

Prof. Derek Hitchins, CEng, FIET, FIM, Wg.Cdr., RAF Retd.

INCOSE Pioneer

Systems Scientist/Anthropologist

17 August 2022



## Inclusivity, Equality & PC— *Man's Inhumanity to Man*<sup>1</sup>—21st Century Style

**W**hen you see the definitions of *Inclusivity*, *Equality* and *Political Correctness*—*the Unholy Trinity*—spelled out, you can be forgiven for finding them neither unreasonable, nor inequitable policies. It's not so much the *policies* that are flawed (although, to be frank, they are not great)—it's more how they are put into *practice*, with either *deliberate*, or *incompetent*, distortion of the ideas and concepts.

**P**C was bad<sup>2</sup> from the outset—censorship, mutual spying and eradication of free speech—and a plug and socket, or tenon and mortice, can no longer be male and female. *Nonsense!* That instinctive analogy has been around

---

<sup>1</sup> “Man's inhumanity to man, Makes countless thousands mourn!” Robert Burns 1759-1796

<sup>2</sup> So bad that it contravenes the US Constitution's First Amendment, the one about free speech. But was nonetheless introduced to the US via universities and colleges...

since Stonehenge. It's not going away. And an Englishman, an Irishman and a Scotsman are no longer allowed to go into a pub—that would be racist. *Rubbish!* PC has submerged satire, comedy and humor in general. Cancel culture, for any performers that “transgress.” And that's *ridiculous!*

**T**hen came *Equality*, which was surely never intended to demolish the family, dismantle our language, encourage gender ‘explosion,’ set male and female in opposition, adversely affect mental health.

**A**nd now we have *Inclusivity*, surely never expected to dismantle our meritocracies, diminish our Armed Forces, degrade our education system...but, of course, these have emerged...

Each on its own has turned out—in practice—to be a poor, unworthy thing. Put together, the *Unholy Trinity*, along with the grossly ill-conceived *Health & Safety at Work*—are *blatant Social Engineering!* Dismantling and destroying our *British Cultures* that has taken many centuries to evolve. And got us through two World Wars. But which are now declared

*bad in every way*, as we are aggravatingly advised in advance of every t.v. film from the 20<sup>th</sup> C.

As bad as today's geriatrics who loved and lived and brought you up through earlier times...only now to be insulted and denigrated as "racist" and "past it." From their experiences, of course, old folks *recognize and ignore social engineering and associated brainwashing via social media*. Still, they don't have human rights...so they don't matter...

**A**nd what are the Unholy Trinity leaving in their wake? *Gender replacing sex—the most confused and confusing invention.*<sup>3</sup> Over 70+ alleged genders? *Sandcastles in the Air...* Plus... Mounting mental health issues, social tension and social anxiety, with neither comedy nor satire to defuse. Balance between the sexes disturbed. Proportion identifying as LGB accelerating. Males and females competing instead of complementing as Nature intended. Males desperate to become females, and *vice versa*, however infeasible... Males *self-identifying* as females, to get into female toilets and into female prisons. (What idiot accepted

---

<sup>3</sup> Gender identity was invented (sic) in 1964 by US psychiatry professor Robert J. Stoller, and was popularized by psychologist John Money, overtaking 'sex' in US publications during the '90s.

that idea?) More babies born *out* of wedlock than *in*, as marriage and the family become “old fashioned.” Increasing domestic violence. Ever expanding hardcore pornography on tap.

**S**o tangled, confused, inflamed-yet-sensitive is the gender subject, and getting progressively more so, that the only possible escape may be to start again, back at the beginning, with “sexual dysphoria” as the root issue, personally distressing<sup>4</sup> as it surely is. To un-invent, & revert ‘gender’ back to—“*classification of nouns and pronouns as corresponding to the two sexes and sexlessness...as used in certain languages; French, German & Latin.*”

**A**nd wouldn't it be great if the scientists, psychiatrists and psychologists, could understand the *cause(s)* of sexual dysphoria. *To dissolve* the dysphoria issue at source... Instead—having *invented gender identity & gender proliferation issues in the first instance—they now find themselves trying to provide “solutions...”*

*...to the insoluble issues they invented???*

---

<sup>4</sup> Sexual dysphoria seems to be experienced in puberty by most, if not all, people...

Then there's the "*woke*" stuff and nonsense. Yes, because that's what it is—why import *yet another* inappropriate US social issue—don't we have enough of our own? If you were to judge by t.v. advertising, quite suddenly the UK at large must be at least 50-75% Black Asian... For the record,<sup>5</sup> as of 2020, UK-wide: 87% are white, 13% are Black Asian, Mixed or other ethnic group. And it's not racist to observe that.

In fact, there seems to be very little *genuine* racism<sup>6</sup> about—lots of name calling, and cultural discord that the PC-indoctrinated all-too-readily *call* racism. But that doesn't make it so. And PC doesn't fix it, either—quite the contrary, although that seems to have been its intention.

Indeed, looking at the Unholy Trinity in the round, it might appear that they are somehow meant to improve things for the underprivileged, minority groups, etc. *A social engineering "cookbook" for racial integration*, you might think.

Their combined effects, however, have been to suppress the majority's cultural identity, to render it bland, uncertain, humorless, anxious and risk averse, to make verbal commu-

---

<sup>5</sup> Government statistics.

<sup>6</sup> The belief that different races possess different characteristics, abilities or qualities especially so as to distinguish them as inferior or superior to one another.

nication hesitant, indirect and nonspecific<sup>7</sup>, and to encourage pseudo-identification as *diverse minorities*, looking thereby to be ‘included’ on that basis if on no other...

There has to be a better way...

**I** *nclusivity* came to the fore recently, w.r.t. the Royal Air Force. Newspaper reports leaked the story:  
Reference: <https://mol.im/a/11116917>

- **Sources say RAF recruiters have been told to pause offering roles to white males**
- **They claim it is part of a drive to meet diversity targets within this financial year**
- **Head of Recruitment at the RAF has reportedly resigned in protest of the move**
- **RAF have denied the allegations and state there is 'no pause and no new policy'**

'There is no scientific or cultural background to these particular levels of ambition.'

The head of recruitment, herself an RAF Group Captain, resigned, allegedly, because she refused to obey an illegal order—for which degree of integrity she deserves *promotion*, not constructive dismissal. Predictably, a spokesman for the RAF disputed the allegations...

---

<sup>7</sup> E.g., a dwarf would be “vertically challenged.”

**H**owever, the alleged policy of ‘pausing’ white male recruiting does go some way to explain a case I have been having trouble understanding.

Recently, two cousins, both with A-Levels, applied to join the RAF. Like their fathers before them. And their grandparents before that! Creation of a veritable RAF dynasty, you might say.

It took each of the cousins about a year of interviews and aptitude tests, during which they received progress reports indicating that they were doing very well! Then, with their hopes high, and keen as mustard for their new careers, they were both—unexpectedly and inexplicably—*failed*.

And the grounds upon which they were failed were, at the very least, dubious. One was failed on peri-natal medical issues, resolved in infancy, and of doubtful relevance, that had been known from the outset—so, if he couldn’t possibly pass, why did he spend a year going through all those interviews and tests and building up his hopes? Disturbing...

The second was even more bizarre. He was failed because he *lacked experience in the rôle* for which he applied (a requirement not mentioned in the recruiting documents). He was SEVENTEEN when he applied. He couldn’t possibly

have experience, and the recruiters knew this from the get-go! Unacceptable! And in both cases—inexplicable. Or, at least, it *was*, BUT...

..NOW WE KNOW! RAF recruiting of white males *paused! The cousins' problem was that they were British white males.* Both of them. Crushed and inconsolable. And, unsurprisingly, no longer quite so enamored with the RAF... It's enough to stop all white male Brits from applying in the first instance... Why try, when *guaranteed to fail?*

**S**imilar things seem to have been going on around the country. Top universities have been told to increase the diversity of their intake. Have they been given quotas—or have they set quotas for themselves, to be seen to be “inclusive”? Which would inevitably mean that top white male applicants would, like the “crushed” cousins, be *paused*. In favor of an applicant who might be good, but who's leading characteristic would be that he/she is NOT male-white-British.

And, surprisingly perhaps, *that would be genuine racism*, the implicit assumption being that white males would be superior by virtue of race, so have to be “paused” (i.e. blocked)



to let “others” through, the clear implication being that these “others” would be inferior, also by virtue of race/ethnicity. What some call “positive discrimination.” But racism, nonetheless...

No argument—this is wrong. Candidates should be chosen on their ability, regardless of sex, ethnicity, race, color, creed, etc. And that has to mean NO QUOTAS. Else, our universities will cease to be the best, our education system will progressively degrade, and our output of brilliant young people will reduce, so diminishing the nation as a whole...

**A**nd there just might be another issue with Inclusivity. It is founded in the idea of including people...

*“...who might otherwise be excluded or marginalized, such as those who are handicapped, or learning-disabled, or racial and sexual minorities.”*

*Oxford Dictionary of English*

Now, with the best will in the world, can we really—I mean *really*—afford to have potentially disadvantaged people in those categories in our top-flight military units? Defending the

nation, reacting *in real time* against who-knows-what attacks from Russia, China and the rest? Or, leading a ground assault on defended territory? Or in a nuclear submarine under Arctic ice, preparing for Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD)? I find that notion untenable...

**N**o, when you look at it square on, we need the *best of the best* in our armed services. Both *prepared* and *able* to make the ultimate sacrifice. *Instantly*, if need be. As we had in the Battle of Britain, thanks be... *Our armed services are meritocracies, each with their own distinctive culture, which are, and have to be, quite unlike those in civilian life.*

Disappointingly, it seems that one very senior officer in the RAF seems to have forgotten that...insisting, as he does, that the *RAF's Operational Capability* is unimpaired. He sees no risk to that Capability in recruiting “less than the best.”

**A**nd another thing. Inclusivity sounds like a good idea—getting everybody on board, an’ all—but is there any *evidence* to support the idea? Are there any sensible *limits* to inclusivity & diversity? Would recruiters take in

convicts, for example, or people on the sex-offenders register, who ‘promise to be good’? What about members of extreme political parties dedicated to overthrow the government, bring down the monarchy, break up the Union, support Putin? Or previous Isis sympathisers, now ‘fully rehabilitated’? Or those harboring a deep-seated resentment about their ancestors of some 400-years back that were enslaved by the British, and who now actively seek retribution with ‘extreme prejudice’? Do we really need to “harbor vipers in our bosom”?

**N**o, there have to be some sensible limits. Systems science indicates that the different parts of any system must both complement & cooperate with other parts within that system, else they become pathogens.

If each of the services, and the military units within them, are considered to be systems, which is not unreasonable, then recruits may come in many forms and varieties, provided they complement and interact—positively—with others in their immediate system.

Indeed, the greater the “connected variety,” the greater the overall *resilience* of the system—provided the conditions continue to be met. Systems science suggests that greater “connected variety” offers greater *flexibility* and *adaptability* to changing en-

vironments. But the reverse will also be true—so *blind Diversity/Inclusivity is unacceptable*—particularly if we are to maintain our meritocracies.

Systems Science offers *no* general insight into “connected variety” and Capability: however...***Operational Capability is best understood in relation to engaging particular opponents in their mutual operational environment...***<sup>8</sup>

**T**okyo, Japan recently exhibited a novel approach to “inclusivity/diversity.” They have opened a restaurant in which the service to customers is provided by robots, that take orders, relay them to the kitchens, and then bring the orders to the tables of paying guests.

The robots are remotely operated by housebound disabled people, from their residences via their internet, using interfaces that enable the operators to ‘see where they are going,’ to talk to the customer, take their order, relay them to the kitchens, return with the order to the customer, take payment, clear up, etc...

The first restaurant is a trial but, if the idea catches on, others will be opened, and the operators will receive a wage as though “in vivo” waiters in a restaurant. Brilliant.

---

<sup>8</sup> As Russian forces are finding out in Ukraine

As more of us take to “working at home,” this idea could be extended to many parts of banking, business and industry. Systems thinking/systems design involves brain-storming when addressing challenging problems. Instead of brain-storming occurring in the one place, could it not be in a *virtual* storm center? Incorporating people with widely different viewpoints and capabilities? Taking best advantage of diversity? You know, I think it could. And that might form the basis of a new business, too...

Software development already lends itself to this ‘distributed’ approach, with both able and disabled accessing a central server via the internet, and each able to see what the others are doing, and so working cooperatively.

**S**ome people with autism have remarkable mental faculties, with eidetic memories, that would be uniquely valuable in the intelligence services, and elsewhere. Napoleon took some of these oxymoronic-ly-termed *idiot-savants*<sup>9</sup> with him when he invaded Egypt, made use of their incredible skills in the recording of many drawings and paintings of ancient Egyptian artifacts. We still marvel at these today, unaware that many were not made until days later, often after only a brief glance at the highly decorated, complex subjects...

---

<sup>9</sup> Meaning *silly-learned* in French. Not, seemingly, rude at the time.

**I**t seems that, instead of positive discrimination, with its racist connotations, it might be preferable and profitable to make use of the unique skills and innate capabilities that impaired people and minorities may possess, and that may be brought to bear remotely.

**S**uppressing the culture of the majority to avoid *supposed* offense being given to an *oversensitive minority* is, not to put too fine a point on it, crass.

It will degrade the whole nation—and in the view of many, it already has! Indeed, it may already be too late to undo the cultural degradation that political correctness has dumped upon the UK.

There are better ways of going about such things, that have been shown to succeed in other countries where, unlike the UK, they have “managed” immigration, rather than just let it happen willy-nilly—the approach, despite many contrary warnings, of successive UK governments.

And in some other countries, rather than suppress the culture of the majority, they have *incorporated* the cultures of the minority groups, so creating a wider, richer, more diverse & interesting *national* culture.

**T**oo late, I fear, for the United Kingdom. Unless...perhaps... After the tremendous success of the Commonwealth Games, held recently in Birmingham, how about the *Commonwealth of Nations* becoming the *United Commonwealth of Nations*...?

Member states already share values of *democracy, human rights, and the rule of law*, as outlined in the [Commonwealth Charter](#). A United Commonwealth of Nations with the UK as one nation among some 54 nations. And some 2.4 billion people. Most of whom already speak English English. Many rather better than the Brits themselves...

United, yet dispersed around the globe, with it's own mutually-beneficial trade arrangements, with multiple cultures...with as little or as much integration as the people concerned wished for. And time to meld...

A fitting tribute and legacy for our dear, departed Queen? Who was, famously, impervious to social engineering...

Just a thought...