

James Damore – Sannleiksbergmálið (maí 2020)

James starfaði sem tæknifræðingur hjá netrisanum Google. Árið 2017 var hann á leið til Kína. Hann varð hugsi um „fjölbreytnistefnu“ fyrirtækis síns. Hann krabbaði niðurstöðurnar á minnisblað undir titlinum; „Hinn hugmyndafræðilegi sannleiksklefi: Hvernig hlutdrægni ruglar okkur í ríminu um fjölbreytni og sameiningu“ (Google’s Ideological Echo Chamber: How Bias Clouds Our Thinking About Diversity and Inclusion). „Echo chamber“ er eins konar bergmálasklefi eða sjálfssönnunarklefi, þar sem skoðanir öðlast styrk og gildi við eigið bergmál. Minnisblaðið var hugsað sem innanhússkjal hjá Google. En því var lekið og komst í há máli. Mánuði síðar var James rekinn frá Google.

Boðskapur minnisblaðsins er m.a. sá, að skýringar á allri mismunun sé ekki að finna í kúgun. Aukin heldur sé það valdbeiting að leita lausna með gagnstæðri mismunun. Bent er á, að mun á körlum og konum megi að hluta rekja til mismunandi eðlis. T.d. því, að konur almennt sýndu meiri áhuga á fólki, heldur en hlutum, væru fremur félagslyndari og listhneigðari – og hneigðustu fremur til hverflyndis (neuroticism). Að lokum setti hann fram nokkrar tillögur að úrbótum á tækniumhverfinu til að auka þar hlutfall kvenna og stuðla að vellíðan.

Í minnisblaðinu stendur orðrétt: „Í stjórnmalalegri hlutdrægni Google er lögð að jöfnu móðgunarvernd og andlegt öryggi. En smáun til þagnar er andhverfa andlegs öryggis. Þöggunin hefur skapað hugmyndafræðilegan bergmálasklefa, þar sem ekki má ræða ákveðnar, heilagar hugmyndir. Umræðubannið elur á öfgafyllstu valdboðspáttum þessarar hugmyndafræði; öfgar, [þ.e.] að allar myndbirtingar mismunar eigi rætur að rekja til undirokunar; valdboð, [þ.e.] að mismuna skuli til að eyða þessari undirokun. Munur á dreifingu hinna ýmsu eiginleika karla og kvenna útskýrir að einhverju leyti [þá staðreynd], að konur starfi ekki að helmingi í tæknigreinum og í stjórnun. Mismunun til að ná jöfnu kynjahlutfalli er ósanngjörn, sundrandi og slæm fyrir viðskipti.“

James leggur út af ýmis konar rannsóknum á kynjamuninum og túlkar þær með hliðsjón af þróunarsálfræði. Hann tekur fram: „Gaumgæfið! Hvorki held ég því fram að allir karlar séu frábrugðnir öllum konum ... né að munurinn sé „réttlátur.““

James lagði mál sitt fyrir Vinnumálastofnun (National Labor Relations Board), sem komst að þeirri niðurstöðu, að uppsögn Google væri réttmæt vegna fullyrðinga „er lutu að lífeðlislegum muni kynjanna, [sem] væru ... skaðleg, óréttlát og sundrandi, ...“

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Google%27s_Ideological_Echo_Chamber -
<https://www.dhillonlaw.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/Damore-Google-Manifesto.pdf>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SEDuVF7kiPU>

James Damore of Google recently wrote a memo detailing his thoughts about Google's diversity initiatives. Within a month, it went viral, and he was fired, for "perpetuating gender stereotypes." The problem is that everything James claimed is solidly backed by well-

developed scientific literatures. Thus, the company in charge of much of the world's communication has now fired an excellent engineer for citing established scientific truths. In this full 50 min interview, James and I discuss his motivations, and the consequences of his actions. We are joined (audio only) by another Google employee who wishes, for obvious reasons, to remain anonymous. A fund-raiser for James has been established, here: <http://bit.ly/2uuI0lf> Here are a series of references buttressing the claims of James' memo: Sex differences in personality/cognition: Lynn (1996): <http://bit.ly/2vThoy8> Lippa (2008): <http://bit.ly/2vmtSMs> Lippa (2010): <http://bit.ly/2fBVn0G> Weisberg (2011): <http://bit.ly/2gJVmEp> Del Giudice (2012): <http://bit.ly/2vEKTUx> Larger/large and stable sex differences in more gender-neutral countries: (These findings run precisely contrary to social constructionist theory: it's been tested, and it's wrong). Katz-Gerrog (2000): <http://bit.ly/2uoY9c4> Costa (2001): <http://bit.ly/2utaTT3> Schmitt (2008): <http://bit.ly/2p6nHYY> Schmitt (2016): <http://bit.ly/2wMN45j> Differences in men and women's interest/priorities: Lippa (1998): <http://bit.ly/2vr0PHF> Rong Su (2009): <http://bit.ly/2wtlbzU> Lippa (2010): <http://bit.ly/2wyfW23> See also Geary (2017) blog: <http://bit.ly/2vXqCcF> Life paths of mathematically gifted females and males: Lubinski (2014): <http://bit.ly/2vSjSxb> Sex differences in academic achievement unrelated to political, economic, or social equality: Stoet (2015): <http://bit.ly/1EAfqOt> Big Five trait agreeableness and (lower) income (including for men): Spurk (2010): <http://bit.ly/2vu1x6E> Judge (2012): <http://bit.ly/2uxhwQh> The general importance of exposure to sex-linked steroids on fetal and then lifetime development: Hines (2015) <http://bit.ly/2uufOiv> Exposure to prenatal testosterone and interest in things or people (even when the exposure is among females): Berenbaum (1992): <http://bit.ly/2uKxpSQ> Beltz (2011): <http://bit.ly/2hPXC1c> Baron-Cohen (2014): <http://bit.ly/2vn4KXq> Hines (2016): <http://bit.ly/2hPYKSu> Primarily biological basis of personality sex differences: Lippa (2008): <http://bit.ly/2vmtSMs> Ngun (2010): <http://bit.ly/2vJ6QSh> Status and sex: males and females Perusse (1993): <http://bit.ly/2uoIOW8> Perusse (1994): <http://bit.ly/2vNzcL6> Buss (2008): <http://bit.ly/2uumv4g> de Bruyn (2012): <http://bit.ly/2uoWkMh> To quote de Bruyn et al: high status predicts more mating opportunities and, thus, increased reproductive success. "This is true for human adults in many cultures, both 'modern' as well as 'primitive' (Betzig, 1986). In fact, this theory seems to be confirmed for non-human primates (Cheney, 1983; Cowlshaw and Dunbar, 1991; Dewsbury, 1982; Gray, 1985; Maslow, 1936) and other animals from widely differing ecologies (Ellis, 1995) such as squirrels (Farentinos, 1972), cockerels (Kratzer and Craig, 1980), and cockroaches (Breed, Smith, and Gall, 1980)." Status also increases female reproductive success, via a different pathway: "For females, it is generally argued that dominance is not necessarily a path to more copulations, as it is for males. It appears that important benefits bestowed upon dominant women are access to resources and less harassment from rivals (Campbell, 2002). Thus, dominant females tend to have higher offspring survival rates, at least among simians (Pusey, Williams, and Goodall, 1997); thus, dominance among females also appears to be linked to reproductive success." Personality and political belief: Gerber (2010): <http://bit.ly/2hOpnHa> Hirsh (2010): <http://bit.ly/2fsxIzB> Gerber (2011): <http://bit.ly/2hJ1Kjb> Xu (2013): <http://bit.ly/2ftDhOq> Burton (2015): <http://bit.ly/2uoPS87> Bakker (2016): <http://bit.ly/2vMIQIN> Occupations by gender: <http://bit.ly/2vTdgPp> Problems with the measurement and concept of unconscious bias: Fielder (2006): <http://bit.ly/2vGzhQP> Blanton (2009): <http://bit.ly/2vQuwEP> (this one is particularly damning) Microaggressions: Strong claims, weak evidence: Lilienfeld (2017): <http://bit.ly/2vS28lg> And, just for kicks, two links discussing the massive over-representation of the left in, most particularly, the humanities: Klein (2008): <http://bit.ly/2fwdLrS> Langbert (2016): <http://bit.ly/2cV53Q8> My links: Patreon: <https://www.patreon.com/jordanbpeterson> Self Authoring: <http://selfauthoring.com/> Jordan Peterson Website:

<http://jordanbpeterson.com/> Podcast: <http://jordanbpeterson.com/podcast/> Reading List:
<http://jordanbpeterson.com/2017/03/gr...> Twitter: <https://twitter.com/jordanbpeterson>