Written by **Selwyn Duke** on March 11, 2024

Feminocracy: DEI Wokesters Upset That Science Institute Appointed Male Scientists

AzmanJaka/iStock/Getty Images Plus

There's a multitude of disparities between the sexes, with probably more than 50 percent of them favoring women. Examples would be how 92 percent of workplace deaths involve men, female fashion models being paid notably more than their male counterparts, and women being more likely than men to attend and graduate from college. This isn't good enough for the social engineers, though: Any disparity favoring men, even in the tiniest little corner of any field, must be highlighted and eradicated under the pretext of "equality."

A recent example is that the "UK's national artificial intelligence (AI) institute has been riven by a diversity row after staff signed a letter questioning the appointment of four male senior scientists," reports *The Telegraph*. The paper continues:

> Employees and researchers at the Alan Turing Institute, Britain's flagship data science and AI research organisation set up in 2015, questioned whether its "commitment to inclusivity" was being followed in its hiring process.
>
> More than 180 people signed the letter … after four top male academics were appointed in February. The signatories said the hiring suggested a "continuing trend of limited diversity within the institute's senior scientific leadership".
>
> In the letter, addressed to chief executive Dr Jean Innes [the woman who *runs* the place] and its operations lead and chief scientist, the staff said: "This is an excellent time to reflect on whether all voices are being heard and if the institute's commitment to inclusivity is being fully realised in our recruitment and decision-making practices."

There's something unsaid, however, about why males dominate the scientific establishment's upper echelons:

Most great scientists are men.

(More on this momentarily.)

In reality, group performance disparities across endeavors are the norm, not the exception. For example and as the late Professor Walter E. Williams wrote in 2019, despite being just two percent of the world's population,

> Jews have been awarded 40% of the Nobel Prizes in economics, 30% of those in medicine, 25% in physics, 20% in chemistry, 15% in literature and 10% of the Nobel Peace Prizes.
>
> …Proportionality injustice doesn't end with the Nobel Prize. Blacks are about 13% of the U.S. population but close to 70% of the players in the National Football League. Blacks are greatly overrepresented among star players and highly paid players.… Proportionality and diversity injustice is worse in the National Basketball Association, with blacks being over 80% of the players.

To the point here, 100 percent of NBA and NFL players are male. Is this an injustice that must be remedied?

Such group disparities manifest themselves the world over, too (e.g., Chinese's dominance in Malaysia). Explaining this, Williams also wrote that only "an idiot" would blame these disparities on unjust discrimination, as "it is excellence that explains the disproportionate numbers."

Is it any different with science and the sexes? Just recently there've been numerous articles about how women are "underrepresented in STEM" (science, tech, engineering, and math) fields, with one headline complaining, "Women Control 85% Of Purchases, 29% Of STEM Roles." (Of course, it never occurs to these kvetchers to try to "correct" the disparity where women "control 85% of purchases!" Hmm.…)

In reality, women are just 24 percent of the STEM workforce; thus, if proportionality alone were any guide, we'd expect 76 percent of upper echelon scientists to be men for this reason itself.

But that doesn't satisfy the social engineers: Were it not for "patriarchal" society alienating women from STEM, they claim, more women would enter that realm. Yet the facts say otherwise.

As research has repeatedly shown — as related in the excellent documentary *The Gender Equality Paradox* — the less patriarchal a nation, the *less likely women are to enter traditionally male fields*. Why?

Because while poorer countries (e.g., India) don't have as much of a luxury of indulging feminism, and hence are more patriarchal, circumstances nonetheless force their women to go into more lucrative STEM fields to make money to survive. Women in the wealthier and more feministic lands (e.g., Norway) have the luxury of going where female hearts lead.

As an MSN commenter put it responding to one kvetcher article, "Women like to socialize, not spend hours figuring out how to inverse a binary tree against a recursive function."

Yet there's another, unwoke factor here, too. Great scientists aren't the average person; they're not even the average smart person.

They're geniuses.

And just as there are more very tall and very short men than very tall and very short women — with any and every trait, males are more likely to occupy extreme ends of the spectrum — most geniuses are men (there are *zero* women in the highest IQ range: above 176). Ergo, you'd expect men to dominate top science positions in a *fair* system.

Of course, these facts won't matter to the hollering hens and complaining capons. For despite the protestations and ululations about "equality," it's all a ruse. As writer Katie El-Diwany wrote at

American Thinker in 2018, within

> the feminist grievance narrative, there is no whining about women being "excluded" from working-class male-dominated professions. There is more than plenty of talk about the dearth of women in science, in engineering, in upper management positions, and as CEOs. But there is no one asking: where are all the female garbage-collectors, the female elevator technicians, the female landscape laborers, the female oil rig workers?
>
> All of this reveals that feminist clamoring for "equal representation" is not about equality at all. It is about power and prestige.

And all this raises a question, too: Is equality dogma the single biggest con of the modern age?