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"Political leadership is a complex phenomenon in which are linked the capacities, skills, and ambitions of the leader and the wants, needs, and/or fears of the followers. Dominance is one determinant of leadership capabilities, but ambition and skills are also important determinants of influence. Power, it is sometimes said, goes to those who seek it - provided that they have the skills needed to translate the personal predisposition into an interpersonal reality." ¹

In what ways do women leaders in politics fit the generic parameters of political leadership expressed in the above passage? As women are still very much the minority in the national political arena, it may be surmised that most women would not fit into such a description. Leadership scholar Barbara Kellerman talks about leadership in the political context being contingent upon dominance and deference. Traditionally, the men dominate and the women defer.² Thus, from a leadership scholar's perspective, an obvious point of interest would be to study whether or not women political leaders exhibit specific leadership styles and behaviors that enable them to participate in a male-dominated realm. Leadership in the political context is very much based upon the art of persuasion. A politician's ability to persuade others to follow in his or her direction is a key component of their success. So do women political leaders really defer to their male colleagues? From my own exploration into this subject, and my analysis of two women political leaders in particular, I cannot find a word more misrepresentative of their leadership styles than that of deference. In fact, throughout the course of the following study, women political leaders have proven to be strong-willed, aggressive, competitive, ambitious and disciplined — all of those traits so often attributed to their male colleagues. Throughout the course of their lifetimes these women have developed strong political leadership capabilities as a result of their socialization and experiences from childhood.


onward. Therefore we will walk with them through their journeys, and in the end we will find that these women exhibit all of the leadership facets listed in the above quote -- dominance, competitiveness, influence, ambition and power. Now, whether or not these qualities mean that these women will be good politicians is the subject of an entirely different study. The purpose of this study, however, is to show that the leadership of these women is breaking down traditional leadership stereotypes of the past. We look at the presence of women leaders in the political realm as anomalies, whereas we should view their presence as necessary and imperative to carry our government into the 21st Century.
**Introduction/Literature Review**

As our political history evolves, slowly but surely more and more women are running for public office. What are the things that propel women to run for local, state, or federal leadership positions? Are there certain factors that are contingent upon their embarkment into the political arena? The answers to these questions all contribute to the "creation," if you will, of a political woman. In order to better understand these factors and their effects, I will examine case studies of two women, Hillary Clinton and Elizabeth Dole, through the lenses of four such factors including the timing as it relates to their lives and possible entry into politics, the national political climate, and each individual's leadership development. Lastly, I will examine the leadership behaviors and styles of these women in relation to leadership in the political context. Both Clinton and Dole are wives of politicians whose careers appear to be on the wane, and, recently, both women have been touted as possible Senate, vice-presidential, and even presidential nominees for the year 2000 elections. Is there a pattern that we can discern and uncover about a woman's decision to run for public office that we can then use as a template or model for women of a younger generation? Through the following case studies and analysis, I will attempt to answer this question.

**Timing of Candidates**

So as to provide an analytic basis for this study, it is important to know that the theoretical framework I will utilize in this study is of my own creation, based on a number of ideas from various other sources and studies that I found throughout my research process. This paper is an exploration of my own model, based on the four lenses discussed above, as it relates to my quest to understand why women run for office. For the purposes of this study, timing is
easily defined. I will look at why neither Clinton nor Dole ran for office 10, 15, or even 20 years ago versus their careful consideration of running in next year’s upcoming elections. I will examine whether timing-wise in their personal lives the year 2000 is better to run than the previous decade. This analysis will be conducted through a thorough examination of their biographies as well as other sources of information available on these two women. For example, for women who are married and have families with young children, this will often be a consideration before opting to run for public office. Dole and her husband, Robert, do not have any children. Clinton, however, has a daughter Chelsea, who is currently a sophomore in college. Therefore the issue of having families and timing a run for office will most directly correlate to Clinton. In her book, *Running as a Woman*, author Linda Witt writes, “Motherhood may be revered within the family, but it has not been considered an experience or credential for holding political office. Over the years, many women have dealt with this particular ‘strategic burden’ by waiting until their children were adults before running for a high-visibility office or one far away from home base.”

In Clinton’s case, Chelsea has reached adulthood and is going to school far from Washington, D.C. As such, perhaps Clinton feels as if she can move on with her life and act on her political ambitions.

Timing can also be thought of in terms of the number of opportunities that now exist for women in the political realm. Dole herself likes to call these expanded opportunities a quiet revolution. In her memoirs jointly written with Robert she writes, “By 1970, 23 million American women were employed full time. Eight million more held down part-time jobs. Forty percent of the female workforce was married. What all this added up to was nothing less than a

---

quiet revolution."^4 Dole in this context was referring to her ability to attend law school when it was still unheard of for women to do so, all the way up to her two Presidential Cabinet positions. Day-by-day women are working to break through the "glass ceiling." In terms of holding political office, Sue Thomas talks about the importance of there being open seats in elections. She believes it is much harder for a woman to beat an incumbent candidate than it is for them to campaign and win an open seat. She writes, "Because open seats are so much more easily won, the chance to run in such a race can be considered a relatively rare opportunity. Women who seek election for the first time must either challenge an incumbent or run in an open seat contest. Challengers win less than 10% of the time, while open-seat candidates win slightly more than half the time."^5 As of now, Clinton and Dole are said to be considering different offices. There have been reports that have so far gone unconfirmed by the First Lady herself, that Clinton is considering a run for the Senate. Dole, on the other hand is said to be considering a possible bid for the White House, either as vice-president or possibly even president. It remains to be seen how many open seats there will be in the Senate, or what state Clinton may choose to run from. The road to the White House, however, is paved with the retreating footsteps of a two-term president.

In reference to timing it is also important to know whether or not these women are really

---


newcomers to the political process. In the case of Clinton and Dole, neither woman is a newcomer to politics. Both women have held public office — Dole has held two cabinet positions and Clinton was appointed by the President to chair a committee on health care reform. The distinction to be made here is that the possible campaigns of these women would be of much higher profile than their past posts. In her book entitled, *In the Running: the New Woman Candidate*, Ruth Mandel writes,

> It is important to stress, however, that today's typical female candidates are not newcomers to the political process. While most are first-time office seekers and thus may be newcomers to candidacy itself, many are veteran political people who have build a record of participation in some phase of politics. What has occurred in the brief span of a decade is that many women who were already politically active now want to take the leading role - that of a candidate.\(^8\)

It will become clear in the case studies that both of these women have been actively engaged in politics since they were adolescents, with their scope of participation growing more and more as they progress in age. Whether this involvement was being active in someone’s campaign for office, or running for student government positions in college, or helping their husbands in their campaigns for higher office, both Clinton and Dole have had a vigorous interest in politics and the political process from young adulthood.

**Political Climate**

In addition to timing, another lens through which I will examine each woman’s path to candidacy is political climate. In many ways, political climate directly relates to the issue of timing as timing will undoubtedly dictate when would be a good time to run for office. Since

---

the 1980's, a small yet substantial dent has been made in women's representation in higher office. In the 90th Congress (1967-1968), there were 11 women in Congress, whereas in the 105th Congress (1997-1998), there were 52 women officeholders. Perhaps this growing trend alludes to a greater willingness to support women candidates in a male-dominated realm.

Beginning in the early 1980's, several groups affiliated with both major parties not only began to exert more energy in soliciting campaign funds from women, but also to raise money for women candidates. There are now organizations that focus solely on generating money, support, and votes for women seeking office in Congress as well as state and local races. Chief among these organizations is EMILY's List (Early Money Is Like Yeast), a Democratic group, and Wish List, its Republican counterpart. Such organizations have helped to open up more opportunities for women to run for office because they are able to help generate the kinds of resources these women need to run a campaign. The impact of these new networks of support is well illustrated by the following story:

Three thousand people, a majority women, filed out of San Francisco's Davies Symphony Hall on the evening of October 19, 1992. They had each paid $100 to support Dianne Feinstein and Barbara Boxer in their bids to represent California in the U.S. Senate. The ability of women candidates to raise $300,000 in one evening did not exist twenty, ten, or even six years ago.

Congresswomen Diane Feinstein's and Barbara Boxer's stories tells us a great deal about the growing reception of women candidates for public office. In the past year alone, a number of

---


articles and lists have surfaced surrounding the most likely women candidates for high office. Both Clinton and Dole have made the top of such lists on a regular basis. So, it appears that if they have the necessary networks to raise the money and support needed for a political campaign, now would be an opportune time for them to pursue office.

Another key element in the political climate today is the public’s perception of women running for the highest U.S. offices. Year after year this possibility is greeted with much less skepticism and more excitement. This idea of running as a woman, used to be very much frowned upon. Then, in the 1992 elections this norm took a positive turn. Running as a woman was actually utilized as a campaign tool. For example, whereas in 1990, Dianne Feinstein’s campaign slogan read “Tough and Caring,” in 1992, it read, “Two Percent Isn’t Enough.” The two percent here refers to women only making up two percent of the Senate prior to the 1992 elections. Clinton herself used to struggle a great deal with her public image during President Clinton’s first term in office. Over the past eight years, more so in the last four, the public response to the First Lady has taken a major turn. In fact, in light of the scandal that has most recently rocked the White House, her popularity has gone up dramatically.

Leadership Development

The third lens through which I will examine the possible candidacies of these two women will be their leadership development. For women in politics, their heritage and socialization environment serve as the basis for their leadership development. The attitudes and beliefs generated in large part by those socialization environments have directly affected the present and future paths of these women. From the outset of their lives, parents’ perceptions

\[\text{\textsuperscript{12}}\text{Ibid. p14}\]
about the roles their children will play as they grow older affects their leadership development.

A great number of women who become political leaders, including Clinton and Dole, come from households where their parents repeatedly made it clear that there was nothing their daughters could not do. Cantor writes,

> Clearly, being female did not present an obstacle to these' women. Their mothers and fathers treated them as if they were competent and could achieve their goals. Not only did these empowering messages enhance the development of their competent self, it enabled them to establish reachable goals and to persevere until they reached them.\(^\text{13}\)

The women Cantor and Bernay refer to in the above passage include former Texas Governor Ann Richards, Congresswoman Patricia Schroeder, Congresswoman Dianne Feinstein, and Congresswoman Barbara Boxer. In reference to Clinton and Dole, their parents were advocates of their daughters' ambitions, political and otherwise. "Consistent among the instigators [women leaders] was the sense that parents and families modeled, encouraged, or, at the very least, allowed them to develop as independent women infused with strong beliefs in social justice and the work ethic."\(^\text{14}\) As the personal histories of these two women unfold, it will become clear that their consideration of running for political office today is in part a direct manifestation of the encouragement and support they received as children and young adults. Without the open-mindedness of both the father and mother, many children grow up never seriously considering running for public office. For Clinton and Dole, as well as others, a supportive type of socialization environment was a key factor in their leadership development.

\(^\text{13}\text{Ibid.}\)

As a direct consequence of their parent’s encouragement, a woman can begin to perceive herself as a leader. A look into each woman’s activities during their childhood, high school, college, and beyond presents a clear picture of how the self-perceptions of these two women led them to the leadership positions they have held as adults. As Dorothy Cantor and Toni Bemay observed, “The women we interviewed...recalled *always* leading their friends and classmates as they grew up, so that leadership felt natural.”15 Oftentimes the activities these women engage in at a young age serve as the foundation for their leadership development. So is there a typical profile that fits women who run for political office? The answer to this question remains unknown. In her book, *Political Woman*, Jeane Kirkpatrick writes,

> The relationship between high school social participation, personality, and politics is significant and intriguing. The record of these women in school extracurricular activity suggests that by late adolescence and early adulthood they had already developed a sense of competence and self-confidence necessary to participation and leadership.16

Clinton and Dole were very active in all sorts of activities, political and otherwise, throughout this developmental period in their lives. As such, it would seem that those experiences helped shape the leadership development of these two women. This proposition will be explored in further detail in the case studies themselves.

In addition, another integral part of each woman’s leadership development is what is at the very heart of her motivation to be involved in politics. By “at the very heart,” I mean that issue or those issues about which these women feel so fervently, that they will exercise the most

---


efficient means possible to bring the issue to the forefront of people's minds. Many women who run for office, including Clinton and Dole, have been very active in their communities since a very young age and that activism has not dissipated with time. Throughout this evolutionary process, they have realized that the political medium is a good venue for making their voices heard and their views known. In a time when women's presence in politics grows a little stronger every day, a platform has been built upon which these women can rally the support they need to further awareness and activism on issues that are important to them and their communities. As Kirkpatrick notes in the *Political Woman*,

> For most, the motives which led them to run for the legislature were the same as the motives that made them community volunteers: an awareness of public problems needing attention and a feeling of personal responsibility for those problems. Most made the switch from community volunteer to legislative candidate out of the conviction that by working through politics they could more effectively achieve the public goals to which they were committed.\(^17\)

Both Clinton and Dole have issues that are very close to their hearts and can serve as vehicles to make themselves and issues known to the public. As I develop these cases studies, those issues will become apparent through the activities and leadership positions that each of these women has held. In other words, for Clinton, Dole, and other women, involvement in politics may be seen as a forum in which they pursue policy goals and their implementation in communities. Men's involvement in politics is no doubt spurred by the same motivation, although one could argue that power is more of a contributing factor for men. However, both men and women look to politics as a means to achieve specific policy ends. It is, quite simply, the nature and purpose

\(^{17}\)Ibid. p62
of the political medium to implement policy goals within the communities that the legislators and executives are elected to represent.

**Leadership Style**

The fourth and final lens through which I will be looking at the lives and political careers of these two women is how their leadership development has led to their exercise of leadership in the political context. In a leadership context that has been traditionally defined in masculine terms — competition, aggression, and power — what are the styles and leadership behaviors that comprise the leadership styles of these women and how effective are these styles in achieving policy ends? Therefore for this lens, leadership style is easily defined. Leadership style for the purposes of this study is made up of the behaviors and characteristics of these women as leaders. In addition, leadership style also refers to how these women interact with and lead others within their organizations. Finally, how has the masculine nature of the political institutions in which these women exercise leadership affected their growth and development as leaders?

The political world of men that 'has passed as a humanistically impartial vocabulary of power, reason, morality, interest, autonomy, justice, history, theory, progress, and enlightenment is actually imbued with gendered masculine meanings and values. As a result of masculinism, males benefit from considerably more social power than females, and in the sexual division of labor men have been assigned most of the “power duties” in society generally and in politics more specifically. Yet most of us experience male political leadership as normal.18

Thus, I will examine not only what are the leadership styles of these two women, but also how successful they are in the political context. Before I conduct such an analysis, however, it is

---

important to go over in general terms both the behavioral and trait aspects of women political leaders that characterize their leadership styles, as well as how such styles are received within the political institution itself.

In most gender-focused leadership studies, there has traditionally been a line drawn between masculine characteristics and feminine characteristics of leadership. For example, some masculine characteristics include aggression, confidence, domination, discipline, task-orientation and power. In contrast, feminine characteristics include nurturing, relationship orientation, guiding and teamwork. However, this falls in contrast to a study of women political leaders in state legislatures conducted by Cindy Simon Rosenthal in 1998. Rosenthal’s study found that, “among those traits that show significant differences, the women on average see themselves as characteristically process oriented, task oriented, managerial, assertive, attractive, affectionate, risk taking, skilled at interpersonal dealings, frank and direct, and team oriented.” If one was to examine the traditional associations with masculine and feminine behavioral patterns with the above statement, they would be able to see elements of both contained therein. Rosenthal calls this the integrative style of leadership, a style based on androgynous traits, rather than being based solely on either masculine or feminine characteristics. While this may be the typical leadership style of women political leaders, the next question surrounds whether or not such a style would be successful in a male-dominated realm.


It is argued by many scholars that to be successful in politics, women have to take on a more masculine type of leadership behavior. Whether this is true or not I will explore in my analysis of Clinton and Dole, but the implications of such a belief system are very great for women who are hoping to pursue a career in public office.

In a sense, bureaucratic organizations require forms of compulsory behavior in all of its participants, particularly if one chooses to rise beyond the support positions of the lower levels and into the instrumental positions of power at the upper levels. Masculinity is one form of compulsory behavior required by bureaucracies.\(^\text{21}\)

Thus, as I look to analyze the lives and careers of these two women, it will be especially important to see how they have adapted their leadership styles and behaviors to better fit the masculine nature of bureaucratic organizations. Given the career paths of both of these women, it will become evident how effective their own leadership styles and behaviors have been in shaping and running the organizations that they have led during the course of their careers.

In sum, it will become clear after reading through the case studies of Hillary Clinton and Elizabeth Dole that both women were leaders among their friends, peers, and co-workers from the earliest points in their lives. This, coupled by their long-standing interest in issues of public interest and government functions, serve to make them excellent candidates for elected office. In addition, their leadership styles have brought them a great deal of success within their respective organizations. It may appear to some that both of these women are now considering political office based on timing alone. As their husbands political careers have moved beyond their respective peaks, it would naturally be a good time for them to put their names on a ballot.

While this is certainly a contributing factor, however, from the following case studies it appears that timing, political climate, leadership development, and leadership style are all key motivations that serve as the impetus for their current, and serious consideration of running for public office. Are these women distinct from other women politicians? Or, is there a common thread that runs through the lives of women who choose to run for public office? Given all of the above information, I propose that the paths leading up to both Clinton’s and Dole’s possible run for office are not unique, but rather share commonalities with not only other women, but men as well.
**Methodology**

In order to analyze the propositions above, I conducted case studies on Hillary Clinton and Elizabeth Dole. Essentially, I conducted comparative case studies of these two women. My analysis rests on available historical and psychological data and perspectives related to each woman. The very definition of case studies is to answer the question “Why?” As such, case studies were the ideal research method for this project. In addition, since my research was of a historical and psychological nature, a case study did not require me to have any control over behavioral events. In his book, *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, author Robert Yin gives the technical definition of a case study. To him, a case study is “an empirical inquiry that: investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real life context; when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident; and in which multiple sources of evidence are used.”

In respect to my research and as evident in the recent media focus on my chosen subjects, the research approach I chose is consistent with the tendency of case studies to focus on contemporary events. Unlike many case studies that involve direct observation and interviewing, due to limited resources, my case studies were mainly based on journal, newspaper, and magazine articles, books, as well as the published interviews and speeches these women have given.

For their personal historical and psychological profiles, I used as my primary sources of information autobiographies written about Clinton and Dole. I also utilized journal, magazine, and newspaper articles, and any published profiles or short stories written about these women.

---


23 Ibid. p17.
Where appropriate and useful, I utilized congressional records as well. For example, Cabinet confirmation hearings for Dole are on file in the congressional records. These records offered good insight on her career and her leadership capabilities, as they recorded comments made not just by the confirmee herself, but by "character" witnesses as well. I also employed any interviews conducted with either Clinton or Dole in developing these case studies as they were a strong source of information that came directly from the subjects themselves. Gathering this data allowed me to conduct my analysis of these women based on my four analytic criteria - timing, political climate, leadership development, and leadership style.

In order to explore the extent to which Clinton's and Dole's consideration of running for office represent the result of evolutionary processes, I divided their lives into five stages: childhood; adolescence, early adulthood, adulthood, and middle age. I then framed each period within the historical context in which it occurred. In other words, for each stage in their life development, I explored their environments, key individuals, key positions of leadership, as well as major turning points in their lives, as identified by the women themselves, all against the backdrop of the appropriate historical context of each period. I analyzed this material through the four lenses discussed in the Introduction -- timing, political climate, leadership development, and leadership style. Therefore, I used a comparative structure for my cases and took a chronological approach to the development of the women as individuals and leaders, with the intent that eventually the questions and issues raised in the Introduction would be fully answered and analyzed.

There are a number of issues that I needed to take into consideration using the case study methodology. First of all, I needed to make sure that I did not take what was said in any of the
documents that I used in my research as “the truth.” It was important for me to remember that these primary and secondary sources of information were written for audiences whose main concern is getting the “facts” as they are known, and not for the analysis of those facts.

In fact, it is important in reviewing any document to understand that it was written for some specific purpose and some specific audience other than those of the case study being done. In this sense, the case study investigator is a vicarious observer, and the documentary evidence reflects a communication among other parties attempting to achieve some other objectives. 24

Except in cases where the information I was able to gather came directly from the subjects themselves, I needed to be careful of my interpretation of the information contained therein. I needed to take into careful consideration the reliability of the sources that I used in order to either avoid bias, or be able to appropriately separate the bias from the information in the article, book, or interview. In addition to the bias inherent in the sources I used, I also needed to be privy to my own biases and opinions. As Yin observes, the key to conducting an effective case study is that the researcher be a “vicarious observer.” In other words, I needed to maintain the highest level of objectivity possible in compiling and analyzing the data within these case studies.

In addition, in order to maximize the reliability of these case studies, I needed to pay particular attention to maintaining a comprehensive catalog of all the data collected and the notes I took on this data. As such, when the reader desires to go back and assess the reliability or validity of the information presented in the case studies, he or she will be able to do so. “The

24 Ibid. p81
main point here is that every case study project should strive to develop a formal, retrievable data base, so that in principle, other investigators can review the evidence directly. In this manner, the data base will increase markedly the reliability of the entire case study."\textsuperscript{25}

Therefore I maintained a comprehensive bibliographic list of sources used to create the profiles on each woman, as well as maintained a collection of any notes I have taken on those various sources during my data collection process.

In his book, Yin also outlines five steps toward creating an exemplary case study. They are: the case study must be significant; it must be complete; it must consider alternative perspectives; it must display sufficient evidence; and it must be composed in an engaging manner.\textsuperscript{26} In order for these case studies to be considered significant, I have repeatedly explored and analyzed my initial propositions, as well as constantly developed new perspectives and propositions to consider. As far as the case studies being complete, it is not the quantity of materials and sources I used that necessarily matters, although multiple sources are best. Rather, the quality of those multiple sources are very relevant to the reliability and validity of my study. In addition, I tried to pay particular attention to making sure alternate perspectives were articulated in my analyses.

It was my intent at the outset of this project to establish reliability for my case studies by having the subjects themselves, Clinton and Dole, review my research and findings. I had the addresses and phone numbers for each of their offices. Knowing that it was unlikely that Clinton or Dole themselves would read the information I presented, I thought perhaps one of

\textsuperscript{25}Ibid. p93.

\textsuperscript{26}Ibid. p140.
their aides would. "The procedure is to have the draft report reviewed, not just by peers but also by the participants and informants in the case."\(^{27}\) According to Yin, were I to do this it would have served as an important validating procedure as I worked to finalize my case study report and analysis. Therefore I attempted to send these individuals my draft paper, have them look it over, and request comments and feedback on its contents. As of the time of my writing this document, however, I have not received responses from my subjects.

In conducting a case study, especially one based more so on historical and psychological information, it was critical for me to maintain a standard of ethics. Any misrepresentation of either Clinton or Dole was avoided through a process of careful observance and objective reporting methods. I tried to pay close attention to the details of their personal profiles for accuracy and correctness. This was achieved in one or two ways. The first was to make the effort, where at all possible, to find the information in one of my sources to be corroborated in another. This allowed me to check for inconsistencies in dates, descriptions and the like. The other method was for these cases to be reviewed by either the subjects themselves, which would have been the ideal, or by aides close enough to them to corroborate my information. Due to the difficulty of the latter, at this time my main focus has been to find multiple sources that corroborated one another's facts and descriptions.

I chose the case study methodology because I felt in answering the question "why women run for office," it was of critical importance to know about those women who are running, or in these cases, who could run for public office. As with any research method, the limitations and possible pitfalls of such an approach were avoided by carefully and thoughtfully analyzing the

\(^{27}\) Ibid. p. 137
information I was able to gather and as objectively as possible presenting that information to the reader. Since case studies especially lend themselves to interpretation, I did my best to avoid problematic interpretations of the information therein. My literature and methodology having thus been outlined, I will now present the profiles of both Hillary Clinton and Elizabeth Dole. In their personal profiles, I will refer to each woman by their first names, so as to avoid any confusion regarding maiden names, married names and the like. From this point until the Analysis section, Dole will be referred to as Elizabeth and Clinton will be referred to as Hillary.
Case Study: Hillary Clinton

Childhood

Hillary Rodham was born on October 26, 1947 in Chicago's North Side and would join the world as a member of the so-called Baby Boomers generation. When she was three years old she moved with her family to Park Ridge, Illinois. Her father, Hugh Rodham owned a textile business in the city, while her mother, Dorothy Howell-Rodham, chose to stay home to be a full time mother. Park Ridge was a Republican stronghold, upper-middle-class Chicago suburb. Clinton's childhood came about at a time of tremendous tension in American history. The Cold War was becoming "colder" day by day. President Harry Truman created the "Truman Doctrine," George Kennan wrote the famous "Policy of Containment" paper, and Winston Churchill declared that an iron curtain had descended in Eastern Europe. In 1949, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) came into being as a move to collectively secure Western Europe from the Soviet Union. In 1950, the Korean War broke out, once again pitting the two superpowers and China against one another. In the United States, all of this tension resulted in a heavy cultural emphasis on conformity, and white, middle-class values and stereotypes. The television shows of the time like "Leave it to Beaver," were created for the purpose of promulgating such ideals. In an interview given with Donnie Radcliffe, Clinton's biographer, Hillary describes what it was like growing up during this time period.

---


29Ibid. p.25.

30The History Channel Online. "1950's." www.historychannel.com
When Hillary was growing up, Park Ridge was an upper-middle-class, strongly Republican suburb just northwest of Chicago where people built bomb shelters in their basements, warned their children against the menace of Communism and never let them forget their duty to God, country and family. 'We would always be engaged in a struggle with Communism — that would determine our entire lives,' Hillary remembered her ninth-grade social studies teacher telling the class. 'That was pounded into us. That was the world view we were given.'

Hillary, therefore, grew up in a strongly conservative community and household. Her father, Hugh, was a staunch Republican. Hillary’s mother, on the other hand, was a Democrat, though she never told anyone in the community her political affiliation because it was frowned upon in certain circles. Nevertheless, in Hillary’s biography, Radcliffe summarizes the environment in which Hillary was raised. “The Rodhams didn’t belong to the country club nearby but nearly everything else about their lifestyle could have been lifted straight out of an Ozzie and Harriet TV sitcom.” A very crucial part of Hillary’s development, however, lay in how her parents viewed her development and her access to the opportunities available at the time.

Hillary was highly encouraged and supported by both her father and her mother from a very young age. Her father, Hugh, was always a very strong force in her life. He placed education among the highest priorities for all of his children, of whom Hillary was the oldest. Thus, he set high expectations for each of his children; Hillary was no different. He was anxious that his children have the maximal opportunities available to them. Hugh purposely moved to a

---


32 Ibid. p25

33 Ibid. p32

34 Ibid. p31.
good school district when Hillary was young and would also make sure in the future that she attended one of the finest women's colleges in the United States. Dorothy, her mother, also played a key role in Hillary's social development. Her mother purposely played down gender roles and encouraged Hillary to do whatever it was she wanted to do. In a time when women were socialized to become housewives and mothers, Dorothy wanted her daughter to follow whatever dream she so desired. "I never saw any difference in gender, as far as capabilities or aspirations were concerned. Just because [Hillary] was a girl didn't mean she should be limited. I don't know whether you could say that was unusual at the time. I guess it was more of an accepted role to stay within your scope," Hillary's mom said in an interview with The Washington Post. This is the political, social, and economic environment in which Hillary enjoyed her childhood. While the 1950's may have had less of an impact on her political development than her adolescent and young adult years, Hillary was socialized from a very early age into the political scene, though not in a unique way for the time. The decade of the 1950's was a major decade in our own history, and those events can not help but have an impact on the children who grew up during that time.

**Adolescence**

Hillary's adolescent years saw a number of shifts in American society and the political system. The 1960's brought the pinnacle of the Civil Rights Movement, the inspiring oratories of Dr. Martin Luther King, Junior, and the heightened activity of organizations such as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC). This decade also brought the assassinations of
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President John F. Kennedy and Martin Luther King, Jr, two events that would transform the American political landscape. It was also the decade of Woodstock, tie-dye, and peace rallies. These events and experiences all combined to make the 1960's a decade of tremendous change and shift in the values and norms that were so idealized the decade prior.

Hillary attended Maine South High School in Park Ridge. She is described by friends and peers as very single-minded, a great debater, sociable, and very intelligent. She works very hard at maintaining relationships once they have been established. According to Radcliffe, she still keeps in contact with a number of people from not only college and beyond, but with high school friends as well. From the above description it would appear that from her youth, Hillary mastered the networking skills she would need to have as a successful politician. Although at this point in her life, she had yet to consider a life in public office. Her leadership capacities and motivations really began to develop during this stage in her life. Radcliffe writes, “She was the one who tried to keep everybody on track in group efforts, and when she wasn’t successful would be visibly frustrated. ‘Don’t you want to be good?’ she might plead in a rehearsal when everybody was horsing around.” Her high school yearbook listed Class Council, junior vice president, newspaper, Girls Athletic Association, Speech Activities and Debate, Student Council, spring musical, Organizations Committee, and she was in the top 5% of her class in academic standing. This is quite an impressive list of accomplishments and gives the reader

---

36 The History Channel Online. “1950’s.” www.historychannel.com


38 Ibid. p39
of this biography the impression that Hillary’s leadership skills and desire to organize, motivate, and lead her peers began from a very early age.

When she was 17 years old, she took part in a mock election, in which she was asked to play the part of Lyndon B. Johnson. Initially, Hillary barked at the idea of having to portray a democrat when she came from such a strong republican tradition. Nevertheless, she took up the challenge, and set off against one of her girlfriends who portrayed Barry Goldwater, in a mock presidential debate. Her teachers insisted that she really try to look at issues from all sides, not merely the Republican angle. While this experience may not have sparked an interest in pursuing elective office as her future career goal, it did begin her ideological transition from one side of the political spectrum to the other. While she still espoused being a Republican, she told a group of Maine South students on a homecoming visit in 1992 that experiences such as that debate and the influence of teachers that challenged her to stretch her mind as a young girl led to a different take on Republican ideology. She told them that she was, “still a Republican but with a different sort of inquiry about what it was I believed. I evolved my own political beliefs...”

In high school, she even worked on Barry Goldwater’s presidential campaign.

It is always important to acknowledge the major turning points in an individual’s life that have had a large impact on their growth as a person. For Hillary, she identifies the “absolute turning point” in her life to be the day President John F. Kennedy was assassinated. That fateful November day in 1963 rocked the entire nation out of their micro-realities and propelled them to confront the tremendous social and political issues of the day, as well as a sign of the troubles

---

40 Ibid. p.24.
41 Ibid. p.28.
ahead, including the Vietnam War and the Watergate scandal. Her gradual “breaking in” to the real world would continue after Kennedy’s death.

Hillary was, and continues to be, a very active member of the Methodist Church. When she was in high school she participated in Park Ridge’s Methodist Church youth group. Knowing that the young kids in the group all came from middle-class, white, and sheltered neighborhoods, one of the youth ministers at her church took a special interest in showing the kids in his program the other side of life. Reverend Don Jones had a significant impact on her development as a youth. Jones would take the kids into the ghettos and have them interact with the inner city youth of Chicago. He would also give them the opportunity to interact with a lot of the migrant farm workers of Hispanic and African-American descent. He called this program the University of Life, and on one day in particular, their outing was to leave a lasting impression on young Hillary. He took the group to see a speech by Dr. King in an Orchestra Hall in Chicago. Radcliffe describes the impact of the event on Hillary’s life.

The speech galvanized his listeners, among them young Hillary Rodham. Jones had made arrangements for his group to meet King, and after the speech was over Hillary and the others inched their way through the crowd to where he was waiting to shake their hands. The meeting was only too brief but Hillary never forgot it and would tell Jones later that it was a seminal event in her life.

These events would serve as the cornerstones of Hillary’s adolescent years. They would provide a means for her to explore the social and political issues and upheavals of the day, as
well as spark her interest in public service. All of these people and events would mean that her idyllic and sheltered upbringing would be rocked, and she would become very aware of the real world. As she looked to the future and to her years ahead in college, Hillary looked forward energized and excited about the chance to make her own impact on the world.

**Young Adulthood**

Hillary chose to attend Wellesley College in Wellesley, Massachusetts in the fall of 1965. Her focus of study was political science, a subject whose complexities would intrigue her for years to come. Radcliffe writes, “But it was much more than just the mechanics of politics or government that interested Hillary. Even in her early years at Wellesley, government seemed to be a means for accomplishing bigger ends.”

Her primary interests, spurred by her experiences in high school in Reverend Jone’s University of Life, were public policy and law. When she arrived at Wellesley, she joined the Republican Club on a strongly Democratic campus. While she still called herself a Republican, she engaged in all sorts of activities on campus, really testing her beliefs and trying to learn as much as she could about the social and political issues of that time.

Hillary saw her role at college as trying to improve the system, a recurring pattern of what she would later explain was a friend’s ‘Bloom where you’re planted’ philosophy. So she took on committee chores, working to eliminate irrelevant courses, increase black enrollment and faculty and relax parietal restrictions. Displaying an instinctive maturity for her age, she became known as a coalition builder.
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She chose to focus on student politics as a means for implementing change on her campus. Those changes being course issues, limited black enrollment issues, as well as the parietal restrictions spoke of before. Later that year, she spent the summer in Washington, D.C. as an intern for the House Republican Conference. She spent the summer engaging many of the politicians in D.C. in spirited debates over revenue sharing and the Vietnam War. Incidentally, she was also able to intern for Illinois Congressmen Harold Collier, whose district included Hillary’s hometown of Park Ridge. In addition that summer Hillary attended the Democratic National Convention in Chicago, which was to be a major turning point in her life as well. Since this election was to be her first, Hillary wanted to make sure she had both candidates firmly understood in order to make her decision. Hillary made a special effort to really study each of the candidates, though her newly found “liberal” tendencies would propel her away from the Republican Party.47

She was elected to be Student Body President her senior year at Wellesley. As of her election as President of her class, there was one Black student enrolled at Wellesley, a young woman Hillary would become allies with in the year ahead as they fought to get more Black women admitted to Wellesley for the start of next year’s fall term. A class mate of hers, Ruth Adams, in an interview with The Boston Globe, told the paper that Hillary’s main interest was of effecting change from within the system. She may have had liberal leanings, but she was in no way “radical” as some of her peers were at the time.48 This desire to effect change within her own university community was merely the beginning of what would become a career of
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effecting change at all levels from local to national. Her years at Wellesley allowed her to break out of the Park Ridge environment and really embrace and develop her leadership capacities, as well as the opportunity to explore and find the areas of interest that would later define the course of her future career.

Adulthood

After her graduation from Wellesley, Hillary chose to attend Yale Law School. She was one of only 30 women entering Yale Law in 1972. She became a sought-after speaker and activist on Yale’s campus for both her presence as an orator as well as her insight. The 1970's brought the Vietnam War, the Kent State incident and the rising power of student-led social change movements and organizations, such as Students for a Democratic Society. In New Haven itself, home of Yale, there was a huge controversy surrounding the arrest and trial of eight Black Panthers, allegedly for the murder of another Panther. The main defendant was Black Panther Bobby Seale, as well as seven others. Students all over the country were outraged and called for the immediate end to the trial. The atmosphere was so tense in New Haven that the National Guard had to be called in. Hillary and her classmates, as a means to help the American Civil Liberties Union get the Panthers acquitted, organized surveillance watches during the entire trial. Not one minute of the trial went by without a student or two there to monitor the goings-on. Through this whole experience, Hillary’s leadership was to be noticed by her peers and professors alike.
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The next two years were to be very important in Hillary’s development. The Kent State Incident of 1970 brought Hillary and many of her peers to Washington, D.C. demanding for President Richard Nixon’s resignation. It was at this time that Hillary met who would become a mentor for her in her life and career, Marion Wright Edelman. Hillary was asked to speak at a League of Women Voters’ National Convention banquet as a result of the notoriety she gained after her commencement speech at Wellesley. The banquet’s keynote speaker for the night was Edelman. Edelman then came to Yale’s campus to speak, and Hillary made it a point to be introduced. She also asked Edelman if she could work for her over the summer. Hillary shared Edelman’s concern for children, and she also looked to Edelman as an ideal example of a civil rights attorney. Edelman agreed to take Hillary on for the summer, on the condition, though, that she would not be paid. “It was all the encouragement Hillary needed. ‘Meeting somebody like Marian, who had a passion about helping children and had a lot of the same values that I had, was a turning point in my life,’ she said.” Edelman put Hillary to work on Senator Walter Mondale’s subcommittee studying migrant labor. For Hillary, this experience would steer her to focus on children and civil rights. “I came back to law school with a growing commitment toward children, and particularly poor children and disadvantaged ones.” This growing passion for children would later determine the focus of Hillary’s post-Yale career as a vocal children’s rights activist. It was also at this time that she met Bill Clinton, in 1971, at the law library.

Hillary got her Juris Doctor from Yale Law in 1973. After that, she stayed in New Haven to keep studying children’s issues at various New Haven hospitals, helping them to create
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policies for victims of child abuse; at this time she was also taking children’s psychology courses. \(^{53}\) In 1974, Hillary worked as counsel on the Judiciary Committee’s Impeachment Inquiry Staff. She was one of three women hand-picked by the head of this staff, Wisconsin Republican John Doar. In addition, from 1973-74 she served as an attorney for the Children’s Defense Fund, the organization Edelman had founded. She served as Legal Counsel to the Carnegie Council on Children that same year. \(^{54}\) Hillary would later describe her experiences with the Impeachment Inquiry Staff as “one of the great professionally and politically that I’ve ever had, to be involved with lawyers of that caliber and that level of commitment to the country.” \(^{55}\) She would then work day and night with the rest of the staff in preparation for sending a report to Congress on whether or not President Nixon should be impeached. To be right in the midst of one of the most important and difficult moments in United States political history cannot help but leave an indentation on a person’s life, as it did for Hillary.

In the meantime, however, Bill had moved back to Arkansas and both of them were grappling with their futures, whether they be together or apart. Once again at a crossroads in her life, Hillary had to choose between Washington and Little Rock, and her decision was definitely not made lightly. Nevertheless, in 1975, she wed Bill, and proceeded to become Associate Professor of Law and the Director of the Legal Aid Clinic at the University of Arkansas. \(^{56}\) She is described by colleagues as hard-driving, imposing, and focused. The drive and energy she had

\(^{53}\) Ibid. p115-116.


exhibited throughout her years at both Wellesley and Yale were immediately put into action when she began teaching at the University of Arkansas. Her most ardent issues with the school were their policies towards women and minorities. She wanted to make sure women were a strong presence on the faculty and that minorities did not suffer any discrimination while attending school there.\textsuperscript{57}

When Bill Clinton won his first election to Arkansas Attorney-General in 1977, Hillary joined the Rose Law Firm, in Little Rock, where she would stay on as an Attorney, and eventually Partner, until her husband became President in 1992.\textsuperscript{58} While her decision to maintain her own career separate from that of her husband’s political career made many people in Arkansas critical of her, she never wavered. She helped to found the Arkansas Advocates for Children and Families in 1977.\textsuperscript{59} The AACF was an organization set up to provide legal assistance to families and children whose rights had been violated. She was very active in her law firm, trying to establish a record for herself. Another turning point in her life was the birth of their daughter, Chelsea Victoria, in 1980. While she took an initial few months off from the firm, Hillary was very soon back on with the firm on a full time basis. In the interim, Bill had taken two years off from politics, and in 1982, decided to run for Governor of Arkansas. In a move that would shock her friends yet somehow appease traditionalist Arkansas voters, she changed her name from her maiden name Rodham, to Clinton, thereby sealing their partnership.
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in Bill’s political career. She continued to work at the Rose firm throughout Bill’s governorship in Arkansas, right up to his decision in 1991 to run for the Presidency in 1992.

Another major experience in her life and career was as Chair of the Arkansas State New Education Standards Committee. When Governor Clinton named her as Chair of the Committee, many of the same feelings of skepticism were aroused in the public, almost a mirror image of the scrutiny she would endure as Chair of the Health Care task force during Bill’s first term as president. Nevertheless, she maintained throughout this time her own career with the prestigious Rose firm, while simultaneously trying to raise a daughter and get used to the rigors of public life. This journey through life was to take an even more interesting turn when Bill decided to run for the presidency in 1992. Thus, during this time, Hillary was able to make a name for herself as an attorney, and family and childrens’ rights advocate, while at the same time getting used to the rigors of being Arkansas First Lady. It was an experience that would prepare her well for the White House.

Middle Age

In 1992, Hillary left her career and life in Little Rock to move to Washington, D.C. In this case, what was to be another major turning point in her life, she was about to take on the role of First Lady, not of the state this time, but of the nation. The public scrutiny she lived through in Arkansas would be magnified tenfold when Bill was elected president. Hillary’s role in her husband’s presidential campaign came under heavy fire, as the nation was not used to
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having a potential First Lady with a life, a career, an agenda, and views of her own.

What fueled uneasiness about Hillary throughout the campaign had been The Clintons, plural, their two-for-the-price-of-one co-presidency. Even among those supportive of women playing a bigger role in policy making, Hillary would be a discomforting presence as she put herself forward to speak, admittedly authoritatively, on issues like health care and children.\textsuperscript{62}

In 1993, President Clinton named her as Chair of the Presidential Task Force on National Health Care Reform.\textsuperscript{63} Although the goals and ideals of this task force were well-intended, her work was not well-received, and unfortunately, her efforts essentially failed. However, throughout the entire process, Hillary learned from her mistakes and misfortunes. Though her tenure as Chair was a stormy one, amid a swarm of criticism from all sides, Hillary remained vigilant in her advocacy of children’s and families’ rights.

She has definitely redefined the traditional role of the nation’s First Lady and made it her own.\textsuperscript{64} In the wake of recent scandal surrounding her husband and his affair with the now infamous Monica Lewinsky, she appears to be distancing herself from all of the talk, and remaining focused on her day to day activities as First Lady. In 1995, she began to write a weekly syndicated newspaper column entitled, “Talking it over.” In 1996, she authored the book entitled, “It Takes a Village and Other Lessons Children Teach Us,” which called for greater awareness of not only parental impact, but also national impact on the lives of American

\textsuperscript{62}Ibid. p228.


children. Her biographer, Radcliffe, describes Hillary’s on-going commitment to the issues she so strongly advocated throughout her professional career before the White House: “Hillary’s passion to make a difference in reshaping public policies and attitudes about children’s and family issues, not the least of which was health care, had not lessened in the twenty years since she was at Yale.”

To date, Clinton has received 16 honorary degrees and continues to be named one of the most influential women of our time. As her husband’s second and final term as president draws to a close, rumors have been spreading that Clinton herself may consider running for a Congressional seat in the next election. While those rumors remain unconfirmed, they remain undenied, a sign that as her husband’s career in public office is on the wane, it might be her time to run for office and continue to advocate the causes she has fought for since her days at Yale.


Case Study: Elizabeth Hanford Dole

Mary Elizabeth Hanford was born on July 29, 1936 in Salisbury, North Carolina. Salisbury typified small town American life. The 1930's and early 40's brought with them a host of world events and historical milestones that would change the face of world history for the years to come. When Elizabeth was born, she was born in the midst of the Great Depression. While the Depression affected almost everyone, the Hanford family floral business was enough of a success for them to live through that period in relative comfort. In addition to the Great Depression, Elizabeth lived her childhood years feeling the effects of a World War an ocean away. Her older brother, Johnny, was one of the GI’s who served in World War II. While she was too young to know the gravity of the war itself, she watched the impact her brother’s being gone had on her family, most especially her mother. She writes in her auto-biography, "However ignorant I was of the war’s larger implications, I found it a continuing lesson in sensitivity to the feelings of others. It was one thing, for example, to adjust to three gallons of gasoline per week; it was something else entirely to go to bed each night uncertain whether your son was alive." For Elizabeth, this was undoubtedly an event that would help to ground her childhood dreams into a harsher reality.

Nevertheless, Elizabeth was an active and engaged youngster. In fact, her desire to organize groups and lead them began from a very young age. When she was in the third grade she organized a Bird Club, and was elected president by its members. Not long after that, she


declared herself president of the junior-high book club she founded. In addition, during the war, although she was unaware of where the war was actually taking place, she still became an activist in the various war efforts going on at the time. She writes,

As ringleader of neighborhood children, I was a precocious organizer. This [lack of understanding of the war] didn’t keep me from joining forces with Miss Fanny Funderburke of the Girl Scouts in supervising what the Salisbury Post called the town’s youngest defense group. We collected used postage stamps, tinfoil, wastepaper.  

At the time of this “organization” of hers, Elizabeth was only 6 years old. Although she surely had plenty of help from her parents being so young, these experiences are testament to her drive and initiative, two attributes that have continued to have a strong influence over her day to day actions and activities to this very day. On the day of her eighth grade graduation, Elizabeth received the Citizenship Cup, as well as another for an essay she had written for class. Her drive and desire for high achievement thus propelled her from a very early age. She enjoyed being active and involved with whatever organizations she could find, but she also loved to be in charge of them.

Elizabeth’s parents, teachers and siblings had a strong influence on her when she was growing up in Salisbury. While much of Elizabeth’s headstrong and driven ways were shocking to her parents (her mother in particular), they never stood in the way of her ambitions. Her father was an extremely hardworking and driven man. In fact, Elizabeth’s work ethic from a

---

71 Ibid. p51.


73 Ibid. p.27.
young age mirrors that of her father. He is described in her biography as very disciplined but at the same time very supportive. Her mother poured all of her energy into raising Elizabeth and her brother and made sure both children were active throughout their childhood in whatever activities most suited them. Perhaps one of the most important influences in her life was her brother, John. John, fifteen years her senior, was a high achiever throughout his childhood and adolescence, and was thus a major motivator in Elizabeth's life. She wanted to be as involved and popular as her big brother since she was a little girl. Elizabeth was able to grow up in a very supportive yet demanding environment. Thus, from a very young age, Elizabeth's role models were hard-working, ambitious and very driven. These are all characteristics that would later come to define Elizabeth in both her academic life, as well as her career.

Adolescence

During her late adolescent years, Elizabeth found herself living through a very socially and politically tumultuous time in the history of the United States. The Cold War was gaining in intensity, President Harry S. Truman had laid down the Truman Doctrine as the foreign policy to guide the United States through the Cold War, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) was established for the collective security and benefit of the Western nations. Senator Joseph McCarthy, now infamous for the “McCarthyism” ideology that he promulgated while in office, was fueling a drive for cultural homogeneity and conformity in the United States. The Korean War once more brought the nation’s armed services into conflict, and television shows
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like *Ozzie and Harriet* and *Leave it to Beaver*, tried to convince the American viewing audience that all was well in their contained society. With all of this going on all around her, what type of impact did these events have on her life during those years? As she writes in her autobiography, these events only impacted her in a very limited way. Being that Salisbury was such a small town, its people were fairly well insulated from the full effect of national and international events. She writes,

> Postwar turbulence did little to disturb the peace of Rowan County. The Cold War found its way into the *Salisbury Post*. So did Chambers, and Hiss, Korea, Joe McCarthy and the first, tentative stirrings of the civil-rights revolution. But townspeople generally went about their business as usual. The daily pattern of small town life gave most people the reassurance they were denied in the headlines.

Elizabeth was very active in her high school years in a number of different activities. She was a part of the Student Government, the National Honor Society, the drama club, as well as the student newspaper. In addition, she was one of the top students in her class. In her senior year, she ran for president of the Student Government. Prior to this election, she had been president of her church's youth group, president of her class, as well as president of the local Salisbury chapter of the Children of the American Revolution. While she had a campaign committee and everything to help her run her bid for Student Government office, she
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unfortunately lost the election in the end. Even in the face of defeat, however, Elizabeth still graduated from Boyden High School receiving both state and national citations for her efforts as the Junior Chairman of the Children of the American Revolution radio and television committee. She was elected by her peers to be Secretary of the North Carolina Student Council Congress, and she was voted by her classmates as Boyden’s “most likely to succeed” woman. All of these experiences were more steps on her path to future successes in her college years and beyond.

**Young Adulthood**

In the fall of 1956, Elizabeth stepped onto the Duke University campus. Contrary to her parents’ expectations for her to major in home economics, Elizabeth chose instead as her course of study political science and international affairs. In the 1950's it was expected that women who attended college study home economics and get married. Hence, all of those things we typically associate with the 50's - the values and ideals of the middle class - were forces that Elizabeth and her classmates had to contend with when they graduated from high school. Her activities list during her years at Duke, however, read even more impressive than her accomplishments in high school. She instantly found herself attracted to Student Government, and, after a failed attempt to win a Class Representative seat her freshman year, ran the
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following year and won her class presidency.\(^3\) In an interview with her biographer, Carolyn Mulford, she told Mulford what drew her to study government

"Although I didn’t have a blueprint of where I wanted to go or what I wanted to do, it was just a natural love of government, of working with people, of selling an idea. I love that part of trying to convince people of an idea. I used to think that I would make a good salesperson because I like to get in there and talk about what I believe in. It was a natural thing to major in political science and run for student office. That led to Washington eventually.\(^4\)

Since high school Elizabeth had been very active in student government and found many valuable lessons in all of her experiences. While she was uncertain of future plans at the time, her extracurricular experiences in college provided the training ground she needed to hone her public speaking and leadership skills.

In addition to these activities, she joined several honorary societies including Phi Sigma Alpha (a national political science society), and White Duchy (a local honorary society for outstanding women leaders). Her senior year she was elected as President of the Women’s Student Government Association and served on the Women’s Judicial Board. Elizabeth demonstrated her desire to organize and lead change during her last year at Duke by lobbying for a number of changes on the university campus. Elizabeth took the initiative on several ends and tried to bring the men’s and women’s sides of the campus together through some fundamental changes in the university system. She felt that student government was the best medium for effecting these changes.

Returning to Durham in the fall of 1957, we launched a series of

\(^3\)Ibid. p. 78.

raids against campus tradition. Heading the list of reforms was establishment of a university-wide honor code. With help from Duke Administrators, including Dean Brinkley, a leadership training program for women was established and a variety of speakers were imported from around the country. We set up a permanent foreign-student fund and raised money to bring a Danish girl to Durham.\footnote{Ibid. p80.}

She made the \textit{Who's Who in American Colleges and Universities} and was selected as May Queen, an honor given to a senior woman who demonstrated outstanding service to their school community. Lastly, she was selected as Student Leader of the Year by her peers. She graduated in 1958 with high honors in Political Science and was inducted into Phi Beta Kappa.\footnote{Duke University Archives. ``Elizabeth H. Dole's years at Duke.'' http://www.duke.edu/web/Archives/current/eh_dole.html} It would appear, that Elizabeth would now have her choice of avenues to pursue upon graduation from Duke.

\textbf{Adulthood}

After college, Elizabeth spent some time trying to figure out which path to take from there. According to Elizabeth, she was trying to figure out which course would most likely bring her into the political arena. ``I was thinking that law might be a very good background for a career in government service. That was beginning to jell, but it wasn't yet a plan or a blueprint.''\footnote{Mulford, Carolyn. \textit{Elizabeth Dole: Public Servant}. Hillside: Enslow Publishers. 1992. p43} In fact, she did not go to law school immediately. Instead, she traveled up to Boston to work at the Harvard Law School Library, and pondered over opportunities to travel. Her first excursion took her to Oxford University, to study English history and government for a summer. She then decided that she wanted to explore the country that had been viewed as the
arch-enemy of the West throughout the Cold War period - the Soviet Union. Incidentally, her father was one of the many Americans to build bomb shelters in their basements, and looked at this sojourn with a strongly skeptical eye.88 Nevertheless, she did just as she wished and traveled to the Soviet Union, returning then to Cambridge refreshed and ready to dive back into the world of academia. “Back in Cambridge, I hedged my bets. In September 1959, I enrolled in a joint degree program that combined the study of government with the occupation of teaching. The first was my emerging passion, the second a vocational insurance policy.”89 Still living in a time when women were expected to work in only teaching, nursing, or secretarial work, if they worked at all, Elizabeth was simultaneously trying to satisfy her passion for governmental studies with the realities of women’s opportunities in those days.90 In the years when the Civil Rights Movement would thrust into the national spotlight and become the forefront of issues for American society, Elizabeth watched, studied, and worked with more than just a passing interest at all the goings-on around her.

In 1960, she worked as a secretary in the office of Congressman B. Everett Johnson of North Carolina. It was the first time she had been in Washington, D.C. since she was a little girl, and she took every opportunity to become as involved as possible in the political process. Among her most memorable experiences that summer was working on the LBJ Express as part
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of the whistle stop tour of the South by the then vice-presidential candidate.\textsuperscript{91} This experience was her first in national politics. In addition to being a part of his campaign for a brief stay, Elizabeth sought the advice of the few women who had run and secured national political office. She writes, “When not staring at senators, gaping at Statuary Hall or climbing to the top of the Capitol Dome, I sought out prominent women in government for professional guidance.”\textsuperscript{92} A woman who had a tremendous impact on the next stage in Hanford’s life was Senator Marjorie Chase Smith from Maine. Elizabeth literally dropped into her office, introduced herself, and asked for Chase’s advice on what might be the best course to plot for a future career in politics. Senator Chase unequivocally recommended that Elizabeth go to law school.\textsuperscript{93}

After earning her Masters Degree in Education and Government, Elizabeth then enrolled in Harvard Law School in 1962. She was one of only 24 women in a Harvard Law class of 550 people. Like most people in 1963, Elizabeth was deeply affected by the assassination of John F. Kennedy. Especially being at Harvard at the time, not only were they mourning the loss of a president but they were also mourning the loss of a fellow Harvard graduate. Nevertheless, Elizabeth was particularly affected by the social and political atmosphere at the time. She writes, “Under John F. Kennedy, Harvard had come to be known, only half in jest, as the fourth branch of American government. While there, I had gotten caught up in the enthusiasm for public service that flavored the early sixties.”\textsuperscript{94} Elizabeth’s passion was international law, and
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she was appropriately elected as President of the International Law Club at Harvard Law. In
1965, the class elected her secretary, which would be a position with no term limit. With all of
these experiences, and the energy and enthusiasm generated therein, Elizabeth was now ready to
conquer Washington, D.C.

In 1965, she made it to the final round of interviews for a place in the newly created
White House Fellows Program, yet unfortunately lost that opportunity. For the next couple of
years, however, Elizabeth would work as a public defender, and through her experiences would
gain insight into the lives of people she had never before come into contact with in her small
town childhood in Salisbury. Then, in 1968, she began working for the White House Office for
Consumer Affairs under President Lyndon Johnson. Elizabeth writes of her interest in public
welfare issues, “What began as just a job soon turned into something of a personal crusade.
Underdogs have always appealed to me. As a public-interest lawyer I had already seen how fraud
or deception can victimize the elderly and others too young or impoverished to fight back.”
Through this job experience, Elizabeth was to meet a woman who would end up having a
tremendous impact on her future career in Washington. Virginia Knauer, the new head of the
Presidential Committee on Consumer Interests under Nixon, would subsequently guide
Elizabeth through the rigors of traveling and selling public policies all over the country. For
Elizabeth, Knauer was “both mentor and surrogate mother.” In 1970, for the recognition of the
work she had done with the Presidential Committee on Consumer Interests, Elizabeth was
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named Washington's Outstanding Woman of the Year.\textsuperscript{98} This experience and recognition would lead to her first appointed political office.

In 1973, Knauer nominated Elizabeth to be the new Commissioner for the Federal Trade Commission, and, after her first bout with Senate confirmation hearings, she would be confirmed as the new Commissioner of the FTC. She would serve in this capacity from 1974 to 1979.\textsuperscript{99} Meanwhile she would meet, court, and marry Senator Bob Dole of Kansas in 1976. Immediately after their marriage, Gerald Ford would name Dole as his chosen vice-presidential running-mate, and Elizabeth would experience for the second time the rigors of assisting in a national campaign for office.\textsuperscript{100} In 1980, Bob Dole would make another run for the White House, only to lose for the second time. Even while campaigning full time with her husband, Elizabeth never stopped mapping out her own political career.

\textbf{Middle Age}

In December of 1980, Elizabeth was named head of the White House Office of Public Liaison under President Ronald Reagan, a post she held until 1983.\textsuperscript{101} She then went on to serve President Reagan again when he appointed her Secretary of Transportation in 1983. At the Senate confirmations hearings, when he was called as a character witness, Senator Dole said, "I


only regret that I have but one wife to give for my country’s infrastructure.”102 However, many in Washington continually speculated about possible conflicts of interest between her career and that of her husband. Even in 1983, people began to wonder if Elizabeth would eventually run for national office.

Dole has earned a reputation as a smart, ambitious, headstrong, zealous overachiever who manages to keep topping herself appointment after appointment. The Department of Transportation, her admirers say, is only the latest rung on the ladder. The next rung? Some people in Washington think Dole has the potential to become the first-ever woman vice-presidential candidate of a major party in U.S. history.103

As Secretary of Transportation, she was the seventh woman to serve in the United States Cabinet, and the first woman to lead a branch of the armed services (the Coast Guard fell under the jurisdiction of the Department of Transportation).104 With these experiences in hand, her future career in Washington politics seemed cemented.

In 1988, Elizabeth was appointed to Secretary of Labor under President George Bush. After four years with the Bush Administration, Elizabeth was looking to move in a different direction. In 1989, in the beginning of her tenure as Secretary of Labor, a member of the American Red Cross called her and asked her to consider becoming the next president of the organization. The representative told her that the “ARC was seeking a dynamic leader with experience in running a complex organization, strong communication skills, the ability to build a

consensus and develop leaders, and the courage to make painful decisions." 105 This phone call
would be of continued interest to her throughout the remainder of her time in the Cabinet, and in
1991, after resigning from Cabinet, she was elected to be the new president of the ARC. 106
Throughout the next eight years, Elizabeth would call for a complete overhaul of the Red Cross' Blood Services, in an effort to make it state-of-the-art and easily adaptable to technical innovations in the medical industry. She took a leave of absence from ARC in 1995, to once again go on the campaign trail with her husband, only to return a year later after a difficult campaign and a difficult loss. 107 Her experiences with ARC appealed to a different calling within her, as opposed to her call to public office.

In January of this year, Elizabeth stepped down from her post as President of ARC. 108 For years now, and growing more frequent each day, is speculation over whether or not Elizabeth may make a run for the White House, either as a vice-presidential candidate or even as a presidential candidate. 109 This talk has reached near record levels now with the announcement of her resignation from ARC. What the future holds for Elizabeth remains to be seen. If she decides to run for national office, or even if she decides against doing so, her life and experiences have been shaped by a love and passion for government and public policy, and rest
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assured her work in these areas will continue in some capacity.
Looking back at the profiles of Clinton and Dole, it becomes clear that their paths to public office have been an evolutionary process that began for both women at a very young age. The issues of timing, political climate, leadership development, and leadership style and their impact on women's consideration of running for national office become very apparent after a thorough analysis of these issues' relationships to one another. While neither of these women knew they were going to run for a political office as young children, they nevertheless set out on a path paved by strong ambitions and work ethics, as well as an ever-present drive to succeed in whatever activity they chose as their passion at the time. Since their youth these women have been powerhouses of activism and leadership. From organizing the neighborhood kids during grade school, to being the recognized leaders in their respective high schools, both Clinton and Dole have chosen to take the leadership role in all of their relationships and work environments. They are both demanding and perfectionists - typical Type A personalities. Throughout their lives and their experiences, these women are proven leaders. In addition, their leadership drive and capabilities have given these women the motivation to become active in their local communities as well as the nation as a whole. So, what about their path to public office has been typical? How does their development differ from that of other women and men seeking public office? The answers to these questions I will comprehensively explore in the following pages.

Timing and Political Climate: two key motivating factors

In reference to timing, there can be no time more open and encouraging to women running for office than that of today. Since the fabled "Women's Year" election of 1992,
women are increasingly seen as viable political candidates and are not regarded with as much "outsider" status as they have been accorded in years past. While their representative numbers in local, state, and national offices are growing at a seemingly slow crawl, those numbers are nonetheless increasing. At the Congressional level, the percentage of women in elective offices has risen from 4% in 1975, to 10% in 1995. Statewide, women have grown from a 10% representation level in 1975, to almost 26% in 1995. Lastly, women in the state legislatures have gone from 8% in 1975 to almost 21% in 1995. Thus, in each of these political arenas, women's representation has more than doubled, an encouraging sign for women who seek office in the upcoming elections. Clinton and Dole, as well as other women, have seen the number of women in public office increase slowly over the past three decades. For these two women, as well as a host of others, there is a strong desire to be a part of the move to increase these statistics even more in the years to come.

While the numbers are still slowly increasing, every year the political climate becomes a bit more welcoming to these women and their political aspirations. In their book studying the current situation of women in politics, authors Sue Thomas and Clyde Wilcox put forth their conclusions as to why the timing for these women is better today than in years past. They write,

> The most recent studies suggest that such discrimination [by party elites] has diminished considerably. Whereas women may once have lost their elections more and more often than their male counterparts, that is not the case today. When factors such as party and incumbency status are taken into account, the evidence is clear that women win races as often as men. Hence, when women decide to present themselves to the public as candidates for local,

---

state, and national offices, their chances of winning are as good (and sometimes better) than those of men.\textsuperscript{111}

Given this encouragement, there can be no doubt that the environment today is more apt to encourage women to run for office. The statistical chances of winning aside, the mere numbers of women running for public office in the past decade inspire would-be woman candidates. In the cases of Clinton and Dole, they have both served in political roles and positions throughout a great deal of their respective careers, and they have met with, and been mentors and friends with a number of women in the political sphere. In addition, there is a great emphasis given today on domestic and social issues.\textsuperscript{112} These issues include health care, child welfare, and consumer interests. Clinton and Dole have made these domestic issues the focus of their political and professional endeavors, and today as opposed to years past, these issues are seen by the voting public as more urgent and in need of reform.

Both Clinton and Dole are witnessing the tapering off of their husbands' careers in national political office. As such, they no longer have to make their primary focus the political careers of their husbands. Instead of campaigning for their husbands, Clinton and Dole can look to achieve their own political ambitions. In addition, especially for Clinton, the fact that Chelsea is almost through with college and no longer dependent on her parents, is of equal importance to the fact that her husband's second and final term is coming to an end. For Dole, who is 64 years old, this will be her one and only chance to run for elective office. Thus, her age has to be an
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important determining factor in her consideration of running for public office. Therefore, in reference to the timing and political climate for a possible run for office, these two women will most likely not be able to find a better time in their lives and careers.

Leadership Development & Leadership Style

In the same vein as domestic issues becoming more recognized, female leadership behavior is becoming more sought after for the three-dimensionality it adds to a once one-dimensional political realm. Since women are more apt to be concerned with issues of direct public interest, their leadership styles, which are more consensual than men, are becoming more and more in demand. In her book entitled, Political Woman, Jeane Kirkpatrick outlines her typology of a political woman. As you will be able to see, the characteristics she lists can be easily used to describe women like Clinton and Dole. Those characteristics are: 1/concern with whole process rather than part; 2/intense commitment exhibited in long hours, hard work, and in preoccupation with the business of the legislature; 3/a detached interpersonal style oriented to maintaining harmony and cooperation rather than winning affection; 4/heavy demands on the self; 5/a clear sense of self; 6/a strong future orientation and defined personal goals; and 7/high level of political skills. In their study done on the feminization of leadership in state legislatures, Thomas and Wilcox discovered that, “women repeatedly told us that they were interested in cooperating, building consensus, and creating a harmonious workplace.” As the social, economic, and political issues before the state and national legislatures become


increasingly complex and multi-dimensional, the leadership styles of legislators of both genders must readily adapt to the changing circumstances. Fortunately for women, their tendency towards this consensus-based leadership style makes that adaption much quicker, and thus, more opportunities to act as leaders within their respective organizations and political systems will emerge. In the cases of Clinton and Dole, their leadership development throughout their lives has served as the foundation for their own leadership development in the political arena, and subsequently points to a pattern of political leadership development for younger generations to follow.

Similar to their male counterparts, women’s leadership development stems in part from how they were socialized by their parents, peers, and the overall environment throughout their lives. Yet, essential to a woman’s desire to run for public office is knowledge that she really can run for office. Not long ago a woman’s lack of consideration to run for public office was predetermined due to social and political limitations imposed on her gender. Both Clinton’s and Dole’s parents were very important in this aspect of their daughters’ leadership development. Both women grew up feeling that there was nothing they could not do. They grew up thinking that gender was not important when it came to the realization of their dreams.

Hillary always considered herself ‘very fortunate, because as a girl growing up, I never felt anything but support from my family. Whatever I thought I could do and be, they supported. There was no distinction between me and my brothers or any barriers thrown up to me that I couldn’t think about something because I was a girl.’

According to Cantor and Bernay, parents’ recognition of a female child’s achievements,

independent opinions, autonomy, and leadership are key factors in their leadership development. Thus for these two women and a number of others, their socialization environments since childhood have been key sources of inspiration and motivation to run for public office.

A natural extension of leadership development in women political leaders, therefore, is an examination of the leadership style they have developed as a result of this socialization and development. Here I will analyze the leadership behaviors and styles of Clinton and Dole as well as assess their effectiveness within the public sector organizations in which they work. Clinton and Dole have very different leadership styles, considering all of the parallels that can be drawn from their leadership development and life experiences.

Clinton has been described by some as direct, domineering, ambitious, and very disciplined. Many people like to draw contrasts between her leadership style and that of her husband. "Hillary Clinton's approach to life is 'focused, pragmatic, and aggressive.' Bill Clinton, on the other hand, remains unfocused, with an aversion to boundaries, and prefers charm to conflict." She remains extremely disciplined, a trait she learned from her father as a young girl. If one were to look at these traits against those discussed in the introduction they would find that Clinton does not fit the traditional "feminine" leadership style. In fact, it could be argued that she is even more masculine than androgynous. She likes to move into a role or an

---


organization and take immediate control of all that is going on. In terms of working with other people, Clinton is not as team-oriented as one might expect from a woman political leader. Thus she never really becomes a part of the group she leads. Instead, she is more apt to perform her role as its leader and whether or not she has the support of her team is insignificant. \textsuperscript{119} "The combination of strong views, strong self-confidence in them, a capacity to stand her ground, and an ability to do what she feels necessary to accomplish her good purposes has buttressed views of her as tough and hard on others." \textsuperscript{120} This leadership style and behavior is manifest in her chairmanship of the President’s Task Force on Health Care Reform. This team was made up of over 500 people who all had to work in absolute secrecy. Clinton was adamant and forceful about her views and opinions, yet was seen by many as power hungry and cold as a leader. The Task Force she headed essentially failed in its objectives, and was engulfed by all sorts of speculation about the First Lady and her leadership capabilities. \textsuperscript{121} Perhaps her independence from those with whom she works could explain her focus on private sector work as a civil rights attorney. While she has an innate capacity to get things done and to do them well, Clinton appears to do her best work on her own, or at the very least independent of a larger team. Nevertheless, many of the qualities and leadership behaviors that she exhibits fit the profile of a political leader within a masculine-oriented environment. Her effectiveness as a candidate for public office, therefore, would be contingent upon her ability to feel closer to her constituents
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and their issues and concerns. In any candidacy for office, if it is to be a success, the candidate must seem a part of the larger constituency, as opposed to being seen apart from it.

Dole, on the other hand, has the reputation around Washington for her "Sugar Lips."122 It could be argued that Dole's leadership style is in direct contrast to Clinton. Dole loves the salesmanship of politics. She is well-liked by everyone she works with for her charm and political sensibilities, however, some people have wondered that she is mostly talk and not enough substance. "She has charisma and strong name recognition, but voters have no clear idea of where she stands."123 In the organizations she has run, and during both of her stints on Presidential Cabinets, Dole was renowned for her perfectionist nature, a nature that in some instances could drive those with whom she worked on a daily basis into a frenzy. She is one of the most requested speakers on the Republican circuit, receiving more than 6,000 invitations a year for various events and meetings.124 Thus, while Clinton may have the direction and passion about policy endeavors and issues, Dole has the ability to sell those policies to the people in Washington. Dole is characterized by her drive, her ambition, her perfectionism and her charisma. Again, these are traits that are often associated with the masculine political leadership style. However, Dole's success as a possible future candidate will hinge on her ability to make the policies articulated in her speeches more passionate and better implemented. Unlike Clinton, Dole has the presence and less of the political zeal. Nevertheless, the roles that these two women are interested in are both very different in nature. Executive positions of power such
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as the presidency and vice-presidency require a leader who is able to make compromises, sell policies to the legislature, and network with other legislators. During the course of her career as a leader in politics, Dole has proven her ability to do all of those things. The question then becomes, if her office is more about selling than actually implementing policy, she will leave behind a mixed legacy as she leaves office. Nevertheless, Dole has proven she has the ability to operate and lead within a male-dominated realm.

**Are Clinton and Dole Unique to Other Women Political Leaders?**

While Clinton’s and Dole’s backgrounds are in no way entirely unique from other women in public office, there were nevertheless different forces at work in their lives and different mentors to look up to during the key development years. “While no one background and no pattern of experience was shared by all the women legislators, the biographies of many include these same key elements: a small town background, geographic stability, middle class, participant parents, higher education, and community service.” These are all elements that fit into the personal profiles of the two subjects of my case studies, but they also fit the lives of several other women in higher office. For example, Colorado Congresswoman Patricia Schroeder describes her upbringing and socialization environment in much the same manner that I have portrayed both Clinton’s and Dole’s socialization environments. She had a father who encouraged her to do anything she wanted, a mother who provided her with both an awareness of the gender-typed society she lived in, but also the impetus for her to go out and change that environment. In addition, her family was always involved in political activities. Her grandfather

---

was once a state legislator in Nebraska.¹²⁶

Similarly, former Texas Governor Ann Richards grew up in a household where the parents were trying to reconcile social expectations for female children at the time with the headstrong and ambitious daughters in their family. Richards parents’, in their own unique and subtle way, were very supportive of their daughter’s endeavors even from a young age. While the risks she took scared them, they were nevertheless very proud of her accomplishments, and though they tried to impose limits, deep down they knew that Richards had her own path to follow, no matter what reservations they may have had.¹²⁷ Former Connecticut Congresswoman Nancy Johnson was also socialized in a similar environment. Like all the women discussed above, Johnson grew up with parents who placed no limits on her abilities and aspirations. She also grew up with strong female role models. “Her paternal grandmother, one of the first women graduates of John Marshall Law School and an early leader in the settlement house movement in Chicago, was also an activist in the League of Women Voters.”¹²⁸ The support and encouragement from such active role models undoubtedly influenced Johnson’s leadership development. Like Clinton and Dole, Johnson, Schroeder, and Richards were very active youngsters, whose leadership capabilities emerged during their childhood years. They were active in their schools, ran for student government offices, participated in community programs, and were all oriented to the goal of furthering their educations and charting their own careers.
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Incidentally, these three women were chosen for my comparison based on the information available on the issues specifically related to my theoretical framework. Thus, while there are any number of women who could be chosen for this analysis, it was merely convenience of available data that made me select these three women political leaders for my study.

Are Clinton and Dole Unique from Male Political Leaders?

So what makes these women distinct, if anything, from men seeking elective office? To begin with, there are a number of similarities between the personal profiles of women and men politicians. Like the women discussed above, it is common for the male candidate to come from a small, close-knit community. In addition, socio-economically their background is middle to upper-middle class. Similarly, these men come from families who were very involved in their community’s affairs. Lastly, male candidates are also strong over-achievers and were quite active extracurricularly in childhood all the way through college. So in the basic aspects of a candidate’s background, there are no major differences between men and women except one very critical aspect; a man is socialized to become whatever he wants to be, politically or otherwise, whereas a woman has to contend with the infamous “glass ceiling” and all of the gender-imposed limitations that ceiling creates. “Cultural change has lessened the impact of situational and structural factors on women’s political participation, but women’s full participation in political affairs will occur only when men and women have the same degree of access to educational and employment opportunities.”


public office is the norm, a woman, the exception. The statistics discussed in the Introduction are testimony to this conclusion. As we work to break down this stereotype in a time when the political climate is perhaps the most favorable it has been in the history of the country, perhaps women running for public office will become not so much of an aberration, but rather become an expected and encouraged announcement every time an election year comes about.
Conclusions

Given the historical and cultural time periods in which they were raised, the socialization environments of Clinton and Dole may have been more the exception than the norm. In fact, all of the women profiled in this paper have been the exception to the norm. Based on sheer numbers alone any woman who seeks and is elected to public office even today, but especially in the past two decades, is unique. While these women are not often unique from one another, they were socialized very differently from the majority of their peers. However, in an age when these cultural and attitudinal constraints are gradually breaking down, and women become more of a demand in the political arena, perhaps the development paths of Clinton, Dole, and their contemporaries will serve as solid templates upon which women of later generations can model their own path to public office. However, each generation of women political leaders evolves into a different type of political woman, both in leadership development and style. Women of each generation must adapt their leadership to the social, political and economic context of their time. Thus for every subsequent generation of women political leaders, this template will be modified and changed to appropriately reflect the needs and issues of the time. In many ways for women of my generation, women such as Clinton and Dole have trodden a path that had not yet been traveled enough for the sojourner to be sure of the obstacles and opportunities that lay in front of them. They have placed markers all along the path so that women of future generations can have an easier journey each time they choose to walk the treacherous path to public office.

These women have each applied their own unique leadership style to their offices and organizations, thus there is no real model for women’s political leadership. Clinton’s and Dole’s
leadership styles are as different as night and day, yet they are both extremely successful in their careers. While neither woman’s style fits a traditional masculine, feminine, or even androgynous mold, both women are still developing their leadership abilities. For Clinton especially, a move from the private sector to the public sector could prove to be especially challenging. For Dole, on the other hand, she would make her candidacy as a seasoned politician. Therefore, whether or not their leadership styles will be appropriate for a run for public office remains to be seen. As the phenomenon of women in public office is itself still in its infancy, such analyses of leadership will no doubt come in time.

Therefore a great deal of progress has been made for women political leaders in a very short span of time. The United States is slowly but surely recognizing the importance of women holding public office. This is especially key where the issues of timing and political climate are concerned. Women can be brought up today feeling the same support, encouragement, and freedom of ambitions that Clinton and Dole grew up feeling. However, if the timing and climate are not favorable, more often than not these women will not consider running for public office. Depending on the socially accepted role for women at the time, as well as the number of opportunities that lay before them will greatly determine a woman’s drive to run for office. All of these aspects of a political career are intertwined and interdependent. While Clinton and Dole were in many ways exceptions to the women of their respective generations, perhaps women will become so prolific in public office that such an accomplishment will no longer be considered a “surprising occurrence,” but rather a respected and expected role for women of future generations to undertake during their lifetimes. The lives and achievements of these women are blueprints for the future of women in politics.
Both Clinton and Dole were brought up to believe that any career aspirations they had were achievable, both were activists in their families and communities from an early age, and both have consistently demonstrated their leadership capabilities and drive throughout their respective careers. For Clinton and Dole, the path they each trod may lead them to run for public office in the next election. However, if they choose not to take that path, they have nevertheless had an enormous impact on the future political opportunities and goals for young women all over the country. That in and of itself, is quite a legacy to leave behind.