



TRUMPED

Ivanka on Gender

The nation's newest first daughter has always seen gender politics through a screen of wealth and an unshakable commitment to traditional notions of femininity. Here are a few of her more memorable quotes:

"My father is a feminist. He's a big reason I am the woman I am today. People talk about gender equality. He has lived it, he has employed women at the highest levels of the Trump Organization for decades, so I think it's a great testament to how capable he thinks women are and has shown that his whole life."
—in *The Times* of London

"I don't talk about my politics.... I don't feel like it's my role.... I'm the daughter... I don't think my politics are relevant to the discussion."
—to Boston Public Radio host Margery Eagan

"We're able to express our femininity very differently from just a decade ago. And I think that's something my brand really embraces: the polished, appropriately sexy aesthetic. It's a dress you can wear in the boardroom and on a date with your husband."
—in *Town & Country*

"We've all been dealt a winning hand, and...it's up to each of us to play it right and smart."
—in *The Trump Card: Playing to Win in Work and Life*

—Ariana Rosas Cárdenas

Katha Pollitt



Feminism for All

Can the fight for women's rights be too inclusive?

Who thinks Ivanka Trump is a feminist? Seriously, who? As far as I can tell, the only people calling her a feminist are Ivanka herself and conservatives who use her to attack real feminists as a pack of radical banshees. What there are a lot of, though, are articles by feminists explaining why Ivanka is not a feminist to the unnamed people out there who supposedly think she is one. Well, OK, message received.

Not so long ago, feminism was said to be enjoying a moment: think grassroots groups like Shout Your Abortion, pop-culture icons like Beyoncé and Lena Dunham, Hillary Clinton's presidential campaign. But popularity bred contempt. Feminism, went the critique, had become too inclusive—too consumerist, corporate, individualist, and superficial. From being a label no one wanted to wear, it had become a label that could be claimed by anyone—and used to sell anything, to the great benefit of the real enemy, capitalism. Jessa Crispin's just-published manifesto, *Why I Am Not a Feminist*, is a particularly sweeping rendition of this line of thinking. ("My feminism is not one of incremental change, revealed in the end to be The Same as Ever, But More So. It is a cleansing fire." Etc.) So too is the demonization of "liberal feminism" as incarnated in Hillary Clinton, which one can find all over the left (even in liberal magazines like the *New Republic*, where Crispin blames Trump's election on Hillary being the Wrong Kind of Feminist—because the evangelical Christians and Republican white women who voted for him are just waiting for that cleansing fire, and the nearly 3 million votes that gave Clinton the popular-vote margin only prove how fraudulent her feminism is).

There's some truth to these critiques. A movement to fundamentally change society has to have more grit and content and analysis than "You go, girlfriend!" I don't think one can be a feminist and oppose legal abortion, for example, because that means you think a woman is basically, as an Oklahoma politician recently put it, a potential "host" for a fertilized egg—a view that is incompatible with women's human rights. At the same time, a movement that claims to represent the interests of half the people in the world has to have broader appeal than one is likely to find in the pages of *Jacobin*

or *The Nation*. The pop-feminist website *Jezebel* has probably introduced more young women to feminism than anything since *The Feminine Mystique* (another work now criticized as bourgeois and individualist, although it was written by a woman who was close to the Communist Party).

I'm not very interested in pop culture myself, but if Beyoncé wants to identify as a feminist, and if Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie, the world-renowned Nigerian novelist, gives a TED Talk called "We Should All Be Feminists" and Beyoncé samples it, isn't that a good thing? We don't want to be like the cashier at Barnes & Noble who looked down

his nose at me as he rang up my copy of *Game of Thrones*, because I'd found out about the books through the TV series, and he'd been reading George R.R. Martin for years.

But even if you dismiss pop feminism, it's not the same as so-called "liberal feminism," which is often depicted as "empowerment"—not liberation—for privileged ladies only.

Glass ceilings, glass cliffs, leaning in: This is the feminism, we're told, that offers nothing to the mass of American women, most of whom are mothers struggling to get by on pink-collar and lower-level white-collar jobs. There's some truth to that, too: A lot of women are in crisis and can't be expected to cheer when a female executive gets a promotion at Apple. Women do need sweeping change throughout society. But does the "liberal feminist" agenda offer nothing to the non-elite? Its docket includes pregnancy- and job-discrimination cases up and down the income scale, from academia to UPS—to say nothing of reproductive rights, no-co-pay birth control, violence against women, equal access to sports programs in school, LGBTQ rights, and many other issues that matter to all women. In recent years, those pesky liberal feminists have actually made significant progress in policies that benefit women economically. In 2016, New York became the fifth state to pass a paid-family-leave



Women do need sweeping societal change. But "liberal feminism" has plenty to offer to the nonelite.

Hillary Clinton's platform was a cornucopia of proposals aimed at low- and middle-income women, from higher wages to free college.

law, and it will also raise the minimum wage for all workers to \$12.50 in 2021. New York City Mayor Bill de Blasio has instituted paid sick days as well as universal pre-K and a \$15-an-hour minimum wage for city workers. President Obama mandated paid family leave for federal employees; Democratic women in Congress have proposed a federal paid-leave law and the abolition of the Hyde Amendment restricting abortion funding. Hillary Clinton's platform was a cornucopia of proposals aimed at low- and middle-income women, from higher wages for day-care workers—currently outrageously underpaid—to free community college. Even supervillain Sheryl Sandberg understands that women need more than pluck and ambition: At Facebook, she's instituted a \$15 wage for contractors, a minimum of 15 paid days off, and a \$4,000 new-child bonus for both parents; she's also called for federal paid parental leave.

"We need to have a united-front approach," Ellen Bravo, co-director of the group Family Values @ Work, which advocates for paid sick and family leave, when I reached her in Milwaukee by phone. "We need a grass-roots movement led by the people most affected, but when a powerful woman implements a policy that's good for workers and families, we should welcome it."

There's a lot of room between celebrating Ivanka's little pink dresses and excluding everyone who doesn't call for communism this afternoon. Feminism has actually become broader and deeper: Reproductive justice, which centers low-income women of color, is replacing choice as the framework for reproductive rights, to choose just one example. The Women's March found room for a broad array of women, from Muslim women to trans women to women of all races, holding signs for Black Lives Matter. It wasn't feel-good feminism—but it did feel good. ■

(continued from page 4)

he advised Ukrainian President Viktor Yanukovich, later deposed unconstitutionally during the Maidan "revolution" in February 2014. This makes no sense. A professional political expert, Manafort was presumably well paid, like other American electoral experts hired abroad. But he seems to have urged Yanukovich to tilt toward the ill-fated European Union partnership agreement and away from Russia—as Yanukovich did—in order to win the votes of Ukrainians outside his constituency in southeastern regions. (Yanukovich, whom Putin loathed for this and other reasons, had fallen out of favor with the Kremlin until late 2013.)

4. A "dossier" purporting to show how the Kremlin could blackmail Trump was leaked to CNN and published by *BuzzFeed*. Compiled by a former British intelligence official in the opposition-research business, its 30-odd pages are a compilation of the innocent, the unverified, and the kind of trash for sale in Moscow and elsewhere. More recently, CNN exclaimed that its own intelligence leakers had "confirmed" some elements of the dossier, but thus far none that actually compromise Trump.

5. The crux of the allegations against Trump was, and remains, that Putin ordered the hacking of the Democratic National Committee and the dissemination of stolen e-mails through WikiLeaks in order to undermine the Clinton campaign and put Trump in the White House. A summary of these "facts" was presented in a declassified report released by the "intelligence community" and widely discussed in January. Though it quickly became axiomatic proof for Trump's political and media enemies, almost nothing in the report is persuasive.

About half are "assessments" based on surmised motivations, not factual evidence of an actual Kremlin operation on Trump's behalf. The other half is standard whining about the Kremlin-funded television network RT, which is at worst an above-average "propaganda" outlet. Moreover, a number of American cyber-experts insist that Russian state hackers would have left no fingerprints, as US intelligence officials claim they had. Indeed, the group Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity believes that the DNC documents were not hacked but rather leaked by an insider. If so, this had nothing to do with Russia. (The CIA and the FBI were "highly confident" about the report's findings, but the National Security Agency, which alone has the capacity to fully monitor e-mails, was only "moderately confident.") Still more, at his final presidential press conference, Barack Obama referred to the DNC scandal as a leak and said he didn't know WikiLeaks' exact role in the scandal—this despite the allegations by his own intelligence agencies. Nor is it clear that Putin so favored the erratic Trump that he would have taken such a risk. Judging from debates in Kremlin-connected Russian newspapers, there was serious doubt as to which US candidate might be best—or least bad—for Russia.

6. Finally, there is the firing of Gen. Michael Flynn as Trump's national-security adviser for having communicated with the Russian ambassador about the sanctions imposed by Obama just before he left the White House and Trump was inaugurated. So far as is actually known, Flynn did nothing unprecedented or incriminating. Communications, including meetings, between representatives of US presidents-elect and foreign capitals, particularly Moscow, have

been "common practice" over the years, according to Jack Matlock, ambassador to Russia for Presidents Reagan and Bush; Matlock had previously arranged meetings in Moscow for President-elect Carter's transition team. Moreover, Obama's own Russia adviser, Michael McFaul, told *The Washington Post* recently that he visited Moscow in 2008, even before that year's election, for talks with Russian officials. The *Post* implied that this was "appropriate contact." So, it seems, was Flynn's, though perhaps inept. Indeed, if Flynn's purpose was to persuade the Kremlin not to overreact to Obama's last-minute sanctions, which were accompanied by a highly provocative threat to launch a cyber-attack on Moscow, his urging was wise and in America's national interest. In fact, it is not Putin who is threatening American democracy, but rather these Kremlin-baiting allegations against President Trump. It is not Putin who is endangering US and international security, but rather the high-level political and intelligence enemies of détente. Similarly, it is not Putin who is degrading the US media with "fake news." Nor is it Putin who is subverting the American political process, but rather the US intelligence leakers who are at war against their own president.

President Eisenhower eventually stopped Joseph McCarthy. Who will stop the new McCarthyism before it spreads further into the "soul of democracy," so revered by liberals and progressives? Facts might do so. But in lieu of facts, there are only professional ethics, decency, and patriotism. STEPHEN F. COHEN

Stephen F. Cohen, a Nation contributing editor, is emeritus professor of Russian studies at New York University and Princeton.

Copyright of Nation is the property of Nation Company, L. P. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.