

# 男女共同参画企画 「全員参加の生命科学研究を目指して」

## 第2部

### 「無意識のバイアス」

塩見春彦

(注：この話はHSの個人的見解であり、  
決して男女共同参画委員会の総意でも見解でもありません)



## WOMANSPACE

Parallel processing.

BY ED RYBICKI

You'd never think that all it took was two middle-aged men, sent shopping by the wife of one to buy knickers, to crack the biggest discovery in modern physics.

It was very simple: I'd been staying with my friend Russell in Canberra, trying to sort out how we were going to get our book on virus structure together, when Russell's wife Lilia decided that their youngest daughter needed new school knickers. She was too busy making supper to bother; these otherwise unemployed elderly men were the perfect candidates — and the prospect of not having to listen to us blather on about just where to pitch the book, and what to put in it, and which Jethro Tull albums we liked, probably tipped the balance our way. Seeing as we could continue to do all those things in a car and in the supermarket — and do a side trip to drool over new electronic goodies in Harvey Norman — we agreed with alacrity.

And so it was, that after a most satisfying comparison shop of iMacs versus the rest, and a cruise through rock nostalgia in the shape of special-offer CDs, we found ourselves in a large supermarket, trawling for girls' knickers.

At this point I must digress, and mention, for those who are not aware, the profound differences in strategy between Men Going Shopping and Women Going Shopping. In any general shopping situation, men *hunt*: that is, they go into a complex environment with a few clear objectives, achieve those, and leave. Women, on the other hand, *gather*: such that any mission to buy just bread and milk could turn into an extended foraging expedition that also snares a to-die-for pair of discounted shoes; a useful new mop; three sorts of new cook-in sauces; and possibly a selection of frozen fish.

And the interesting thing is — and this is what sparked the discovery — that any male would be very hard pressed to say where she got some of these things, even if he accompanied her.

Have you never had the experience of talking to your significant female other as you wend your way through the complexity of a supermarket — only to suddenly find her 20 metres away with her back to you? And then she comes back with something



you've never seen before, and tosses it in the trolley as if nothing has happened?

I know I have — and until recently, I had always assumed it was just me not noticing new things in the aisles we were walking through.

So there we were, looking for knickers, and a rather wary woman asked if she could help, given that we looked lost and hopeless. Russell explained to her exactly what we were looking for, and her wariness seemed to become mild alarm, until we hastened to reassure her that this was in fact a commission for the mother of said child. She then said, with what seemed to be great satisfaction, "Oh, no; you'll never find those in here — you'll have to go down to [some remote location]," which we had no chance of achieving before they closed, so the whole mission was now a failure.

It was as we trudged our forlorn way back to the car that Russell said: "You know, I'm sure we've found them there before — at least, Lilia has."

I said, only half-joking: "Well, women seem to be able to do that — maybe they're getting into spaces we poor guys can't?"

That was the catalyst: suddenly, we Hunters had an insight into how real Gatherers operated, sparked by our own hopelessness and some considerable acquaintance with the formidable talents of wives when it comes to finding things, and enough science

(and science fiction) background to be able to appreciate that parallel universes were quite a reasonable answer to a

number of important questions. Including, it seemed, supermarket shopping.

Oh, we were roundly scorned when we got back, knickerless; both for the lack of same, and for our absurd idea — which smacked of desperate snatching at straws to excuse incompetence, to the astrophysics-qualified wife. However, we persevered: we talked it through exhaustively, even conquering problems like:

"What happens when you take some item from another universe to the checkout — when they won't recognize the barcode?" Except they do — electronic systems are quantum-computing devices in their ability to access stock codes, and when they don't, then it's invariably a woman who gets sent to look for them, and they, of course, find them...

And there it might have sat, had it not been for the Internet. We simply put the idea up in as many forums as we could access; we blogged on it; we talked to everyone we knew (well, male, obviously) who could be relied on to observe such phenomena — and slowly, the observations came in.

Then, of course, there was arguing about significance, and power of the statistical methods used, and it all got usurped by some theoretical physicists the moment it started to look as though there was something in it.

But the answer is clear: women can access parallel universes in order to find things, whether they do it consciously or not. They have probably always been able to do this, and now there is fierce speculation as to whether this constituted the evolutionary advantage we had over other primates: the presence of bulbs, grains and nuts on the table that had been retrieved from parallel universes when the hunters came home empty-handed was probably a major factor in the survival of our species.

The difference is that now they know that they can do it — and things have changed.

Because groceries aren't all they go looking for. It turns out the next item on the shopping list is better-looking versions of us.

Russell and I no longer communicate. And we're very lonely. ■

Ed Rybicki swears that at least some of this is a true story. The part about Russell Kightley and the knickers, anyway.

➔ NATURE.COM  
Follow Futures on  
Facebook at:  
ga.nature.com/mtoodm

# WOMANSPACE

Parallel processing.



number of important questions. Including, it seemed, supermarket shopping. Oh, we were roundly scorned when we got back, knickerless; both for the lack of same, and for our absurd idea — which smacked of desperate snatching at straws to excuse incompetence, to the astrophysics-qualified wife. However, we persevered: we talked it through exhaustively, even conquering problems like: “What happens when you take some item from another universe to the checkout — when they won’t recognize the barcode?” Except they do — electronic systems are quantum-computing devices in their ability to access stock codes, and when they don’t, then it’s invariably a woman who gets sent to look for them, and they, of course, find them ...

And there it might have sat, had it not been for the Internet. We simply put the idea up in as many forums as we could access; we blogged on it; we talked to everyone we knew (well, male, obviously) who could be relied on to observe such phenomena — and slowly, the observations came in.

Then, of course, there was arguing about significance, and power of the statistical methods used, and it all got usurped by some theoretical physicists the moment it

you’ve never seen before, and tosses it in the trolley as if nothing has happened?

I know I have — and until recently, I had always assumed it was just me not noticing new things in the aisles we were walking through.

So there we were, looking for knickers, and a rather wary woman asked if she could help, given that we looked lost and hopeless. Russell explained to her exactly what we were looking for, and her wariness seemed to become mild alarm, until we hastened to reassure her that this was in fact a

commission for the moment. She then said, with what satisfaction, “Oh, no; you’re in here — you’ll have to go to a remote location!” which was a relief, because the mission was now a failure.

It was as we trudged out to the car that Russell said, “I’m sure we’ve found them, at least, Lilia has.”

I said, only half-jokingly, “I seem to be able to do things that get into spaces we probably haven’t even considered.”

That was the catalyst: we had an insight into the way the world operated, sparked by a woman’s common sense and some consideration of the formidable talents of wives when it comes to finding things, and enough science (and science fiction) background to be able to appreciate that parallel universes were quite a reasonable answer to a

## “Innate ability”

生まれながらの能力 (の違い)

gender bias and other stereotypes

shopping list is better-looking versions of us. Russell and I no longer communicate. And we’re very lonely. ■

Ed Rybicki swears that at least some of this is a true story. The part about Russell Kightley and the knickers, anyway.

➔ NATURE.COM  
Follow Futures on  
Facebook at:  
[go.nature.com/mtoodm](http://go.nature.com/mtoodm)

## Comments

“I cannot believe something like this would be published in 2011”

“Publishing this article promotes the idea that Nature’s review process is greatly flawed”

“By publishing this article, Nature promulgates such nonsensical Men are from Mars, Women are from Venus ideas”

“This “humorous” article is sexist and completely unscientific”

“It clearly demonstrates the lack of sensitivity”

“This kind of article makes women feel excluded and hinders their progress in science careers”

“The story places women and men in fundamentally different categories”

“It is surprising that the authors didn’t actually realise that his article would cause offense, and that is one of the most worrying things about it”

## “Latent bias”

## 潜在的偏見

# Unintentional, latent, subconscious bias 故意でない（何気ない）、潜在意識の偏見／先入観

*“Men are hunters and women are gatherers”*

*“Women are well-organized and domestically-oriented whereas men are useless in everyday life  
but come up with theories about the universe”*

隠されているメッセージ：  
優位にある事を心地よく思う気持ち

私たちのコミュニティが正面から取り組まなければならないこと

- 1. 私たちが持っているこのような偏見を認め、それを乗り越えることが  
私たち全ての利益となる**

「男女共同参画に関して」議論するとき、人はしばしば「退行」におちいってしまう。つまり、意識が一時的に、より未熟な状態に逆戻りしてしまう。なぜだろう？

「退行」

「劣化」

「攻撃的」

「下品」

「客観性の低下」

（「匿名性／匿名である自由」との類似性）

## 2. 自然科学的な考え方：論理的かつ定量的に考え、実証に基づいて自分なりに結論を導くという（普段私たちが実践している）考え方が私たち全ての利益となる

“We have to recognize that group averages cannot be applied to individual members of the group, and that individual behavior does not necessarily imply that all members of the group share said behavior”

“Scientists should judge their colleagues on the basis of direct professional interactions rather than applying averages and stereotypes”

**横行している科学的根拠のないバイアスを「理性的・意識的に排除する」**

## 「女性は使いにくいよね」「女性って大変でしょ？」

これって、「全ての女性は」って言う意味ですか？全ての男性は使い易い？  
「女性は使いにくい」と言っている教授（女性PIも含め）、あなた大丈夫ですか？

## 「女性と医者研究者って似てない？すぐ「降り」ちゃうっていう意味で」

これって、「全ての女性は」って言う意味ですか？全ての男性は降りない？就職／昇進が難しいから、結婚して生活を安定させようとしているだけ？医者は資格だけど、専業主婦（家事手伝い）って資格？夫の出世で自らも偉くなったと感じる？夫の肩書きで自分の社会的地位が決まる？本当は、妻のサポートで思い切り仕事に打ち込める夫が羨ましい？仕事を続けられない不完全燃焼感？専業主婦なんてものはない？

## 「彼は家事・育児に協力的なので、これからも助けてもらいながら、頑張っていきたいです」「へー、そんなにいろいろ手伝ってくれるの。ダンナさん、優しいねー」

協力的で優しいダンナを持つのは、幸運？家事や育児の分担は男性の優しさに期待するものですか？家庭のことはヨメさんがやってくれるって、それは甘え、それとも「男の甲斐性／沽券」？  
「家庭のことは私がやらなければ」って、それ本当？





# 毎日があせん



西原理恵子

第397回

「夫のしつけ①」



そもそも  
「手伝おうか?」  
って発言が大問題

本来お母様がやうにと  
いかん家事を私が  
やうてこのに「それぞ  
手伝おうか?」

歴代、夫、彼氏が  
ほぜいた、  
ムカフク発言選手権

よめある川上は爆弾  
おい、アレ  
や、とけって  
言っただろ

**自分で  
やれ。**  
私は母ちゃんじゃない。

10年たっても覚えません。  
不眠不休の  
育原中  
高熱で

オレの  
飯は  
いいから

もしくは  
オレの  
飯は  
買って  
きたから

はい私  
私に言わせて  
わあまたちゃん  
相当たまごそう。

いやー5人も  
甲の子だよー  
当然子育て  
してるよ

もちろんオムツも  
かえるしー

でもさすがに  
ウンコは

子育てはウンコ  
ふいて初めて  
子育てウンコ  
ふけ、ウンコ  
まちゃん落着いて

前にタイに住んでた時、  
働く者の  
お牛伝いさん  
お牛伝いさん  
何軒もかけもちで働いてる。

頑張ってるね  
頑張ってるね  
頑張ってるね

**待てる。**

メイちゃんか  
仕事してる家の前で  
待ってる千代ト君。

はい、会ったこと  
ないけど、たかり

**「自らを客観視する視点を失うと、世界に自分と相手の2者関係しか存在していないかのような錯覚がもたらされる。そしてほとんどの3者関係は、その起源である母親と子供の2者関係に限りなく近づいていく」**

齋藤 環 「公共性と匿名性」

**—自然科学的な考え方—**

## **“Glass ceiling” (1970’s)**

**invisible barriers that block the upward mobility of women in the workforce**

## **“Leaking pipeline” (2000’s)**

**under-representation of women, especially at senior levels, in science  
(women dropping out of science instead of moving up the career ladder)**

## **“Walking on eggshells” (2010’s)**

**you should walk on eggshells if that would help you avoid making  
statements or judging people based on “latent bias”**

**横行している科学的根拠のないバイアスを「理性的・意識的に排除する」**