

Universities have changed from hierarchical institutions into a collection of special interest groups. Instead of feudal guilds they now consist of tribal confederations. Special interests by race and by gender have replaced the exclusive club mentality that previously existed. Fortunately, an influx of women created a balance that did not previously exist. However, that balance loses impetus when women divide themselves into special interest groups with the sole purpose of advancing extreme feminism. Instead of advancing the liberal values of tolerance and intellectual openness these extremists have now become entrenched in defiance of the historical record and common sense.¹

The atmosphere among women academicians started to change when the urge to manipulate, chastise, and feel superior eclipsed the desire not to offend. Those who stayed at the front knew the latest propriety and looked down on those who did not. They correctly suspected that most people, even those who claimed to be liberal and tolerant, practiced some form of racism and sexism. What is more important, they confirmed self through their own “proper thinking” and politically correct language. They became liberal fascists.²

These imperialistic groups base their agenda upon questionable demands disguised as pleas for equal opportunity and fairness. They make preferential demands in nearly all aspects of academic life including salaries and course content. They claim discrimination against themselves as a minority although they number in the majority. In addition, they insultingly call for “women-friendly and culturally diverse” classrooms and sensitivity training for male professors. To do this they demand surveillance by autonomous women’s studies counselors and ombudsmanship to maintain “equitable recognition” for women. Given more than a decade of female parity and increased graduation rates, entry into professional schools, and appointment to faculty positions, their propaganda confounds the evidence.³

Extreme feminism supports radical speech codes (political correctness) to achieve its goals which seriously impedes free expression. This language idea originally placed a laudable emphasis on mutual sensitivity especially in long-suffering racial groups for whom language commonly represented derogation. However, this has turned into a culture of euphemism that supports special group interests to the exclusion of other groups. Academic communication has become a public language that nobody speaks plainly and relates solely to self-interest.⁴

Any group has the right to designate itself as it chooses but when the terms change month by month, those designations have no value. The lunatic fringe of the women's movement insists on using the term “womyn” as a politically correct way to replace the term “women”. Similarly, through an ironic linguistic twist, the term “colored people” once considered derogatory, has returned as “people of color.” A few years ago, departments virtually forbade feminism as a research topic. Today in certain fields extreme feminism has become almost mandatory under the

guise of women's studies. Many of these studies contain exceptionally lurid courses. Exclusive to women, many of these programs have no social or academic value at all.⁵

Honest women follow balanced behavioral patterns, similarly men. However, a preponderance of both male and female university officials vary their behavior and habits to mislead. They then publicize them as virtues. They think that lies prevent the public from recognizing the deviousness with which they plan their restrictive ideologies. Then they lie again to obtain promotion because self-disclosure only conveys truth and exposes disgraceful acts that would deny them promotion.

For centuries, the public has paid for, and expected, an ethical approach to the accumulation of knowledge by its universities. Repugnantly, the promotion of merit-less, feminist extremists to authoritative positions in universities, either on their own or by group recognizance, now defeats this universal purpose and encourages abhorrent behavior. The public now realizes that two new cloned hybrids have arisen to challenge the ideal: womyn, a breed of academic amazons, and womynx a breed of academic panderers. These hybrids allow animus (woman's masculine inner personality) to subvert all equity and justice. Like Queen Victoria, Margaret Thatcher, and Bella Abzug, they prove that women can do anything that men can do without retaining a single feminine attribute. Given absolute power, they become headstrong, obstinate, and dangerously self-opinionated.

Both womyn and womynx form part of an ultramodern species of human being prevalent in academic communities. Respectively, they contrast through dominance and dependence. Womyn overtly try to control the presence of males by manipulation of affirmative action while womynx act covertly. Both belong to a preferred, protected special interest group that preys on non-preferred, unprotected groups. Womyn, strident feminists, remain offensive, vociferous, bigoted, and aggressive. Conversely, womynx, pandering feminists, remain impudent, subordinate, sycophantic, and submissive. Both types lack merit, moral fiber, and ethics. They disregard or violate the rights of others. Womyn, consistently irresponsible, show no remorse for the consequences of their acts. Conversely, womynx, fearing loss of support or approval, pander to superiors and inform on colleagues using compliant actions and passive attitudes. As servile self-seekers they attempt to win favor by flattering influential people and depend upon others for aid or support. Consequently, both womyn and womynx show complete indifference to social norms and due process attributed to women with integrity. Inherently, they agree with wrong actions through political correctness and self-censorship. They devise superficial, patriarchal rationalizations that support discrimination against males and use frivolous sexual harassment allegations as blackmail.

Both womyn and womynx exercise sociopathic influence or control through deceit and manipulation. Moreover, the essential features of passive-aggressive personality disorder split and relate to womynx and womyn respectively. They lie inveterately, probably by natural disposition.

Multitudes believe them then critical inquiry exposes them as witless liars. They lack intellect and cannot bear the truth. Most have not experienced life outside the university and have learned nothing from people who have led a balanced life. Their egotistical superiority overrides any reason and justice. Their words reveal less about their knowledge and more about controlling their subordinates or pandering to their supervisors. This pervasive pattern of negativity and passive resistance supports a female polarization that promotes a cult mentality and causes resentment and opposition to women who function normally.

These female misfits corrupt their own stated principles then go on to corrupt the institutions that they represent. One sees a great deal of taxpayer money wasted to support academic liars and cheats who greedily lie in wait to interpose their self-aggrandizing will. However, increased moral and ethical public disposition will cause them to destroy themselves as many others have done before them. Like all whores, both womyn and womynx eventually outlive their usefulness. Moreover, their victims will treat their experience as a short madness from which they will recover. Causes, symptoms, and consequences constantly change and eventually prove, by example, that truth sometimes arrives late but always prevails.

The taxpaying public deserves more competent, better-informed boards of regents, men and women devoted to more than abstracting universal acclaim or balancing the demands of special interest groups.⁶ Morality defines human character by its depth and strength. Unfortunately, people do not consider that phenomenon until deprived of their livelihood or self-respect.

Journalists and public intellectuals will continue to ask questions and evaluate answers that reveal personal bias. Personal reification makes that bias part of a revelatory persona that allows them truthfully to report academic malfeasance to the fullest extent. Fortunately, the satirist's wit eventually reveals devilish behavior and exposes the underlying dysfunction. These writers have begun to publish feminist curricula vitae which reveal much of their privileged social backgrounds and fraudulent political manipulation. Examination of these documents exposes their academic fraud and shows how they have usurped affirmative action advantages intended for the truly deprived.

Public intellectuals expose these feminist parasites and the public despises them. Their inflated salaries give them their only solace. They loudly cry "misogynism" when these writers report feminist polarization and coercive indoctrination of students. However, most competent writers, both male and female, identify aberrant feminist academic activity and report it truthfully. They predominantly agree with rational feminists that any form of hatred, whether of women or any other group, has no place in the academe. Many also agree that almost every organized religion had a patriarchal but not necessarily misogynistic beginning. They understand that the term "misogyny" only describes organized patriarchal ideologies that contribute to woman-hate, woman-fear, and woman-evil.

For example, the Roman Catholic Church uses its immense power to affect women's lives directly. It exists as an all-male, celibate (or sodomite), hierarchy that skillfully uses wealthy lobbies to prevent legislative change on birth control and abortion issues. Moreover, it tries to control millions of women's lives by using ethical constructs to legislate their morality.⁷ However, this does not mean that most Roman Catholics subscribe to this dogma any more than most journalists who criticize extreme feminism classify as misogynists. If one takes the trouble to read carefully and with an open mind one finds that these writers do not refer to women disparagingly. For example, the remarks contained in this essay relate to adequately defined stereotypes of womyn and womynx. If women readers see themselves reflected in this and other essays then they have chosen those roles for themselves probably through self-loathing but not from the writer's misogyny.

Nmesis.

1. Daphne Patai, Why Not a Feminist Overhaul of Higher Education, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 23 January 1998, A56.
2. Robert Solomon and Jon Solomon, *Up the University*, (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company), 1993, 5, 199-200, 238, 260.
3. *See Note1.*
4. *See Note2.*
5. *See Note2.*
6. *See Note2.*
7. Robin Morgan, *Sisterhood Is Powerful: An Anthology of Writings from the Womens Liberation Movement*, (New York, NY: Random House Inc.), 1970.

© Copyright 1998 by Paul Trummel
All Rights Reserved: 17 Sep 98/12:00 PST
Edition: #603-04-00-0227-1620
Feedback: trummel@nwlink.com