



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on March 21, 2022

Does the World Now Have Its First Anti-feminist President?

A year ago, Sweden declared itself as having the first official feminist government. Now we may have another milestone: the first avowedly anti-feminist president.

As the left-wing *Guardian* [reports](#):

The election of an avowed “anti-feminist” as the next president of South Korea has been greeted with dismay amid accusations Yoon Suk-yeol fuelled the country’s [sic] gender divide to garner support from young male voters.

Former top prosecutor Yoon defeated the liberal ruling party candidate Lee Jae-myung by a margin of 263,000 votes in one of the most closely contested presidential elections in recent memory.

Yoon has blamed the country’s low birthrate on feminism. He has called for the abolishment of the gender equality ministry, which he says focuses too much on women’s rights and is no longer necessary. He has promised to enhance punishments for false accusations of sexual violence, a step campaigners say will deter even more women from coming forward.

An exit poll showed only 34% of women in their 20s marked Yoon on their ballot paper, compared with 59% of men in their 20s, and 53% of those in their 30s.



AP Images

South Korea's president-elect Yoon Suk-yeol

So feminists don’t exactly swoon over Yoon; he’s not singin’ their tune. *The Guardian* quotes some of these complaining feminists in its article, too. But it cites not one word from a Yoon supporter, let alone a quote from a masculinist, for balance (because that’s what they call “hard news”).

(Note: If anyone thinks “masculinist” sounds strange and silly, well, that’s a hint.)



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on March 21, 2022

As for Yoon, he has in the past tried to massage the feminism issue a bit, such as in a *Washington Post* interview earlier this month.

“When asked whether he was a feminist, he said: ‘I think there are many different ways to interpret feminism,’” the paper [related](#). “He added: ‘Feminism is a form of humanism, recognizing that gender discrimination and inequality is a reality and it is a movement to correct that. In that sense, I consider myself a feminist.’”

He later [repudiated](#) the “feminist” label after receiving pushback in South Korea. Yet while Yoon was perhaps implying above that the sex (not “gender”) discrimination in question was against men, the reality is this:

“Equality” is not a virtue.

Contrary to billing, it’s also not something feminists actually strive for — or ever have.

South Korea is an ideal example. *The Guardian* quotes upper-echelon feminist Yanglee Hyun-kyung as saying about Yoon’s victory, “Korean society will continue to be very unequal and polarised, and I am very concerned about how this discrimination will be resolved.” If she’s truly concerned, however, here’s a good place to start:

Korea requires mandatory military service — but *only of men*.

Equality?

This is no small matter. Being compelled to serve your country for 18 months is a serious burden, especially when you could be required to risk life and limb. It’s the epitome of “having skin in the game.” Yet feminists are content to let this game be fueled with male skin.

Put differently, even though responsibility should come with authority, the feminists demand that women enjoy equal authority but lesser responsibility.

Military service is perhaps the most striking example of this double standard, but hardly the only one. Consider: Despite talk about “glass ceilings” disadvantaging females, within “the feminist grievance narrative, there is no whining about women being ‘excluded’ from working-class male-dominated professions,” American Thinker’s Katie El-Diwany [wrote](#) in 2018. “There is more than plenty of talk about the dearth of women in science, in engineering, in upper management positions, and as CEOs. But there is no one asking: where are all the female garbage-collectors, the female elevator technicians, the female landscape laborers, the female oil rig workers?”

Equality?

Another example: With MUSS (Made-up Sexual Status, a.k.a. “transgender”) men such as swimmer Will Thomas taking titles from females and using their locker rooms, there’s now much self-righteous talk about “respecting women’s spaces.” The irony is that some of these feminists are the same people who actually demanded that women and girls be allowed to invade boys’ and men’s spaces.

For example, in 2002, golfer Jenny Suh was [allowed to enter](#) the Virginia AAA boys’ high-school championship, at least partially, no doubt, in deference to an equality argument. This was despite there already being a girls’ championship in which Suh could — and did — participate. Yet when competing, the equality “imperative” went bye-bye: Suh was allowed to play from tees that were *20 percent (1100 yards) shorter* than those of her male opponents.

And when she finally won the event after two or three tries, there were no feminist complaints about



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on March 21, 2022

how she stole the title from the “second-place” boy.

There are countless other examples, such as female fashion models earning substantially more than their male counterparts. Yet feminists complain about none of them, all the while touting “equality.”

“But wait,” some may say, “that’s their goal and job: to improve *women’s* lot.” While many would point out feminist agitation doesn’t actually do this (e.g., the deriding of motherhood), this is *precisely the point*:

As the aforementioned El-Diwany concluded, “All of this reveals that feminist clamoring for ‘equal representation’ is not about equality at all. It is about power and prestige.”

“Equality” is mantra, not moral imperative. It’s a ploy, not a principle.

And perhaps, just maybe, this reality is hitting home. As commentator Edward E. Bartlett [wrote](#) Monday about Yoon’s victory, his anti-feminism “charges were buoyed by a 2021 poll in which 84% of Korean men in their twenties, and 83% in their thirties, said they had experienced ‘serious gender-based discrimination.’”

So is there a new Korean war? If so, this is one that should spread worldwide.



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.