

# THE THEORY OF EQUALITY: PATRIARCHY DISGUISED AS FEMINISM

Carmen M. Cusack<sup>▼</sup>

## I. INTRODUCTION

Men act as if though all women are equal.<sup>1</sup> They may disguise patriarchy as feminism.<sup>2</sup> They pretend that by employing a woman, they are effectuating feminism.<sup>3</sup> An exceptional woman is not hired, and then is portrayed as rotting.<sup>4</sup> The employed woman

---

<sup>▼</sup> Thanks is given to Tiberius Washington for his support.

<sup>1</sup> United States Supreme Court jurisprudence is cited *infra*. The cases document discrimination and quotas. They demonstrate that the Court's power has not prevented the continuing war against women. *Anderson v. City of Bessemer*, 470 U.S. 564 (1985); *Arbaugh v. Y & H Corp.*, 546 U.S. 500 (2006); *Arizona Governing Comm. for Tax Deferred Annuity and Deferred Comp. Plans v. Norris*, 463 U.S. 1073 (1983); *AT&T Corp. v. Hulteen*, 556 U.S. 701 (2009).

<sup>2</sup> *Hoyt v. Florida*, 368 U.S. 57 (1961); *Rostker v. Goldberg*, 453 U.S. 57 (1981).

<sup>3</sup> *Corning Glass Works v. Brennan*, 417 U.S. 188 (1974); *County of Washington v. Gunther*, 452 U.S. 161 (1981); *Craig v. Boren*, 429 U.S. 190 (1976); *Crawford v. Nashville & Davidson County, TN*, 555 U.S. (2009). *Davis v. Monroe County Bd. of Educ.*, 526 U.S. 629 (1999); *Desert Palace, Inc. v. Costa*, 539 U.S. 90 (2003).

<sup>4</sup> *Duren v. Missouri*, 439 U.S. 357 (1979); *Faragher v. City of Boca Raton*, 524 U.S. 775 (1998); *Florida v. Long*, 487 U.S. 223 (1988);

perpetrates patriarchy by going along with the plan.<sup>5</sup> The theory of equality is a cover-up notion exemplified by universities employing women, who are less qualified than the exceptional professionals denied deserved accolades, benefits, fraternal and sororal embrace, and employment.<sup>6</sup> This exposition will describe in Section II the misallocation of the theory of equality.<sup>7</sup> The theory is premised in legal arenas on case law developed according to the United States Constitution, Bill of Rights, and Declaration of Independence.<sup>8</sup> Section III chastises women for absorbing the benefits of gender oppression.<sup>9</sup> Universities are reproved in Section IV, particularly because of their ongoing resistance to ending phony

---

Ford Motor Company v. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 458 U.S. 219 (1982); *Frontiero v. Richardson*, 411 U.S. 677 (1973).

<sup>5</sup> *Babb v. Wilkie*, 589 U.S. \_\_ (2020); *Bd. of Dir., Rotary Int'l v. Rotary Club of Duarte*, 481 U.S. 537 (1987); *Bostock v. Clayton County*, 590 U.S. (2020); *Boy Scouts of Am. v. Dale*, 530 U.S. 640 (2000); *Burlington N. & Santa Fe Ry. Co. v. White*, 548 U.S. 53 (2006).

<sup>6</sup> *Califano v. Goldfarb*, 430 U.S. 199 (1977).

<sup>7</sup> See Section II.

<sup>8</sup> See *e.g.*, U.S. Const. art. II §§ I-III; U.S. Const. amend. V and U.S. Const. amend. XIV; Thomas Jefferson, Declaration of Independence (U.S. 1776).

<sup>9</sup> See Section III.

quotas and insulting illusions of fairness.<sup>10</sup> A conclusion is reached in Section V.<sup>11</sup> The Conclusion suggests to universities that they should fairly hire women.<sup>12</sup>

## II. MEN ACT AS IF THOUGH ALL WOMEN ARE EQUAL.

Men act as if though all women are equal.<sup>13</sup> Not all men, but many men willingly portray a woman as a unit of gender.<sup>14</sup> A woman is treated as signifying a human who is something not-male.<sup>15</sup> A woman is a widget.<sup>16</sup> Men perpetrating this mentality do not always act this way.<sup>17</sup> However, they form circumstances during which that mentality suits their

---

<sup>10</sup> See Section IV.

<sup>11</sup> See Section V.

<sup>12</sup> *Id.*

<sup>13</sup> *Altitude Express v. Zarda*, 470 U.S. 564 (1985).

<sup>14</sup> *Dothard v. Rawlinson*, 433 U.S. 347 (1977).

<sup>15</sup> *Caban v. Mohammed*, 441 U.S. 380 (1979).

<sup>16</sup> *Burlington Indus., Inc. v. Ellerth*, 524 U.S. 742 (1998).

<sup>17</sup> *Harris v. Forklift Sys., Inc.*, 510 U.S. 17 (1993).

plan.<sup>18</sup> Circumstances are not given constraints.<sup>19</sup>  
They are concerted actions.<sup>20</sup>

It occurs in a workplace when men espouse the theory of equality.<sup>21</sup> They propose to hire a woman.<sup>22</sup> They choose a woman, who seems compatible with the group.<sup>23</sup> She is hired for her ability to maintain a cohesive, complacent, or willing attitude.<sup>24</sup> Her credentials are irrelevant.<sup>25</sup> If her credentials seem brilliant, then to the group they attest to her willingness to institute patriarchal control over gender.<sup>26</sup>

They pretend that by fraternizing with and paying one woman, they are effectuating feminism for any woman who could have held the position.<sup>27</sup> They truly expect others to accept that one woman

---

<sup>18</sup> *Id.*

<sup>19</sup> *Heckler v. Matthews*, 465 U.S. 728 (1984); *Hishon v. King & Spalding*, 467 U.S. 69 (1984).

<sup>20</sup> *Harlin v. Missouri*, 439 U.S. 459 (1979).

<sup>21</sup> *Id.*

<sup>22</sup> *Id.*; *Harris*, 510 U.S. 17.

<sup>23</sup> *Mohammed*, 441 U.S. 380.

<sup>24</sup> *Id.*

<sup>25</sup> *Id.*

<sup>26</sup> *Zipes v. Trans World Airlines, Inc.*, 455 U.S. 385 (1982).

<sup>27</sup> *Se. Cmty. Coll. v. Davis*, 442 U.S. 397 (1979).

represents all women.<sup>28</sup> They deeply portray the image of equality.<sup>29</sup> Their actions are alleged to signify not only the absence of sexism, but the promotion of a woman.<sup>30</sup> The promotion entices further feminist conduct.<sup>31</sup> Feminism, not seen as an ultimate position taken in demand of dignity, is displayed as having achieved success.<sup>32</sup> Feminism is given a place in ownership.<sup>33</sup> Women, who get along with men, can accept the proximity of patriarchy, boys clubs, old guards, or other quasi-flattering qualifications.<sup>34</sup> They are used as trophies, in their minds, by other women, who no longer have to complain.<sup>35</sup>

They turn away exceptional professionals.<sup>36</sup> Women unrecognized by a field are turned-away.<sup>37</sup> They are portrayed as silently plugging along;

---

<sup>28</sup> *Id.*

<sup>29</sup> *Id.*

<sup>30</sup> *Mississippi Univ. for Women v. Hogan*, 458 U.S. 718 (1982).

<sup>31</sup> *Id.*

<sup>32</sup> *Id.*

<sup>33</sup> *Id.*

<sup>34</sup> CARMEN M. CUSACK, *CRIMINAL JUSTICE HANDBOOK ON MASCULINITY, MALE AGGRESSION, AND SEXUALITY* (2015).

<sup>35</sup> *Id.*

<sup>36</sup> *Davis*, 442 U.S. 397.

<sup>37</sup> *Id.*

exercising independence; being renegades; innovating for a brave new economy; and attempting what has never been done before.<sup>38</sup> They are described as breaking boundaries.<sup>39</sup> The boundaries renewed are not like glass ceilings.<sup>40</sup> Rather, the boundaries are placed at the outer ambits of rejection.<sup>41</sup> As they are pushed from the protection of the center, they are confronted by new and demeaning obstacles.<sup>42</sup> The obstacles announce a new level of failure.<sup>43</sup> Breaking through the boundaries means an ultimate failure suggesting that reentrance to any previously perceived level of accomplishment is unlikely.<sup>44</sup>

The professional woman is left by her profession and to herself.<sup>45</sup> She is revered as a goddess of creativity and eruptive potential.<sup>46</sup> Her horizons are

---

<sup>38</sup> *Id.* Accommodations signify evolution. *See* *Edwards v. Aguillard*, 482 U.S. 578 (1987).

<sup>39</sup> *Davis*, 442 U.S. 397.

<sup>40</sup> *Id.*

<sup>41</sup> *Brown*, 347 U.S. 483.

<sup>42</sup> *Id.*

<sup>43</sup> *Id.*

<sup>44</sup> *Id.*

<sup>45</sup> *United States v. Virginia*, 518 U.S. 515 (1996).

<sup>46</sup> *Id.*

clear.<sup>47</sup> She possesses none of the financial benefits deserved by a person of her age.<sup>48</sup> She lacks the defining praise (e.g., bonuses and announcements) bestowed upon a similarly educated, accomplished, and well-behaved member of a civilization, society, culture, craft, and profession—if such a person can be proffered.<sup>49</sup> The younger generations’ gratitude for her work, clean living, and investment does not trickle-up.<sup>50</sup> The forebearers are portrayed as failures and their laborious beneficence is not trickled-down to her.<sup>51</sup>

She is portrayed as rotting.<sup>52</sup> Without money; acceptance from a community; guarantees of protection within her profession (e.g., intellectual ownership and secrecy); a wardrobe that speaks her mind, challenges folly, and rejuvenates a sense of fun; access to enlivenment supplied through the fringe benefits of a career; and comradery during

---

<sup>47</sup> *Id.*

<sup>48</sup> *Phillips v. Martin Marietta Corp.*, 400 U.S. 542 (1971).

<sup>49</sup> *Id.*

<sup>50</sup> *Id.*

<sup>51</sup> U.S. Const. amend. V and U.S. Const. amend. XIV. Jefferson, Declaration of Independence.

<sup>52</sup> *See* Jefferson, Declaration of Independence.

hardship that fights to guide another from difficulty, she seems childlike.<sup>53</sup> This is the goal of patriarchy.<sup>54</sup> Patriarchy destroys the dignity of women, and then children.<sup>55</sup> All are made to seem like rivals.<sup>56</sup> Families dissipate, and men can own everything.<sup>57</sup> The constructed image that she is rotting refreshes those who sought to upheave her innate and cultivated power.<sup>58</sup>

### III. WOMEN PERPETRATE PATRIARCHY.

Women perpetrate patriarchy.<sup>59</sup> Some women have betrayed the cause.<sup>60</sup> The cause is made to seem like it may only work if a group of women were to

---

<sup>53</sup> *Califano v. Webster*, 430 U.S. 313 (1977); *California Fed. Sav. & Loan Assn. v. Guerra, Dir., Dep't of Fair Employment & Hous.*, 479 U.S. 272 (1987); *City of Los Angeles Dep't of Water & Power v. Manhart*, 435 U.S. 702 (1978).

<sup>54</sup> *Supra* note.

<sup>55</sup> *Phillips*, 400 U.S. 542.

<sup>56</sup> *Id.*

<sup>57</sup> *Id.*

<sup>58</sup> *Id.*

<sup>59</sup> *Schlesinger v. Ballard*, 419 U.S. 498 (1975); *Stanley v. Illinois*, 405 U.S. 645 (1972); *Stanton v. Stanton*, 421 U.S. 7 (1975); *Taylor v. Louisiana*, 419 U.S. 522 (1975); Tuan Anh Nguyen v. Immigration and Naturalization Serv. (INS), 533 U.S. 53 (2001).

<sup>60</sup> *INS*, 533 U.S. 53.



invest in feminism.<sup>61</sup> At times, it is described as being like a team sport.<sup>62</sup> The patriarchy will assume whichever position to disavow the theoretical weight of not hiring a qualified woman.<sup>63</sup> Women in places of employment deny a relationship to other qualified women.<sup>64</sup> This discounts feminism.<sup>65</sup> Their presence demonstrates equality.<sup>66</sup> This also discounts feminism, which suggests that women should be evaluated as individuals free from the badges of gender supremacy.<sup>67</sup>

They go along with the plan.<sup>68</sup> When women who work ask to be treated specially because they have histories of sexual misconduct; poor work performance records; and access to male

---

<sup>61</sup> Taylor, 419 U.S. 522.

<sup>62</sup> Mathews v. De Castro, 429 U.S. 181 (1976).

<sup>63</sup> De Castro, 429 U.S. 181; McKennon v. Nashville Banner Publ'g Co., 513 U.S. 352 (1995); Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co. v. Equal Employment Opportunity Comm'n, 462 U.S. 669 (1983).

<sup>64</sup> *Id.*

<sup>65</sup> Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins, 490 U.S. 228 (1989).

<sup>66</sup> *Id.*

<sup>67</sup> Kahn v. Shevin, 416 U.S. 351 (1974); Kirchberg v. Feenstra, 450 U.S. 455 (1981); Ledbetter v. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company, 550 U.S. 618 (2007); Lehr v. Robertson, 463 U.S. 248 (1983).

<sup>68</sup> Geduldig v. Aiello, 417 U.S. 484 (1974); General Electric Co. v. Gilbert, 429 U.S. 125 (1976); Great Am. Fed. Sav. & Loan Ass'n v. Novotny, 442 U.S. 366 (1979).

manipulation through the misappropriation of friendship or flirtation; and reveal inklings that their fathers or male relatives could supply fortune, they knowingly and intentionally foist patriarchy into the workplace.<sup>69</sup> When they deny a more credible, developed, and superior woman a job by applying for a job that is or should have been out-of-reach, they knowingly further the oppressors' plan personally to take the value of an institution.<sup>70</sup>

They accept the demise of another woman.<sup>71</sup> These are women who can watch a hero be transformed into a victim.<sup>72</sup> In opposition of feminism they wait, inertly, to be mobilized against another woman.<sup>73</sup> They accept all possible positions

---

<sup>69</sup> *Orr v. Orr*, 440 U.S. 268 (1979); *Parham v. Hughes*, 441 U.S. 347 (1979); *Pennsylvania State Police v. Suders*, 542 U.S. 129 (2004); *Pers. Adm'r of Massachusetts v. Feeney*, 442 U.S. 256 (1979); *Phillips*, 400 U.S. 542; *Pollard v. E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 532 U.S. 843 (2001); *Price Waterhouse*, 490 U.S. 228; *Quilloin v. Walcott*, 434 U.S. 246 (1978); *Stanton v. Stanton*, 429 U.S. 501 (1977).

<sup>70</sup> *Meritor Sav. Bank, FSB v. Vinson*, 477 U.S. 57 (1986); *Michael M. v. Superior Court of Sonoma County*, 450 U.S. 464 (1981); *Nashville Gas Co. v. Satty*, 434 U.S. 136 (1977); *New York State Club Ass'n Inc. v. City of New York*, 487 U.S. 1 (1988).

<sup>71</sup> *Price Waterhouse*, 490 U.S. 228.

<sup>72</sup> *Turner v. Dep't of Employment Sec. of Utah*, 423 U.S. 44 (1975); *Weinberger v. Wiesenfeld*, 420 U.S. 636 (1975).

<sup>73</sup> *Virginia*, 518 U.S. 515.

including dating a colleague; demeaning a woman by participating in an unfair hearing or process involving gender discrimination and sexual harassment; pretending to overlook or misunderstand clear expressions of discrimination and dissatisfaction; and willfully believing that life is unfair.<sup>74</sup> These women collect paychecks; and what was once a normal, common, average, and attainable goal for feminists has come to be a tell-tale of foul play.<sup>75</sup> A paycheck is an object of suspicion among women now because of the immense gender discrimination in the workplace.<sup>76</sup>

They further the plan, especially by seeming excited to harm the patriarchy, feminism, or a

---

<sup>74</sup> *Oncala v. Sundowner Offshore Serv., Inc.*, 523 U.S. 75 (1998); *R.G. & G.R. Harris Funeral Homes Inc. v. Equal Employment Opportunity Comm'n*, 590 U.S. \_\_\_ (2020); *Reed v. Reed*, 404 U.S. 71 (1971); *Richmond Unified Sch. Dist. v. Berg*, 434 U.S. 158 (1977).

<sup>75</sup> *Int'l Union, United Auto., Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of Am., UAW*, 499 U.S. 187 (1991); *J.E.B. v. Alabama ex rel T.B.*, 511 U.S. 127 (1994).

<sup>76</sup> *Wengler v. Druggists Mut. Ins. Co.*, 446 U.S. 142 (1980); *Wimberly v. Labor & Indus. Relations Comm'n of Missouri*, 479 U.S. 511 (1987); *Young v. United Parcel Serv., Inc.*, 575 U.S. (2015); *Zipes*, 455 U.S. 385.

diminishing rival.<sup>77</sup> Women may say that they oppose the patriarchy.<sup>78</sup> Some will make claims in order to hurt the patriarchy, so that they can take the lead.<sup>79</sup> They will hire men and women who behave like men in opposition to the true meaning of equality.<sup>80</sup> Their fabricated and immature enthusiasm for corporate nonsense insults professional standards and causes a loss of productivity.<sup>81</sup> They are intent on portraying the changing of rules.<sup>82</sup> Thus, a loser emerges. The self-loving women pretend to achieve a philosophical and psychological balance that accepts the loser without destroying the capable structure that she was hired to complete.<sup>83</sup>

---

<sup>77</sup> *Metro Broad., Inc. v. Fed. Comm'n Comm'n*, 497 U.S. 547 (1990); *Minnick v. California Dep't of Corr.*, 452 U.S. 105 (1981); *Morton v. Mancari*, 417 U.S. 535 (1974); *Regents of the Univ. of California v. Bakke*, 438 U.S. 265 (1978).

<sup>78</sup> *Supra* note.

<sup>79</sup> *Implement Workers* 499 U.S. 187.

<sup>80</sup> Jefferson, Declaration of Independence; U.S. Const. amend. V and U.S. Const. amend XIV.

<sup>81</sup> Jefferson, Declaration of Independence.

<sup>82</sup> *Id.*

<sup>83</sup> *Loving v. Virginia*, 388 U.S. 1 (1967).

They achieve success by accepting the plan.<sup>84</sup> They get rewards.<sup>85</sup> The women are advertised as having earned prizes, grants, loans, assets, leadership positions, recommendations, loyal fans, and media attention.<sup>86</sup> Unable to come-up with a better plan, they take all of the goodwill that was bestowed upon them by teachers, ministers, family members, coaches, clerks, and others.<sup>87</sup> They each propel themselves with duplicitous jargon, including the theory of equality; and land in undeserved splendor.<sup>88</sup> The truth of the place cannot be destroyed.<sup>89</sup> It, silently, intimates its spirit and professional benefits to the truly deserving women.<sup>90</sup> It gives her none of itself.<sup>91</sup> Yet, the website bears

---

<sup>84</sup> Ricci v. DeStefano, 557 U.S. \_\_\_ (2009); Schuette v. Coalition to Def. Affirmative Action, 572 U.S. 291 (2014); Davis, 442 U.S. 397; Texas v. Lesage, 528 U.S. 18 (1999); United States v. Paradise, 480 U.S. 149 (1987); United Steelworkers of Am., AFL-CIO-CLC v. Weber, 443 U.S. 193 (1979); Weinberger v. Rossi, 456 U.S. 25 (1982); Wygant v. Jackson Bd. of Educ., 476 U.S. 267 (1986).

<sup>85</sup> Zipes, 455 U.S. 385.

<sup>86</sup> Virginia, 518 U.S. 515.

<sup>87</sup> *Id.*

<sup>88</sup> *Id.*

<sup>89</sup> Local 28 of the Sheet Metal Workers' Int'l Ass'n v. Equal Employment Opportunity Comm'n, 478 U.S. 421 (1986).

<sup>90</sup> *Id.*

<sup>91</sup> *Id.*

her picture or a bullet next to her name in a long list of cheaters, has-beens, freeloaders, and scammers.<sup>92</sup>

#### IV. THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM IS A PRIME EXAMPLE.

The university system is a prime example.<sup>93</sup> Readily, the example of fabricated colleges is available.<sup>94</sup> A fabricated college is an institution that defies all tradition, occupies an office building, and sends students into the world unprepared.<sup>95</sup> It is easy to dismiss the problem by demonstrating that the government attacks for-profit or once for-profit schools.<sup>96</sup> The claim is that those criminal and illegal syndicates are already and obviously headed for demise.<sup>97</sup> They flout nearly every area of the law.<sup>98</sup> Gender discrimination and exploitation are no

---

<sup>92</sup> Zipes, 455 U.S. 385.

<sup>93</sup> Gratz v. Bollinger, 539 U.S. 306 (2003); Johnson v. Transp. Agency, Santa Clara Cty., 480 U.S. 616 (1987); Local 28, 478 U.S. 421; Martin v. Wilks, 490 U.S. 755 (1989); Metro Broad., Inc. v. Fed. Commc'n Comm'n, 497 U.S. 547 (1990).

<sup>94</sup> *Supra* note.

<sup>95</sup> Metro Broad., 497 U.S. 547.

<sup>96</sup> CARMEN M. CUSACK, ABORTION IS THE 'A' WORD (2018).

<sup>97</sup> *Id.*

<sup>98</sup> *Id.*

different.<sup>99</sup> Yet, the problem is obvious to those outside state and otherwise aboveboard private schools.<sup>100</sup> Many universities substitute one failing woman for the presence and leadership of an awesome individual.<sup>101</sup>

They tolerate the 1:1 proposition.<sup>102</sup> This proposition is lethal to academia.<sup>103</sup> It has been criticized in *Mississippi University for Women v. Hogan*, *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*, and numerous other cases.<sup>104</sup> The relevance of race and sexuality to this cannot be unheeded.<sup>105</sup> Some

---

<sup>99</sup> *Id.*

<sup>100</sup> *Clark County Sch. Dist. v. Breeden*, 532 U.S. 268 (2001); *Cleveland Bd. of Educ. v. LaFleur*, 414 U.S. 632 (1974); *Fitzgerald v. Barnstable Sch. Comm.*, 555 U.S. 246 (2009); *Franklin v. Gwinnett County Pub. Sch.*, 503 U.S. 60 (1992); *Jackson v. Birmingham Bd. of Educ.*, 544 U.S. 167 (2005); *NCAA v. Smith*, 525 U.S. 459 (1999).

<sup>101</sup> *Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Peña* (1995); *City of Richmond v. J. A. Croson Co.*, 488 U.S. 469 (1989); *DeFunis v. Odegaard*, 416 U.S. 312 (1974); *Firefighters Local Union No. 1784 v. Stotts*, 467 U.S. 561 (1984); *Firefighters v. City of Cleveland*, 478 U.S. 501 (1986); *Fisher v. Univ. of Texas*, 570 U.S. 297 (2013); *Fisher v. Univ. of Texas*, 579 U.S. \_\_\_ (2016); *Fullilove v. Klutznick*, 448 U.S. 448 (1980).

<sup>102</sup> See CARMEN M. CUSACK, *TWINS AND DEVIANCE* (2016) discussing Plato and soulmates.

<sup>103</sup> *Id.*

<sup>104</sup> *Mississippi Univ. for Women v. Hogan*, 458 U.S. 718 (1982). *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).

<sup>105</sup> *Brown*, 347 U.S. 483.

persons, who may be described by the patriarchy as being Native, Black, White, Latin, Asian, Jewish, Arab, Muslim, and so forth, will be involved.<sup>106</sup> Transsexuals, bisexuals, heterosexuals, homosexuals, pedophiles, the curious, the polyamorous, the autoerotic, and others will accept the university's open door.<sup>107</sup>

They accept the leadership of crooked patriarchs.<sup>108</sup> Crooked patriarchs took the battleground for themselves.<sup>109</sup> Diversity was a goal.<sup>110</sup> Now it is a pretext.<sup>111</sup> Schools inquiring about the meaning of "diversity" from potential hires disclose a capacity for patriarchal revision of theory.<sup>112</sup> The theory of equality is rooted in the

---

<sup>106</sup> See Carmen M. Cusack and Matthew E. Waranius, *Visual Detection of Sex Offenders and Consequential Biases among Christians*, 10 J. L. & Soc. 42 (2015).

<sup>107</sup> See Matthew E. Waranius, *What Up with DADT: Addressing Confusion from inside the Military*, 1 J. L. & Soc. 56 (2011).

<sup>108</sup> *Gebser v. Lago Vista Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 524 U.S. 274 (1998).  
*Gloucester County Sch. Bd. v. G.G.*, 136 S. Ct. 2442 (2016); 2016 U.S. LEXIS 4361; \_\_\_ U.S. \_\_\_ (2017).

<sup>109</sup> *Davis v. Passman*, 42 U.S. 228 (1979).

<sup>110</sup> *Id.*; *Grove City Coll. v. Bell*, 465 U.S. 555 (1984).

<sup>111</sup> *Bell*, 465 U.S. 555.

<sup>112</sup> *Virginia*, 518 U.S. 515, at 525. *Vorchheimer v. Sch. Dist. of Philadelphia*, 430 U.S. 703 (1977); *North Haven Bd. of Educ. v. Bell*, 456 U.S. 512 (1982).



Constitution.<sup>113</sup> Those who would infiltrate the sacred place where theories, propositions, and other information is meticulously and carefully passed down, would attempt to dilute and *ad hoc*-revise constitutional interpretation.<sup>114</sup> The people within the university who would lead others to accept the 1:1 proposition would gain positions in government companies, political arenas, and in commissions intending to redetermine the force of rights.<sup>115</sup>

They finance and fund the plan.<sup>116</sup> The university system is perceived as being wealthy.<sup>117</sup> Unfortunately, they have less capital than they are made to seem as possessing.<sup>118</sup> Yet, the money entrusted to them is misallocated to schemes that are both unlawful and unprofitable.<sup>119</sup> Funding of programs substituting qualified female professors for

---

<sup>113</sup> Virginia, 518 U.S. 515; Jefferson, Declaration of Independence; U.S. Const. amend. V and U.S. Const. amend. XIV.

<sup>114</sup> Richmond Unified Sch. Dist. v. Berg, 434 U.S. 158 (1977); NCAA v. Smith, 525 U.S. 459 (1999); Virginia, 518 U.S. 515.

<sup>115</sup> CUSACK, TWINS AND DEVIANCE. Mississippi Univ. for Women, 458 U.S. 718.

<sup>116</sup> Price Waterhouse, 490 U.S. 228; Stanton v. Stanton, 429 U.S. 501 (1977).

<sup>117</sup> Price Waterhouse, 490 U.S. 228.

<sup>118</sup> *Id.*

<sup>119</sup> *Id.*

unqualified and conspiring women are not gaining attendance.<sup>120</sup> Those gaining enrollment are the same as those deceiving students about the value of their educations, degrees, networks, and time.<sup>121</sup> Conspirators fail to preserve economic value.<sup>122</sup> Much of this conduct is intentional.<sup>123</sup> It dissuades investment from rivals and imparts a sense of control or actual control amounting to private dominance over a department, school, or campus.<sup>124</sup> The goal of the patriarchy is to reduce true investors to objects and seize whatever value can be privatized.<sup>125</sup> Privatization discounts the actual value.<sup>126</sup>

They accept the rewards of an inferior woman's achievement.<sup>127</sup> All of the university participants are aware of the system.<sup>128</sup> There is no recourse, and many are without a voice.<sup>129</sup> They are uninvolved.<sup>130</sup>

---

<sup>120</sup> *Id.*

<sup>121</sup> *Id.*

<sup>122</sup> *Id.*

<sup>123</sup> Price Waterhouse, 490 U.S. 228.

<sup>124</sup> *Id.*

<sup>125</sup> *Id.*

<sup>126</sup> *Id.*

<sup>127</sup> *Id.*

<sup>128</sup> *Id.*

<sup>129</sup> Price Waterhouse, 490 U.S. 228.

<sup>130</sup> *Id.*

They may complain, discuss, and produce research that demonstrates the problem.<sup>131</sup> Yet, those who assert that they add value to the university by furthering the scheme accept not only the privately held value of the university, they accept the cost of destroying a woman as a positive asset.<sup>132</sup> They are inverted.<sup>133</sup> By accepting the rewards of the inferior woman's accomplishment, they sever ties to the woman who deserves the position.<sup>134</sup> That is a loss.<sup>135</sup>

## V. CONCLUSION

Equality has been portrayed by the patriarchy as feminism.<sup>136</sup> Feminism is a belief and a rich culture.<sup>137</sup> The women and men who fight for it know that women are equal to men.<sup>138</sup> They disclaim

---

<sup>131</sup> *Id.*

<sup>132</sup> *Id.*

<sup>133</sup> *Id.*

<sup>134</sup> *Brown*, 347 U.S. 483.

<sup>135</sup> *Virginia*, 518 U.S. 515.

<sup>136</sup> *Id.*

<sup>137</sup> *Price Waterhouse*, 490 U.S. 228.

<sup>138</sup> *Virginia*, 518 U.S. 515.

affiliation with people promoting male superiority as a result of having been born male.<sup>139</sup>

The open claim of male supremacy is rare.<sup>140</sup> Instead, it exposes itself in practice.<sup>141</sup> The practice of viewing women as interchangeable and preferring those who signify male control is patriarchy.<sup>142</sup> The education system is supposed to alleviate that problem.<sup>143</sup> Instead, it complies with it.<sup>144</sup> To remedy this dysfunction, universities should only hire the superior candidate.<sup>145</sup> Feminism should regroup and reassert its power so that women who are left to rot and rethink their positions will find reconnection, adhesion, and promotion.<sup>146</sup>

---

<sup>139</sup> Davis, 442 U.S. 397; Edwards, 482 U.S. 578.

<sup>140</sup> Boren, 429 U.S. 190.

<sup>141</sup> Carmen M. Cusack, *Boob Laws: An Analysis of Social Deviance within Gender, Family, or the Home (Etudes 2)*, 33 WOMEN'S RTS. L. RPTR. 197 (2012).

<sup>142</sup> Carmen M. Cusack, *Busting Patriarchal Booby Traps: Why Feminists Fear Minor Distinctions in Child Porn Cases, An Analysis of Social Deviance within Gender, Family, or the Home (Etudes 4)*, 39 S. U. L. REV. 43 (2011).

<sup>143</sup> Carmen M. Cusack, *Context: Use of the Word "Fuck" in Pedagogy and Higher Learning*, 8 J. L. & SOC. DEVIANCE 133 (2014).

<sup>144</sup> Carmen M. Cusack, *A Feminist Inquiry into Intimate Partner Violence Law, Policy, Policing, and Possible Prejudices in Alaska*, 5 J. L. & CONFLICT RES. 24 (2013).

<sup>145</sup> Price Waterhouse, 490 U.S. 228.

<sup>146</sup> Mississippi University for Women, 458 U.S. 718.