the jerk who was fired for presenting ill-informed, sexist opinions.

This is NOT a free speech issue, no matter how you slice it. Freedom of speech laws protect your right to speak without persecution or prosecution from the state. Just like how your right to move freely through your country does not give you the right to trespass on private property, your right to freedom of speech does not prevent people from denying you a platform on which to voice your opinions, nor does it prevent them from telling you to STFU.

I would argue that anyone calling such a sweet kid a sexist is in fact a sexist themselves.

Then you don't know what sexism is, and you don't understand that bigotry in all of its forms exists as a result of ignorance, not necessarily hatred. He may very well be sweet, but he is dead wrong and his words have caused significant problems for his employer. Now he, and people like you, think he is being oppressed.

Edit: The reason why Google is purposely seeking out women in its hiring process is precisely because hiring in tech (and most fields) is not done on merit, and that is one reason why there are less women in tech. They are correcting for a mistake.

[deleted] • 2 points • 15 August, 2017 09:58 PM

From your own sources:

<http://www.aauw.org/files/2013/02/Why-So-Few-Women-in-Science-Technology-Engineering-and-Mathematics.pdf>

If you scroll down to page 23 of that document, you'll find they have a graph of sciences, enrollments numbers of men vs. women. There is no psychology

major listed here, so it's not that I'm the only one who thinks this way.

You say it's not raw opinion but you disregarded Baron-Cohen so readily. I don't know anything about the guy, or anyone with an opposing opinion. If one is shit, they're probably all shit. If you can take one person's work and so readily toss it aside as trash, what's to stop me from doing the same to any other psychologists work? Clearly this field is wrought with opinion.

Getting women into stem fields is a nice notion, it's certainly a good goal. But at what point does the narrative change from 'more women in stem fields would be good' to 'men being the majority in stem fields is bad'. I feel like there's a push for a shift against men, rather than for women, once you get towards the kind of workplace that google is offering. Otherwise the shift would be pro-men, and pro-women, which would be great. What makes me say this? A man at google got fired for sharing an opinion. They thought it was a bad idea but offered no discussion whatsoever, no effort from higher up to try to work with him, improve his idea, or anything of the sort. The second they got wind of him and his wrongthink, they just fired him. So is it really that much of a stretch? If a woman had written this I bet she'd still be in the company.

And to your disregard for facts, he said nothing about not seeking women out. I think he wanted to comment on the over-aggressive tactics they were using to seek them out. And what's wrong with hiring people purely based on merit, or how likeable they are to their potential boss? I understand there are discrimination laws that can be enacted should anyone find out someone only hires 6ft white males who bike to work and has blonde hair blue eyes, sure, but this generally doesn't happen to begin with. Ctrl + f for brain, and structure come up with nothing in that memo. He said nothing about brain structure.

Directly from the first source of one of those articles (the aaup link above):

Well-documented gender differences exist in the value that women and men place on doing work that contributes to society, with women more likely than men to prefer work with a clear social purpose (Jozefowicz et al., 1993; Konrad et al., 2000; Margolis et al., 2002; Lubinski & Benbow, 2006; Eccles, 2006). The source of this gender difference is a subject of debate: Some claim that the difference is innate, while others claim that it is a result of gender socialization.

This is exactly what Damore said, although he claimed a more definite cause, people are certainly entitled to their positions. This is what you're calling sexist in our discussion, this is what you're saying makes someone an absolute bigot.

Looking more through this article,

Plant et al. (2009) reported an increase in middle school girls' interest in engineering after the girls were exposed to a 20-minute narrative delivered by a computer-generated female agent describing the lives of female engineers and the benefits of engineering careers. The narrative included positive statements about students' abilities to meet the demands of engineering careers and counteracted stereotypes of engineering as an antisocial, unusual career for women while emphasizing the people-

oriented and socially beneficial aspects of engineering. Another ongoing study and outreach project is focusing on educating high-achieving, mostly minority, high school girls about what scientists and engineers actually do and how they contribute to society. Although the girls knew almost nothing about engineering at the start of the study, of the 66 percent of girls still participating after two years, 80 percent were seriously considering a career in engineering (Eisenhart, 2008). The Engineer Your Life website (www.engineeryourlife.com), a project of the WGBH Educational Foundation and the National Academy of Engineering, has also been shown to increase high school girls' interest in pursuing engineering as a career. In a survey by Paulsen and Bransfield (2009), 88 percent of 631 girls said that the website made them more interested in engineering as a career, and 76 percent said that it inspired them to take an engineering course in college.

There's a lot here about the positives of showing them engineering lifestyles, but nothing (yet, see below) about the negatives, or what was supposedly shown by Damore.

Now for:

In the study of STEM professionals in the private sector described earlier, Hewlett et al. (2008) found that many women appear to encounter a series of challenges at midcareer that contribute to their leaving careers in STEM industries. Women cited feelings of isolation, an unsupportive work environment, extreme work schedules, and unclear rules about advancement and success as major factors in their decision to leave. Although women and men in industry and business leave STEM careers at significantly different rates, the situation in academia is somewhat more nuanced. In a recent study on attrition among STEM faculty, Xu (2008) showed that female and male faculty leave at similar rates; however, women are more likely than men to consider changing jobs within academia. Women's higher turnover intention in academia (which is the best predictor of actual turnover) is mainly due to dissatisfaction with departmental culture, advancement opportunities, faculty leadership, and research support. Goulden et al. (2009) compared men and women in the sciences who are married with children and found that the women were 35 percent less likely to enter a tenure-track position after receiving a doctorate.

Which is nice and all, that feelings are somewhat quantitatively comparable (again, psychology = trash). But what this completely ignores is the perspectives of men. The perspectives of women alone is worthless, where are the opinions and reasons for men leaving, or disliking, or anything else regarding academia? If you have nothing to compare to all this information on women, then this whole article just becomes massive bias. What is there to compare it to? What if men are facing all of the exact same trouble? If they are, it goes unheard of here.

Not to mention, there's absolutely no reporting (as if more of this self-reporting

bullshit needed) on the source of these feelings. No one says 'that one guy at google who put out an opinionated memo got me discouraged from my job in academia'. They treated the situation with massive overkill that shows a whole fuck-ton of bias towards men in general. It's not just a pro-women opinion over there, that is most definitely worth criticism.

A private organization, yes, but he works there. So he has every right to try to improve the internal processes or get his opinions double-checked. Hell, I would call that a great employee. He seemed rather obligated to help.

Firing him though? Maybe that's the way to treat children, but these are adults. Why the need for such childishness? Also, why the need for such cold, uncaring behavior towards someone for what they believe is an altruistic motive? They say they aim for diversity and he brought in the idea of diversity of thought. In his firing, he proved them exceptional hypocrites. Diversity of thoughts and opinions makes a successful group, throwing it away is as stupid as it is insulting to everyone who agreed with the man. What kind of damage have they done to themselves? People already refused to attend their company-wide diversity meeting over fearing for their own jobs. Again, these are adults, there's no need for such childishness.

And whether or not he's sexist, he's certainly not actively sexist. He's not trying to be sexist. There's a whole ton of people who don't think he's sexist. But there's also a few who are labeling him as such and pushing it much harder than it has to be. If your opinion is somehow correct, is being passively sexist without aiming for that goal so corrupt? He still seems rather innocent regardless of whatever you can say about him.

I find it hard to simply judge someone's actions without judging their motivation. Of course a lot of people that hold the opinion that this is sexist would never put themselves in his sexist shoes, leading to a massive lack of empathy and understanding. They would downright refuse to think in his perspective because they demonize it so hard. Myself, I would never block such ideas because it's naive and foolish. The road to greater thought and a greater society is through understanding, no doubt.