

Women against feminism: Exploring discursive measures and implications of anti-feminist discourse

Alex Phillip Lyng Christiansen, Aalborg University
Ole Izard Høyer, Aalborg University

Abstract: The present paper studies anti-feminist discourse within the tumblr-based group Women Against Feminism, and explores how the sentiments of these anti-feminists, as expressed in a multi-modal format, may help to understand the difficulty feminism has with gathering support from its female audience. The textual corpus, gathered through the site, is analysed with methods inspired by Fairclough's 2012 version of CDA, focused on discovering social issues within feminism as it relates to a female audience. By considering implicature and counter-discourse, the analysis demonstrates that anti-feminists perceive feminists as victimising the female population and depriving them of agency, and call for feminism to consider their viewpoint. Conclusively, the created perception of victimisation then serves to illustrate how language works to construe modern feminist discourse in a negative light, and how this may further hinder feminism in reaching the audience it desires.

Keywords: Antifeminism, counter-discourse, Critical Discourse Analysis, victimisation.

1. Introduction

Women have real reasons to fear feminism, and we do young women no service if we suggest to them that feminism itself is safe. It is not. To stand opposed to your culture, to be critical of institutions, behaviors, discourses--when it is so clearly not in your immediate interest to do so--asks a lot of a young person, of any person. At its best, the feminist challenging of individualism, of narrow notions of freedom, is transformative, exhilarating, *empowering*. (Hogeland 1994)

While feminism has, at this point in time, at least partially been introduced as a normalised feature of what modern Western civilisation considers 'freedom' (McRobbie 2008), it continually struggles to find footing within a young female audience. As such, in their study on media representation of feminism, Jaworska & Krishnamurthy (2012: 402) found that feminism had decreasing relevance to contemporary female life, noting that "although there is an awareness of continuing gender inequalities, for example in the gender pay gap, women very rarely identify themselves as feminists, or indeed simply reject feminism."

Likewise, in a 2013 study on the disparity between the support of feminism and the act of self-identification amongst social work students, Lazar (2013) concluded that "Most do not self-identify as feminist (58%), but both feminist and non-feminist students endorse feminist attitudes and ideologies, suggesting a disconnect between self-identification and values". She further states that this might be the result of a "stigma" with which feminism has been seated as a result of people's poor overall knowledge of the term.

McRobbie (2008: 16) takes it one step further, suggesting that this conduct is not simply a result of individual lacking knowledge, but encouraged as a "ritualistic denunciation" in modern media discourse. Lazar's findings suggest a discrepancy between the wish for equality between sexes and change, and the willingness to identify as someone defined by those exact terms,¹ perhaps indicating that feminism is no longer specifically tied to those defining values, at least in the eyes of

¹ As defined by *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*: "Feminism"

this specific target group. Previous studies, such as the one conducted by Toller et al (2004) on "willingness to consider oneself a feminist", drawing on Rubin (1994), also connect lacking support of feminist views amongst female participants to representation of the subject matter, suggesting that "Possible explanations (...) may be that women often describe feminists with masculine traits, such as "dominating" and "aggressive" (Rubin 1994: 89). Thus, the more feminine women (...) may have viewed feminism and non-traditional gender roles as masculine."

According to McRobbie and Hogeland, feminism is being "historicised and generationalised" (McRobbie 2008: 16), to a point where it appears out of date, as if modern society has already successfully implemented the important parts of feminism and then moved on. Lazar, Hogeland, McRobbie and Toller et al. all agree that feminism is in a situation of distress, stressing that the people feminism is meant to help are showing a growing tendency to disagree with the movement, but none of them believe that the undoing of feminism has anything to do with feminism itself, arguing rather that feminism is once again being marginalised by a system that wishes to see women's rights movements appeased but not applied.

This is where the Tumblr group Women Against Feminism (WAF), a group which welcomes critique of feminism, disagrees heavily with established feminists, such as McRobbie and Hogeland, and where they are an interesting point of view into the everyday perception of feminism. To help determine whether feminism itself faces issues of representation, it may help to look at how the people who have historically had the most interest in supporting feminism (i.e. women) are disagreeing with and rejecting the movement. In order to do this, the present paper studies anti-feminist discourse within the tumblr-based group Women Against Feminism, and explores how the sentiments of these anti-feminists, as expressed in a multi-modal format, may help to understand the difficulty feminism has with gathering support from its female audience.

2. Aims and methods

This paper seeks to contribute to the understanding of feminist language production, as it is received by a segment of its female audience, and the exploration of the issues feminism faces, going forward, as a major social theory and ideology. In order to attain this, we have used mixture of linguistic approaches, focused on validating qualitative analyses and supporting it with quantitative data. Utilising Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), as inspired by Fairclough's (2012) approach, implied aspects of speech are drawn from a sample corpus of 75 smaller, transcribed WAF tumblr texts and grouped, in order to observe tendencies within the group as a whole. It is important to note, though, that this paper does not go in depth with feminist literature and the discourse that surrounds it, even as it relates to the subject at hand, focusing instead on the way a perceived public representation reflects on feminism, through reactionary texts. In other words, this paper serves as an exploration into one of the larger issues modern feminism faces, i.e. that of constant, un-moderated representation, and does not venture into any analysis of feminist literature or representative material, neither does it delve into opposing opinions regarding the state of feminism, such as may be found on pro-feminist tumblr groups.

The above-mentioned approach was chosen after an initial tentative analysis of the textual material. In this regard, Fairclough alone presents a multitude of different ways to explore the texts at hand, especially as it relates to the actual visual material, but based on the most apparent linguistic features found during the initial analysis, the present paper focuses on what we deem the texts' two most significant and recurring characteristics, namely implicature and counter-discourse. As such, the employed methods serve to identify prominent discourse within WAF: 'implicature' was chosen based on its frequency of use, while 'counter-discourse' appeared the very cornerstone of WAF's existence and thus played a major role as a method of establishing ethos. Lastly, CDA, as a method of viewing the wrongs of society, helps to bring the problems these anti-feminists claim exist into perspective in a way that respects their choice to speak out and examine the importance of

their claims, while staying critical to the way their discourse construes feminism.

The linguistic analysis itself leans heavily on the consideration of two ideas from pragmatics and discourse studies respectively: Grice's conventional 'implicature' as presented in Huang (2007) and the Foucauldian idea of 'counter-discourse' as presented by Macgilchrist (2007), both of which work within understanding the framing of texts. As Macgilchrist writes, "[t]here is always a gap, through which marginal discourses can break in and take over a more central position." (2007: 75) In this way, counter-discourse serves as a perspective from which can be viewed the kind of semantic struggles, which might tip marginal views into the popular, creating new norms. Huang (2007: 7) notes that it is "widely accepted that there's a huge gap between the meaning of a sentence and the messages actually conveyed". It is from this understanding that 'counter-discourse' and 'implicature' are useful concepts, in that they concern themselves mainly with re-framing of a given text or construction through a number of lexicogrammatical functions, i.e. parody, extrematisation, nominalisation, simplification etc. (Macgilchrist 2007; Huang 2007), which helps to discern what is meant from what is being said.

Grice makes a distinction between two types of implicature: on one hand, *conversational implicature* adheres to – or specifically defies – certain structures, or 'maxims', which make up the structure of social interaction, including principles of truthfulness, clarity, and, most importantly, co-operation. *Conventional implicature*, on the other hand, lacks this aspect of co-operation, and adheres to no calculable procedures or maxims, except for, sometimes, convention; the importance of conventional implicature is, therefore, on the linguistic expression, i.e. constructions of argumentation such as *therefore* or *because* (Huang 2007). The transcribed texts observed in this article tend not to follow traditional conversational structure, i.e. Grice's maxims of conversation, wherein the speaker's expressions are determined by relation to the audience and the following of conversational maxims. As such, WAF can be said, rather, to adhere to Grice's latter idea of *conventional* implicature, especially observable in the consistent use of the cornerstone argument and its emphasis on the construing *because*.

Throughout the exploration of the observed anti-feminist discourse, the paper employs Fairclough's *social semiotic approach* to discourse analysis, as well as his definition of discourse as "meaning-making". Fairclough chooses instead to term this form of discourse as 'semiosis', arguing that on top of this definition clearing up differences between the three varying definitions of 'discourse'², it also helps by "suggesting that discourse analysis is concerned with various 'semiotic modalities'" (2012: 3). Important to Fairclough's expression of semiosis is the idea that all social practices (i.e. belief, power, cultural values) serve to create meaning, although they should never be reduced to meaning on their own terms. In other words, 'meaning' cannot be drawn simply from the observation of a given social practice, but should always be seen as part of a semiotic 'whole'. Other terms important to this observational practice includes his explanation of the *real*, the *actual*, and the *empirical*: Of note here is the idea that the *real*, i.e. subjects and constructs of power, and the *actual* i.e. what change these constructs bring, can be in stark contrast to the *empirical*, by which is meant the observations made by aspects of society on the nature of the constructs and their changes.

Fairclough's methods are continually used as a point of reference, from which is considered the cause of the anti-feminist discourse at hand, as well as the cultural implications of its existence in this form. That said, in terms of cultural status, and thereby the determination of social class, there really is no clear indication as to the status of each individual participant. This makes a determination of particular belief, power or cultural patterns impossible, limiting the analysis to a focus on the text-production – and consequently the individual stories and arguments – to determine whether the participants truly share a semiotic bond. Determining whether such a bond exists is

2 Fairclough presents three concepts of 'discourse': (a) meaning-making as an element of the social process, (b) the language associated with a particular social field or practice (e.g. 'political discourse'), (c) a way of construing aspects of the world associated with a particular social perspective (Fairclough 2012)

important exactly because it lends credence to the voice of the participants, suggesting that there might be something wrong with the target of their critique, or at least with the representation of said target.

Also, while this paper is heavily inspired by Fairclough's (2012) approach to CDA, a key feature of his steps in utilizing CDA is finding what he terms "a social wrong", which is something this paper does not, as such, seek to follow. While this exact anti-feminist movement argues, as the deviator, against a larger feminist movement, it cannot necessarily be identified as someone/something answering a social wrong. That said, determining the theoretical 'legitimacy' of the movement's response as a 'social wrong', in the sense that they are demanding a required change in the larger discourse of feminism, is part of the point of the paper itself, and the reactions, obstacles, social orders and norms are all present as gatekeepers³ which are addressable by means of the utilised version of CDA.

3. Data

The analysed texts were all taken from the Women Against Feminism blog, which runs through the blogging-website Tumblr. All of the texts were originally part of pictures on the website, and were transcribed in a manner as faithful to the source as possible without coloration. The sample spans all English-language posts posted within four months, from August to November 2014. Although permission to use the pictures was given as well, none of the pictures transcribed are included in the paper itself (except one, used to exemplify), but they are freely available on the website. All of the texts are voluntarily submitted to the website, always by the use of the hashtag phenomenon #Womenagainstfeminism, a collective bond that binds all participants within this particular speech situation.

Example (1) below represents the central construction that characterizes WAF discourse:

- (1) I don't need feminism because...
- I am not a victim
 - I am not oppressed

The sentiments emerging in the data are summarized in the sentiment breakdown in Table 1 on page 74. A number of the expressed notions appeared in larger frequency than recorded in Table 1, due to participants, as seen in the above example, expressing the same opinion with more than one construction, often through implicature. In such instances, the meaning conveyed by the participant has simply been recorded once. As such, although expressions and implications of 'victimhood' (or anti-victimhood) appeared far more frequently than the number recorded in Table 1, the smaller number shown is due to a choice of recording only the overall opinions of any given participant.

4. Analysis

The analysis spans three parts, after which follows a discussion. First, a look at the *I don't need feminism because...* construction, as this is considered the cornerstone of the argumentation from almost all participants. Second, the direct expressions and implicature of the 'victimisation' aspect, based on its importance as a point of critique. Lastly, a short consideration of the *Feminism doesn't represent me* sentiment, exploring the possible implications of such a statement coming from the exact group of people that feminism claims to represent.

3 The term 'gatekeeper' was originally coined by Lewin (1943), but was later broadened in scope by Bourdieu. Bourdieu's definition of 'gatekeepers' as entities holding the key to acceptance through the authority to judge 'right' and 'wrong' ("being what is right to be") behaviour serves to inform the term within a context of Social Capital (Bourdieu 1979). In CDA, Fairclough's approach asks "what it is about the way in which social life is structured and organized that prevents it [social wrongs] from being addressed." (Fairclough 2012: 7)

Table 1: Sentiment breakdown

Sentiments	Number of participants who agree
I am (and you are) not a victim	39
I strongly dislike feminism (and feminists), they are doing it wrong	19
Feminists don't represent me	14
Feminism has changed (Modern feminism is a thing)	9
Feminism is about women and by women	17
Feminists ignore the real issues (like women in 3 rd world countries)	7
There's a better term	6
Everything isn't rape	5
Not all men are bad or rapists	19
It is not only men hurting women	16
I don't hate men, (I love them/him)	15
I have the same rights as, or better rights than, men	16
Women aren't/shouldn't be superior to men	3
Differences are okay/important	7
There is no patriarchy	5
Respect doesn't come from nowhere	5

4.1. *The I don't need feminism because... construction*

Although a small number of participants chose to alter the construction (e.g. appendix 1, data #11; #21; #36) and a smaller number yet entirely circumvented it (e.g. appendix 1, data #5; #27) this phrase is largely a normalised feature of WAF as a platform for argumentation. The lexical construction serves as a sort of argumentative cornerstone, to which the participants add personal opinions and sentiments, which is effective in part because of the way it draws on implicature. The sentence *I don't need feminism* serves mostly as a statement, showing the stand-point of the speaker, but with the added conjunction *because*, it suddenly makes an implication of every following statement.

As such, through implicature, the sentence often takes on accusational features, and by using the construction *I don't need feminism, because* – most of the participants indirectly accuse feminists and feminism as a whole of representing/not representing and endorsing the values they then further express. E.g.

- (2) I want the option to follow gender roles and not be ridiculed for following them. (Appendix 1, Data #9)

On its own, this utterance implies merely that the person did not, at that point in time, have this option, but presented as a sentiment following the *I don't need feminism, because* construct, it serves to construe a reality in which feminism argues against the choice of becoming a stay-at-home mom, over pursuing a paid career path:

- (3) I don't need modern feminism because...
 – I want the option to follow gender roles and not be ridiculed for following them. (Appendix 1, Data #9)

The difference between (2) and (3) is perhaps the most important part of the construction; the *proposition*. The propositional content of the sentence becomes the 'fact' that feminism is limiting her options. Instead of directly accusing feminism of doing something negative the participant simply argues against feminism on the basis of wanting options, implicitly proposing that this option cannot be found in the feminist movement. Implicature, in this sense, helps the participant to characterise both her and her 'opponent' at the same time.

There are clearly inherent lexical choices to the cornerstone argument, perhaps best proven by the participants that avoided following the structure. Consider, for instance, the following examples:

- (4) FEMINISM SUCKS HARD (Appendix 1, Data #5)
- (5) Generation X and their identity politics ruined feminism for everyone. I reject the cult of victimhood (...) (Appendix 1, Data #35)

These participants often express some of the same values but in vastly different expressions and using various different genres, i.e. appealing to reason versus objecting to abuse. Whereas most of the constructions that do not follow the *I don't need* feature make up an accusational form, the ones that do follow the construction appear more in accordance with logical reasoning – at least in structure – even when followed by aggressive features as seen in the following example:

- (6) I don't need Feminism Because...
– I don't hate all men

As seen here, whereas the sentence *Feminists hate all men* would be very directly accusational, the participant in (6) avoids this by implying the accusation through a type of self-praise. It is curiously repeated a second time, but with a directly positive evaluative feature: *love*, instead of the previously inverted version: *don't hate*. Naturally, this is important, because she doesn't 'love' all men, she simply doesn't hate them, like she indirectly accuse feminists of doing. Some actually did express love for all men, though (Appendix 1, Data #7; #9), and a few did so for both men and women.

Lastly, here is a short consideration of the visual, multi-modal aspect of the texts as this relates to the cornerstone argument (see Figure 1 on page 76). Although this paper does not concern itself more than superficially with the statement that the argument serves as a direct counter to (i.e. *I need feminism because*) it does bear mentioning in this instance. There are clearly a multitude of similar but opposite features, such as implicature to the *benefit* of feminism, but the important thing to understand is that the visual representation made by the anti-feminists *is* a direct attempt at counter-discourse, while also being a key part of the legitimation process. Indeed, just like a key feature of the feminist movement is to show that there are real people experiencing these issues – making them, in turn, real issues – a key feature of WAF is to show that there are also real people *not* experiencing these issues, as a means to prove that the construed reality of feminism does not necessarily cover them as well. In essence, the connection between the construed *I* in the *I don't need feminism* argument and the actual *I* seen in the picture serves to prove that the argument is being made by a real person.

A curious side-note regarding the cornerstone argument is the fact that quite a few members added the word *modern* to the sentence in a very deliberate fashion:

- (7) I don't need modern feminism. (Appendix 1, Data #9)

Figure 1: Example of WAF Tumblr post (October 26, 2014).



(8) I reject modern feminism because I am not a victim. (Appendix 1, Data #21)

(9) I don't need modern feminism because it wants to limit me. (Appendix 1, Data #40)

This could indicate a concordance with earlier observations like Lazar's, pointing to the idea that people disagreeing with feminism might often agree with the ideal of it, or with its previous victories. It also might indicate that the source of this discontent is to be found within popular modern media, rather than more traditional media, and that a different representation might exist there, which skews the overall public picture of the movement. This observation appears in line with what McRobbie (2008: 11) notes as the 'post-feminist' approach of modern media, wherein "feminist gains (...) are actively and relentlessly undermined", but may also reflect the fact that blogging, as WAF exemplifies, is actually dominated in large part by women, and has been shown (Stavrositu & Sundar) to act as an outlet for the sort of messages which, as McRobbie notes, are less welcome in traditional media.

4.2. *The I am not a victim! construction*

An interesting thing to note, from all the sentiments that didn't warrant specific consideration, is exactly how many there are. While it is, as has been mentioned earlier, impossible to say much about the social status and general cultural values of the participants, it is inferrable from the texts themselves that the participants are of a rather diverse nature – if nothing else, then simply from their varying arguments. What makes the *I am not a victim* construction interesting, then, is the amount of repetition, not only in the overall consideration of sentiments, i.e. things that implied 'victim', but also in the very direct use of the word *victim*, which appeared in almost a third of the individual texts – this is even ignoring similar words such as *oppressed*. The fact that the 'victimisation' construction appeared more than twice the amount of any other argument build on the cornerstone makes it the clearest point of agreement between all of the participants, and

arguably elevates the argument to a point where the sheer volume may speak to the likeliness of the statement. In order to understand exactly *how* many WAF participants generally use the term 'victim', it is worth looking at some examples:

- (10) Dividing people and labelling them as victims will ensure that they will NEVER be empowered (Appendix 1, Data #6)
- (11) Because I am a women does not equal me being a victim! (Appendix 1, Data #22)
- (12) Playing the victim and shielding yourself from reality is not empowering (Appendix 1, Data #51)
- (13) True equality isn't drilling into women that they are praise worthy just for existing and that every time their feelings are hurt, they are being victimised, while saddling men with increasingly crippling and contradictory expectations (Appendix 1, Data #59)

It should be noted that all of the above statements followed the cornerstone argument. As arguments, these are all quite different: the participant in (10) mentions labels, the one in (11) considers how victimisation is equalised with being a woman, the one in (12) mentions reality-shielding and the one in (13) characterises victimisation as being *drilled* into women. And yet, these all bear obvious similarities: despite the difference in modality, all of the above examples imply that victimisation is something that is being forced upon women in a way that is not in thread with reality – an argument which is backed up in other ways, for example by denying the existence of a "patriarchy", in many of the other texts. Not only are the participants very specific about denying that they are victims, many, such as the participant in (10), consider the implication of 'victim' as something which has an overall negative effect on the way women perceive themselves. These arguments – especially by the use of the word *empowerment* – serve as counters to the implied 'victim' label. Words like *drilling*, *playing* and *labeling* are used to modalise the representation of 'victim' in a way that implies that they never actually were what is being proposed in the first place. Instead, what is happening, according to the participants, is a systematic degrading of females by "equating" them with this false "label" and in turn denying women the kind of "empowerment" which feminists, such as Hogeland (1994) and McRobbie (2008), claim is core to the feminist movement.

While the construed idea of "playing the victim" (Appendix 1, Data #20; #51; #75) does not appear quite enough to warrant calling it a general tendency, it *is* an oft-implied aspect, especially through a construction that actually did appear enough to warrant that definition: the *I take responsibility for my own actions* construction. Second only to the actual wordings of *I am not a victim* this construction appears both together with and as a substitute for that, and implies that victimisation is something feminists are pretending is there, or actively creating, because they are not willing to take responsibility for their own actions.

4.3 *The feminism doesn't represent me construction*

While it is easy to overlook this argument, in part due to the obvious connotations of both the cornerstone argument and many of the following sentiments, there is something quite special about the construction itself being used as is done in the examples below:

- (14) I DON'T NEED FEMINISM COZ I DID NOT APPOINT FEMINISTS TO REPRESENT ME (Appendix 1, Data #2)

(15) Been told, in the ultimate in irony and hypocrisy, that I should remember that "my personal experiences don't represent all women", even though the entire damn problem is that feminists are using their personal experiences to represent all women even though large numbers of us don't share those experiences! (Appendix 1, Data #36)

(16) I am happily and perfectly free. (Appendix 1, Data #49)

The point that repeats itself is that of personal experience – i.e. *I'm happily and perfectly free* – this is backed up by many of the other expressions shown in Table 1. As such, the "not all men are bad/rapists" category was defined mostly by people expressing their own experiences (or lack thereof) with 'bad' men, and how that should not define all men (Appendix 1, Data #9; #21; #29). What the participants seem to express in these instances is a lacking feeling of belonging in the discourse expressed by feminists, which serves to alienate a lot of WAF from the feminist message. There is an interesting duality between the two expressions. As noted multiple times already, the *I don't need feminism because* cornerstone is interesting because of its repetition and the way it allows for implicature. On top of that, however, it has the added point of being an individualist argument, wherein the focus is on the *I*, while at the same time being all about the group expression and the basis of further arguments. In the same way, *Feminism doesn't represent me* can be both a statement of the lacking validity of feminism, as well as a point of contention; questioning whether feminism should not, also, include these women. As noted earlier, Lazar (2013) suggested that people who disagreed with feminism showed signs of agreeing with the ideals of feminism, but, at the same time, they lacked the connection between the ideal and the representation they perceived; WAF seems to affirm that conclusion in this regard.

But that begs the question, then: are they (WAF) the ones perceiving feminism in a wrong manner? Some self-appointed feminists certainly do argue that this is the case (Valenti 2014). Feminism suggests that women should be equal to men, but is it then simply 'wrong' to feel that women in the first world have gained a large part of that equality? What WAF suggests is that feminism – as a movement for change – refuses to listen to the women that do not agree with feminists, or, as one participant puts it; *why do I need a movement that has told me time and time again that it doesn't give a damn about representing me, because they don't want to change their narratives and worldviews to accommodate me and other women who don't fit the existing ones?* (Appendix 1, Data #36.). Other participants are more blunt, example (11) being a case of this bluntness, but the message is much the same: according to them, feminists have one particular thing they want people to see and believe, and their discourse is that of the all-encompassing 'truth'.

5. Discussion

In the utilised CDA approach, Fairclough (2012) is in large part concerned with causality and how discourse affects society, in a manner that allows it to alter the way we perceive the actual world. While the present paper does not concern itself with proving the assumptions of anti-feminists, the analysis does serve to make clear that a portion of the female audience experience – or perceive – a reality wherein feminism is causing harm to female self-perception through a discourse of victimisation. In Fairclough's (2012) words, the *real* and the *actual* are in possible contrast with the *empirical*. Whether or not feminism is actually responsible for the kind of discourse which is being perceived by the women who support WAF, this is how some women perceive reality, and in turn how they will reproduce it in the form of counter-discourse. In this sense, whether WAF are right in accusing feminists themselves of creating such a discourse or not is of little importance, as feminists do clearly face misrepresentation in some form.

As Fairclough (2012: 1) argues, one should be careful not to simply consider construals –

such as WAF's perception of feminism – the same as constructions (the creation of truths), noting that "what constructive effects such construals have depends upon various non-discoursal as well as discoursal conditions". Arguably, however, feminists face, and always have faced, issues with power-relations. Feminists have fought battles against ideologies and normalcies so ingrained in society that they extended to the very fundamentals of family life, something which constitutes an issue in the non-discursive (as defined by Fairclough.)

The importance of this observation lies in the created definition of feminism, in the empirical sense. The 'truth' of what feminism is lies largely in the way it is presented, as has been proven by the many 'waves' of feminism which have served to continually re-frame and redefine the movement through the ages. In essence, while feminism arguably does not construe a reality in which choosing to stay at home as a woman is wrong any longer, it undeniably did so in the late 70s, early 80s (Offen 1992; McRobbie 2008), and as several examples (appendix 1, Data #4; #23; #68) in the textual material prove, this image still haunts the movement to this very day. The issue is multifaceted, however, and cannot be limited merely to the historical aspects of feminism. Looking at the many arguments brought up throughout the textual material – especially the repeated mention of the word 'patriarchy' – brings to mind that WAF does not necessarily disagree with all feminism(s). The identification of a patriarchy is, after all, usually associated with what has been termed 'radical feminism', and therefore seen as a further-leaning aspect of feminism, which focuses on entirely changing the social order of things, in the belief that male-dominated thought made the system in the first place, and simply changing this system to accommodate women better will never constitute true 'change' (Pateman 1992: 70). Indeed, Pateman begins her explanation of the way feminism has developed through the ages by recognising that "The word 'feminism' continues to inspire controversy – indeed, even evoke fear" admitting that when it comes to what feminism *is*, "everyone seems to have different answers". Spindelman (2011: 5) goes one step further, suggesting that, at least in terms of its analytical merit "feminism is and only ever has been, at most, an empty vessel." What Spindelman and Pateman point to is the idea that feminism has been split into a multitude of possible construals, politically and socially, to the point that it is incomprehensible as a singular construction and therefore rendered almost useless as a word. Feminism is at once radical and moderate, focused on western society and women in third world countries. It concerns itself with the realities of rape and sexualisation, at the same time as it fights to legitimize women's sexual currency and agency for choice. To return to Fairclough (2012), what is ultimately the consequence of all these different construed versions of feminism is the notion that no one truly knows the construction. The question then becomes, whether such a construction is determined by the 'authors' of feminism, i.e. people like McRobbie (2008), Valenti (2014) and Hogeland (1994), or the 'audience' perceiving their discourse, i.e. groups such as WAF. If feminism is for individuals to decide, meaning anyone can claim to be 'feminist' and at once embody any of the many construed feminisms, then it is no wonder that feminism could at times – through such a collective of individuals – appear "condescending" or "aggressive", as proposed by WAF, as any individual portrayal of feminism may represent the collective whole of the feminist movement.

6. Conclusion

Disregarding Spindelman (2011) and Pateman's (1992) suggestions of recontextualising feminism, the analysis indicates that an issue of representation, as proposed by Lazar (2013) and McRobbie (2008), does in fact exist, reflected by the population of women who disagree with feminism. As such, in accordance with the theories of Fairclough (2012), WAF shows tendencies towards the kind of discourse used to battle social inequality, wherein a key aspect is to show that a certain discourse is being used to control a minority. While there are certainly variations in modality and genre found in the textual material, a considerable amount of the participants expressed concerns with the way feminism, according to them, represents women as victims, arguing that feminism in its modern

form denies women agency. The amount of correlation found in the texts suggests that there may be a larger representational issue, unrelated to the individual experiences of the participants. Many of the participants also implied that there was a change in how feminism acted previously, to how it acted now – rejecting 'modern' feminism - implying perhaps a negative current regarding feminism within modern media.

Determining whether feminist literature truly does promote a discourse of victimisation may be possible through further studies of 'central' feminist literature, which lies far beyond the scope of this paper, but recognising that feminism faces an issue of representation either way is paramount to the continued success of the movement. Perhaps, as Spindelman (2011) suggests, completely redefining feminist terminology and reconceptualising feminism itself may be the only way for the feminist movement to retain its power as an argumentative stand-point.

References

- Bourdieu, Pierre (1979). *La distinction: Critique sociale de jugement*. Paris: Les Editions de Minuit.
- Fairclough, Norman (2012). 'Critical discourse analysis'. URL: https://www.academia.edu/3791325/Critical_discourse_analysis_2012_. Retrieved November 11, 2014.
- Gibbs, Nancy & Ann Blackman (1992). 'The war against feminism'. *Time*, 139(10): 50.
- Hogeland, Lisa Maria (1994). 'Fear of feminism: Why young women get the willies'. *Ms. Magazine*, November-December: 18-21. Retrieved from search.proquest.com.zorac.aub.dk (ProQuest Research Library)
- Huang, Yan (2007). *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Jaworska, Sylvia & Ramesh Krishnamurthy (2012). 'On the F word: A corpus-based analysis of the media representation of feminism in British and German press discourse, 1990-2009'. *Discourse & Society*, 23: 401-431.
- Lazar, Charter Mollie (2013). 'Feminist Self-Identification Among Social Work Students: Possible Implications for Education'. Poster presented at the 13th Annual Conference of the Society for Social Work and Research, San Diego, January 18.
- Lewin, Kurt (1943). 'Forces behind food habits and methods of change'. *Bulletin of the National Research Council*, 108: 35–65
- Macgilchrist, Felicitas (2007). 'Positive discourse analysis: Contesting dominant discourses by reframing the issues'. *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis Across Disciplines*, 1(1): 74-94.
- McRobbie, Angela (2008) *The Aftermath of Feminism: Gender, Culture and Social Change*. London: SAGE.
- Offen, Karen (1992). 'Defining feminism: A comparative historical approach'. In Gisela Bock & Susan James (eds.), *Beyond Equality and Difference: Citizenship, Feminist Politics and Female Subjectivity*. London: Routledge. 69-89
- Pateman, Carol (1992). 'Equality, difference, subordination: The politics of motherhood and women's citizenship'. In Gisela Bock & Susan James (eds.), *Beyond Equality and Difference: Citizenship, Feminist Politics and Female Subjectivity*. London: Routledge. 17-31.
- Spindelman, Marc (2011). 'Feminism without feminism'. *Issues in Legal Scholarship*, 9(2): Article 8.
- Stavrositu, Carmen & Shyam Sundar (2012). 'Does blogging empower women? Exploring the role of agency and community- *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 17(4): 369-386.
- Toller, W. Paige., Elizabeth A. Suter & Todd C. Trautmann (2004). 'Gender role identity and attitudes toward feminism'. *Sex Roles*, 51: 85-90.
- Valenti, Jessica (2014). 'Feminism makes women 'victims'? I think you've mistaken us for the sexists'. *The Guardian*. URL: <http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2014/jul/30/feminism-makes-women-victims-sexist-women-against-feminism>. Retrieved September 29,

2015.

Appendix 1: Data

1. I am against FEMINISM because sexual abuse is not about gender and shouldn't ever be made to be about gender. Both men and women are abused (38-50% of victims are male according to the Bureau of Justice Statistics 2012). Making sexual abuse ONLY about men hurting women is SEXIST and encourages INEQUALITY between men and women. Sexual abuse should be ABOUT sexual abuse, not about women. (Nov 9. 2014 / 160 Notes)
2. I DON'T NEED FEMINISM COZ I DID NOT APPOINT FEMINISTS TO REPRESENT ME (Nov 9. 2014 / 60 Notes)
3. I don't NEED feminism because
 - I respect men and they do the same to us
 - Not all men are rapists
 - I can take responsibility of my actions
 - Feminism is not about equality anymore
 - I don't hate men.
 - We have the same rights that men do
 - I BELIEVE IN REAL EQUALITY (Nov 4. 2014 / 109 Notes)
4. I don't need feminism because as a first time grand-mother. I feel this picture says it all... What could be more important in a woman's life than raising her children and providing her family with a clean and comfortable home? Yet for too long we have been made to feel inadequate, worthless even, if we do not take on a job outside the home. We have a job. Our job has been provided by nature – and nature dictates it is the fathers of our children who should provide for us financially. So let us not exhaust ourselves, feeling we ought to adopt their role as well, or in place of, our own. The differences between the sexes should be enhanced, not erased (Nov 4. 2014 / 77 Notes)
5. FEMINISM SUCKS HARD (Oct 31. 2014 / 108 Notes)
6. I don't need feminism because:
 - Men today are not responsible for what men of the past did. LET IT GO.
 - Being financially responsible for one's own promiscuity isn't being oppressed; it's being an adult.
 - Dividing people and labelling them as victims will ensure that they will NEVER be empowered
 - There are women in the world who are actually being oppressed who are being ignored by western feminists because they don't fit the agenda. (Oct 31. 2014 / 151 Notes)
7. I DON'T NEED FEMINISM BECAUSE I LOVE MEN AND A WOMEN-ONLY WORLD WOULD BE A NIGHTMARE (Oct 31. 2014 / 106 Notes)
8. I don't need Modern Feminism because it's shameful to suggest women in the U.S. are oppressed when there is ACTUAL oppression happening in other parts of the world! (Oct 31. 2014 / 253 Notes)
9. I don't need modern feminism because
 - I can take responsibility for my mistakes instead of labelling myself as a 'victim'
 - I accept that men might be better than me at certain professions and therefore *should* be paid more. Not everyone is equal and we should not be treated as such.
 - I don't take offense to men complimenting me
 - I want the option to follow gender roles and not be ridiculed for following them
 - I realise that I have more opportunities in STEM than my male counterparts, simply

- because I am a women, not because of my talents, and I don't consider that to be just
- I believe that the banning of words such as 'bossy' and 'bitch' is against the concept of freedom of speech. We should be allowed to speak freely about others even if it is in a negative sense
 - As a bisexual, I love both men *and* women, and I try not to discriminate against either gender. I don't let a few bad people define a gender. Meanwhile, I see countless feminists wage a war against men and the 'patriarchy'. (Oct 26. 2014 / 229 Notes)
10. I don't need feminism as every social issue identified by feminists that applies to me has been caused by OTHER WOMEN. We do not need feminism. We need equality between women. (Oct 26. 2014 / 74 Notes)
11. I need feminism because... Oh wait... NO I DON'T! I am a STRONG, INDEPENDENT human being. I live and love on my own terms, and I take accountability for my actions. I am not a victim. And guess what – NEITHER ARE YOU. (Oct 26. 2014 / 381)
12. I Don't NEED Feminism because...
- I wouldn't spend more time *defending* a movement than actually helping people.
 - Using women from different countries you've never *helped* or travelled to as a reason why you still need Feminism is *ignorant, selfish, condescending and tactless*.
 - Equality isn't hand outs and *special treatment*. We all need to be held to the same standards!
 - And being a (Secular) *Humanist* is a hell of a lot better! (Oct 26. 2014 / 91 Notes)
13. I DON'T NEED FEMINISM BECAUSE I AM NOT A DELUSIONAL, DISGUSTING, HYPOCRITICAL MAN-HATER! I RESPECT MEN AND THEY RESPECT ME! (Oct 14. 2014 / 392 Notes)
14. I don't need feminism because there is a difference between equality and entitlement. Because men as a whole aren't womanizers. Because there is a difference between gentlemen and assholes. Because I don't want to raise children in a society that bashes men, and gives entitlements to people who don't deserve them #womenagainstfeminism (Oct 14. 2014 / 116 Notes)
15. I DON'T NEED FEMINISM..... I work for what I have, and everyone is not equal. I refuse to be paid the same amount for a job I am less qualified for and I'll be DAMNED if an overweight, insecure, unhealthy female tells ME how to respond to the men in my life. I AM NO FUCKING VICTIM. (Sep 28. 2014 / 321 Notes)
16. I don't need feminism because respect is not something you are born with based on your gender. It's something that you earn over time by showing people that you are worth fighting for #womenagainstfeminism (Sep 28. 2014 / 87 Notes)
17. I don't need feminism because that is my decision as a women. That's the only answer I need to give anyone, feminist or not. If, as a feminist, you feel the need or try to divert me from this, you have failed your feminist mantra of, "women know what's best for them." (Sep 23. 2014 / 492 Notes)
18. I don't need feminism because:
- I love my boyfriend, and respect him!
 - I make my own decisions without being pressured!
 - I enjoy makeup & like feeling pretty!
 - Also don't need to be superior to men! ☺ (Sep 23. 2014 / 344 Notes)
19. I DON'T NEED *FEMINISM* because I *REFUSE* to stand alongside *WOMEN* who *PREACH* about "EQUALITY", but act like certain *STANDARDS* and/or *SITUATIONS* don't apply to *MEN*. #Womenagainstfeminism (Sep 18. 2014 / 172 Notes)

20. Ugh see this is exactly what is wrong with first world feminists, the way they harp and whine about women in third world countries but never actually go and help them. Feminism in western society right now is doing positively NOTHING to help third world women. So what do you do? You bitch and moan about how YOU NEED FEMINISM (basically an excuse to play a victim) because there are other oppressed women around who you 100% are not helping. The only time you even mention them is to tell people why we need feminism. You don't care. You literally do not care about these women but you scapegoat them and trot them around like you do. You are the WORST kind of person and I seriously hope people who do this rot in hell. If feminism is needed THAT badly in those countries, how about you move there, instead of staying at home, writing stupid, oppressed articles on your 1000 dollar computer when you damn well know you don't give a flying crap about these women other than to use them to further your god awful hate movement. (July 29th, 2014) (Sep 18. 2014 / 343 Notes)
21. I reject modern feminism because I am not a victim of society. I do not need to be protected, I need to be partnered. Men are not inherently malicious. Women must be held accountable for their own actions too. We can do more good in this world united than disjointed. (Sep 16. 2014 / 305 notes)
22. I DON'T need feminism
- Just because a man "cat calls" at you does not equal rape or harrasement
 - I wear revealing clothes, AND I take full responsibility if people decide to stare!
 - Because I am a women does not equal me being a victim!
 - Men can be raped to!!
 - This isn't 1920! Were not fighting for anything anymore. Women have freedom!
 - Feminism is an negative!! (Sep 16. 2014 / 109 Notes)
23. I DON'T NEED FEMINISM BECAUSE... I AM NOT OPPRESSED. MY HUSBAND IS NOT AN OPPRESSOR. MY HOME IS NOT A PRISON. MY CHILDREN ARE NOT A BURDEN. ABORTION IS NOT HEALTHCARE. DRUNKEN MISTAKES ARE NOT RAPE. MY SON AND DAUGHTER ARE OF EQUAL VALUE. MOTHERS AND FATHERS ARE OF EQUAL IMPORTANCE. INTELLIGENT PEOPLE DON'T NEED SPECIAL TREATMENT TO GET A JOB OR COLLEGE DEGREE. MEN AND WOMEN ARE DIFFERENT...AND THAT IS A GOOD THING! (Sep 16. 2014 / 150 Notes)
24. I don't *NEED*:
- Feminism
 - OR
 - Masculism
- Because the only thing that should determine my life is my own potential *NOT* my gender (or race) we are *ALL* human, and we should all be *EQUAL* #equalism *spread the word!* (Sep 16. 2014 / 278 Notes)
25. I DON'T NEED FEMINISM BECAUSE: AS A SELF-RESPECTING ADULT, I AM ACCOUNTABLE FOR MY OWN ACTIONS, I DON'T BLINDLY CLING ON TO EMOTIONAL ARGUMENTS / PROPOGANDA AND RECOGNIZE THAT A VICTIM COMPLEX IS NOT EMPOWERING. #WOMENAGAINSTFEMINISM. (Sep 14. 2014 / 485 Notes)
26. From what I have been reading lately it seems modern day feminism doesn't fight to be equal- it fights to be superior. I personally don't believe in equality,I believe in supporting one another. Both men and women have different roles to play in this world, and it is the job of another to support or help the other. I know that when something happens with my car or house I turn to a male figure to help, not because they are 'superior' but because 9/10 will

- know how to fit it. Just like the majority of males would turn to females to help with their laundry because many have no idea what to do. Feminism was needed prior to the sixties but modern in Australia and other western civilizations there is minimal discrimination and no need to downgrade the success of a male because of his gender, when that could have easily been a woman who worked just or harder than them. (Sep 14. 2014 / 250 Notes)
27. WOMEN HAVE AGENCY!!! IF I DRESS LIKE THIS, I WANT YOU TO LOOK!
28. **I don't need feminism because...** There is no women who can tell me what I HAVE TO do with my life (except my mom of course <3) #Womenagainstfeminism
Greetings from Poland! (Sep 14. 2014 / 62 Notes)
29. I don't need feminism because my abusive ex-husband does not represent all men and I don't believe they must bear collective responsibility for the acts of a few scumbags. I also refuse to hate the men who protected me from him. (Sep 14. 2014 / 263 Notes)
30. YouTube: Flippantly facetious: I don't need feminism seeing how I'm an ambitious, hard working, confident person living in 21st-century America. Why fight for rights I already have? (Sep 14. 2014 / 128 Notes)
31. I don't need feminism because:
- This isn't the 1920s. You're not Juffragettes, you're not Martyrs, you're not fighting for any real thing.
 - Cat calls and compliments from men you don't know/like are not harassment and DEFINITELY NOT RAPE.
 - I don't shave my legs or pits because I'm lazy, not to make some sort of statement.
 - Being a women has advantages AND disadvantages. Being a man does too. I think it evens out.
 - Hitting my boyfriend didn't make me right, didn't bring me to his "level" and didn't "empower" me. It left me feeling awful and guilty for a long time.
 - The whole "I drink/bathe in/etc." "male tears" thing is hypocritical, stupid, condescending, and disgusting.
 - I have a personality besides being an edgy, contrarian, special-snowflake tumblr TWAT.
- (Sep 9. 2014 / 225 Notes)
32. I DON'T NEED FEMINISM BECAUSE I WANT TO BELIEVE THERE IS A HEALTHIER & MORE CONSTRUCTIVE WAY TO STOP OPPRESSION AND ABUSE OF WOMEN THAN DOING THE SAME THING TO ME.
I WILL SUPPORT FEMINISM WHEN IT STOPS BEING SO VICIOUS AND VENGEFUL. HATE LEADS TO BIG MISTAKES. (Sep 9. 2014 / 161 Notes)
33. I DON'T NEED FEMINISM
BECAUSE THIS WAS MY AMBITION AND ALL YOUR LIES ABOUT EMPOWERED SLUTHOOD AND RAPE CULTURE AND EVIL MEN DIDN'T KEEP ME FROM REACHING IT
(SEP 6. 2014 / 176 Notes)
34. I DON'T NEED FEMINISM
- I like cooking, cleaning, sewing, only wearing skirts & dresses, and folding clothes
 - I don't need feminists to "liberate" me from my favourite activities.
 - Yes, men have treated me wrong. But feminists have as well.
 - Just because I am quiet & enjoy more peaceful activities, you don't have to "defend" me from the "patriarchy."
 - The same "patriarchy" I am "already brainwashed by."
#Womenagainstfeminism

(Sep 6. 2014 / 143 Notes)

35. Generation X and their identity politics ruined feminism for everyone. I reject the cult of victimhood, celebrate sexuality and support people's right to choose their own lifestyles. ANTI-FEMINISM is the NEW FEMINISM.

36. WHY I DON'T NEED FEMINISM

Because feminism has made it clear to me over and over again that IT only "needs" that tiny percentage of women whose thoughts, feelings, problems, and experiences affirm their narratives.

As a woman whose thoughts, feelings, problems, and experiences often contradict feminism narratives of "what all women [whatever]", I have had one or more of the following reactions every time I talk about my own experiences:

- Been banned/censored. In one case I was perversely accused of "misogyny apologia" for *talking about how feminist messages can be misogynist against women who don't match the narratives*, and perversely accused of derailing a "women's issues" thread for *talking about my own issues as a woman*.
- Been accused of being a man pretending to be a woman, or otherwise called "not a real woman".
- Been accused of lying about my experiences.
- Been told that feminism "doesn't exist to represent me".
- Been told that my experiences don't matter or matter less compared to other women's.
- Been told, in the ultimate in irony and hypocrisy, that I should remember that "my personal experiences don't represent all women", even though *the entire damn problem* is that *feminists* are using their personal experiences to represent all women even though large numbers of us don't share those experiences!

I've also been accused of things like "internalized misogyny", being brainwashed by the patriarchy, and saying things just to impress men.

So, seriously, why do I need a movement that has told me time and time again that it doesn't give a damn about representing me, because they don't want to change their narratives and worldviews to accommodate me and other women who don't fit the existing ones?

(Sep 4. 2014 / 202 Notes)

37. I don't need feminism because I lack a victim complex. Youtube: flippantlyfacetious (Sep 3. 2014 / 99 Notes)

38. I DON'T NEED FEMINISM BECAUSE

I AM STRONG ENOUGH TO ADMIT THAT SOMETIMES I NEED HELP FROM MEN
#WOMENAGAINSTFEMINISM

(Sep 3. 2014 / 112 Notes)

39. I don't support feminism because:

- I'm done w/ people automatically looking at the boy when trouble starts. It was always me!
- Feminists believe in winning, not teamwork. I need logic!
- Feminism is necessary in third-world countries only.
- Not only men can be pigs, but ladies, too! Not all women are the same. Therefore, not all men are the same!
- I'm a big girl – I can take responsibility for my actions & decisions!
- Egalitarianism: EQUALITY FOR EVERYBODY

(Sep 3. 2014 / 99 Notes)

40. I don't need modern feminism because it wants to limit me. (Sep 3. 2014 / 88 Notes)

41. I DON'T NEED FEMINISM B/C...

- I love my BOYfriend and we **BOTH** respect each other.
AND

I am **willing and able** to defend myself against any man or women who does not respect me #Women against feminism (Sep 2. 2014 / 83 Notes)

42. I DO NOT NEED **MODERN** FEMINISM BECAUSE:

- I already feel empowered to make my own decisions + be my own woman....
- I have a loving + respectful partner who deserves the reciprocation of my love + respect as my equal.
- Not all men are rapists, just as not all women are child killers (...)
- I refuse to be oppressed by women who tell me that cooking is for victims! I <3 FOOD!

(Sep 2. 2014 / 69 Notes)

43. I DON'T NEED FEMINISM BECAUSE I WANT TO PROMISE MY MAN TO LOVE HIM, HONOR HIM AND OBEY HIM! <3 -ITALY- (Aug 28. 2014 / 110 Notes)

44. My uncle lost custody of his 4 kids (2 teens, 1 small child and 1 newborn) to his cheating, party life ex-wife because she made the kids lie in the court and make him look abusive. The courts accepted this without any evidence. She got the house, both cars, the kids, child support and alimony. He got to live on his friend's couch and get cut out of the family. But you need feminism because people find personal grooming attractive.

(Aug 28. 2014 / 309 Notes)

45. I Don't Need FEMINISM because the anti-whiteness in today's western feminists makes it out as if only white men are capable of sexism, and that men of other races do no harm. I've been accused of "insulting" brown men just for bringing up that as a little girl, my father (who is of indigenous Mexican descent) had traditional sexist beliefs that I strongly disagree with. I no longer call myself a feminist because I refuse to side with a group of ignorant close-minded women who **erase** my voice and experiences. (Aug 28. 2014 / 57 Notes)

46. I don't need Feminism to say my success is their win but my failure is patriarchy.

My career is my own. Good or Bad.

I don't need a council to decide if my art is "problematic" I don't want their decision redacted when they find out I am a woman

Or

They say I'm lying about being a woman because I don't (...)

I'm so afraid my feminist peers will find out how I think I don't want to post anything identifiable about myself or my art.

I'm a straight woman that loves sexy comic art.

Pink pencil means I'm a girl

47. I Don't need feminism

- Because it needs to be conserved for the the ones that do.
- To blame all men for the actions a minority do is wrong.
- The warped and right winged views of modern feminism don't want equality, they want the tables turned
- I am not better than men, nor am I underneath them.
- Feminism fights sexism with sexism
- A majority of men are beautiful and kind-hearted, not the rapist pigs this bullshit movement makes them out to be.

(Aug 26. 2014 / 77 Notes)

48. I don't need feminism because: I all ready have the same equal rights as men. I love my

- husband and don't need to put him down in order to build myself up.
Because fighting for woman superiority is not fighting for equality.
(Aug 26. 2014 / 126 Notes)
49. I don't need feminism
Because I don't need naked women to protest against my 'oppression'!
I am happily and perfectly free.
Your perception of my rights doesn't represent me...
Feminists don't represent me!
(Aug 24. 2014 / 216 Notes)
50. I am against modern feminism because (white) women feminist philosophy professors insulted me for being Chinese as I pursue my career in philosophy of science during my undergraduate studies. Philosophy of science is my passion and I am excellent of what I do. I also feel the need to protect the people that I know who happen to be men from harm inflicted on them by feminism.
Feminists: you are obsolete. Oh and check your white privilege.
51. I don't need feminism because
- Being a woman is not a disadvantage
 - Taking responsibility for your actions/choices is not oppression
 - Playing the victim and shielding yourself from reality is not empowering
 - Feminists only want the good parts of "equality". When was the last time feminism fought for women to equal jail time as men?
- (Aug 23. 2014 / 151 Notes)
52. "To call a man an animal is to flatter him: he is a machine, a walking dildo" – Valerie Solangs *feminist*
"I want to see a man beaten to a bloody pulp with a high heel shoved in his mouth like an apple in the mouth of a pig" – Andrea Dworkin *feminist*
(arrow points to the quotes) this is why I. Don't. Need. Feminism.
Yes, these are radical quotes, but they still identify as feminists
I would not want to identify with a group of man hating women who are so focused on ruling the world that they put any women, even if they identify as a feminist, also down, because they don't feel the exact same way
Why not be a humanist? There are no nasty, full-of-hatred humanists out there that get horrible publicity. Also they're striving for equality just like the feminists claim to be.
(I also don't need feminists like Andrea comparing men to being pigs. I think men + pigs are awesome, so awesome that I don't want to eat them.)
(Aug 23. 2014 / 102 Notes)
53. I don't need feminism because equality of opportunity already exists
(Aug 21. 2014 / 364 Notes)
54. I can honestly say that I don't believe in feminism, bc the second that women are treated as equally as men, is the second that we get talked to with disrespect, we don't get our doors opened for us, or asked if we need help when carrying something heavy. The truth is that women are weaker than men, physically and emotionally and we need them. That's how we were created.
(Aug 21. 2014 / 348 Notes)
55. I don't need feminism because..
- Not all men are rapists
 - I am not a victim
 - I am not oppressed

- Men have problems too
- I am responsible for my actions

(Aug 20. 2014 / 217 Notes)

56. I don't need FEMINISM because: the word 'feminism' is not 'just about equality', it relies on the assumption that women have it worse I THINK WOMEN HAVE IT BETTER

(Aug 19. 2014 / 217 Notes)

57. I don't need feminism because: as a muslim woman who CHOOSES to cover, I don't need feminists telling me I'm oppressed DESPITE having all the same rights as anyone else living in this country. OPPRESSION is feminists Telling you how they think you should dress! (Or how you should think/feel/live etc)

(Aug 19. 2014 / 79 Notes)

58. I don't need feminism because...

I believe women should be supportive of one another regardless of where they choose to work, whether it be in an office or in the home. (Aug 19. 2014 / 269 Notes)

59. I DON'T NEED FEMINISM BECAUSE

- Cruelty & violence have no gender and casting men as inherent evil-doers or evil-doers-in-the making and women as their passive victims is wrong
- True equality isn't drilling into women that they are praise worthy just for existing and that every time their feelings are hurt, they are being victimised, while saddling men with increasingly crippling and contradictory expectations

(Aug 19. 2014 / 1027 Notes)

60. I don't need feminism because it is a movement Full of hypocrisy and hate

Feminists only see what they want and the use of logic and critical thinking with them is useless.

61. I don't need feminism because:...

- A feminist once told me: 'you can't be sexist to a man only he can be sexist to you'
- Women already get it easier!
 - o Released from police custody faster!
 - o Get lesser sentences in court!
 - o And until last year we got cheaper car insurance!
- Women are not 'victims of society'
- We already have equal rights
- I don't agree with belittling one sex to get equality for the other.
- No man sees me as a 'sex object'

(Aug 18. 2014 / 184 Notes)

62. Why I'm Against Feminism:

- I am not a victim of the non-existent Patriarchy
- I believe that sexist against men exists
- I respect both men and women
- I take responsibility for my own actions
- I don't want to politicize my gender
- I don't appreciate being put down by feminists whom I disagree with
- I want to be judged by my abilities instead of my gender
- I don't believe catcalling is the same/equivalent to rape
- I believe that feminism is an irrational fear of men disguised as equality
- We are all human

Why don't we fight for the equality of all instead of solely focusing on women? We aren't

- the only ones 'suffering'.
 #Womenagainstfeminism
 (Aug 18. 2014 / 237)
63. I don't need feminism because I feel more oppressed by feminists than I do by men
 #Womenagainstfeminism (Aug 17. 2014 / 241 Notes)
64. I don't need modern feminism
- I don't want to BE part of a movement THAT idolizes CONSENT UNLESS you say no to Modern Feminism. Then "No" Means "You stupid, uneducated bitch."
 - I don't want to be part of a movement where #notallmen is attacked, since all men should take responsibility for what few do, but "not all feminists" are crazy extremists who trend things such as #Killallmen
 - I need the definition of feminism. Not this newage TUMBLR SHIT
 - Re-evaluate your movement
- (Aug 17. 2014 / 167 Notes)
65. I Don't need Feminism Because...
- I am NOT a victim
 - I don't hate all men
 - I love my boyfriend
 - It's not wrong to believe in traditional family values
 - I take responsibility for my own actions
- #antifeminism #womenagainstfeminism
 (Aug 14. 2014 / 132 Notes)
66. I'm against feminism, because I'm against sexism, including sexism toward men
 (Aug 13. 2014 / 123 Notes)
67. I do not need feminism because I should protect myself instead of being afraid due to the image of men that has been created and to not consider myself a victim. Feminism is supposed to teach empowerment and being strong, so let's start acting like it
 We cannot destroy the concept of rape, it's been going on longer than America has even been around "Rape, pillage, and burn" three words to sum up Vikings. We can only prevent it. My body means I need to ensure it's safety.
 (Aug 13. 2014 / 80 Notes)
68. I don't need feminism b/c
- I don't need to feel EMPOWERED at the expense of men
 - I don't need to HAVE A CAREER in order to boost my self-esteem
 - I can be whatever I want to be. And I WANT to be a stay-at-home mom
 - We are ALL THE SAME inside
 - Being IN THE KITCHEN is actually kinda fun (Aug 12. 2014 / 55 Notes)
69. Why I DON'T need Feminism...
- I refuse to accept abortion as 'empowering'.
 - I am my Husband's Equal.
 - Myself and my 3 daughters are not victims. We are strong... not helpless.
 - My 4 sons respect women and girls because their Dad is an excellent teacher.
 - Still have doubts about my reasons? Check out my shirt! ☺
- (Aug 12. 2014 / 85 Notes)
70. I don't need feminism because...
- I'm not going to empower myself by bringing others down.
 (Aug 12. 2014 / 63 Notes)

71. I don't need feminism because I don't see women as Weak and pathetic victims of the non-existent patriarchy.

(Aug 12. 2014 / 57 Notes)

72. I don't need feminism because I don't feel oppressed. It's really that simple. I think that feminism is good for girls in the third world who are legitimately oppressed, and for girls in the first world who struggle with body image, street harassment, and obnoxious guys who invade their personal space. But I don't fit into either category, and feminists just refuse to accept that.

I'm sick of being told I have internalized misogyny for not feeling oppressed. It doesn't even make sense – why would feminists have a problem with me feeling like guys treat me just fine?

Either way, not needing feminism certainly makes it easier to be critical of it, and that's a good thing – because from transphobia to glorified misandry, there's a lot about feminism that's worthy of criticism. Feminists have this idea that being critical of the movement must mean you're a misogynist, and that's really harmful.

TL;DR We need to remove the idea that not personally needing feminism, and being rightfully critical of the movement equates to not supporting it. Which is why feminists need to learn to respect the people who hold the above perspectives and leave them be.

(Aug 12. 2014 / 48 Notes)

73. I am not a feminist because...

- There are women out there getting **acid** thrown on them for rejecting a marriage proposal but all I ever see are outcries against school dress codes
- I believe that sexism against men exists
- I don't think women are victims
- I don't want to be! And that should be okay.

(Aug 12. 2014 / 149 Notes)

74. I don't need feminism because

- Men and women already have equal rights where I live
- I do not limit my cares to the needs of one gender only
- If I want to be a boss, I'll start a company
- If I'm unhappy with my wage I'll re-negotiate my salary or find another employer
- Forced discrimination against men is not a reasonable trade-off for perceived and unproven discrimination against women
- The initiatives proposed by modern-day feminists are either unnecessary, ineffective and/or destructive

(Aug 12. 2014 / 197 Notes)

75. I need EQUALITY because:

- I respect men AND women
- I refuse to demonize all men
- I take responsibility for my own actions
- I refuse to play victim for manipulation
- I don't wish to politicize my gender
- WE ARE ALL HUMAN!!!

(Aug 12. 2014 / 197 Notes)