

STEM Calendars and Men's Hour

The push is on. It's everywhere now. If you read my piece on education (<http://redpilluk.co.uk/UKEducationData.pdf>) you may recall that, despite the universal disadvantage of males in UK education, there was a frank admission by the National Foundation for Educational Research that only one thing is actually being done right now and that is aimed at encouraging more women into STEM subjects (science, technology, engineering and maths). They don't hang about these women. It is very clear that this push of women into STEM subjects is being pursued with vigour.

I turned on the radio at random the other day (2/12/13). Woman's Hour was on (it seems always to be on). They were featuring women scientists ("Power List Scientists"). Give the girls some role models and they might follow suit, that was the purpose. Another random switch-on of the radio the next Saturday (7/12/13) and, guess what, it was Woman's Hour again. This time there was someone exhorting girls to do STEM subjects at A level. Same message, different day

The same day I got an email from my trade union. It was advertising a 2014 calendar produced by the union celebrating women working in male-dominated professional occupations, essentially STEM areas. It's hard to believe that this is not all coordinated, isn't it? Well, it is. Just look at how much muscle these women can pull. The union, together with the photographer, is mounting a one day exhibition of these portraits at the Royal Society on 10/12/13. This year the union also produced a charter for women in STEM – supported by the TUC, and launched a campaign at the House of Commons in November, which involved MPs signing pledges to act on a number of issues of concern, one of which is women in STEM occupations. It would be nice to have the Royal Society, the TUC and the House of Commons all pulling together to get more men teachers into primary schools, wouldn't it? So why hasn't *this* happened?¹

And the very next day, 9/12/13, on the Radio 4 Today programme there was a woman reporting on a study by the Institute of Physics, just issued on their web site, "Subject choices reveal depth of gender prejudice in schools", another part of the big push to get more girls doing physics and maths at A Level. It's a coordinated campaign, right enough.

So what's wrong with encouraging more women into STEM education and STEM professions? Nothing. Absolutely nothing. Let me reiterate. I am fully in favour of equality of opportunity and equality of respect (always noting that this does not imply equality of outcome). So what has got me hot under the collar this time? It's this: half a truth is a whole lie. Action to further improve the lot of women is fine. But only ever taking action to further improve the lot of women whilst completely ignoring the disadvantaged, and worsening, position of men and boys is just not acceptable. The union's web site contained the following introduction to their page advertising the calendar:

"100 years ago most women who worked were in domestic service. Those with appropriate qualifications could make it into the lower ranks of teaching, nursing and

¹ Couldn't answer? Come, come, that's an easy one. It's because there's nothing in it for women to get more men into primary schools, quite the opposite. They are happy with things the way they are. And since it's only women who have the political power and command the sympathy to get these august bodies to oblige them, it ain't gonna happen. Not until men manage to acquire a little of such power and sympathy themselves.

secretarial work. Today, women make up half the workforce, but patterns of work remain very different and gender segregation is still far too prevalent."

A brief word on the historical issue with which this innocent-seeming paragraph opens. It's half a truth making a whole lie, yet again. The implication of the first sentence is that 100 years ago men were enjoying life to the full in Elysian bliss. The trouble is that the feminist propaganda machine has implanted in women's minds a false picture. They seem to imagine that, 100 years ago, men were all wealthy moustachioed Victorian patriarchs in tail coats, commanding servants and wife alike. But, no, they were not. Would you have wanted to be a typical man 100 years ago? The main difference between the gruelling life of domestic servitude suffered by women, and the gruelling life of the working man was that the latter was also frequently dangerous, generally physically even harder, and often outdoors in all weathers. 99% of men 100 years ago would have regarded it as an unbelievable uplift in their ease, status, wealth and life expectancy to "*make it into the lower ranks of teaching*". The truth is not reflected in those innocent seeming first couple of sentences, is it? And this is not accidental. It is propaganda. The best propaganda is not untrue, but nevertheless gives totally the wrong impression by virtue of omission. The impression is given that women were uniquely oppressed. Not so. Both men and women had very tough lives. There is no call for women to claim to have been especially burdened. The working class women of the time would not have wanted to swap places with their working class husbands. That sort of envy, where it occurred at all, was confined to the middle and upper classes - at that time a far smaller proportion of society than today. And do be aware: the main reason why the lot of both men and women has improved immeasurably in the last 100 years is due to technology, not feminism, and you can thank men almost exclusively for technology.

But, there is no reason why that must continue. Of course women can, and should, be encouraged to participate in the production and deployment of technology, the very message of the calendar. I repeat, I have no problem with that.

That brings us to the final sentence of the above quote. Yes, there are indeed many work areas which are dominated by one sex or the other. (I presume that is what was meant. I don't think "gender segregation" is the right term, though. The sexes are not segregated in any job, as far as I am aware). But the technology professions are not the only gender-skewed work areas, are they? The most serious gender-skewing is in education. Primary school teachers are 86% women; secondary school teachers are 62% women; teaching assistants in primary schools are 96% women; and teaching assistants in secondary schools are 84% women. Moreover, due to the prevalence of households with no man, an alarmingly large number of boys will have no knowledge of adult males at all before they reach the age of 11. This is a far more serious issue than the gender-skew in technology. Why? Because the gender-skew in teachers has the potential to disadvantage the entire future population of males. (I say "potential to" because it is not proved that the current disadvantage of boys in our educational system is a result of the preponderance of female teachers - though the disadvantage itself is absolutely indubitable, see <http://redpilluk.co.uk/Education.html>).

Which brings me to this key fact: the trade union in question also represents the educational sector. So, why have they not had a similar initiative in this area? A calendar featuring some photogenic male primary school teachers, perhaps? Of course, no one will buy pictures of blokes. But feature said men at their work with a class of children and it could be a winner. But even if it flops, surely it is the sort of thing that should be tried. The idea that men are not suitable as primary school teachers needs to be overturned - urgently. It would help if the media, and feminists, stopped portraying all men as paedophiles or potential paedophiles. I will be

suggesting this pin-up calendar of male primary school teachers to the union. I'll report back (I'm not optimistic).

Before closing, allow me to rant a little about Woman's Hour since it featured above. Actually, this is not really about Woman's Hour. Just like the women-in-STEM things, it's not that there's anything wrong with having a Woman's Hour programme. The issue is the other half of the truth, as usual: there's no Men's Hour. Historically Woman's Hour was for housewives, in the bad old days when most women were married and stayed at home rather than worked. That being the case, the programme was aired at a time of day when the men were all at work, and it was confined to weekdays. And now? Well the former 5 times a week at 10:00 continues. But at some point (I don't know when) the women must have argued that most women now work, and hence will miss the weekday programmes, so they really need a prime-time Saturday programme as well. So they have one.

I've no problem at all with any of that, apart from the obvious question that any child of six would ask, "what about Men's Hour"? There isn't one, of course. There was one on Radio5Live between summer 2010 and September 2013, but it seems to have died. I don't know why. I suspect that many people think that virtually everything other than Woman's Hour is male biased, so there is no need for a Men's Hour. But this is the opposite of the truth. In fact men's perspectives on Men's Rights issues, such as are featured on this web site, do not receive any airing at all on the media - absolutely none. In contrast women saturate the media with their perspective on everything - Women's Hour is just one example. Take the following examples from just the last couple of weeks,

- 6/12/13: Women's Hour features a piece on abortion rights. OK, no problem with that. But there is so much more that men could say on the subject of reproduction rights - or, rather, there's just the one thing with a lot of ramifications - men don't *have* any reproduction rights.
- 26/11/12: Women's Hour featured the new Director of Public Prosecutions, Alison Saunders, on "Women and the Law". But a male-led interview of the DPP could have been so much more challenging. Just why is the Crown Prosecution Service continuing to promulgate the obscene fiction that domestic violence is always men beating up women? (see <http://redpilluk.co.uk/PartnerViolence.html>). And the DPP could do with being really solidly attacked on the farcical bias of the so-called family courts.
- 19/11/13: Women's Hour ran a piece "Does the education system fail boys?" featuring Dr Alice Sullivan of the Institute of Education and a head teacher. You may like to listen to it <http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b03hvql7#segments>. Or you may not - it had me screeching with anger. My problem is with Alice Sullivan. I expand upon that below*. The point to make here is that when faced with an appallingly biased piece like this, men have no means of reply. In fact, men have no outlet to present their view on this most important question at all. Instead we have two women being interviewed by another woman. People like Alice Sullivan, in positions of power and influence, are getting away with outright sexism and no one can challenge them.

But what really needs projecting into peoples' consciousnesses are the issues raised by the men's rights movement, such as on this web site and many others. There is every bit as much material about MRM issues as there ever was for women to discuss. What we need is a really edgy, no-holds-barred, full-on MRM programme presented by committed MRAs. However...I don't entirely blame the BBC. The audience for such a

programme would probably - initially - be very small. But this is a chicken and egg problem. We cannot rouse people from their somnambulism without a publicity channel, but we won't be granted such a programme until there is a large enough sympathetic audience.

*"Does the education system fail boys?" (19/11/13): Alice Sullivan's view was, "no". She was asked directly, "should boys poor performance at school worry people". Her response was essentially, "no". Actually she just ducked the issue completely. She chose to take the line that social class was more important to educational attainment than gender. Well, OK, but that was not the subject up for discussion, was it? This approach is a typical politician's method for deflecting attention from an unwelcome subject. What she implied, but did not say explicitly because she knows it would not be true, is that the gender gap is not significant. What she most certainly conveyed, and this deliberately, was that she was unconcerned about the gender gap in education. Ye Gods! How can this be acceptable in someone from the Institute of Education? She should be sacked. Don't doubt the seriousness of the gender gap (if you haven't read it already see <http://redpilluk.co.uk/Education.html>). She said that, "at a national education policy level gender is not a key issue" and then went on to talk about "stereotyping in education" - which means the low take-up of STEM subjects by women! If gender isn't an issue, why is this overtly gendered issue currently being subject to the most enormous PR push as described above? What she really meant, clearly, was that, "at a national education policy level boys are not a key issue". Under the control of people like Alice Sullivan it will get worse. Because she doesn't care about boys - not one jot. Hateful woman.

Her sexist mindset is betrayed by her insistence that it is actually girls who continue to be discriminated against. She said the following (not necessarily the precise words but close enough), "when girls do well, people say it's because the system has been fiddled to favour them. But when boys do well people say it's because they are cleverer than girls". What? What? When did boys do better than girls? Certainly not in the last 27 years. And never in the case of primary schooling. And no serious person has ever said that boys are cleverer than girls. Even 30+ years ago, when girls did less well at A Level than boys, this was recognised as something which needed addressing, and it was addressed. It is a fact that school syllabuses and pedagogy have changed over the last 30+ years, and done so in a direction which has favoured girls. Alison Sullivan knows this. I don't say this amounts to 'fiddling', but schooling *has* been feminised. Today's school children would be shocked to be exposed to the almost military style discipline I experienced in my (all boys) secondary school. No one has ever said what Alison Sullivan's claimed. She made it up. Her remark is actually an echo and corruption of what many people have really said: "when girls did less well than boys it was axiomatic that it must be sexism, but now that boys do less well than girls we are encouraged to believe it's their own fault - they should be more like girls". What Alison Sullivan's nasty little remark seems to mean is that she does not think the system has been fiddled and girls really are cleverer than boys. That's the bottom line here. She *wants* girls to do better than boys, and counts this as a success, not something to be corrected. With people like this in the Institute of Education and similar authoritative bodies, boys are totally f*cked, aren't they?

Sullivan then went on to claim that any lower educational attainment of boys does not matter anyway because when it comes to getting a job they do just as well as girls. This is the same irrelevant non-argument which was soundly trashed by The Higher Education Policy Institute (see <http://redpilluk.co.uk/UKEducationData.pdf>): one disadvantage does not justify another. The reason why I have become an MRA is

largely due to the realisation that there are vast numbers of Alison Saunders all over the place, in positions of influence working away to further the cause of women with no regard whatsoever for men and boys. None. At all. They don't care about males, they really don't. And they have been getting away with it for decades. The occupation of influential posts by people pursuing a sexist agenda must come to an end. The era in which feminism is mistaken for equality must be terminated.