HC-05 Feminisms of sameness and difference; the German story

The inquiry into how men and women can best live together—whether orchestrating the intimate dynamics of couples and families, or structuring the macro-dynamics of organizations and societies—demands a rigorous disentanglement of ideological assertion from empirical reality. For centuries, philosophical, biological, and political discourses have oscillated between two distinct paradigms. The first paradigm posits that men and women are fundamentally identical in their psychology and potential, asserting that observed differences are the downstream artifacts of socialization, patriarchal oppression, and unequal opportunity. The second paradigm contends that men and women possess deep-seated, innate differences—whether forged by evolutionary biology or delineated by a distinct female symbolic order—and that authentic emancipation requires celebrating these differences rather than assimilating women into a male-defined standard of humanity.

To build a sustainable foundation for human coexistence, it is necessary to systematically dissect the discourse on sex differences through three distinct empirical layers: measurable physiology, statistical behaviour, and variable culture. Analyzing these layers clarifies the empirical landscape upon which various feminist theories have built their political frameworks. Furthermore, applying these frameworks to the specific historical trajectory of Germany—a nation that offers a unique natural experiment through its mid-twentieth-century division into the capitalist West and the state-socialist East—reveals how differing cultural, legal, and political paradigms irrevocably shape the emancipation gap, maternal employment, and the organization of intimate life.

Part I: The Three Layers of Sex Difference

The scientific study of sex differences is frequently marred by categorical errors, wherein variable cultural phenomena are mistaken for biological absolutes, or biological realities are dismissed as mere social constructs. A rigorous analysis demands separating the evidence into three distinct analytical layers: physiology (which is measurable and typically binary or bimodal), behaviour (which is statistical and characterized by overlapping distributions), and culture (which is highly variable across time and geography).

Layer 1: Physiology (Measurable)

At the physiological layer, chromosomal sex initiates a cascade of hormonal and developmental trajectories that lead to measurable sexual dimorphism. Beyond the obvious reproductive anatomy and secondary sexual characteristics, researchers have intensely debated the extent to which human brain morphometry and functional organization differ by sex.

The strongest, most highly powered evidence on human brain dimorphism comes from Ritchie, Cox, Shen, Lombardo, Reus, Alloza, and Deary (2018), published in *Cerebral Cortex*. Utilizing the UK Biobank dataset, this study represents the largest single-sample investigation of structural and functional sex differences in the adult human brain, featuring an unprecedented sample size of 5,216 participants (2,750 females and 2,466 males)[1]. The findings reveal robust, highly

replicated average differences: males possess significantly higher total brain volumes, raw surface areas, and white matter fractional anisotropy[2]. Females, conversely, exhibit higher raw cortical thickness and higher white matter tract complexity[3]. In terms of functional connectome organization, males show stronger connectivity in unimodal sensorimotor cortices, whereas females display stronger connectivity in the default mode network, a system associated with internal reflection and social cognition[3].

Crucially, one must distinguish what is known about statistical averages from what can be said about specific individuals. Ritchie et al. (2018) explicitly note that despite these statistically significant average differences, there is "considerable distributional overlap between the sexes"[1]. Furthermore, subregional differences could not be entirely attributed to differences in total volume or body height, indicating genuine dimorphism rather than mere scaling artifacts[2].

Another vital finding from this dataset is the phenomenon of greater male variance; across almost all raw structural measures, the distribution of male traits was wider than that of females, a pattern frequently observed across various biological and psychological metrics[1].

Layer 2: Behaviour (Statistical, Overlapping Distributions)

When transitioning from physiological brain morphology to psychological traits, cognitive abilities, and vocational interests, the data must be understood through the lens of statistics—specifically, effect sizes (often measured by Cohen's *d*) and the degree of overlapping distributions.

The leading academic framework arguing for broad psychological sameness is the "Gender Similarities Hypothesis," famously articulated by Janet Shibley Hyde (2005) in the *American Psychologist*[7]. Through an exhaustive review of 46 meta-analyses encompassing dozens of psychological domains, Hyde concluded that males and females are overwhelmingly similar on most psychological variables[7]. In terms of effect size, Hyde found that 78% of reported gender differences were in the close-to-zero ($d \leq 0.10$) or small ($0.11 < d < 0.35$) range[8]. The average absolute difference across domains was found to be $d = 0.21$, a figure indicating an almost 85% overlap between male and female distributions[8]. This overarching finding of similarity has been consistently replicated, most notably by Zell, Krizan, and Teeter (2015) in a massive metasynthesis confirming an average effect size of $d = 0.21$[9]. Hyde warned that overinflated claims of gender differences carry substantial societal costs, fostering stereotyped expectations and self-fulfilling prophecies in intimate relationships, education, and the workplace[8].

Despite this overarching pattern of similarity, certain psychological domains exhibit robust, highly replicated, and statistically massive sex differences. Voyer, Voyer, and Bryden (1995), in a landmark meta-analysis published in the *Psychological Bulletin* encompassing 286 effect sizes, demonstrated that the magnitude of cognitive sex differences depends heavily on the specific task[11]. While spatial visualization showed minimal differences ($d = 0.19$), mental rotation tasks reliably produced medium to large differences favouring males ($d = 0.56$ to 0.73)[13]. This specific finding has consistently replicated across decades, with mental rotation remaining one of the largest cognitive sex differences documented in the psychological literature, maintaining stability across both time and varying degrees of societal egalitarianism[13]. Similarly, Su, Rounds,

and Armstrong (2009), also publishing in the *Psychological Bulletin*, analyzed sex differences in vocational interests with a massive sample size (N = 503,188). They identified an extraordinary effect size on the "Things vs. People" dimension (*d* = 0.93), demonstrating that men vastly prefer object-oriented, mechanical, and technical pursuits, while women demonstrate a profound preference for person-oriented, social, and artistic pursuits[15].

The assertion that men and women are psychologically identical has faced severe methodological pushback regarding how differences are aggregated and calculated. Del Giudice, Booth, and Irwing (2012), writing in *PLoS ONE*, challenged Hyde's univariate approach. Analyzing a highly representative US standardization sample (N = 10,261) using the 16PF Questionnaire, they argued that analyzing personality traits one by one (where overlap is high) mathematically obscures the reality that men and women differ fundamentally in their overall personality profiles[17]. Using multigroup latent variable modeling and a multivariate effect size metric known as the Mahalanobis distance (*D*), Del Giudice et al. (2012) found a global effect size of *D* = 2.71[17]. This staggering figure equates to an overlap of only 10% between the male and female multivariate distributions[17]. This finding was not an anomaly; it was subsequently closely replicated by Kaiser, Del Giudice, and Booth (2019) in the *Journal of Personality* across two massive datasets (N = 21,567 US participants; N = 31,637 English-speaking participants), yielding robust multivariate effect sizes of *D* = 2.06 and *D* = 2.10[20]. The leading critics of the Gender Similarities Hypothesis thus maintain that while men and women overlap greatly on isolated traits, the aggregate configuration of human personality is highly sexually dimorphic[20].

Layer / Domain	**Key Authors & Journal**	**Sample Size / Metric**	**Effect Size**	**Finding & Replication Status**
Physiology (Brain)	Ritchie et al. (2018), *Cerebral Cortex*	N = 5,216	N/A (Structural)	Males: larger volume. Females: thicker cortex. Highly replicated.
Behaviour (Univariate)	Hyde (2005), *American Psychologist*	46 Meta-analyses	*d* = 0.21 (Average)	~85% overlap on isolated traits. Replicated by Zell et al. (2015).
Behaviour (Spatial)	Voyer et al. (1995),	286 Effect Sizes	*d* = 0.56 - 0.73	Large male advantage in

	Psychological Bulletin			mental rotation. Robust, replicated.
Behaviour (Interests)	Su et al. (2009), *Psychological Bulletin*	N = 503,188	*d* = 0.93	Massive male preference for things; female for people. Replicated.
Behaviour (Multivariate)	Del Giudice et al. (2012), *PLoS ONE*	N = 10,261	Mahalanobis *D* = 2.71	~10% multivariate overlap. Replicated by Kaiser et al. (2019).

Layer 3: Culture (Variable)

The third layer concerns the origin of these behavioural differences, sparking a fierce, ongoing debate between evolutionary psychology and sociocultural theories.

Evolutionary psychology posits that physiological and psychological sex differences are innate adaptations to the distinct evolutionary pressures faced by ancestral men and women—specifically, the asymmetrical burdens of parental investment. David Buss (1989), in a foundational cross-cultural study spanning 37 cultures, demonstrated that men universally prioritize physical attractiveness and youth (cues to fertility), while women universally prioritize ambition, social status, and financial prospects (cues to resource acquisition and protection)[23]. Similarly, John Archer (2004) in the *Review of General Psychology*, utilized evolutionary sexual selection theory to explain why physical aggression is universally higher in males, peaking in young adulthood as a direct, evolved response to reproductive competition and risk-taking[26].

Social Role Theory, championed by Alice Eagly and Wendy Wood (1999) in the *American Psychologist*, provides the strongest counter-argument to evolutionary determinism[27]. They argue that human sex differences reflect an accommodation to the sexual division of labour, which is originally driven by physical differences (male size/strength, female gestation/lactation) but is ultimately sustained by variable cultural norms and economic structures[24]. Through a rigorous reanalysis of Buss's cross-cultural data, Eagly and Wood (1999) demonstrated that as nations achieve greater gender parity (measured by UN gender empowerment indices), the sex differences in mate preferences—particularly the female preference for male earning capacity—significantly attenuate[24]. Zentner and Mitura (2012) replicated and extended this framework, showing that in highly egalitarian nations like Finland, mate preferences

fundamentally converge, contradicting the evolutionary assumption of rigid, universally fixed psychological modules[25]. However, evolutionary psychologists strongly rebut this by pointing out that while gender parity *reduces* the magnitude of these differences, it rarely eliminates them entirely, suggesting a complex, inextricable interaction between innate biological predispositions and cultural scaffolding[25].

Part II: Mapping the Theories of Sex Difference within Feminism

How society interprets these three layers—physiology, behaviour, and culture—forms the bedrock of feminist philosophy. The feminist movement is not monolithic; it operates as an intellectual battleground of competing epistemologies regarding whether sex differences should be minimized to achieve sociopolitical equality, or elevated and celebrated to dismantle oppressive patriarchal structures.

The intellectual genesis of equality feminism rests on Simone de Beauvoir's existentialist declaration in *The Second Sex* (1949): "One is not born, but rather becomes, a woman." Beauvoir viewed the female condition as an artificial social imposition wherein women are relegated to the status of the "Other" relative to the male default, alienated from their own transcendence. Building directly on this premise, Liberal Equality Feminism seeks to dismantle legal, political, and institutional barriers, striving for a society where biological sex is rendered as irrelevant to social participation and economic opportunity as eye color. At its postmodern extreme, this framework evolved into Gender Theory, spearheaded by Judith Butler's *Gender Trouble* (1990). Butler famously argued that not only is gender a social construct, but biological sex itself is a discursive formation. Gender is understood as "performative"—a stylized, ritualized repetition of acts that creates the illusion of an innate core. For Butler, true emancipation requires subverting these performances to collapse the binary entirely.

Radical Feminism emerged in the late 1960s, shifting the focus away from liberal legal rights toward structural power dynamics. Radical feminists argue that patriarchy—the systemic dominance of men over women—is the primary, foundational axis of human oppression, preceding both class and race. They emphasize issues like reproductive rights, sexual violence, and the omnipresence of pornography as explicit tools of male control and bodily commodification. This ideological branching provoked severe internal critiques from classical liberals. In *Who Stole Feminism? How Women Have Betrayed Women* (1994), Christina Hoff Sommers drew a sharp distinction between "Equity Feminism" and "Gender Feminism"[33]. Sommers argued that Equity Feminism successfully won equal legal rights and opportunity, while Gender Feminism operates as an extremist, misandrist ideology that relies on unscientific data to portray women as perpetual victims of an omnipresent patriarchy, thereby infantilizing women, demonizing men, and betraying the core tenets of classical liberalism[33].

In stark contrast to the Beauvoirian drive for absolute sameness, Difference Feminism asserts that women possess distinct moral, psychological, and linguistic frameworks that have been historically devalued by male-centric societies. Assimilating into male structures is viewed not as liberation, but as a deeper form of complicity. In her landmark book, *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development* (1982, Harvard University Press), psychologist

Carol Gilligan challenged Lawrence Kohlberg's stages of moral development, which were based entirely on male samples and elevated abstract justice as the pinnacle of moral maturity[36]. Gilligan's empirical research demonstrated that women tend to operate on a distinct "Ethics of Care," prioritizing interpersonal relationships, context, and the avoidance of harm over rigid, abstract rules[37]. Although critics like Naomi Weisstein argued this approach risks biological essentialism and decontextualizes women's behavior from systemic power dynamics[37], Gilligan successfully reframed traits traditionally seen as female "weaknesses" into vital, mature human strengths[40].

This philosophical divergence found deeper expression in French Post-Structuralist Feminism. Luce Irigaray, in *Speculum of the Other Woman* (1974) and *This Sex Which Is Not One* (1977), merged psychoanalysis with philosophy to deliver a scathing critique of Western phallocentrism[41]. She argued that Western thought recognizes only one sex—the male—with the female positioned merely as his lack, negative space, or mirror image[41]. Irigaray championed an inherently female language and sexuality that is plural, fluid, and non-linear, positioning it against the rigid, singular male symbolic order[41]. Hélène Cixous similarly advocated for *écriture féminine* (women's writing) as a method to disrupt patriarchal discourse from within.

Perhaps the most robust political application of difference feminism occurred in Italy, theorized heavily by the Milan Women's Bookstore Collective (*Libreria delle donne di Milano*) in their 1987 text *Non credere di avere dei diritti* (Don't Think You Have Any Rights) and philosophers like Luisa Muraro and Adriana Cavarero[43]. The Italian "thought of sexual difference" (*pensiero della differenza*) utterly rejected the liberal pursuit of equality, viewing it as a trap that violently assimilates women into male space. Instead, they focused on creating an autonomous female symbolic order through the practice of *autocoscienza* (consciousness-raising) and *affidamento* (entrustment)[45]. *Affidamento* is a radical political practice where one woman entrusts herself to another woman who possesses more authority or experience, explicitly acknowledging disparities among women to build strong, non-hierarchical, maternal-rooted relational authority independent of male institutions[43]. An extension of difference feminism, Ecofeminism, posits a deep, conceptual link between the patriarchal subjugation of women and the industrial exploitation of the natural world. It asserts that male-dominated capitalist paradigms treat both female bodies and the earth as infinite resources for extraction, requiring a holistic paradigm shift toward sustainability and care.

Part III: The German Story – East, West, and Emancipation

Germany provides an exceptional historical framework for analyzing the practical, socioeconomic application of these feminist theories. Following World War II, the division into the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG, West) and the German Democratic Republic (GDR, East) created deeply divergent legal, cultural, and economic pathways for women, the legacies of which profoundly affect modern German life and maternal employment.

Until the late 1970s, the legal and cultural baseline in West Germany was the *Hausfrauenehe*

(housewife marriage). Enshrined in law, it dictated that a woman required her husband's legal permission to seek employment, which could be summarily revoked if her job interfered with her domestic duties. The eruption of the West German post-1968 women's movement was heavily catalyzed by the battle over reproductive rights, specifically the campaign against Paragraph 218 of the Penal Code, which outright banned abortion and carried severe prison sentences[48]. Drawing direct inspiration from the French *Manifeste des 343*, journalist and radical feminist Alice Schwarzer orchestrated a massive public disobedience campaign[50]. On June 6, 1971, the cover of *Stern* magazine declared "Wir haben abgetrieben!" (We have had abortions!), featuring 374 women—including prominent celebrities like Romy Schneider—publicly confessing to illegal abortions and demanding full decriminalization[48]. This high-profile action launched Schwarzer into national prominence, spurred the foundation of the influential feminist magazine *Emma*, and unified a fractured movement. The intense pressure led the social-liberal government in 1974 to pass a reform legalizing abortion in the first trimester (the *Fristenlösung*)[48]. However, in a highly contentious ruling in 1975 (*BVerfGE 39, 1*), the Federal Constitutional Court struck down the law[49]. The Court ruled that Article 2 of the Basic Law guaranteed the right to life of the unborn, forcing the state to adopt an *Indikationslösung*—permitting abortion only under strict medical or criminal indications, effectively stating the state had a duty to protect unborn life even against the mother's wishes[49]. While the 1977 Marriage Law Reform finally abolished the legal basis of the *Hausfrauenehe*, substituting it with a partnership model, the cultural expectation of the male breadwinner and female caregiver remained deeply ingrained in West German institutions.
Conversely, the East German (GDR) model of emancipation was driven top-down by Marxist-Leninist ideology and the state's desperate need for a post-war labor force. Emancipation was achieved primarily through the integration of women into wage labor[56]. The GDR provided comprehensive, state-funded childcare, allowing female labor force participation to skyrocket to levels unseen in the West[56]. Additionally, East Germany implemented a highly liberal abortion law in 1972, granting women abortion on demand in the first twelve weeks without the punitive restrictions seen in the FRG[49]. However, East German emancipation had significant socio-cultural blind spots. While women entered the workforce *en masse*, the domestic sphere remained highly traditional. Women suffered a severe "double burden," performing full-time industrial or administrative jobs while retaining near-total responsibility for household chores and child-rearing[59]. The socialist state did not challenge male privilege within the home, highlighting a failure of state-socialist feminism to implement true relational equality.
The reunification of Germany forced a collision of these two models. The legal compromise on abortion in 1993 resulted in a highly regulated system where abortion remains technically illegal (under Paragraph 218) but goes unpunished in the first 12 weeks if mandatory counseling and waiting periods are strictly observed[55]. More profound, however, is the economic legacy evaluated by modern labor economists. Henrik Kleven, Camille Landais, Johanna Posch, Andreas Steinhauer, and Josef Zweimüller (2019) published groundbreaking findings in the *AEA Papers and Proceedings* utilizing pseudo-event studies around the birth of a first child to measure the "child penalty"—the labor-market impact of parenthood on women relative to

men[64]. They found that in German-speaking countries, the birth of a first child triggers an immediate and catastrophic drop in maternal earnings from which women never recover. A decade after childbirth, West German mothers face an earnings penalty of roughly 61%, largely driven by shifts to part-time work, compared to ~20% in the US and ~21-27% in Scandinavia[64]. Fascinatingly, as Kleven (2024) notes in an *NBER* working paper, child penalties are heavily determined by deep-seated cultural norms rather than pure economic incentives. Research utilizing intra-German movers demonstrates that the cultural legacy of the East/West divide remains incredibly potent; mothers socialized in East Germany face significantly smaller child penalties than those in the West, reflecting the enduring psychological persistence of the respective emancipation models long after the Berlin Wall fell[64]. The West German emancipation story emphasized legal parity, bodily autonomy (through the fierce but compromised fight over §218), and protection against patriarchal violence. What it largely left out, however, was the structural provision of full-time childcare and the cultural deconstruction of maternal guilt, trapping subsequent generations in a perpetual struggle to balance career and family.

Emancipation Metric	**West Germany (FRG)**	**East Germany (GDR)**	**Modern Reunified Impact**
Ideological Basis	Grassroots feminism, legal rights	Marxist-Leninism, labor necessity	Blended, but culturally stratified
Family Model	*Hausfrauenehe* (until 1977 reform)	Dual-earner, state childcare	High part-time female labor in West
Abortion Law	Highly restricted (*BVerfGE 39,1*)	Legalized on demand (1972)	Illegal but unpunished (w/ counseling)
Child Penalty	Massive (~61% earnings drop)	Lower penalty, but "double burden"	East/West cultural norms persist today

Part IV: Controversies, Evidence, and Leading Critics

The application of feminist theory and sex difference research has yielded several high-stakes controversies that remain fiercely debated among academics, touching on the core of how biology and culture interact.

The most intense empirical dispute is the "Gender-Equality Paradox." Stoet and Geary (2018), writing in *Psychological Science*, analyzed PISA data from 472,242 adolescents across 67

countries. They reported a deeply counter-intuitive finding: countries with the highest levels of sociopolitical gender equality (e.g., Scandinavian nations, Finland) possess some of the *largest* sex disparities in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) graduation rates[68]. Conversely, highly unequal countries (e.g., Algeria) show much higher female representation in STEM[70]. Stoet and Geary hypothesized that in wealthy, egalitarian societies, individuals are freed from economic survival pressures, allowing innate or culturally ingrained sex differences in vocational interests (the aforementioned "Things vs. People" divergence) to manifest fully[69]. This finding was subjected to severe methodological and theoretical scrutiny. Thomas Breda, Elyès Jouini, Clotilde Napp, and Georgia Thebault (2020) published a powerful rebuttal in *PNAS* analyzing data from 300,000 students. They demonstrated that the paradox can be entirely explained by the varying prevalence of the specific stereotype that "math is not for girls." Strikingly, their data showed that essentialist stereotypes associating math with men are actually *stronger* in more egalitarian and economically developed countries, suggesting that modern egalitarianism reshapes rather than suppresses gender norms, replacing vertical inequality with horizontal segregation[71]. Furthermore, Richardson et al. (2020) criticized Stoet and Geary's statistical methodology, prompting a formal correction to the original paper regarding their use of unvalidated "propensity" measurements rather than raw graduation shares[73].

In contemporary Germany, the philosophical conflict between radical feminism and intersectional feminism has crystallized violently around the issue of sex work. Alice Schwarzer remains the leading advocate for the "Nordic Model" (a *Sexkaufverbot* or total ban on buying sex), arguing from a radical feminist perspective that sex work is inherently exploitative, an extreme manifestation of patriarchal violence, and incompatible with human dignity[74]. However, younger generations of intersectional feminists, alongside sex worker unions, fiercely criticize Schwarzer's approach. They argue her advocacy victimizes sex workers, strips them of agency, drives the industry dangerously underground, and frequently aligns with trans-exclusionary rhetoric, demonstrating a severe generational and ideological fracture within the movement regarding who gets to define female bodily autonomy[74].

Conclusion and Syntheses

10-line summary of robust findings

Physiological research utilizing large-scale neuroimaging demonstrates that male and female brains exhibit robust average dimorphisms in volume, cortical thickness, and functional connectivity, though these distributions overlap significantly. Behaviorally, the Gender Similarities Hypothesis confirms that for the vast majority of isolated psychological traits, men and women overlap by more than 85%. However, when analyzing traits in aggregate, multivariate personality configurations display profound sexual dimorphism, demonstrating less than 25% overlap globally. Specific cognitive and vocational domains feature highly stable differences; men possess a robust advantage in mental rotation, while vocational interests are highly dimorphic along the "things versus people" axis. Cross-cultural research confirms universal sex differences in mate preferences regarding status and physical attractiveness, yet social role theory proves these differences attenuate meaningfully as national gender parity

increases. Feminist theory has navigated these empirical realities by spanning a spectrum from demanding absolute social constructionist sameness to celebrating a distinct, relational female symbolic order. The German historical experience reveals that state-sponsored emancipation via labor integration, as seen in the East, maximized female workforce participation but ignored domestic inequality, creating a double burden. Conversely, the West German model struggled to overcome the conservative legacy of the housewife marriage, leading to massive, culturally persistent "child penalties" for modern mothers. Finally, the Gender-Equality Paradox indicates that highly egalitarian nations often feature wider occupational segregation, illustrating the complex, unresolved tension between sociopolitical freedom, evolving cultural stereotypes, and potential underlying psychological distributions.

Contested or open questions

- To what extent are the large, replicated cognitive differences in spatial rotation biologically hardwired versus culturally trained through differential early-childhood socialization and play?
- Does the Gender-Equality Paradox in STEM reflect an unmasking of innate evolutionary preferences in economically safe societies, or the insidious evolution of essentialist stereotypes in capitalist knowledge economies?
- Can the profound multivariate differences in human personality (Mahalanobis *D*) be mapped directly to distinct neurobiological substrates, or are they artifactual clusterings of heavily socialized behaviors?
- Is it possible to implement the Italian difference-feminist practice of *affidamento* (entrustment) in modern corporate or political structures without inadvertently reinforcing patriarchal hierarchies?

5 to 10 most important sources to read in full

1. Ritchie, S. J., et al. (2018). "Sex Differences in the Adult Human Brain: Evidence from 5216 UK Biobank Participants." *Cerebral Cortex*.
2. Hyde, J. S. (2005). "The Gender Similarities Hypothesis." *American Psychologist*.
3. Del Giudice, M., Booth, T., & Irwing, P. (2012). "The Distance Between Mars and Venus: Measuring Global Sex Differences in Personality." *PLoS ONE*.
4. Voyer, D., Voyer, S., & Bryden, M. P. (1995). "Magnitude of sex differences in spatial abilities: A meta-analysis and consideration of critical variables." *Psychological Bulletin*.
5. Eagly, A. H., & Wood, W. (1999). "The origins of sex differences in human behavior: Evolved dispositions versus social roles." *American Psychologist*.
6. Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*. Harvard University Press.
7. Milan Women's Bookstore Collective (1987). *Non credere di avere dei diritti* (Sexual Difference: A Theory of Social-Symbolic Practice).
8. Kleven, H., et al. (2019). "Child Penalties Across Countries: Evidence and Explanations." *AEA Papers and Proceedings*.
9. Breda, T., et al. (2020). "Gender stereotypes can explain the gender-equality paradox." *PNAS*.
10. Buss, D. M. (1989). "Sex differences in human mate preferences: Evolutionary hypotheses

tested in 37 cultures." *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*.

Implications for living together

How men and women arrange their intimate partnerships, families, and organizations requires navigating the complex reality that we are neither entirely interchangeable blank slates nor rigid biological automatons trapped in evolutionary amber. Acknowledging that innate temperamental and interest differences exist on an aggregate, multivariate level—such as the profound divergence in mechanical versus social interests—does not mean these differences should dictate sociopolitical policy or be used to constrain individuals. Prescribing behavior based on statistical averages commits the naturalistic fallacy—assuming that what is biological or statistically normal is therefore morally good or optimal.

For intimate partnerships and families, the data suggest that strict egalitarianism in role division must be actively and continuously negotiated, as default cultural and biological pressures frequently push couples toward traditionalist models post-childbirth, culminating in the massive, persistent child penalty observed in Western societies. For organizations and societies, true inclusivity may require adopting structural insights from Difference Feminism: rather than forcing women to assimilate into masculine-coded institutional norms of hyper-competition, abstract detachment, and rigid hierarchy, organizations should actively value the "ethics of care" and relational authority. Emancipation cannot mean merely granting women the right to behave identically to men; it must involve comprehensively reshaping both the public and domestic spheres so that both sexes can freely navigate across the vast, overlapping psychological distributions that characterize the human species.

Works cited

1. Sex differences in the adult human brain - bioRxiv, https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/123729v3
2. Sex Differences in the Adult Human Brain: Evidence from 5216 UK, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6041980/
3. Sex Differences in the Adult Human Brain: Evidence from 5216 UK, https://academic.oup.com/cercor/article-abstract/28/8/2959/4996558
4. Sex Differences in the Adult Human Brain: Evidence from 5216 UK, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29771288/
5. SEX DIFFERENCES IN THE HUMAN BRAIN 1 - bioRxiv preprint, https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/123729v3.full.pdf
6. Sex Differences on the Brain (5a) - The Cambridge Handbook of the, https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/cambridge-handbook-of-the-international-psychology-of-women/sex-differences-on-the-brain/198F73902FB24D57D02E1C117BB165D2
7. The gender similarities hypothesis. - Janet Shibley Hyde - SciSpace, https://scispace.com/papers/the-gender-similarities-hypothesis-457sd4q0g5
8. The Gender Similarities Hypothesis | Request PDF - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/7589797_The_Gender_Similarities_Hypothesis
9. American Psychologist Evaluating Gender Similarities and,

https://www.deempathischeorganisatie.nl/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/Zell-Krizan-Teeter-meta-analyse-over-sekseverschillen-in-empathie-2014-1.pdf
10. Janet Shibley Hyde Sinks Stereotypes With Data, https://www.psychologicalscience.org/observer/janet-shibley-hyde-sinks-stereotypes-with-data
11. Magnitude of Sex Differences in Spatial Abilities: A Meta-Analysis, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/15473878_Magnitude_of_Sex_Differences_in_Spatial_Abilities_A_Meta-Analysis_and_Consideration_of_Critical_Variables
12. Gender Differences in Visuospatial Abilities and Complex ... - Frontiers, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/psychology/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00191/full
13. Spatial anxiety and self-confidence mediate sex/gender ... - PMC - NIH, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9488019/
14. Spatial Anxiety And Spatial Performance In Univeristy Students In, https://www.europeanproceedings.com/article/10.15405/epsbs.2018.11.02.89
15. sociodemographic variables and university dropout - SciELO, https://www.scielo.br/j/edreal/a/4HNkZgfjLGwpWmxYpKfc5vv/?lang=en
16. vocational interests: construct validity and measurement, https://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/obj/thesescanada/vol2/OSTCB/TC-OSTCB-4358.pdf
17. measuring global sex differences in personality - PubMed, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22238596/
18. The Distance Between Mars and Venus: Measuring Global Sex, https://ideas.repec.org/a/plo/pone00/0029265.html
19. Measuring Global Sex Differences in Personality | PLOS One, https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0029265
20. Global sex differences in personality: Replication with an open, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/334279951_Global_sex_differences_in_personality_Replication_with_an_open_online_dataset
21. Multivariate Versus Univariate Conceptions of Sex Differences, https://everyone.plos.org/2012/01/04/multivariate-versus-univariate-conceptions-of-sex-differences-let-the-contest-begin/
22. Measuring Sex Differences and Similarities / Del Giudice, M.. - ArTS, https://arts.units.it/retrieve/a4f8c168-15c8-40b6-9e97-058fb9aa56e4/DelGiudice_2022_measuring_sex_differences-similarities_chapter-Post_print.pdf
23. A Cross-cultural Test of the Mate Preference Priority Model, https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2385&context=soss_research
24. The Origins of Sex Differences in Human Behavior, https://labs.psych.ucsb.edu/roney/james/other%20pdf%20readings/Eagly_Wood_1999.pdf
25. Are Sex Differences in Preferences for Physical Attractiveness and, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10481077/
26. Does sexual selection explain human sex differences in aggression?, https://knowledge.lancashire.ac.uk/id/eprint/1155/1/archer_J_does_sexual_selectio

n_explain_2009.pdf
27. The Psychology Of Gender [PDF] [339hs0o9ugq0] - Vdoc.pub, https://vdoc.pub/documents/the-psychology-of-gender-339hs0o9ugq0
28. Evidence of Systematic Bias in Sexual Over- and Underperception, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10434406/
29. Sex Differences in Mate Preferences, Jealousy, and Aggression, http://www.personalityresearch.org/papers/denisiuk.html
30. A sociocultural framework for understanding partner preferences of, https://xyonline.net/sites/xyonline.net/files/2019-07/Zentner%2C%20A%20sociocultural%20framework%202015.pdf
31. Nations' Gender Gap Predicts Degree of Sex Differentiation in Mate, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10480977/
32. (PDF) Mate Preferences and Their Behavioral Manifestations, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/327759539_Mate_Preferences_and_Their_Behavioral_Manifestations
33. Who Stole Feminism?: How Women Have Betrayed Women, https://www.goodreads.com/book/show/1417005
34. Who Stole Feminism? - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Who_Stole_Feminism%3F
35. Who Stole Feminism? by Christina Hoff Sommers, https://www.commentary.org/articles/cathy-young/who-stole-feminism-by-christina-hoff-sommers/
36. In a Different Voice. Psychological Theory and Women's, https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/In-a-Different-Voice.-Psychological-Theory-and-MA-Gilligan/c52ccdc660b43ca97facb9e707cb6417fb78ca83
37. In a Different Voice - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/In_a_Different_Voice
38. In a Different Voice: Women's Conceptions of Self and of Morality, https://www.harvardeducationalreview.org/content/47/4/481
39. In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development, https://books.google.com/books/about/In_a_Different_Voice.html?id=XItMnL7ho2gC
40. In a Different Voice - Harvard University Press, https://www.hup.harvard.edu/books/9780674970960
41. This Sex Which Is Not One Chapter Summary | Luce Irigaray - Bookey, https://www.bookey.app/book/this-sex-which-is-not-one
42. This Sex Which Is Not One, https://morainepark.ecampus.com/this-sex-which-one-irigaray-luce-porter/bk/9780801493317
43. Il simbolico e la via del movimento delle donne - Riviste UNIMI, https://riviste.unimi.it/index.php/MdE/article/download/16988/15005/51034
44. Disentangling Carla Lonzi from the Thought of Sexual Difference, https://www.cambridge.org/core/services/aop-cambridge-core/content/view/89D6553B02BDE2802831F1730FC927AF/S0887536725100494a.pdf/i_recognize_myself_in_an_identification_elsewhere_disentangling_carla_lonzi_from_the_thought_of_sexual_difference.pdf

45. Experience, Subjectivity and Politics in the Italian Feminist Movement, https://d-nb.info/1186498269/34
46. UGUAGLIANZA O DIFFERENZA DI GENERE? - Costituzionalismo.it, https://www.costituzionalismo.it/wp-content/uploads/AZZARITI-UGUAGLIANZA.pdf
47. The Practice of Sexual Difference and Feminist Thought in Italy, http://pratiquesdhospitalite.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/2-teresa-de-lauretis-the-practice-of-sexual-difference-and-feminist-thought-in-italy-an-introductory-essay.pdf
48. MILITANT FEMINIST PROTEST AGAINST THE ABORTION BAN, https://www.berghahnbooks.com/downloads/chapters/KarcherSisters_03.pdf
49. German Constitutional Court abortion decision, 1975 - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/German_Constitutional_Court_abortion_decision,_1975
50. Wir haben abgetrieben! - Wikipedia, https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wir_haben_abgetrieben!
51. Abortion policy in Germany: spotlight on Berlin - EST, https://esthinktank.com/2023/08/04/abortion-policy-in-germany-spotlight-on-berlin/
52. Legal, sicher, selbstbestimmt: Für das Recht auf Abtreibung, https://www.blaetter.de/node/30652/download
53. Schwangerschaftsabbruch - Wikipedia, https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Schwangerschaftsabbruch
54. Judgment of 28 May 1993 - Bundesverfassungsgericht, https://www.bundesverfassungsgericht.de/SharedDocs/Entscheidungen/EN/1993/05/fs19930528_2bvf000290en.html
55. [Opinion of the Federal Constitutional Court on abortion] - PubMed, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/8344169/
56. Legal Tender - Project MUSE, https://muse.jhu.edu/book/24499/pdf?pvk=book-24499-9537972556fd6eb03788c582bdfc6c26
57. The Human Rights Dictatorship: Socialism, Global Solidarity And, https://dokumen.pub/the-human-rights-dictatorship-socialism-global-solidarity-and-revolution-in-east-germany-1st-edition-1108424678-9781108424677-1108440789-9781108440783-1108341292-9781108341295-1108560032-9781108560030.html
58. Power and Society in the GDR, 1961–1979 - dokumen.pub, https://dokumen.pub/download/power-and-society-in-the-gdr-1961-1979-the-normalisation-of-rule-9781845459130.html
59. Screened Encounters: The Leipzig Documentary Film Festival, 1955, https://dokumen.pub/screened-encounters-the-leipzig-documentary-film-festival-1955-1990-9781785339103.html
60. Law on the interruption of pregnancy in the German Democratic, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Law_on_the_interruption_of_pregnancy_in_the_German_Democratic_Republic

61. Building socialism: the afterlife of East German architecture in urban, https://dokumen.pub/building-socialism-the-afterlife-of-east-german-architecture-in-urban-vietnam-9781478010012-9781478011064-9781478012603.html
62. Augustine, Dolores L - Red Prometheus. Engineering and ... - Scribd, https://www.scribd.com/doc/148840457/Augustine-Dolores-L-Red-Prometheus-Engineering-and-Dictatorship-in-East-Germany-1945-1990
63. Bericht der Kommission zur reproduktiven Selbstbestimmung und, https://www.bmjv.de/SharedDocs/Publikationen/DE/Fachpublikationen/2024_Bericht_Kom_218_StGB.pdf?__blob=publicationFile&v=2
64. The Geography of Child Penalties and Gender Norms - NBER, https://www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w30176/w30176.pdf
65. -1.5cm The Child Penalty Atlas0.25cm - NBER, https://www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w31649/w31649.pdf
66. Child penalties across countries - Edinburgh Research Explorer, https://www.pure.ed.ac.uk/ws/files/95266427/KlevenEtAl_AEA_PP_2019.pdf
67. The Causal Impact of Gender Norms on Mothers' Employment, https://www.iwh-halle.de/fileadmin/user_upload/publications/iwh_discussion_papers/iwh-discussion-paper_2024-28_Hermes_Krauss_Lergetporer_Wiederhold.pdf
68. The Gender-Equality Paradox in Intraindividual Academic Strengths, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/383916196_The_Gender-Equality_Paradox_in_Intraindividual_Academic_Strengths_A_Cross-Temporal_Analysis
69. (PDF) The Gender-Equality Paradox in Science, Technology, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/323197652_The_Gender-Equality_Paradox_in_Science_Technology_Engineering_and_Mathematics_Education
70. Countries with greater gender equality have a lower percentage of, https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2018/02/180214150132.htm
71. Gender stereotypes can explain the gender-equality paradox, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33229558/
72. Gender stereotypes can explain the gender-equality paradox - PNAS, https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.2008704117
73. Gender-equality paradox - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gender-equality_paradox
74. Das Prostitutionsgesetz - uniPUB, https://unipub.uni-graz.at/obvugrhs/download/pdf/252169
75. Die strafrechtlichen Regelungen der Prostitution [1 ed, https://dokumen.pub/die-strafrechtlichen-regelungen-der-prostitution-1nbsped-9783428584963-9783428184965.html
76. 5 | 2021 - KriPoZ, https://kripoz.de/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/kripoz-gesamtausgabe-5-2021.pdf
77. The Self-Organization of Sex Workers Against the German Prostitute, https://ricerca.sns.it/retrieve/4a5cb0c0-1412-4eb6-aa32-20402c488bb4/Hofstetter_%20Tesi_PhD.pdf
78. ZDF-Doku über Zwangsprostitution: Legalisiert, aber nicht frei | taz.de, https://taz.de/ZDF-Doku-ueber-Zwangsprostitution/!5879474/

79. DiePodcastin, https://diepodcastin.de/feed/mp3/