

Well done for leaving the feminst cult, and all your other achievements

July 15, 2020 | 1247 upvotes | by [mhandanna](#)



Archived from [theredarchive.com](https://www.theredarchive.com)

Comments

TSM_Cracker • 63 points • 15 July, 2020 09:08 AM

“Left feminism and embraced femininity” love the way that’s put. Really sums up the way it should be

[deleted] • 6 points • 15 July, 2020 06:53 PM

Last time I've checked, Anita Sarkeesian was pretty feminine in her appearance and behaviour.

andalldaytodoit41 points 15 July, 2020 05:15 AM **[recovered]**

Overcame the brainwashing

seajayde • -42 points • 15 July, 2020 10:48 AM

And replaced it with religious brainwashing instead. Soooo much better(!)

SlavNotDead • 24 points • 15 July, 2020 12:15 PM

Whatever your thoughts on religion are, your comparison is absolutely idiotic.

I am atheist, but It is not fucking hard for me to admit that it is infinitely better for her and everybody around to believe in a kind invisible old man than to write ‘killallmen’ and other “beautiful” feminist hashtags on twitter.

seajayde • -32 points • 15 July, 2020 12:19 PM*

Yes God is so kind, he wants to stone people to death based on their sexuality. So kind, he killed an entire town cos of that. So loving that he'll send you to hell if you don't believe in him. Just like any loving parent would! Lol it seems you know nothing about religion. Also both are sexist. Most religions' holy books treat women as inferior and think they should just shut the fuck up. Extreme feminists hate on men. Maybe read up on something before you call someone an idiot, huh? EDIT: Wow people hate it when you point out what is in their holy book. Hahahahaha it's in there but I guess you have to learn to read before you see it. Plus you gotta stop with the 'it was different back then' and 'you're taking it out of context' bullshit and actually READ what it says. Like anyone with any common sense.

SphinxGames • 10 points • 15 July, 2020 12:41 PM

Ezekiel 16:48-50 As I live, saith the Lord God, Sodom thy sister hath not done, she nor her daughters, as thou hast done, thou and thy daughters. Behold, this was the iniquity of thy sister Sodom, pride, fulness of bread, and abundance of idleness was in her and in her daughters, neither did she strengthen the hand of the poor and needy. And they were haughty, and committed abomination before me: therefore I took them away as I saw good.

From this we can conclude that pride, gluttony, incredible laziness, and not giving care in any way to the poor and needy as the primary reasons for the destruction of Sodom, of course there is more to be read than just these few passages but these summarize quite well.

seajayde • -16 points • 15 July, 2020 12:44 PM

Yes well done. That one passage based on one thing I said totally contradicts everything I said. Also one of the reasons it was destroyed was cos of the gays. Maybe not the only reason but a big reason. It's where the term sodomy comes from.

SphinxGames • 5 points • 15 July, 2020 12:58 PM

To address stoning, stoning was not a punishment for homosexuality in particular, it is was a form of execution for a myriad of crimes. While it is true that the partaking of homosexual intercourse was punished harshly in the days of the bible, this was done by the populace and not by God, I am not brushed up on my Bible unfortunately, and most definitely need to fix that, however I cannot think of many examples of God executing someone himself and most certainly not for homosexuality. HOWEVER, you also must be aware that life was drastically different then, things were acceptable then that would be unfathomable now and vice versa, punishment for sin was taken much more seriously and was much harsher, at least in life, and whether or not you agree with it homosexuality is a sin according to christian belief, I being a christian also believe that homosexuality is a sin, however that does not mean I chase down homosexuals guns blazing threatening their life, I know many homosexuals and even though I strongly disagree with their sexuality I do not think less of them as a person, because we all sin, everyone sins, we are human, I sin, you sin, every single person sins, so hating someone because they sin is probably one of the most idiotic things you could do. As far as "most religious holy books treat women as inferior" that could very well be true for other religions of which all of them I believe to be false, but as far as the christian bible goes, women are not treated as less human than men, if anything as christians we are taught to hold nothing but the utmost of respect for women, never strike a women, never disrespect a women, although not exclusive to christianity in the slightest. Something else to note, again as I am not fully brushed up on my Bible knowledge at this point I am not 100 percent sure on this, but as far as I am aware all instances of harsh punishment for homosexuality is for engaging in homosexual intercourse and not for feeling for someone of the same gender.

seajayde • 0 points • 15 July, 2020 01:04 PM*

Yes that explains why female rape victims had to marry their rapists cos women were so beloved. And also this quote: 1 Timothy 2:12 'I do not permit a woman to teach or to assume authority over a man; she must be quiet.' Oh I see, so you were only punished for having gay sex, well that makes it so much better then! Also what God says is always relevant as he says in the bible. If he okayed something back then, he would okay it now. This is PAINFUL. Yep, your religion is the only true one, all the others are bullshit. Haha. I'm sure your gay friends are so lucky to have a friend that thinks they're going to hell just cos of how they were born. And also, according to your logic, how God made them.

SphinxGames • 3 points • 15 July, 2020 03:43 PM

I do not think they are going to hell, if I thought that it would be because I do not think they are good God fearing christians, but I know several of them are fantastic people, just because I disagree with something they do doesn't mean I think they are going to hell. Let me quote Henry Madison Morris about your insistence that the Bible says women are inferior, which it does not, and they are not, "The intended leadership role for men in the basic institutions of the home and church dates from the creation itself. That is, Eve was formed from Adam's side, to be "an help meet for him" (Genesis 2:18). This is not an invention of the supposedly anti feminist apostle, as some have alleged, but the stipulation of God Himself, even before the entrance of sin and the curse of the world. This in no way means that

man is superior to woman in God's sight, for both were created "in the image of God" (Ge 1:27), and both are "one in Jesus Christ" (Ga 3:28). Each, however, was created for a distinctive role and purpose, and neither is truly fulfilled apart from that." While not my own words, this definitely summarizes it quite well, and in terms of "if he okayed something back then, he would okay it now" that is correct, however I never said otherwise, what I said was that stoning was done by the populace, not by God, in general.

seajayde • 0 points • 15 July, 2020 03:54 PM

The Bible contradicting itself?! Religious people only cherrypicking what they deem as the good bits out of their holy book? Well, colour me shocked! God literally said to Eve that she would have to serve under her husband for punishment and every woman would have to serve under their husbands for eternity. Yep, that's equality alright! (Plus let's just ignore female rape victims having to marry their rapists for some reason.)

SlavNotDead • 0 points • 15 July, 2020 12:30 PM

The only addition your comment needs is a longass

REEEEEEEEEEEEEE

at the end. For a someone on an antifeminist sub you act remarkably close to one of them.

Also, for a supposed nonbeliever, you put a lot of *faith* into the "holy books" as if they were true to history. All those books were written by humans (shocking, I know) and to believe in some form of a higher power people do not have to believe in a specific version of it. It is like judging the Joker by the "Suicide Squad". Like I said, absolutely idiotic.

seajayde • 1 point • 15 July, 2020 12:34 PM*

Yes by explaining what's in the Bible, I'm 100% like a feminist bitching about nothing. I never said they were true to history, just said what's in them. If you don't follow a holy book then you're not religious. People who just believe in a higher power but aren't sure of what it is don't subscribe to any religion. Also lol, you're about as much of an atheist as I am a unicorn. And I don't say that cos you disagree with me, I say that cos you're using religious 'arguments'. Well done in comparing God to the Joker, both are fictional. You said better for her to believe in a kind old man, which suggests actual religions. (The Abrahamic ones to be specific.)

SlavNotDead • 1 point • 15 July, 2020 01:34 PM

And I don't say that cos you disagree with me

Uh-huuuh

seajayde • 0 points • 15 July, 2020 01:44 PM*

I knew you would focus on that which is why I said that and then I thought 'surely they'd at least attempt to answer my other points even if they mention that cos I've explained why I said it.' Well done.

vasekgamescz • 3 points • 15 July, 2020 04:09 PM

It's better to believe that there is a god above you rather than that wage gap exists

seajayde • 1 point • 15 July, 2020 04:11 PM

Both are fictional and harmful.

[deleted] • -8 points • 15 July, 2020 11:17 AM

True. Just exchanged one delusion for another :/

vicsj • 10 points • 15 July, 2020 10:24 AM

I will say though that you don't need to be super feminine to be against feminism - your friendly neighborhood MRA tomboy lol

mhandanna[S] • 7 points • 15 July, 2020 11:40 AM

Oh absolutely, we should be free to be as we please... hence most of us here are anti feminists, feminism does not allow that

Neveah_Hope_Dreams • 10 points • 15 July, 2020 10:59 AM

Great!

I'm glad shes changed her view of the world to a more optimistic way and is leading healthy habits. All part of leaving feminism.

tw1nm3t30r • 45 points • 15 July, 2020 05:22 AM

Excellent! There is hope in the world after all ☐

[deleted] • 8 points • 15 July, 2020 04:38 PM

I remember leaving feminism and focusing on my femininity, it was so relieving that I could finally be free of it. I'm a hopeless romantic and love the idea of being a housewife one day but feminists didn't like that. Whenever I brought it up they'd treat me like a wounded puppy, a misguided little kid or I'd get the famous "What about your career?" question. Whenever I watched girl power tv shows, I always notice how they discouraged femininity in girls; they'd mock relationships, make the highly feminine character the villain, make fun of girls who liked to put effort into their appearance and mocked girly activities and would always make the heroes butch, very aggressive, cynical, rude or lesbians (Because in feminist land being a lesbian is the most "empowering" thing a woman can do and be).

mhandanna[S] • 5 points • 15 July, 2020 04:53 PM

Erin Pizzey, the pioneering woman who once was a feminist until she broke out of the cult said how viciously detested women who wanted to have children were (not stay at home to look after kids, i mean HAVE children), how they viewed being with a man as sleeping with the enemy etc.

https://youtu.be/53Gmx_wfft8

Given women and men the complete choice of whether to pursue a career, stay at home, do what they want is fantastic... however that isn't feminism... feminism is literally forcing women into a role... they even devalue and make worthless careers such as teaching, healthcare etc and call it low value low status work, they call being a good human "emotional labour" and they have completely downgraded being a homemaker, a very highly skilled and pivotal role.... its fucking unreal as well and dumb, they completely downgrade looking after kids, but at same time want men to do more childcare? Huhh?

The movement is just fucked. A cult ideology

[deleted] • 3 points • 15 July, 2020 04:59 PM

Or how Rockefeller funded feminism to get women out of the house and into the workforce to get women to spend more money

<https://m.youtube.com/watch?v=cddidL2MQo>

mhandanna[S] • 3 points • 15 July, 2020 05:07 PM

Yeah tonnes of examples of that, supporting ms magazine etc, feminists have been played like fools at times, and in others played people like fools. Cigarette companies using feminism to get more women to smoke, (failing) to use feminism to get women to buy diamonds for men, or for their other hand.

A lot of the support at the global level for feminism is to get women to pay more tax (e.g. women in UK pay 27% of the annual income tax), women to spend more money, increase work supply, depress wages etc

The sister of one of the most important feminist ever reveals all:

https://www.reddit.com/r/MensRights/comments/hovc1c/the_sister_of_the_iconic_and_pioneering_feminist_k/

BupSpoi • 7 points • 15 July, 2020 07:26 AM

NGL, the hedgehog look is kinda cute, though, I'm sure she would have hatred being called "cute" when that photo was taken.

[deleted] • 3 points • 15 July, 2020 11:28 AM

If the pic on the left had long hair, that would have been the cuter one. Not even gonna front.

That said, these leftist ideologies are all aligned with destructive behavior. She did well to leave the cult.

wolfreturned • 20 points • 15 July, 2020 06:37 AM

Can't reverse your body count

hatefulreason • 27 points • 15 July, 2020 07:03 AM

also can't jump back over the wall :)

sanrio-sugarplum • 11 points • 15 July, 2020 10:16 AM

Why is body count talked about so much in relation to feminism? I feel like a decent percentage of feminists are femcels. Even when I was a radical feminist I was never into hookup culture

TiredExFeminist • 4 points • 15 July, 2020 05:43 PM

Because this dude can't get any at all so when a woman is more experienced than him he feels he needs to use bullshit to sound more intelligent than her to make up for his obvious deficiencies in the bedroom.

eldredge_ape • 14 points • 15 July, 2020 08:13 AM

So long as her body count (whatever number that may be) isn't high enough to make pair bonding impossible for her, I think she'll be alright. I just hope she's not still hanging in or around the same circles that rooted her in her former tumblrina phase because she could change back in a heartbeat otherwise.

bsutansalt • 5 points • 15 July, 2020 02:03 PM

That number is far lower than most people think. just having two former sexual partners lowers women's long-term relationship chances of succeeding down to about 50%.

TaunTaun_22 • 3 points • 15 July, 2020 10:46 AM

How would a high body count make pairing with someone difficult at a different time?

pinkeythehoboken22 • 5 points • 15 July, 2020 02:56 PM

Because they're insecure. It doesn't make a difference if you don't give a shit And love each other. But if you're a man-baby it's different bc you want your "unsoiled virgin flower"

eldredge_ape • 2 points • 15 July, 2020 04:22 PM

That's an erroneous way of viewing the situation. Given the number of "Where Are All The Good Men"/"Why Can't I Find a Man Worthy of Me" themed articles and talk show segments out there, I'd say it's not men who are the insecure ones. Like it or not, a low body count matters to a lot of men when seeking a long-term romantic partner, primarily for evolutionary psychology reasons referenced above but also because of the simple fact that women can essentially have sex whenever they want to with little effort involved. Men have never and will never be able to get sex as easily as a woman can, so a woman with a low or nonexistent body count will of course be seen as more pure than one who's been with double digit men. Shaming and name-calling are poor counters to logic.

pinkeythehoboken22 • 1 point • 15 July, 2020 05:10 PM

Lol, "logic." More like insecurity.

pinkeythehoboken22 • 1 point • 15 July, 2020 05:14 PM

The only one who gives a "body count" any value, is you. It's no one else's problem, because it doesn't matter.

eldredge_ape • 3 points • 15 July, 2020 05:40 PM

I'm clearly not going to change your mind, nor am I going to get you to, for even the briefest of moments, re-examine your stance on things. Personally, I care more about whether or not one's body count has affected her mentality, health, and ability to navigate monogamous relationships than I do about the number itself, but I understand why some might care and I advocate for those people against the ones who would rather throw labels, logical fallacies, and shame at them rather than listen to their concerns. Coming back with "Insecurity LOL", regardless of how you feel about what I've said, is no more logically sound, and if a great deal of people weren't already willing to write it off as such, you'd be no more able to convince others of your stance than I was able to convince you.

pinkeythehoboken22 • 1 point • 15 July, 2020 05:45 PM

You're just performing mental gymnastics and being pedantic so you think you have a point. I'm telling you you don't.

So, we'll agree to disagree. I don't care about changing your mind, even though I used to think like you. That's why you won't change mine.

eldredge_ape • 2 points • 15 July, 2020 05:49 PM

I'm curious then, if you don't mind me asking: What changed your mind?

pinkeythehoboken22 • 2 points • 15 July, 2020 06:00 PM

Realizing that the only person body count mattered to, was myself.

It's like words, that number only has power when you give it power. But if you meet someone who loves you for you, and makes you feel like the most important person to them, why does it matter how many partners they've had? Short answer, it doesn't. A person's "body count" doesn't define how their mental process works. Some people figure out love in different ways at different speeds, but what matters is the person, not how many people they've slept with.

Just because they've had more than one partner doesn't mean you're not the best they've had. Or that they're incapable of being in a monogamous relationship.

I nearly killed a relationship with a girl who loved me dearly, and treated me like the most important person to her, because I was immature and couldn't get over the fact that she had been with one more person than I had before we got together. But the fact of the matter was, those guys meant nothing to her because she had me now, and I was just too blinded by my own insecurity to see it.

The fact is, if she's with you, it's because you chose each other, and it doesn't matter how many partners she's had, unless you let it matter.

Also, experience is a really great thing in the bedroom.

PS sorry I was being a dick, I thought you were being one of those "bEcKY FuCKs ChAd & TYroNe" dudes.

Mewster1818 • 10 points • 15 July, 2020 12:41 PM

Studies show that particularly women who have had multiple sexual partners have a harder time feeling satisfied and happy in relationships. I wish I had a link to the study, but it did show reduced positive outcomes for women (the higher the "body count" the worse off the outcome in pair bonding usually.)

I don't really think it's surprising, biologically there is no good reason for a woman to be promiscuous, in fact the only reason it's common now is the feminist lie that "men and women are the same".

TaunTaun_22 • 7 points • 15 July, 2020 01:42 PM

Does this apply to men as well? Not asking for a "wHaT aBoUt MeN" way, more like curious about myself and others. I used to have a bit of fun in the early college days

Mewster1818 • 2 points • 15 July, 2020 01:45 PM

Nope. Men are biologically inclined to "spread their seed" as much as possible, while it's always been more advantageous for women to get commitment and a dedicated partner rather than lots of partners.

seajayde • 0 points • 15 July, 2020 02:21 PM

Men who fuck women, get them pregnant and fuck off are perfectly fine. But how dare a

woman have 1 or more partners before being in a long term relationship!

Mewster1818 • 7 points • 15 July, 2020 03:10 PM

I'm just talking about the research that shows declining happiness in women who have a lot of sexual partners. Which from a biological standpoint makes sense as sex is a much riskier activity for women than it is for men. It makes sense that most women are less fulfilled with lots of sexual partners versus very committed partners.

I'm not condoning men who do what you said. I'm just pointing out the reality that the child is a burden for the mother, less so for the father, if they are not in a committed relationship. Men are not as naturally inclined to need commitment as a condition for their happiness and fulfillment.

pinkeythehoboken22 • 0 points • 15 July, 2020 02:58 PM

Right? What man children. Women like sex too, there's nothing wrong with that.

pinkeythehoboken22 • -3 points • 15 July, 2020 02:57 PM

How convenient.

Mewster1818 • 3 points • 15 July, 2020 03:03 PM

I'm not sure I follow?

When we're talking about biology you have to remember that for the vast majority of human evolution and history birth control was not available, so there was no advantage for a woman to be promiscuous, meanwhile there is no real issue for men being promiscuous as they're not going to get pregnant and have a child that physically depends on them for years. It's not crazy to see how that would have affected men and women to have different sexual needs.

pinkeythehoboken22 • 0 points • 15 July, 2020 03:05 PM

Well for the last 100+ years birth control HAS been available. Shit changes.

Mewster1818 • 3 points • 15 July, 2020 03:19 PM

Yes, but human evolution takes longer than that to change. Which is the theory behind the declining mental health and happiness reported by women, especially among those with high numbers of sexual partners.

I'm not saying there aren't women who are 100% fine with it, but those people are the outliers. The majority of women are less happy when they have lot of sexual partners, whereas there is no impact in happiness for men.

Also you don't have to have a lot of partners to have a lot of sex, you only need one person. So I don't know why people equate this to "women don't like sex" arguments...

*also birth control pills weren't widely available til the mid-60s and birth control options before then were not great nor widely available/in-use(that's not 100+ years)

[deleted] • 0 points • 15 July, 2020 01:48 PM

See my reply above. From personal experience, I would say yes.

[deleted] • 1 point • 15 July, 2020 01:47 PM

I'm a male with a high count. It took me a long time to bond with my wife. Better part of a year. And she's a keeper by all measures. Beautiful, one partner before me, smart, submissive. It should have been very easy, but it wasn't. Took a lot of prayers and time.

baneyney07 • 5 points • 15 July, 2020 06:52 AM

Maybe you can reverse your wack reading comprehension? Nowhere did it mention a body count

wolfreturned • 2 points • 19 July, 2020 06:37 AM

Didn't need to.

baneyney07 • 1 point • 19 July, 2020 08:46 AM

Can't reverse ignorance I guess ☐☐☐

probablybex • 1 point • 29 October, 2020 06:17 AM

okay but literally why does it matter. mind your own business

Earth_is_dirt9 points 15 July, 2020 02:53 AM **[recovered]**

Looks exactly the same but with longer hair.

qemist45 points 15 July, 2020 03:47 AM* **[recovered]**

Could be same person?

Veivampire19 • 9 points • 15 July, 2020 06:04 AM

Hmm I wonder XD

El_Maltos_Username • 1 point • 15 July, 2020 09:41 AM

I thought they get replaced.

Earth_is_dirt • 1 point • 15 July, 2020 10:06 AM

There is no mistaking that head shape.

baneyney07 • 7 points • 15 July, 2020 06:51 AM

You don't say....

Whippyice • 2 points • 15 July, 2020 02:14 PM

GG WP welcome back.

EarthDustGaming • 1 point • 15 July, 2020 10:43 AM

Great job!

CoolGuySauron • 1 point • 15 July, 2020 11:37 AM

I though it was Elsa Jean.

FauzanZaenuri • 1 point • 15 July, 2020 12:51 PM

Congrats

Inevitable-1 • 1 point • 15 July, 2020 05:17 PM

It sounds to me like they traded one cult (feminism) for another (christianity). Weak minds often waffle from one bad influence to another.

HrCx13 • 1 point • 16 July, 2020 09:21 PM

There are so many women who are against feminism. Feminism may have been necessary in the suffragette era but now it's just hateful and divisive. Good on her for waking up to the bullshit.

Muri_i • 1 point • 15 August, 2020 12:33 AM

sana hak veriyorum

Mr_potatoaim69 • 1 point • 12 November, 2020 06:29 PM

Good for her I'm happy she got smart

ONEFRYBOI2 • 1 point • 15 July, 2020 12:47 PM

Is her before picture better or is it just me

RedTheCat1 • 2 points • 15 July, 2020 01:02 PM

not a fan of her Dolph Lundgren haircut

[deleted] • 1 point • 19 July, 2020 04:58 AM

I actually think shorter hair looks better on her, but I am also a homosexual man (stylish one, but still homo asf).

X__III__X • -5 points • 15 July, 2020 08:36 AM

Ain't falling into the bullshit of these *fake converts*.

This is a standard operating procedure for feminishits / SJW scum / modern independent wahmen - she did all the crazy shit, screwed her body with drugs, fucked numbers of chads & tylers, got the 1000 cock stare and eventually realized she had hit the wall; and then *after* all this shit, she found her dumb beta cuck to leech on to.

pinkeythehoboken22 • 2 points • 15 July, 2020 03:00 PM

So, no girlfriend, huh?

EpicKiwi225 • 2 points • 16 July, 2020 02:45 PM

Bruh, who hurt you

X__III__X • 2 points • 17 July, 2020 02:47 PM

lol, I didn't knew antifeminists were this level of *naive*.

empatheticapathetic • 2 points • 15 July, 2020 10:44 AM

It's a non religious version of a 'born again virgin'

[deleted] • 0 points • 15 July, 2020 02:42 PM*

Unless she starts speaking on the issues men face and spreading awareness, her "non-feminist" status doesn't concern me one bit. I am sick & tired of complacent people.

josiah_simon2011 • 1 point • 28 January, 2022 08:03 AM

The flash s7 villains be like:

blazetheheck • -3 points • 15 July, 2020 01:38 PM

Thing is ,the feminist ideology by definition is good (equality, and includes men's rights), it became shitty when it became an organization.

mhandanna[S] • 8 points • 15 July, 2020 01:58 PM*

Womens right of course is good and something we all strive for.

Feminism is not that at all, its an ideology with all sorts of theories and bull shit, its a cult... many of the things it does harms women, harms men and massively harms socieity... and ironically yes many feminists are misogynists... and that is a very overused word I rarely used, but many feminists are misogynists, and of course misandrists fucked up hate mongerers

blazetheheck • 3 points • 15 July, 2020 02:03 PM

Yeah, that's why I said feminism is shitty as an organization

[deleted] • 3 points • 15 July, 2020 02:44 PM

Which ideology? The one that men conspire to systematically oppress women and that any toxic female behaviour is a product of "internalized SiMoGyNy"?

blazetheheck • -4 points • 15 July, 2020 02:47 PM

You completely misunderstood my comment. The ideology of equality is good, when it became some sort of organization and political tool it became an unwashed shoe filled with shit.

Razorbladeandyfan • 6 points • 15 July, 2020 02:57 PM

The ideology of equality is not feminism though. Feminism is the advocacy of women's rights. Nothing in there about equality.

Axleonder • 3 points • 15 July, 2020 05:54 PM

Correction: Feminism is the advocacy of women's **privileges**.

[deleted] • 5 points • 15 July, 2020 02:59 PM

Feminism is pro-female. Nothing more, nothing less. I am really sick & tired of this lie being perpetuated ad naseum.

mhandanna[S] • 2 points • 16 July, 2020 09:39 PM

I get where you are coming from dude, I ussed to think the exact same way...you are just very badly misinformed. Research...

Feminsim was founded in Senneca falls, it was fucked up from inception.

Then modern feminism is based on patraichy theory... that comes from Kate Millet... listen to her OWN SISTER explain how fucked up Kate Millet was.... yes it was fucked from inception. Modern feminism is drawn from her, and she is utterly fucked.

https://youtu.be/Bm5ZAQ9EREM

it aint pretty