



BIOLOGY AND RITUAL OUTRAGE

The Future of Gender Relations

Gerhard Amendt



ABSTRACT

The intense argument around the software developer James Damore and his then employer Google was not about the effectiveness of biology or society. For ideological reasons it was denied that differences between men and women in the professional world are increasingly due to independent decisions by women.

Keywords: gender, James Damore, Google, workforce relations, male studies

INTRODUCTION

At Google™ too, freedom of speech only exists if pre-set bans on speaking are obeyed. This is what we have learned from the affair about the software developer James Damore¹. In his essay about diversity and his employer's problematic approach to the issue, he stripped the gender debate of its reproachful moralising, instead letting facts speak for themselves. At the same time, while he was not dismissive of inequalities between men and women, he also wanted ensure the acceptance of differing opinions that are critical of the deconstructionist theorems of gender ideology. In place of dogma, he called for scientific arguments. But Damore was fired due to the dissemination of gender stereotypes.

ENLIGHTENED SAVIOR-ELITE

Damore's thought through and well founded paper on the absence of women in engineering and leading positions posits that at Google too the preferences and abilities of men and women are partly due to biological reasons. Simultaneously, these differences explain why we have no equal representation of men and women in technical professions and leading functions and probably will not have them in the future either.

The reference to the impact of biology triggered the anticipated ritual outrage. As a matter of fact, biology puts an end to the lofty illusions of boundless arrangement options. And it isn't even necessary to return to biological gender differences in order to explain dissimilarities. Therefore, Damore accepts other causes, too. Yet he refrains from explicitly deriving them from every-day habits. Meaning, what's amenable to women or not. Which decisions they are making spontaneously, which ones are made thoughtfully by themselves, together with their partner or in a disputing manner. This equally holds true for men.

Alone these decisions are contributing to the underrepresentation of women in technical and leading functions as well as other specific professions. That is because most women prefer

¹ James Damour. *Google's Ideological Echo Chamber: How bias clouds our thinking about diversity and inclusion*. See <https://assets.documentcloud.org/documents/3914586/Googles-Ideological-Echo-Chamber.pdf>, accessed January 20, 2018.

professions with immediate personal contact. The immediate satisfaction is of higher importance to them than the delayed one. Recognition and satisfaction do exist in male professions as well, but often only after longer lean periods. Research should establish whether women really tend to prefer professions that require the application of female and motherly abilities, at times as a substitute for a family of their own.

Most roles in the field of psychology will shortly be filled 100 per cent by women. That's not much different for social professions such as social education, education, translation and others. In face of the unlimited choices, women want it like this and not differently. They are consciously choosing, they are exerting a "rational choice". The free choice of profession is their attested right; to deny it to them will therefore fail. Statistics about professions testify of women's independence of will and therefore gender ideologues reach the limits of possible manipulation. Women are mostly unmoved by the promises of left-leaning politics and gender theory. Scandinavia and the USA have invested considerable sums into the mobilisation of women into STEM subjects (science, technology, engineering, mathematics). The successes are scanty, there's talk about failure. Why don't gender theoreticians want to acknowledge this? No matter whether it is founded on biology or behaviour derived from "rational choice"?

The question is explosive because it undermines the foundations of gender ideology. The latter has declared men as such as an obstacle for women's success. According to this, men have prevented women throughout history, by way of discrimination, from rising socially.

It is interesting that this theory only addresses desirable professions. The assertion of the man-made disparagement of all women is and remains the argumentative equity of gender politics. Meanwhile, the reproach has developed into an aggressive culture of shaming. It functions thus: A) The moral outrage about all men is made to appear justifiable. B) It deprives all women of the responsibility for their own lives and for societal conditions. C) All the blame and responsibility for eternal crimes is laid on men. D) Through shaming it silences most men.

The fact that male and female gender theoreticians don't object to the interlinked infantilising of women has one simple reason: They both consider themselves as chosen to be the *saviour-elite* for all women. For that reason we are confronted with their sectarian furore and religious intolerance towards dissidents and also the similarities with the ideology and repression under real socialism. Following the inherent gender logics, confident women are not

possible and therefore female subjectivity does not mean much to Judith Butler and her entourage. Butler has demonstrated this in an argument with psychoanalysts in New York in detail: female subjectivity, in other words historical impact, did not exist. Instead, women should – in analogy to the gender ideologues – adapt the amorousness with the myth of a female existence as a victim. The physician J. P. Möbius established in 1900 a similar diagnosis: the one of the “idiocy of woman”, declaring women unfit for the professional world. The absurd – as it is phrased in a less comprehensive manner – has a notable comeback between the lines of gender literature.

A DOGMA BECOMES SHAKY

James Darmore has aptly brought out the tedium of monocausal accusations of sexism. His dismissal initiated an overdue debate. The “echo chamber of gender-ideology” has not only started to totter in the house of Google but also in other enterprises, in administration and universities. Google has expelled Darmore as a dissident. *“Public shaming serves not only to display the virtue of those doing the shaming but also warns others that the same punishment awaits them if they don’t conform,”* writes Damore.

Men and women are different in many regards. If they have all the more often equal chances, the differences will by no means disappear but rather increase. Women will never be like men and men never like women. That may appear paradoxical at first and may contradict the politics of equality. Much points to the fact that the difference of the sexes could become more pronounced in equal measure as the freedom of a self-determined lifestyle increases.

This tendency begins already to emerge in societies that are wealthy and egalitarian. These give men and women the choice to live according to their own wishes and preferences and to also develop what we describe as “female” and “male” in a biological disposition. These are developments that would not be possible without freedom and wealth. The dialectics between/freedom and biology could further let drift apart the difference of personality between men and women.

It is about time to let go of the intellectually unsophisticated gender-political doctrine, according to which differences between men and women are to be attributed only to sexism, i. e. the mean-spirited and strategic exclusion of all women in the “patriarchy”. The interconnections

are far more complicated.

AUTHOR PROFILE



Gerhard Amendt, Ph.D., is an emeritus professor of the University of Bremen (Germany) and founder of the Institute for Gender & Generation Research. He has published numerous books and essays on the dialectic of gender relations and their conflict dynamics. Amendt is critical of any notion of gender with an inherent polarisation and instead proposes a dynamic model for reorientation within the gender arrangement. Amendt has worked in the past as a documentary filmmaker and had been for many years the chairman of the German Pro Familia, first clinic for abortions. Amendt is currently preparing a conference² aimed at professional helpers to familiarise them with the paradigm shift from polarisations to a dynamic understanding of violent conflicts in family and partnership.

Contact details: amendt@uni-bremen.de

NEW MALE STUDIES: AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL (NMS) IS AN OPEN ACCESS ONLINE INTERDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL FOR RESEARCH AND DISCUSSION OF ISSUES FACING BOYS AND MEN WORLDWIDE.

THIS JOURNAL USES OPEN JOURNAL SYSTEMS 2.3.4.0, WHICH IS OPEN SOURCE JOURNAL MANAGEMENT AND PUBLISHING SOFTWARE DEVELOPED, SUPPORTED, AND FREELY DISTRIBUTED BY THE PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE PROJECT UNDER THE GNU GENERAL PUBLIC LICENSE.

THIS ARTICLE HAS BEEN DOWNLOADED FROM [HTTP://NEWMALESTUDIES.COM](http://newmalestudies.com)

² *Handling Conflicts without violence. Effective Means of Prevention* at Goethe Universität in Frankfurt, Germany, from 13- 15 April 2018 <https://familyconflict.eu/en/>