

James Damore and his Google Memo on Diversity (complete).mp3

[00:00:01] Hello. So.

[00:00:03] Some of you may have heard about the leaked Google memo that has been circulating viral around the internet for the last couple of days. That was written by James Damore who was fired for it last night and. Calling of his reached out to me and put us together and so I'm going to talk to James today about exactly what happened and why and perhaps what should be done about it. So. All. So that's what we're going to do in the interview I had with him which finished at about 3 o'clock on Tuesday August 8th follows immediately after this introduction. Hi everybody I'm speaking today with James Moore and an unidentified Google employee who wishes to remain anonymous on.

[00:01:00] Reasons that I think are obvious. And James last week put his hand in the blender by circulating an internal memo on that I would say it has become somewhat empty. So James let's start with let's start with a bit of discussion about you to tell us who you are about your background and about what you were doing at Google right.

[00:01:22] Yes so I was actually just you know I'm really interested in science and psychology and stuff.

[00:01:30] And then I really like puzzles and that's how I got into Google actually I did when they're going in competitions. They just threw me out of that. And so I google I was mostly working on a search and image videos and working on.

[00:01:47] It. So what's your educational background.

[00:01:52] Yes.

[00:01:54] I just did a random science and math in undergrad and I ended up with a degree I didn't really know what I was going to do. So I I started doing research at MIT and then I went to

systems biology at Harvard. I initially wanted to work with Martin Kodak is really great an evolution. And game theory but then I started working on other things.

[00:02:21] So tell us a bit about systems biology. What do you what kind of research are you doing lucky. Yes the system's biology has many different meanings but.

[00:02:33] It's definitely just mathematical biology. And.

[00:02:39] I guess seeing biological systems as a whole rather than just individual molecules. And so I like looking at populations. And so my interest in evolution.

[00:02:52] So why did that viable candidate say. I think they just saw a smart guy that.

[00:03:02] Could code turnout for the next three years. Is that correct. But also has an intern before that.

[00:03:09] So about four years total.

[00:03:11] So how would you say you performed as an employee. You don't one people being happy with you are you getting together.

[00:03:19] I got promoted twice. My last review was the highest possible Tipper which is the top 2 percent though I definitely wasn't based on performance that they fire.

[00:03:33] Have you enjoyed working experience.

[00:03:37] Yeah. I love Google and that's barbel part. Like I've always been the biggest Google and play all like I've never had an iPhone. I've always tried to convince my friends to use Android and all these different things.

[00:03:53] Yeah I mean this just puts a sour taste in my mouth.

[00:03:58] So you've got a good educational background you read things that people would be interested in. You're a good coder. You've worked with them for a number of years and done an excellent job. You're pretty good. That's basically the background. Yeah. OK. Now last week you wrote a memo which has attracted a tremendous amount of attention and the you. You made a number of claims and the claims were and please correct me if I got this from non-surprise.

[00:04:27] It was probably you were attempting to describe reasons why there might be a lack of gender parity exist within the for example with me into engineering more broadly and also in patients.

[00:04:42] And yet you laid out a very elaborate document and I reviewed it. And as far as I can tell your opinions are well-supported by the relevant psychological science and I think what all do is a description of this video when I link it is are the references so that people can decide for themselves. I want to put up with age about gender differences in general but I'll try to get the highlights for this particular document.

[00:05:09] So why did you do this.

[00:05:14] Yes. About a month and a half ago I went to one of our diversity summits all unrecorded and supersecret and they told me a lot of things that.

[00:05:28] I thought just were not right. They went unrecorded and supersecret Well I mean they were telling us about a lot of these potentially illegal practices that they've been doing to try to increase diversity. And what kind of practices well basically treating people differently based on what their race.

[00:05:53] Or color are racism basically.

[00:05:57] I see. And so and it was Ultra-Secret nonrecourse and in what manner.

[00:06:03] Yes. Most meetings at Google are recorded anyone like Google can watch it. We're trying to be really open about everything except for this. You know they don't want any paper trail for any of these things. OK keep watching because I think it's illegal and I mean as some of

the internal polls showed there were a large percent of people that agreed with me on that document. And so if everyone got to see this stuff.

[00:06:33] Then you know they'll really bring up some criticism.

[00:06:38] You know a large number of people in Google in a very large number of well-informed biological scientists. So I mean I was quite struck by your argument given that no it would have been a decent argument for a well-informed psychologist research psychologist.

[00:06:56] Right. But it was somewhat of an outsider. But you've got to you've got the highlights accurate as far as I'm concerned so. OK so you went to this diversity meeting and you weren't happy with the sorts of things that you were being told and with the practices. Is that correct.

[00:07:12] Yeah.

[00:07:13] And what Rentoul was it.

[00:07:19] I mean there's a lot of ways in which they pressure people to increase the diversity of their team. And you know there's no way to do that besides. Actually choosing someone based on their race or gender.

[00:07:34] I don't know.

[00:07:38] I mean more women or under represented racial minorities because you know can I jump in yeah.

[00:07:48] I would hesitate to say that that's 100 percent true across a hundred percent price. So the organization that I'm in I have not personally seen anything that I would deem crossed the line. You know I personally believe that there are a good amount of synergies to be found if you can combine you know slightly different ideologies into a room. And that is the thesis that some groups are working towards. And obviously there's going to be a distribution of how people follow the rules. And you know it's unfortunate to hear that it's you know it couldn't be that some people fall to the wrong side of that distribution.

[00:08:32] But that certainly wouldn't it would not apply to everybody but it certainly it's certainly also distressing to hear that there is acceptance of the idea that diversity can be mapped on race and gender especially with regards to performance because there there's no evidence for that whatsoever. So case if you went to this and then you decided to write this document. How long had you been working on it before he released it.

[00:08:59] Yes. I was doing it like throughout my free time. I and I just wanted to clarify my thoughts on this and I really just wanted to be proven wrong because you know if what I was saying was right then something bad is happening. And so.

[00:09:15] Yes about a month ago I submitted feedback to that program and you know I saw that people looked at it but no one actually said anything.

[00:09:25] And I basically said what I said in the in the document and then I link to the document itself.

[00:09:34] And so I actually publish this about a month ago and it was only after I got viral and then read the news the Google started airing.

[00:09:46] So how did it go viral. You know how was the yes.

[00:09:53] I. There was a group at Google called skeptics and so I was like OK maybe they'll be able to prove me wrong in some way.

[00:10:01] Like they're skeptical about things right now I guess. And so I sent them a message like OK what do you think about this. Is Google in some sort of echo chamber or am I in an echo chamber. And. Then it just explodes after that and they are internal. Yes. It's just spread through out all of them will do.

[00:10:27] And you know what the skeptics group has started to spread it around yeah.

[00:10:34] And then there are a lot of upper management that you know specifically call that out and start saying how harmful it is and how it's unacceptable this sort of viewpoint is not allowed at Google.

[00:10:49] Yeah. What's your point exactly. The idea that there were differences between men and women that actually might play a role in in in in you know in the corporate world that that's not in yeah it seems and you know understandably it is this these issues are tricky morally and politically. But this thing that was disturbing to me about watching the response to you is that as far as I can tell there isn't anything that you said in that paper. First of all that is in fact biased in a manner that should open you up to the sorts of charges that might be opened up against you or that violates the scientific literature as it currently stands. So both of those are rather distressing.

[00:11:35] Yeah. And there's a lot of misrepresentation by upper management just to silence me I think.

[00:11:43] Yes and why is it that you think like white lies that Google couldn't have actually. You think that Google couldn't have promoted having an intelligent discussion about this instead of. Well first of all releasing what I read of Daniel Brown's response to it which I thought was absolutely appalling and appalling.

[00:12:00] And then they fired you which seems to be like really bad PR move. But more importantly doesn't actually deal with the issues at hand. You know they're basically saying something like well what was the rationale for firing you exactly what was the excuse that was given.

[00:12:15] So the official case was that I was perpetuating gender stereotypes that you were perpetuating gender stereotypes.

[00:12:23] And did they say anything else about your performance or about anything else that you'd done.

[00:12:28] No. That was the only reason. Who fired you.

[00:12:35] It was my H.R. representative and my director K and you do you have any idea on whose orders they were acting or if this was something that they conjured up themselves or I I'm sure it probably went from higher up than the is.

[00:12:56] I mean this is a huge PR move. So they would need approval from. Right. Ira great.

[00:13:03] I think the CEO CEO actually made some comments about the issue today which will probably cut into this video as we did so. Yeah. OK. All right so the first question is how are you doing.

[00:13:20] I'm doing OK.

[00:13:22] There's a lot of messages that I'm trying to sort through and just trying to figure out what I should do now.

[00:13:30] Yeah you've been given this interesting job offers as far as I can tell.

[00:13:34] Yeah. I've done a surprising amount as support.

[00:13:38] Yeah. Well I suspect I'm shocked. I'm virtually certain that you have a majority viewpoint is just that the people who hold the alternative perspective which are the radical social constructionist types insist that everything is a consequence of socialization. They're a little bit more organized politically but they're clearly wrong scientific when they're wrong. Actually the wrong ethically for now. So. So you probably have more support than you say and it would be very interesting to see how that turns out. So so what do you think about having greatness or meaning now in your life is going to be turned upside down and for quite a while I suspect. I mean so you get yourself out of line doing this. So what do you think about that.

[00:14:27] It definitely sucks. But I at least I was proven right.

[00:14:33] You know what do you mean by group right well just that the whole culture just tries to silence any dissenting view.

[00:14:45] And that we really need some more objective way of looking at these things.

[00:14:52] Well I felt the same way with the university drawn and decided to go in depth to shut me down after I made my day. So I thought well that just proves my point. I mean I made a video saying well I don't like the climate that's developing and it's making it very difficult to have conversations about certain things and your example is even more egregious I think because you know I always object to a piece of legislation that in principle would have been a benefit to an identifiable group but say a transgender group I don't believe it is of any benefit to them but you could make a case that it was. But you or you did as far as I can tell is review of the borders no literature and literature on individual differences relating to men and women and other groups. There's actually not very much of opinion in your piece at all. So what that says is that it is not possible to actually have a discussion about the scientific literature on these issues without putting yourself at risk. That's a hell of a thing for an engineer because the engineer isn't really relying on the facts as far as I can tell and one of the things I like about engineers is that they tend to stick very closely to the facts that they're not a very political group.

[00:16:09] It's you know generally speaking they're much the tactical yet. I. Don't know how they can expect to silence so many.

[00:16:20] Engineers and intelligent people and just deny science like this.

[00:16:26] Yeah well the question is what are your supporters within the hill going to do because you know I would say you're a great word again because you you showed what happened.

[00:16:38] You showed exactly what happens if you have announced I don't know what you'd call it curiosity and courage I suppose but but mostly curiosity to lay out what you think. For discussion we need to open this conversation. You said that you know you weren't jumping up and down and insisting you were right. You were trying to lay out what you understood from doing a bit of reading and ends and make the case that the facts the facts about the differences between men and women in employment choice and payment and all that aren't being discussed and they're not being discussed. I mean we know for example in our book The citation in description has been very difficult for the Swedes for example to flatten out the gender distribution for engineers in Sweden and in the Scandinavian countries in general despite their advanced social engineering let's call it and they can get male nurses.

[00:17:40] You know I think it's four or five nurses in Scandinavia if I remember correctly or the reverse number or our engineers or male and you know that seems to be associated with this

quite well-founded scientific observation that women tilt towards interesting people and men tilt towards interesting things and that's associated with testosterone exposure in utero. This is science you know and I think anybody being an ideological Trump because most of the people I would say that most of the people who are publishing this would have been even happier had it turned out the other way you know the findings actually run contrary to their biases because academia is generally full of people whose biases are less and now and then you know scientific findings emerge to dispute an ideological proposition. That's certainly the case with the role of biology versus society in establishing gender differences so the science is very credible. It doesn't mean it's completely beyond dispute but that's not the point either because your survey was actually a pretty decent survey of the current state of affairs with regards to individual differences. That doesn't mean it's right. So OK so what what are you what are your what does your family think about all this.

[00:19:06] Yeah they definitely support me but they don't really know what I should do from here. They they don't want me to you know just go to a ton of news corporations and do all these areas and stuff. And because they just point out whatever I say towards their agenda. It's it's not really clear what I should be doing.

[00:19:26] You know there's certainly no shortage of people that want to talk to you. I mean I've been contacted by four or five journalists who would like to speak with you so we can talk about don't ask. I can let you know they are but.

[00:19:39] Yeah. Well you've got to you've got a conundrum on your hands. No. I mean you're you're a you're a very straightforward person and you're obviously not granting any x at least not in any way.

[00:19:55] So my suspicions are that talking to the right people could be of substantial use to you. But I guess it also depends on what it is that you want me. And that's something we can talk about. Now you you you to a lump in cages of seven people and a very large organization. Interestingly enough just on the heels of Google and U-joints announcement devoted to free speech restrictions on on YouTube and the incorporation of NGOs into that censorship process so it's been quite a week for Google I would say. So you've opened up this can of worms. What is it. So imagine if you're looking six months down the road and say and things happened that were good because of what you did.

[00:20:42] What is it that you would like to have happen.

[00:20:46] At the very least I want because I do still care about Google. I want some conversation to be had and for the ideologues to not just have their way but I still don't have a clear vision on how exactly this will happen. Yeah how how this can spread farther than just Google.

[00:21:11] Well it may be useful for just Google that's for sure.

[00:21:15] You know I mean I would say my experiences with the press is that the first thing that happens that will happen is that you'll get jumped on by people who call you the sorts of epithets that would be appropriate if you were a bad guy and you should just shut up and go away. That's already happened. But I think you're going to get it out real quick because I went through your your writings which are not history by the way and are certainly not in diversities three way writing some. And I can't see anything there that identifies you as the sort of person that can be easily and permanently tarred with a hateful epithet. But you know it's logical for the public let's say including the media to jump on someone like you when they blow a whistle because the first thing that you might presume if someone's causing trouble is that there's something wrong with them. Then you have to sort of beat them a while with the idea that there's something wrong with them to see what happens. And so the first thing is you have to withstand that. But there don't seem to be any smoking pistols in your background. So for example you heard an ideal Google employee well that protects you a lot and you don't have a history of this of any sort of troublemaking and you have a solid educational background and you're clearly a reasonable person. And so the first thing is it's just to steal yourself to get through that and then out.

[00:22:44] And I think if you do talk to media organizations and especially if you talk to them the way that you're talking to me which is extraordinarily calm and composed then you're going to reveal yourself even more as a reasonable person and the press overall will start to shift behind you. And I think the reason for that is one thing you got to remember about the press is that when push comes to shove they're actually rather in favor of free speech. Yeah and given that without it they would be dead. So I don't think like I don't think that you have to worry about being exploited and twisted by media sources. I actually think that it might be to your advantage to talk to people you know you can figure out who those people are. But you're just not the kind of person that can be easily transformed into a villain. And the more that you can demonstrate that the better it might be you know for a cause that you're engaged in but also for yourself.

[00:23:54] So what. So how are you feeling about this emotionally. You must be in a bit of a state of shock.

[00:24:01] I would say that it's been a stressful week.

[00:24:05] Herscher but I am not feeling too negative about it.

[00:24:14] I it hasn't fully hit me I don't think.

[00:24:17] Yeah well I won't. Because God only knows what's going to happen to you in the next few weeks and it's going to be a real rollercoaster. And you know the other thing that you might consider is that it's possible that this will turn out extraordinarily positive for you. You know there's going to be it's going to be a rough ride but to the degree that you are accurate in your observations then you know it's not that easy to. It's not that easy for the opponents of truth to have a battle with truth. It's not about being real you know. Let's go over some of the things that he said and so that we can discuss. Yes sir. Right so I'm going to take a look here. So you started with a pretty good solid statement I would say. Google's political bias because he equated the freedom from health with psychological safety put shaving into silence is the antithesis of cycling safe. Well that seems even more relevant now usage with the science has created an ideological echo chamber where some ideas are too sacred to be honestly discussed. Well you can check that one off too. Right right right. That certainly seems to indicate that was the case the lack of discussion for just the most extreme northern tier and elements of this ideology some of the extreme strangeness all disparities in representation or oppression. That's a good one right. That's a very. Very very simple minded. And then the authoritarian element you defined as the idea we should discriminate to correct for this oppression.

[00:25:52] And then you make a claim just difference distributions of traits between men and women may in part explain why we only have 50 percent representation of women in tech and leadership discrimination to reach equal representation is unfair and divisive and bad for business. OK so that's your thesis and then you go along and try to justify it. So the first thing you do is talk about left wing versus right wing biases. And I should point out that you don't concentrate on the left biases or on the right as if you're completely evenhanded with regards to laying out the pros and cons. So the last passion for the week disparities are really injustices. Humans are inherently offer that change is good slash unstable open and idealistic. Fair enough man. Dead on with regards to the relevant psychological literature. Where are we seeing that political correctness is motivated by agreeableness and that liberalism is fundamentally predated by openness and the right biases respect for authority. Disparities are natural and just humans are inherently competitive. Change is dangerous. Stable. That would be high conscientiousness low openness and they're closed rather than open and pragmatic rather than idealist. Yeah well I don't think any reasonable person could read that column and say that you were coming down hard on the side of either part of the political spectrum.

[00:27:18] Dr. Peterson can I jump in with a question. It appears from my interactions with many people that they are projecting words that were not written onto the paper. And would you be able to elaborate on the schemas that people develop and how they classify information in their minds. Because this is very much a stereotype form I would think is kind of just grouping a bunch of disparate but semi related people or things together and then projecting an idea that may or may not pertain to that.

[00:27:55] Well it's it's a low resolution thought issue. I mean what happened to James is that he you know he he he put up his hand and said wait a second I don't agree with the diversity of theology. And he was immediately classified essentially as a misogynist bigot. And that's the simplest thing to do. Right.

[00:28:15] Because misogynists and bigots will hold viewpoints that are anti-female and racist. And so it's a lot easier just to paint someone with a broad brush especially if they're violating the tenets of your implicit temperament. Let's say that you need to dive into the details where real thought occurs and I think one of the sins that James committed was that he actually dared to make this about details rather than about vague hand-waving ideology. That's very annoying to people who don't want to think in order to analyze his claims.

[00:28:54] You'd have to go through. Well let's say 20 or 30 scientific papers and actually understand what they need. And that's very annoying especially if you're pursuing an agenda. So OK so then you say neither side is 100 percent correct and both viewpoints are necessary for a functioning society or in this case company. Yeah well I think the data is solid there. I mean our research has indicated that open people who are primarily liberals start companies and the more people the conservatives the traditionalists are good at running. They're better at getting managers and administrators and that's associated with high conscientiousness So you've got it right there a company doing far to the right now too slow to react or hire love her and untrusting and the company to part of the last will be will just diversify its interests already trust its employees and managers and change perhaps too rapidly. Yeah great point. Perfect. Nicely balanced as far as I can tell all only facts and reasons can shed light on these fires. But when it comes to diversity and inclusion Google has left biases created in a politically correct monoculture that maintains its holds by shaming dissenters into silence. Well that certainly seems to be the case.

[00:30:07] OK this site has rules and checks against encroaching extremists and that's where policies aren't. I Google who regularly told that implicit unconscious and explicit Barss are holding women back in tech leadership. Of course men and women experience bias and workplace differently than we should be cognizant of. But it's far from the whole story. On average men and women are biologically different in many ways. These are just socially

constructed because they're universal across cultures clear by logical and causes linked to prenatal testosterone biological males joust birth and race as females often still identify and act like males. The underlying traits are highly heritable and they are exactly what we would predict from an evolutionary psychology perspective. No I'm not saying that all men differ from women in all ways or that these differences are just. And then you put in a nice chart indicating that the amount of overlap between men and women per trait is greater than the amount of difference. Wrong in so you state that directly boxtops perfect that's a very good way of defending your thesis and also of not overstating the case then you do a nice job of also graphically indicating what happens if the distribution is ignored and people are just treated as if they're human color representatives of a given group which is kind of what they've done with the people who are predicating the push for diversity on gender and race are assuming right which is really so funny because it's really a biologically essentialist organ much much greater than that.

[00:31:40] Then the argument that you're making which is that men and women and the members of different races are so different that in order for a full diversity of viewpoint to be achieved you have to pull in people by race and gender which which you implicitly states that the differences are so great that the distributions don't overlap. Yeah. You couldn't make it more racist and misjudging this statement than that. And it's also technically wrong because men and women are more alike than they are different. Maybe if you summed up all the differences you can absolutely differentiate between you know in all likelihood you're going but some of those differences are clearly irrelevant to the workplace. OK then you go through the personality difference literature and you're exactly right on now I see that the CEO took you to task for using the word neuroticism. However that is the technical term in the personality literature and there are historical reasons for that. A better word might be negative emotion but it's clearly the case that women are higher negative emotion than men and that means that they are on average less tolerant of uncertainty and stress they suffer more psychologically or for equivalent levels of uncertainty. Stress is also why cross-culturally women have more depressive disorders and anxiety. And the research on that is rock solid rock solid. Men have their own problems right. They're more likely to be anti-social they're much more likely to be in prison. They're more likely to have learning disabilities. So it's stating that there are differences in the rates and certain kinds of psychopathic Oleg's doesn't put any either gender into a position of relative in theory or so.

[00:33:24] And then you quote research that suggests that greater nation level gender equality leads to psychological similarity dissimilarity in men and women's personality traits. Absolutely. That's one of the Scandinavian studies indicate there's been a number of there are very large studies. So you got that right.

[00:33:43] What what does what the researchers demonstrated was that as top come as countries move to flatten out the socioeconomic playing field and remove discrimination the differences between men and women are many of the differences between men and women maximize instead of minimizing and in Scandinavia you really see maximization of the difference in men and women with regards to interesting people versus interest in St. A major major issue men's hard drive for status. Yeah. Well we know that women are high Pergamos and that they choose men on the basis of their socioeconomic status. Right. Well documented in cross-culturally. And also just rational because women have to make themselves dependent when they are pregnant and when they have the answer that makes perfect sense for them to seek out the most confident person they can manage the most competent and generous person they can manage in order to help them bear the burden. So so no no no. Still there at least. No you're not diverting from the central tenets of evolutionary psychology and biology. People will say that is fine. But you know what. Conjuring this out of thin air. There's a nice solid scientific literature behind so. And you know it's also very interesting to look at the U.S. labor stance on gender differences in occupations you know because it's so funny to watch the radical feminists only go after the high status occupations like a hundred percent of bricklayers are men.

[00:35:26] We don't hear not being being complained about. And of course men occupy most of the outside jobs. They move more and they will get more dangerous jobs as well. So so these are all factors that are relevant but completely undiscussed as far as I can tell by the sort of the ideological types that would be going after you.

[00:35:47] So women are on average more co-operative. Yes specially with members of their in-group whether they're more cooperative members of their own group is a different story. Right because agreeable people are in-group oriented and very hard on no group numbers which I think is partly why the PC types are so hard on their enemies because you know them as predators predators on instance essentially do something with women on average are more prone to anxiety. Yes that's true. Women on average look for more work life balance. That seems to be the case. I don't know if the literature on that is. You know but it's certainly the case that law firms for example how the hell they're keeping their women and in partnership positions because most of them don't want to work the 60 hour work week 60 to 80 hour work weeks that are necessary to performance out that extremely high level so Dr. Petersen for for anybody who might be new listening in.

[00:36:48] You mentioned that a lot of women might not be you know interested in working those you know 60 to 80 hour work weeks.

[00:36:56] Do you think it makes sense to expand upon that just a little bit. I know you talked to you occurred to me but you've also mentioned the thing about why would anybody want to do that no matter what age gender is.

[00:37:07] We've got to get this right here. The mystery isn't why. There are a bunch of people who are low status because almost everyone is low status comparatively speaking. Right. Men and women like it's a small minority of people who are high status on any damage and they tend to be hyper successful and they tend to be men. So you see this in scientific publishing for example so the median professor's male publishes as much as the median processor female. But the vast majority of the high shoot people are males and that seems to be because there are a small percentage of males who are very stout who seek very focused very energetic and very much prone to put their careers first. And part of the theory for why that is is that some men are that that the the evolutionary sexual tradeoff for men with regards to high status is much higher than it is for women.

[00:38:06] So there's good documentation and I can find these references to that. The number of sexual partners or opportunities that a man has in previous years tightly associated with socioeconomic status whereas the number of partners or opportunities for art that a woman has is negative correlated with her status.

[00:38:26] And that might be partly because high status women who are looking for either even higher status men priced themselves out of the mating market. And there's is actually pretty good documentation of that as well. So. So you're fine you're fine with all that the harm of being piousness to achieve a more equal gender race representation. Google has created several discriminatory practices programs measuring in classes only for people with a certain gender or race or a high priority in special treatment for Diversity Candidates. Higher Ground is that we can effectively lower the bar for Diversity Candidates by decreasing the false negative rate. Yeah that's a big problem. Either have standards or you don't. The problem is that if the standards produce a non equitable outcome then what happens is people criticize the standards and that would be fine if the standards bore no relationship to the job. But the problem is is that if you have your hiring practices set up halfway intelligently in the end it's never perfect. You're actually hiring for out of huge staff.

[00:39:31] We've made our job is much more likely. So how did you come across all this information. Part of it was through that diversity on the.

[00:39:44] And just looking through all the stuff that we have online or through our internal sites yes and in a bit of literature review.

[00:39:54] Yeah. Yeah.

[00:39:58] These practices are based on false assumptions generated by our biases that can actually increase race and gender tensions. Yeah. Well the whole unconscious bias thing is a great example of that is like first of all those tests the implicit association test are nowhere near reliable or valid enough so nowhere near the quality necessary to diagnose anyone as having any unconscious bias. Second second the data relating those so-called unconscious viruses to actual behavior is weak. Third there's no evidence whatsoever that any unconscious bias training programs have any positive effect whatsoever. And some that they have negative that say that because people don't like to be called racists and marched on to forced re-education training. So suggestions were lies. Diversity Yeah that would be good. And start to define it more appropriately. Right. And just just start having a real conversation about what proper hiring practices should be which should be objective standards universally applied without bias because that's the best we can do. That's still going to introduce some not equal outcomes but of course hiring practices are designed to do that. For example clearly designed to reward more intelligent people and that is hardly heritable that's actually a real problem.

[00:41:22] Yeah.

[00:41:23] And we definitely set up our practice to more conscientious people zow and what are going to go from big city to negative emotion.

[00:41:34] It seems to me that screening resource is a reasonable thing to do in high stress jobs. You want to put the person in a position where they're likely to collapse to be miserable. I don't see any difficulty now.

[00:41:47] Dr. Petersen I had a question actually relating to that from an employment standpoint. Is there an optimal sensitivity to stress that you've seen from the most economically productive employees. By that I mean I feel like there's a middle ground between people who are laid back versus people who are probably overstimulated by external factors that make them self-conscious and these people I think at least at the lower mid levels of many companies actually have a little bit more anxiety that powers their ascension through the dominant hierarchy.

[00:42:26] Yeah. Well it's a tricky issue because you're probably the sort of negative emotion that might be useful in motivating you is probably more associated with conscientiousness than was neuroticism neuroticism seems to be pretty tightly to anxiety and emotional pain frustration disappointment grief those sort of feeling that those categories where is the negative emotion perhaps that's associated with conscientiousness and industriousness in particular seems to be more something like self contempt and disgust and so conscientious people are made uncomfortable by their lack of productive effort. But that doesn't seem to be associated with trait eroticism it's a different thing. So that's partly why it's so necessary to get the same metrics right. Right and to get them to get the measurement right. So the best hiring the best hiring screeners are one can find personality test. Roughly speaking especially weighted toward conscientiousness and for complex jobs in general cognitive ability tests although there's some question about legality of those in the current clinical situation so all alienating conservatives is both non-inclusive generally bad business because conservatives tend to be higher in conscientiousness which is required for much of the Gendry maintenance work characteristic of a mature company. Yes absolutely. So now here's what you suggest. Confront Google's biases like you've done now you've seen how that went. I to start by breaking down Google scores by political orientation and personality to give a fuller picture to how our biases are affecting our culture. That's a fine idea. Stop restricting programs and classes to certain genders or races. Yes. Well obviously have an open and honest discussion about the costs and benefits of our diversity programs.

[00:44:21] Well I guess that's what we're trying to do right now discriminating just to increase the representation of women in tech is this misguided advice as mandating increases for women's representation home work related violence as Christians in school drop out. Yes this the same thing and it's the same issue as the bricklayer issue as well. What are you going to do to chase the nurses out of the women out of nursing and medicine and psychology and social work and university undergraduate programs where they're radically overrepresented. So what about Jews you can get rid of them too. We're over represented in most complex occupations and Asians as well. So are you own your own. You can do this in very limited circumstances to figure out some way to put a limit on that. It seems very unlikely.

[00:45:11] I almost wonder what the ADL is. You know we'll be thinking six six months from now or 12 months from now given the high number at least in the United States.

[00:45:22] Ashkenazi Jews in leadership positions at companies that are advocating for less of themselves or less people who are in the bucket that they're in.

[00:45:31] Yeah well as long as the discussion centers on the representation of white people seem to have no problem. But you started to break that down a little bit. And because when

Jewish white men are particularly overrepresented when you can make an issue that really we're going to do that so and Asians are already having a harder time getting into universities.

[00:45:52] So that's well-documented. So I'm not that's a terrible thing partly because of the cost to the individuals involved but also the cost to society because it means that we're not taking the people who are most competent and loaning them to expand their education to the greatest degree possible and because there aren't that smart competent people are actually rather rare. And it's to society's advantage to exploit the hell out of them. And you know pay them well for now.

[00:46:19] But it's not like they are of no benefit and everyone knows that when they try to hire someone competent de-emphasize empathy Yes empathy is a good thing.

[00:46:31] Ethics for small family units and a terrible ethic to run a company by it looks like conscientiousness is the right way to run a company. But I think conscientiousness we don't have good animal models for conscientiousness. But I think conscientiousness probably evolved so that human beings could could operate in groups that were larger than just king size. You know because when he makes sense I think Kyneton level every day for children to have a good outcome in life and once resources are distributed equally between them. So it's not like it's something that doesn't have a niche microloan prioritizing Tenshi are focused on micro aggressions etc. and other unintentional transgressions increases are sensitive. You do a nice job of criticizing. Now I read Darrell wingsuit book on Michael Gresh. It's an appalling. It's a whole load of trying to put it politely and I believe Scott Lilienfeld who's a very good psychologist has recently published a paper shredding the construct validity of the concept of Mike regression. So it's a non-valid construct right from the bottom up. It's purely ideological in nature and it's also one of those constructs that allows anyone who's tended to to weaponize their revenants discourse around that so reconsider making unconscious training bias training mandatory for promotion committees. Yeah that's just one senator. It should be stopped. There's no scientific basis whatsoever for proceeding with that operation. So great.

[00:48:05] Well you know it's a pretty straightforward document as far as I'm concerned and I've gone through it with a very fine tooth comb as a behavioral scientist and I would like to state for the record that I believe that what you said in there if not accurate was at least representative of the current state of art among well-trained psychometrics we inform psychologists who are experts in the field of individual difference.

[00:48:32] So congratulations.

[00:48:37] You have to pay such a price for.

[00:48:41] All right well thank you very much for the conversation or one question. Why did you agree to talk to me.

[00:48:50] I'm a huge fan and I know that you went through a similar thing.

[00:48:56] Any influence on this. I mean you're going to pay. No actually I'm not sorry. I'd like to say I was sorry but I'm not actually really clean. I do think that you're going to be paid the price for this but that the consequences will be very close. And I I I think you did an excellent job on this document. I think you were very careful. I think the fact that you're being labeled with epithets and that you were fired is absolutely reprehensible. You know it's clear to me that you're just trying to figure out what the hell's going on. And you know you're not you're not any of the things that people would like to think people are so that they don't have to bloody well think about what it is that you said get. So like congratulations to you that courageous people are rare and you put yourself on the line. And I really learned out last year. So I would say keep your head up. Assume that this is going to work out. I wouldn't hide from the press because I think the press is actually you're the right kind of person for the press to be on something for you to use. You know you're well-spoken compliant you're you're you're condensing irrational. You're obviously at least you come across as a decent diet very very rapidly. There's no reason I would say there's no reason not to let people see who you are. Because I think that would improve your credibility and make your message even more powerful.

[00:50:30] So you know out in Europe you are have every right to defend your products you know. But and that's fine. But I don't think that you have any reason to be afraid of the press. I would say a couple of things.

[00:50:43] When you're talking to the press don't apologize don't tell people what you're not don't tell them that you're not making them yourself.

[00:50:54] That's a technical error. And stick to your damn guns. You know as as as quietly and forthrightly as you can. And now you're going to come out on top of this because you're you're on the side of the right so far as I'm concerned.