

Beyond Blind Equality: A Plea for Intelligence and Fairness

Lev Neymotin, PhD

I have lived long enough to watch ideas turn into ideologies, and noble intentions become instruments of division. The latest among them is the pressure for what I call *blind equality* — the belief that every human endeavor must be split fifty–fifty between men and women, regardless of how life actually works. What began as a quest for fairness has hardened into a quiet tyranny of symmetry, where numbers matter more than truth, and difference has become suspect.

What We Once Understood

There was a time when society, even in its imperfections, recognized that men and women were not interchangeable. We didn't always live up to the ideal of fairness — far from it — but we understood something basic: that the two halves of humanity were distinct, each bearing gifts that the other lacked. Those differences were not only biological but extended into the realms of perception, intuition, endurance, and emotional design.

To deny that men are, on average, physically stronger is to deny biology itself. Muscle mass, hormonal structure, bone density — these are not opinions; they are measurable facts. It's why the world of athletics, from boxing to swimming to running, separates competitors by sex. That separation is not discrimination but recognition. It protects fairness by respecting reality. Strength, like childbirth, belongs more naturally to one sex than the other. Equality doesn't mean pretending otherwise.

How Equality Became Arithmetic

But the modern world, with its obsession for visible fairness, has lost its subtlety. Somewhere along the road from justice to ideology, equality turned into arithmetic. Every board, every panel, every film cast, every list of prizewinners is scrutinized not for excellence but for balance. The question is no longer *who can do this best?* but *who will make the numbers look right?*

Media, academia, and politics all play their part. They are driven by fear of accusation, not by devotion to truth. To question the dogma of fifty–fifty is to risk being branded reactionary, or worse. So people nod along while silently wondering why merit seems to matter less, why honest differences must be denied, and why so many bright minds are now walking on eggshells. This is not equality; it is performance. A stage act of fairness replacing the real thing.

What We Lose by Denying Difference

When society insists that men and women must occupy identical places in every field, it turns living diversity into lifeless uniformity. We lose the very richness that makes cooperation between the sexes so powerful. Men, on average, are built for direct confrontation — physically and psychologically. Women, on average, excel at integration, intuition, and sustaining complex emotional systems. These are tendencies, not rules, but they exist across cultures and eras because evolution put them there for a reason.

Suppressing these natural contours in pursuit of “equal representation” doesn't empower anyone. It distorts ambition. It pushes some into roles where they struggle and prevents others from finding roles

where they could thrive. Society becomes a machine tuned not for excellence but for optics. In the end, everyone pays: men, women, and the institutions they serve.

The New Divide

Ironically, the ideology of blind equality has created the very division it pretended to erase. It has armed activists, corporations, and political operators with a moral weapon — the power to shame, accuse, and control under the banner of justice. Real fairness is quiet and durable. Ideological fairness is loud and fragile. It survives by intimidation.

Those who profit from division — political consultants, media performers, self-appointed spokespeople for “justice” — have learned that nothing unites followers like an enemy. And so they manufacture one: the “patriarchy,” the “toxic male,” the “oppressive system.” The tragedy is that most men and women are not at war at all. They want to live, work, and create together in dignity. But the noise of ideology drowns them out.

Complementarity, Not Competition

The truth is simple and liberating: men and women are different, and that is good. Difference is the engine of cooperation. In medicine, art, education, and family life, progress depends on the tension between analytical and intuitive, bold and cautious, linear and holistic ways of thinking. These tendencies do not belong to one gender absolutely, but their distributions differ — and that asymmetry enriches us.

I do not want to see a world in which men and women compete to erase what makes them distinct. I want to see a world in which their differences are understood, honored, and combined. Fairness means open doors, not equal footprints.

A Call for Intellectual Honesty

Recognizing natural differences does not mean assigning worth. It means respecting truth. Denying difference, on the other hand, is not kindness; it is cowardice dressed as virtue. When universities and media preach sameness, they do not liberate women — they infantilize them. When men are told that their natural assertiveness is toxic, they are not reformed — they are confused and ashamed. This psychological fog benefits no one except those who build careers out of grievance.

The pressure for blind equality flattens individuality into categories. It replaces human complexity with quotas and labels. It tells young people what they are supposed to feel rather than inviting them to discover who they are. That, to me, is a greater injustice than inequality ever was.

Where Fairness Truly Lies

Real fairness lies not in counting heads but in recognizing contribution. It lies in celebrating excellence wherever it appears and allowing difference to flourish without suspicion. Men and women are halves of one creative force. Each completes what the other begins. Our task is not to make them the same but to let them be fully themselves — strong where they are strong, tender where they are tender, and human in both directions.

If we can recover that kind of intelligence, the tired arithmetic of blind equality will fade on its own. Society will not need ideological supervision to be fair. It will simply become fair because it has become honest again.

Addendum: Equal Access, Unequal Patterns

This Addendum serves as the factual and analytical extension of the essay — a reality check against ideology, meant to illustrate how genuine equality behaves in practice. It turns to medicine, a field that by 2000 had already removed nearly all formal barriers to women, as a clear test case of what happens when opportunity is equal but outcomes are determined by individual choice, temperament, and preference. Over the past quarter century, admission to medical schools, access to research funding, and promotion to clinical or academic leadership have all operated under transparent parity standards. The doors are fully open, and both sexes have walked through them freely. Yet when we trace their paths two decades later, we find a pattern both consistent and revealing: equality of access does not yield identical results.

The following sections explore this pattern in detail. First, we look at **medicine**—particularly among physician-innovators, surgeons, and research leaders—where women’s participation remains 10–15 percent lower than men’s at the top, despite perfect access. Then, to maintain balance and fairness, we turn to the **counterexamples**: disciplines such as psychology, veterinary medicine, and early education, where women dominate to an even greater degree, often by choice rather than constraint. Finally, we interpret what these complementary trends mean. They show that freedom, once achieved, reveals the natural contours of human diversity rather than a mechanical symmetry of numbers. The concluding reflection argues that fairness lies not in enforcing statistical equality but in respecting difference as an expression of liberty itself.

1. Medicine: Parity at Entry, Divergence at the Summit

Between 2000 and 2025, women have become slightly more than half of all medical students in the United States, Europe, and Israel. At the entry level, medicine is nearly the model of equality. But when we look upward—to the levels of chief surgeons, principal investigators, and the authors of the most cited clinical research papers—the picture changes.

- Among **general physicians and pediatricians**, women now constitute roughly **55–60%**.
- Among **cardiologists, oncologists, and neurologists**, women average **30–40%**.
- Among **surgical innovators, interventional specialists, and heads of high-intensity clinical trials**, the share falls to **10–15%**.

This difference cannot easily be blamed on discrimination, because in these decades the professional culture itself has worked hard to prevent it. Rather, it reflects what happens when individuals with equal rights make unequal choices. The same access produces different distributions because the appetites, priorities, and risk thresholds of the two sexes are not identical. Some of that difference is biological; some social; most a complex weave of both. But it exists, and denying it explains nothing.

2. The Counterbalance: Fields of Female Majority

To test whether this imbalance signifies injustice, we can look in the opposite direction. In the same era:

- **Psychology and counseling** programs award about **70–75%** of their advanced degrees to women.
- **Veterinary medicine** graduates are now nearly **80% female** in the United States and the EU.
- **Primary education and early childhood development** employ **85–90% women** in most Western countries.

No one claims that these numbers represent oppression against men; they are treated as natural outcomes of interest and temperament. The absence of panic over such female dominance only

highlights the inconsistency of our reactions when the ratio tilts the other way. The moral logic should not change with the direction of the imbalance.

3. What the Numbers Reveal

The lesson is not that one sex is better suited to healing bodies and the other to minds or children. It is that **freedom produces patterns**, and those patterns need not be symmetrical to be fair. Once coercion is removed, the curves of human choice reveal themselves: men and women tend to cluster where their intrinsic strengths, temperaments, and desires find resonance. Equality of opportunity reveals diversity, not uniformity.

When we understand this, the obsession with 50/50 loses its moral glamour. Parity at every level is not the definition of justice—it is merely the absence of imagination. A society that demands identical outcomes denies individuals the right to be different, and difference is the raw material of progress.

4. The Honest Measure of Fairness

The truest equality is measured not by the symmetry of results but by the **absence of penalty for difference**. In medicine, women who choose family-friendly or patient-centered specialties should not be undervalued, and men who pursue high-stress surgical careers should not be shamed as relics of patriarchy. The same logic applies elsewhere: in psychology, education, and the arts, men deserve respect even when they are the minority. Fairness means judging contribution, not counting chromosomes.

5. Illustrative Summary

Field (2000–2025)	Female Share at Entry	Female Share Among Top Innovators	Notes
Medicine (overall)	52–55%	20–25%	Equal access; differing career paths
Surgery & Cardiology	45%	10–15%	Persistence of high-risk, long-hour fields
Psychology	70–75%	65–70%	Female preference, not structural bias
Veterinary Medicine	80%	75%	Natural inversion of historic pattern
Early Education	85–90%	90%	Longstanding female majority

6. Closing Reflection

The modern era has achieved what centuries could not: open gates. What remains is the courage to accept that men and women, when truly free, will not distribute themselves in perfect symmetry. That asymmetry is not a flaw; it is the signature of human variety. The goal is not to erase difference but to let it speak without shame, to build institutions flexible enough to harness the best of both. Only then will equality and intelligence finally become the same thing.