

Further reflections on Valerie Hudson and Patricia Leidl's *The Hillary Doctrine: Sex and American Foreign Policy*

(Continued from “Political Correctness as Culture Industry and Revolt of the Masses”
And “Extra Bibliography on Political Correctness”)

L. C. Chin, April 2016

My postings on Partisans Marine after the completion of “Extra Bibliography” contain proposals which have resulted from further reflections on Hudson and Leidl's *The Hillary Doctrine*. Proposals, again, for the Russians and the National Front, policies which they might consider implementing for their own national interests but which would help save the world from the brain-killing and earth-destroying global consumerism:

“Mon idée c'est que, si les Américains, suivant le 'Hillary Doctrine', voudraient bien exporter le féminisme américain au Tiers Monde, les russes ou les français (sous le FN), quand ils auront créé un Nouveau Féminisme Européen (un féminisme plutôt conservatrice qui s'oppose au féminisme libéral du Clinton), devront eux aussi l'exporter au Tiers Monde. Le marché mondial du féminisme ne doit pas se laisser dominer par les américains. On ne doit pas permettre aux américains d'utiliser le féminisme comme un instrument de l'impérialisme ou bien de la mondialisme.”

“My idea is that, if the Americans, following the 'Hillary Doctrine', would like to export American feminism to the Third World, the Russians and the French, when they shall have put together their own New European Feminism – a conservative form of feminism which is opposed to the liberal feminism of Mrs Clinton [again, not necessarily the NFE created by Ms Montford] – must themselves also export it to the Third World. The world market of feminism must not be dominated by the Americans. We must not allow Americans to use feminism as an instrument of imperialism or globalization.”

“De même, les russes et les français (sous le FN) doit proposer leur propre Nouveau Féminisme Européen aux Nations Unis en concurrence avec le féminisme américain qui aujourd'hui domine la pensée sur la question de la femme dans l'ONU.”

“In the same way, the Russians and the French must then propose their own New European Feminism to the United Nations as a competitor to American feminism which today dominates UN's thinking the Question of Woman.”

To be sure, similar criticisms of US' (especially Bush Administration's) use of feminism to advance imperialist aims have been advanced by US liberals (e.g. Iris Morion Young, a feminist professor at the University of Chicago; *The Hillary Doctrine*, p. 35). This, despite the fact that, in Bush administration's use of the Hillary Doctrine in Afghanistan and Iraq, “[George and Laura Bush] were... sincere in their belief that the improved security of women in these countries would, over time, improve national and international security” (p. 36). Namely, they were firm believers in the “Hillary Doctrine”.

Furthermore, the above is probably not much of a proposal, since the Russians have probably been thinking along this line for a long time – they just never have had any “alternative” feminism to offer.

“Et biensûr j'espère que les russes et les français (sous le FN) considéreront mon version du Nouveau Féminisme quand ils seront prêt à créer un Nouveau Féminisme Européen pour concurrencer avec les

américains.”

Then:

“Pour préciser mon idée un peu plus: les russes et les français pourront, en créant leur Nouveau Féminisme Européen, bien utiliser les femmes avec qui je suis obligé de travailler comme les exemplaires produits du féminisme libéral américain qu'il est le but de 'Hillary Doctrine' d'exporter au Tiers Monde. Les femmes américaines avec qui je travaille représentent le vrai visage des femmes libérales américaines qui est normalement caché aux yeux.”

Hudson and Leidl's appraisals of Bush administration's use of the “Hillary Doctrine” (“... a nation can only flourish if its women flourish...” “A nation which subjugates its women is a nation which will harbor terrorists...”) are generally positive, and so are their evaluations of Bush administration's general policies on women's issues (fighting human trafficking, disproving prostitution, outlawing sex tourism, etc.). This increased congruence between radical feminists (those marked by opposition to prostitution and sexual objectification) and the Republicans – leaving only differences on matters like abortion rights and CEDAW – is confirmation of our assertion that the “standard” has been raised among those on the right, i.e. those on the right have become increasingly politically correct although not to the extent to which those on the left are politically correct. C.f. also the authors' note of the striking parallel between Hillary Clinton's editorial for the *Washington Post* of 24 November 2001 and Laura Bush's radio address a few days earlier, both on the relationship between 9/11 attacks and Taliban's treatment of women.

We can thus speak generally of a “US export of American feminism” that is bi-partisan and despite the fact that many American feminists do not accept Mrs Clinton's hawkish stance that the United States is justified in using military intervention to save women in backward countries. Many American feminists' belief that the use of violence, even for supposedly good purposes, is antithetical to “women's culture” is no comparison with their fundamental agreement with “feminist hawks” that all evils in the world are a mere superstructure of the subjugation of women and that women's full participation in the public sphere will save the world. It is this latter idea which, when the United States exports it to the rest of the world, whether through peaceful means or through force, will destroy the world. And this is what we mean by the “dominance of world's market of feminism by the American version”.

This note, Nicki Lisa Cole and Alison Dahl Crossley's “On Feminism in the Age of Consumption” (December 2009, http://csrn.camden.rutgers.edu/newsletters/11-1/cole_crossley.htm), opens with a very relevant observation:

“The largest growing economic force in the world isn't China or India – it's women. The earning power of women globally is expected to reach \$18 trillion by 2014 – a \$5 trillion rise for current income, according to World Bank estimates. That is more than twice the estimated 2014 GDP of China and India combined” (Voigt 2009)

“The above quote from a recent article posted on CNN.com, titled 'Women: Saviors of the world economy?' reflects heightened attention to both the earning power and spending power of today's women. Economists, product designers, and marketers are turning to women as the consumers who can perpetuate capitalist growth in this post-economic crisis

moment. The FemmeDen, a group of women researchers who focus on the gendered implications of product design, write in one of their online publications, 'Why is gender important? Women's continuing evolution combined with their increasing buying power has created an explosive business opportunity in the consumer products industry.' They then point out that women in the U.S., though once 'powerless,' are now 'powerful,' in that they buy or influence eighty percent of consumer decisions (FemmeDen 2009a).

“This heightened attention to U.S. women's purchasing power comes at a time when discourses that link women's independence to consumption abound in popular culture. Today's television line-up, heavy in 'reality' programming focused on celebrities and wealthy women, serves this intersection to millions of viewers on an everyday basis. Wealth and the ability to consume are routinely celebrated and held up as exemplars of the most current iteration of the American Dream, which today is illustrated as a lifestyle display rather than a particular set of achievements. Shows such as MTV's *The Hills* and *The City*, Bravo's *Real Housewives* franchise (which now includes New York, New Jersey, and Atlanta, in addition to the original: Orange County), and E! Entertainment's *Keeping up with the Kardashians* and *Kourtney & Khloé Take Miami* emphasize a celebrity lifestyle and all the consumer trappings that come with it.

“These shows are not unique or particularly new. This trend has grown over the last decade, and has included shows such as *Rich Girls*, *The Gastineau Girls*, *The Osbournes*, *Newlyweds*, *Run's House*, *My Super Sweet Sixteen*, *MTV Cribs*, *Life in the Fab Lane*, *Princes of Malibu*, *Laguna Beach: The Real OC*, *Newport Beach: The Real OC*, *So NoToriOus*, *Inn Love with Tori and Dean*, and *Hogan Knows Best*. Although popular entertainment media has historically represented and focused on the lives of men, now women's lives can be found at the front and center as stars of a narrative in which they are modern day 'heroes of consumption' (Lowenthal 1961).

Just observations which have confirmed out thermodynamic interpretation of history, i.e. my assertion that women's economic empowerment is good for capitalism and so bad for the earth and the human brain. The feminists then begin to err:

In an age in which women's independence and achievement are often framed by and articulated through consumer discourses and practices, what does this mean for the future of feminism and feminist identities? We wonder about such consequences precisely because the consumer lifestyle, as the cultural logic of capitalism, is a fundamentally unfeminist thing. The epistemological foundation of feminism and feminist identity historically has been the eradication of inequalities. Thus, feminism is diametrically opposed to consumer practices which support the dominance of global capitalism: a system which thrives on the exploitation of labor, theft of resources, and facilitates vast accumulation of wealth among a tiny percentage of global elite, while simultaneously impoverishing the majority of the world's population. Further, since consuming is a singular act of identity formation and expression, we question whether women's empowerment through consumption at the individual level undermines the possibility of gendered social change at the collective level. In responding to these questions in this essay we critically interrogate the intersection of discourses of women's independence with discourses and practices of consumption, with an eye for contemporary attitudes toward

and definitions of feminism.

The typical American feminists are unable to see the reality that their feminist ideologies are a superstructure of consumerism by which actions motivated will only result in the reinforcement of capitalism because they essentially adhere to an outdated description of capitalism which belongs to a bygone era – to its production phase – and because they are unable to calculate the consequences of helping the poor and the oppressed (i.e. creating profits for the capitalists). This is another perfect example of the phenomenon we have examined in “Political Correctness as Culture Industry and Revolt of the Masses”, i.e. the next generation mindlessly repeating the words once uttered by the previous generation simply as a matter of self-intoxication, without understanding what empirical reality the words really refer to.