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Abstract
In 1995, Hillary Clinton gave her famous speech at the United Nations Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing, and stated that “women’s rights are human rights” and that the status of women is of great significance for the democratic development of one country in the coming new millennium. In 2003, her autobiography *Living History* was published and sold more than one million copies, inspiring millions of women around the world. In 2016, Hillary Clinton has become the first woman in American history to be the nominated Democratic candidate for the presidential elections and moves one step closer to break the highest glass ceiling. Influenced by Hillary Clinton and many other female political leaders, this essay will deal with the manifestation and exemplification of female leadership in autobiographies written by American female politicians.

Autobiographies written by female politicians present the female perspective on how female leaders improve the political status of themselves and women in general, and how they strive for political leadership and become role models. The present paper is focused on the development and achievement of female political leadership in Hillary Clinton’s autobiography *Living History*. This essay will focus on *Living History* as document about the empowerment of women and the political leadership, explaining how Clinton has become “a lightning rod for political and ideological battles waged over America’s future and a magnet for feelings, good and bad, about women’s choices and roles” (Clinton vi).

The Chinese have an ancient saying, that women hold up half the sky, but in most of the world, it’s really more than half. Women handle a large share of the responsibility for the welfare of their families. Yet their work often goes unrecognized and unrewarded inside the family or by the formal economy.

- Hillary Clinton, *Living History*

Leadership is an aspect of power, but it is also a separate and vital process in itself.

- James Macgregor Burns, *Leadership*

Introduction
1 The notion of political leadership is often still understood as referring to “a privileged group of ‘great men’ who [define] power, authority, and knowledge” (Klenke “Women and Leadership” 1). Indeed, *power* proves to be “a gendered concept” (Klenke “Women in Leadership” 51) at the center of hierarchically organized political structure. The “understanding of leadership behavior” has been “shaped” by men throughout Western history (Rosenthal 5). In
the context of the 1960s women's liberation movement Betty Friedan has identified “the problem that has no name,” namely, the successful self-limitation of women who have been made to believe that they “do not want careers, higher education, political rights,” but rather stay in the private sphere considering husband and family as top priorities (1). In addition, various “sources and forms of prejudicial behavior” have created obstacles and “restrictions” for women attempting to “reach[...] leadership levels” (Foley 228). Consequently, the underrepresentation of female politicians in senior political positions has prevented a more balanced and less prejudiced definition to female political leadership. Nevertheless, the gradually growing number of female politicians since the latter half of the twentieth century has led to more diverse interpretations of female leadership, and has provided the opportunity for women to redefine notions of political leadership and power.

2 In 1995, Hillary Clinton gave her famous speech at the United Nations Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing, where she emphasized that “women’s rights are human rights” and pointed out the great significance of the status of women for the democratic development in the new millennium. In 2003, her first autobiography Living History was published and sold more than one million copies. In 2016—thirteen years after the publication of Living History, at the age of 69, Hillary Clinton was the first woman in American history to be the nominated Democratic candidate for the presidential elections. Even though Hillary Clinton has not become the first female president of the United States in 2017, her concession speech, in line with her autobiography Living History, is an encouragement and inspiration to women: “never doubt that you are valuable and powerful and deserving of every chance and opportunity in the world to pursue and achieve your own dreams” (Clinton “Read”). This essay will focus on Living History as document about the empowerment of women and the political leadership, explaining how Clinton has become “a lightning rod for political and ideological battles waged over America’s future and a magnet for feelings, good and bad, about women’s choices and roles” (vi).

American Political Autobiography

3 Throughout American political history, political autobiography has been “immensely popular” in recording and presenting American lives and connecting the private/personal with the public/political (Abbott 14f.). American political autobiography comprises “a full-scale political treat” as well as “an alternate epistemology in American liberal political thought” (Abbott 16). After early considerations of politics in autobiographical writings by Puritans, political leaders of the United States gradually established the tradition of American political
autobiography. In these texts, American political leaders record their life experiences, their political careers, and their contribution to the political developments and transformations of the United States.

4 Today, political autobiography has become a crucial factor in the studies of American autobiographies. As James M. Cox points out in “Autobiography and America,” Benjamin Franklin’s autobiography can be considered as the first American autobiography¹ (167; cf. Dippel 257). Most early American autobiographies before Benjamin Franklin are more centered on “religion” and “religious confession,” whereas the objective of Franklin’s autobiography is to provide “moral instruction” and to exemplify the significance of the pursuit for happiness “in an open, democratic society for personal improvement and public benefit” (Dippel 257). After the publication of Franklin’s autobiography in 1791, political autobiographies have gradually become popular² among American politicians (Dippel 258). Influenced by the tradition created by Franklin’s autobiography, later American political autobiographies have combined “traditional elements” with “modernity” to reflect the integration of “personal political life and public political culture” and “the evolution of American democracy and political culture in America” (Dippel 258-59).

5 Within this context, the functions of American political autobiographies are closely connected with the politicians’ political objectives. Firstly, political leaders can and are willing to utilize their autobiographies to create a platform in the “political system” where they can “directly” communicate with and connect to their readers and voters (Shally-Jensen, Rozell, and Jelen 856). By sharing “first hand”—information of their personal, educational, and professional experiences, politicians present what they have accomplished during their political careers, and explain their political policies and objectives to the readers—for instance, “the decisions that these chief executives were confronted with during their presidency, along with their expectations for why they chose certain courses of action” (Shally-Jensen, Rozell, and Jelen 846). The detailed life experiences presented in political leaders’ autobiographies help to eliminate the distance between the successful and the ordinary, and make them more approachable for the people.

¹ When the first autobiographical work of Benjamin Franklin was written and published at the end of the eighteenth century, autobiography is still not a legitimate genre (Abbott 14).

² According to Dippel, Abraham Lincoln, John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, James Monroe, Martin Van Buren, and Ulysses S. Grant have written their autobiographies before, during, or after their presidency (Dippel 258). Besides, political leaders such as James Buchanan, Theodore Roosevelt, Calvin Coolidge, Herbert Hoover, Harry S. Truman, Dwight D. Eisenhower, Lyndon B. Johnson, Richard Nixon, Jimmy Carter, John F. Kennedy, Ronald Reagan, Bill Clinton, George W. Bush, George H. W. Bush, and Barack Obama have also written and published autobiographies before, during, or after their presidency.
Secondly, in their autobiographies, politicians present themselves as role models and leave their political and moral legacies to their fellow Americans. As a result, American political autobiographies, as “political reflection,” have created a “didactic” or “sermonic tradition” to highlight the pursuit of the American dream and the values of democracy and equality (Abbott 15f., 186). For example, Franklin not only writes his autobiography with the intention to give “moral instruction” to the readers, but also to present the example of a successful “American life” by highlighting the importance of “an active life in an open, democratic society for personal improvement and public benefit” (Dippel 257). In particular, Franklin shares his personal and political experiences and achievements in his autobiography with the motivation that “posterity will see his life ‘fit to be imitated’” (Abbott 15).

Overall, American political autobiographies reflect the “common feeling of representativeness” of the political leaders, since they consider themselves as “legitimate interpreters of the history and politics of their time and of the mood of the nation” and thus as “integral parts of the American experience” (Dippel 266). American political leaders’ autobiographies unveil the “secrecy” of political lives and achievements, construct a foundation to express political ideas, and provide the opportunity for their readers to deepen their knowledge of the American political spirit (Shally-Jensen, Rozell, and Jelen 856).

**Women and Political Autobiography**

Before the twentieth century, women were conventionally connected with the “private sphere” and thus did not have the privilege to “create public documents like autobiographies,” as this would have been seen as a rebellious action that “violates social norms” (Marshall and Mayhead 7). Autobiographies written by female politicians as vivid reflections of women’s progress of independence, testify to women’s efforts of writing themselves into the history of autobiography as well as of politics, and run counter to the conventional view of autobiographers as “unquestionably white, male, and Western” (Smith and Watson 8). In their autobiographies, female politicians record their own life stories “through [their] own lens of bias, prejudice, existential angst, and lived experience, [choosing] to tell the truth, to embellish, or to lie in every line” (Marshall and Mayhead 9). Likewise, autobiographies by female politicians construct their own “form of history” from their own perspectives, and contribute to the inclusion of women’s writings into “the literary canon” of autobiography: “if a woman possesses language or a symbol system, she can tell her own story” (Marshall and Mayhead 9).

Thus, in their autobiographies, female politicians “have woven the threads of their identities into a tapestry, declaring their positions on ‘sexuality, race, gender, class’ as well as
‘politics, law, science and communities’” (qtd. Marshall and Mayhead 185). The personal anecdotes and private stories included in these autobiographies conjoin the personal with political and construct a bridge between the autobiographer and the reader. Marshall and Mayhead point out that autobiographies by female political leaders can function as enlightening sites, especially for female readers, to conduct an experiment in “self-discovery” and to “follow in their footsteps”:

Thus, the self-discovery and sense of agency emerging from the reading of these autobiographies potentially leads readers to identify with the writer and to imagine themselves following in her footsteps. [...] The telling of one’s life story exemplifies the human desire to connect with others, provide insight into one’s personal and public choices, give advice to those who may wish to follow in one’s footsteps, contest others’ representations of self, and leave a legacy validating one’s existence. (Marshall and Mayhead 3, 7)

This is emphasized in Madeleine Albright's autobiography Madam Secretary, where she explicitly points out that her intention of writing an autobiography as a female political leader is to “combine the personal with policy and describe not just what happened but also why and how events were influenced by human relationships” (xi). Similarly, in her analysis of Living History, Karrin Vasby Anderson states that Hillary Clinton has utilized “personal narratives as a rhetorical strategy” in order to present to the readers “her political ideology,” her professional competence, and the contribution she has made to promote gender equality (132). Thus, women politicians’ autobiographies can work as records of women’s history combining both private and political lives, and can be taken as important inspirations for women readers to construct independent identities, achieve professional competence, and find the power to change the world around them.

**Hillary Clinton’s Living History**

10 *Living History* can be considered as one of the most influential American political autobiographies written by a female politician. On the political level, it has provided an opportunity for Hillary Clinton to connect with her supporters, to convince her potential followers that she is capable to lead, and to persuade the public that “a woman [can] assume national leadership” (Smith 4). In *Living History*, the autobiographical ‘I’ stands out as “a convincing political persona” who is “feminist, professional, former First Lady, and duly-elected senator” (Smith 4) at the same time.

**The Empowerment of Women**
Even before the reader opens the book, the cover of *Living History* stands out to visualize the writer as embodiment of female power. According to Sidonie Smith

[…] the front cover projects a singular iconic image of the celebrity. This is a figure sans ‘background,’ san relationship. The hair that has often been so unruly is almost perfect coiffed. The eyes sparkle. The mouth smiles. This ‘Hillary’s’ chin rests on her hands in a gesture of assured self-confidence and self-support. The eyes are marked with age lines, enough to project experience, but not too many to foreground aging. The cheeks are marked by smile lines, intimating the ludic break-up of a gendered mask. The cover gives us an iconic figure of a powerful woman, staring directly at the reader, unafraid of public scrutiny. It announces everything: I’m here. I’m together. I’m “like steel tempered in fire.” (Smith 21)

In this analysis, on the one hand, the self-confidence and “self-sufficiency” evident in facial expression and gesture present Clinton as a strong and capable female politician (qtd. Smith 21); on the other hand, the alluded to amiability brings her closer to her readers not only as a politician, but also as a person/woman. In this sense, this picture not only foregrounds the female power of Clinton in the political context, but also in a more personal way.

Within Western history the definition of female power has never been identical with the seemingly gender-neutral definition of power as such. According to Peggy Reeves Sanday’s *Female Power and Male Dominance: On the Origin of Sexual Inequality*, "Females achieve economic and political power or authority when environmental or historical circumstances grant them economic autonomy" (Sanday 114). In the opening passage of *Living History*, Hillary Clinton points out that she has been very lucky to be born at a time when American society has started to provide women with comparatively more chances to thrive in the public sphere:

I was born an American in the middle of the twentieth century, a fortunate time and place. I was free to make choices unavailable to past generations of women in my own country and inconceivable to many women in the world today. I came of age of the crest of tumultuous social change and took part in the political battles fought over the meaning of America and its role in the world. (Clinton 1)

Without equal social circumstances to guarantee women’s autonomy through equal educational and professional opportunities, women have little chances to become economically and politically independent, to accumulate professional experiences or develop leadership capabilities.

In *Living History*, Clinton exemplifies the significance of a social environment which guarantees gender equality. Firstly, Clinton emphasizes the important role of the family in empowering her to become a self-confident and independent woman. Being valued and respected within the family appears as important factor in the development of the strength nec-
ecessary to step into the public sphere. Clinton depicts her parents as fully supportive, treating her equally, paying attention to her education, and helping her to develop a confident and independent identity. At the same time Clinton foregrounds how she was introduced to the necessity to fight for herself from an early age onwards. This is highlighted in an anecdote describing the, four-year-old Clinton running home crying after having been bullied by some older boys and girls and and “complaining” to her mother (Clinton 12). Rather than just comforting her and intervening in the affair, her mother “stopped” her crying and encouraged her to “[g]o back out there” “to stand up for [herself]” since “there [was] no room for cowards in this house”(Clinton 12). What might seem a harsh treatment, taught Clinton to develop courage to face challenges, rather than to feel inferior and intimidated as a girl who seemingly has to rely on others. Meanwhile, Clinton’s father helped Clinton to gain more confidence by engaging her in their outdoor sport activities. As a result, Clinton developed both physical and psychological strength and “became a serious fan and occasional competitor” in different sport teams at school (Clinton 13).

Secondly, a social environment, which promotes and guarantees gender equality, is vital in empowering women. In particular, an equal social environment can provide educational and professional opportunities for women to equip them with professional capabilities to enter the workforce. In the 1960s, it was still quite difficult for women to have equal educational opportunity in American society. Despite “the continuing expansion of women’s education” (McClelland 11) women were “warned against” outstanding achievements at school, because a woman with outstanding academic performance could possibly “[scare] off prospective suitors” (Chafe 180-84). Thus, as described in Living History, many of Clinton’s female classmates were forced “to conform to sexist stereotypes”; accordingly, some of them gave up better educational opportunities, while others pretended to be mediocre at school (Clinton 20f.). Moreover, women were often offered with a “distinctively feminine curriculum” since they were expected to do household works or related professions in the future and thus were not encouraged to pursue disciplines, such as law, medicine, science, and engineering in universities (Chafe 180f.). Before she took the LSAT test, Clinton was insulted and threatened by some male participants in the examination room, who asserted that women should not take part in this test, and that Clinton would ruin a man’s life by taking up his place in law school (Clinton, “Humans of New York”). When she “entered Yale Law School in the fall of 1969” as “one of the twenty-seven women out of 235 students to matriculate,” Clinton came to know “how polarized America’s political landscape had become” (Clinton 44) at a time of increasing visibility of women in the public sphere.
In the latter half of the 20th century, in many cases, women were still not treated as equal in legal and political professions, which prevented women from reaching for power and leadership positions. When Clinton was working as a lawyer on a rape case, a judge asked her to “leave the courtroom” before he sentenced the defendant, arguing that he could not “talk about these things in front of a lady” (Clinton 73). Clinton appropriately answered: “Judge, […] don’t think of me as anything but a lawyer” (Clinton 73). Due to her educational and professional experiences, Hillary Clinton became an urgent advocate of equal educational and professional opportunities for women. As emphasized earlier in this essay, she advocated in her speech in the United Nations Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing in 1995 that “it is no longer acceptable to discuss women’s rights as separate from human rights” and that all nations should make “efforts to improve educational, health, legal and political opportunities for women” (Clinton 80f., 305). Clinton has always drawn on her own experiences to demonstrate that in order to really achieve real power, “the ability or right to control or influence group decision making, including the assignment of leadership roles beyond the household level” (Sanday 114), two factors have to come together: women have to face challenges and overcome obstacles, and society has to provide an equal environment for women to thrive, to participate, and, finally, to lead.

Female Political Leadership in Living History

In Living History, Clinton shares her life experiences chronologically from her childhood to the end of her time as First Lady, connecting the personal to the political with the help of anecdotes. Based on the idea of a gradual accumulation of strength and power over time, this autobiography can be interpreted “as a coming-of-age story of education” as well as “a journey of subjective incorporation as a normative national subject” (Smith 8). On the one hand, Living History follows the didactic tradition of American political autobiographies and provides moral and political instructions for the readers; on the other hand, this autobiography exemplifies the realization of American dream and presents the development of Clinton from an ordinary girl to a female role model and national political figure. The personal experiences at every stage of Clinton’s life are indispensable components in the construction of her identity. Her childhood and teenage experiences, such as facing the bully when she was four years old, participating in social work to help women and children, overcoming the feelings of insecurity and loneliness when she first entered Wellesley, and trying her best to use her professional knowledge to make a difference in her legal and political career, have all contributed to the accumulation of professional skills and inner strength which are essential for the devel-
opment of her leadership styles. This development does not only become apparent in the text, but also in the many photographs inserted in the book. Apart from the front-cover portrait of Clinton, there are about 140 pictures printed in this autobiography - mostly black-and-white - displaying Clinton’s life to the readers. These photos present Clinton as a little girl with her parents and grandparents, as a teenager involved in high school activities, as a hardworking and confident young woman in Wellesley and Yale, as a young and promising lawyer with colleagues, as a wife and mother with her husband and daughter, and more importantly, as the First Lady during her eight years in the White House. The photos in Living History, mostly private ones, are arranged in time order to accompany the written text and to visualize how Clinton gradually turns into a national political figure. Specifically, in those pictures, where Clinton appears as the only women surrounded by a group of male politicians, her role as a female public leader gains immediate visibility and is captured in a strikingly impressive way.

17 In Living History, Clinton links her personal experiences as a woman with her political achievements, to develops her own leadership style, which significantly differ from conventional male-oriented leadership styles. It is worth mentioning that in Clinton’s earlier book It Takes a Village (1996), she has already connected the traditional obligations of women such as “child-rearing” and “housekeeping” to women’s roles as political leaders in public office and political issues concerning the welfare of women and children (Christ 255). In each chapter Clinton links political issues with personal anecdotes, in particular with “her own experience as a mother” (Christ 263-65). She thus “moves from the personal to the political or governmental” by “zooming out from the individual mother and family to the national community and its lawmakers” (Christ 263-65). Similarly, in her second autobiography Hard Choices (2014), Clinton points out that her identity as a woman plays an important part in her leadership style: “I would guess that many leaders choose to ignore the fact that they’re dealing with a woman when they’re dealing with me. But I try not to let them get away with that” (50). In Living History, Clinton gives various examples of how her political beliefs and leadership styles are influenced by her experiences as a woman, a daughter, and a mother. During and after her pregnancy, Clinton does not only emphasize the importance of the birth of her daughter Chelsea as “the most miraculous and awe-inspiring event in [her] life,” but also links this experience to the political issue of women’s welfare during and after pregnancy (Clinton 84):

Bill and I both recognized the need for parental leave, preferable paid. We emerged from our experience committed to ensuring that all parents have the option to stay home with their new born children and to have reliable child care when they return to
work. That’s why I was so thrilled when the first bill he signed as President was the Family and Medical Leave Act. (Clinton 85)

In her analysis of *Living History* Karrin Vasby Anderson notes that “[r]epeatedly, throughout the book, Rodham Clinton suggests that her views on public policy have been shaped by personal interactions” and “connects her personal experiences with specific policy initiatives” (135).

When connecting the personal to the political, Clinton uses distinctly gendered metaphors to explain and describe her political work, indicating a different leadership style. In *Living History*, she chooses the term “Delivery Room” with a double-fold connotation to describe the Health Care program initiated by her and Bill Clinton (Clinton 182). In the political context, “delivery room” refers to the Congress room where the President delivers the Health Care initiative to the Congress members; at the same time the term compares the Health Care program itself to a child waiting to be “delivered” (182, 188). In Clinton's description of the health care project, she tends to consider herself as mother and as carer for those in need:

I spoke to people who temporarily lost their coverage because they switched jobs—which was happening to an average of two million workers each month. I met men and women who discovered they couldn’t get insurance if they had a “a preexisting condition” like cancer or diabetes that was already diagnosed and part of their medical history. Some elderly Americans living on fixed incomes told me they were forced to choose between paying the rent or buying prescription drugs. My father’s hospitalization taught me that even with the best care and support, losing someone you love is indescribably painful. I couldn’t bear thinking how much harder it would be if the loss were avoidable. (Clinton 183)

Since she has the power to change and improve the health care situation for those who are in need of medical support, Clinton takes up responsibility and attempts to raise public awareness on health care issues. At the same time, by referring to the personal experiences of her father’s hospitalization, Clinton can appeal to “shared values” with others and emphasize the need of people as top priority (Rosenthal 5).

To give a second example, Clinton uses the phrase “kitchen table issues” to metaphorically refer to Democratic Party issues during the presidential campaign in 1996:

I thought about to how present the issues I championed and better relate them to the public’s concerns. Countless families, including my own, tend to congregate after school or work to discuss the issues of the day, often sitting around the kitchen table. I began describing Democratic Party issues as “kitchen table issues,” which became a catch-phrase in the campaign. The discussion of kitchen table issues led some Washington pundits to talk derisively about “the feminization of politics,” an attempt to marginalize, even trivialize, policies such as family leave or extended mammogram coverage for older women or adequate hospital stays for mothers after delivering their babies. With that in mind, I coined my own term—“the humanization of politics”—to
publicly advance the idea that kitchen table issues mattered to everybody, not just to women. (Clinton 364)

As Anderson argues, the phrase “the kitchen table issues” integrates “public and private realms” and is “symbolic of women’s experiences” (144). Even though Clinton emphasizes that she coined this phrase to turn the kitchen into a symbolic site of democracy and equality, undermining the traditional binary opposition between the private/domestic and the public/political spheres.

20 Based on the examples in her autobiography, Clinton’s leadership style shows characteristics of “integrative” (Rosenthal 29-30), connective (Lipman-Blumen “Connective Leadership: Managing in a Changing World” 181-83), and “transformational” leadership styles (Rahim 4). Although sharing a similar aim to promote equality, each of these three leadership styles has a distinctively different focus: the integrative style aims to create equal opportunities and share resources; the connective style highlights building networks between different people and platforms; the transformational leadership style focuses on encouraging and inspiring people for change. Firstly, Clinton’s leadership style can be considered as integrative, specifically concerning the welfare of women and those who are in need of help. According to Rosenthal, increasing evidence demonstrates that women’s leadership style can be characterized as “an integrative style,” which is reflected in “sharing power and empowering others, being noncompetitive and inclusive, seeking consensus and mutuality in relationships, and inviting participation rather than imposing dominance” (5). Since they “approach politics with understanding and skills that have been shaped by family, community, volunteerism, and education,” female political leaders often tend to care more about the needs of others and create equal opportunities for people to share information and resources (Rosenthal 161). In both examples referred to in this essay, the “delivery room” as well as the “kitchen table,” Clinton’s leadership style of “[c]aring,” “[b]eing involved,” “[h]elping,” and “[b]eing responsible” thus undermines the unreflected association of leadership with masculine power (Helgesen 21).

21 Secondly, Clinton also draws on a connective leadership style. The main features of a connective leadership style are to take others’ perspectives into account aiming at the creation of networks and platforms for people, instead of fostering “competitiveness” and “individualism” (Lipman-Blumen 200). According to recent analysis, female political leaders often use “more democratic,” “effective,” and “connective” leadership methods and try their best to be “contributory” by considering “the needs of others above [their] own” (Eagly 9; Lipman-Blumen 200; Eagly and Carli 814). In the case of the delivery room, Clinton focuses on peo-
people’s needs of health care and tries to develop networks and platforms for people to exchange ideas and voice their needs.

22 Thirdly, Clinton’s also draws on a transformational leadership style. According to Peter G. Northouse, the transformational leadership “is a process that changes and transforms people” on personal or cultural levels (185-86). The transformational leadership style aims to “stimulate and inspire followers” to reach their goals and discover their own strengths through “idealized influence,” “inspirational motivation,” “intellectual stimulation,” and “individualized consideration” (Bass and Riggio n.p.). According to Burns, this leadership style creates more interactions between people and has a “transforming effect” on both the leader and the followers (Burns 20), thus “[raising] the level of motivation and morality” (Northouse 186). Using a transformational leadership style, the leader often actively engages with the followers, considers the followers’ benefits as of great significance, and helps the followers to “reach their fullest potential” (Northouse 186).

23 In both examples discussed, Clinton’s leadership style reflects most of the features above, specifically those of inspiring, motivating, and stimulating people. In particular, Clinton’s leadership style conveys the transformational message which encourages women to break down the invisible barriers which limit their impact on the public sphere. Clinton's argument that her use of the phrase “kitchen table issues” does not aim at “the feminization” but rather “the humanization of politics”(Clinton 364) highlights her interest in tackling the problem of gender stereotypes in the political field, and encourages women to overcome gender bias in politics. Moreover, by using the term “kitchen table issues” with reference to political issues, Clinton “publicly advance[s]” the idea “kitchen table issues [matter] to everybody, not just to women” (Clinton 364). This echoes the feminist belief that “the Personal is the Political” to advocate a more democratic and equal society (Clinton 364).

Conclusion

24 In Living History, Hillary Clinton utilizes “personal narratives” to connect the personal with the political, and demonstrates her political objective as a female political leader to “[making a] commitment to women’s active leadership, to making a difference for all” (Marshall and Mayhead 185f.). By telling the stories of her own empowerment, Clinton not only criticizes the invisible barriers existing in American society, but also points out the necessity of a combined contribution from the private sphere as well as the public sphere to create equal opportunities for women to break through the glass ceiling and become political leaders. Therefore, influenced by her personal experiences concerning women and empowerment,
Clinton’s own leadership draws on integrative, connective, and transformational leadership styles. These three leadership styles reflect Clinton’s aim at overcoming gender stereotypes and constructing a more equal and democratic social environment, for the benefit not only of women but every citizen. Drawing on the notion of the private as the political Clinton can emphasize the importance of her roles as a woman/daughter/wife/mother for her political agenda, and raise people’s awareness of the detrimental effect of gender inequality as well as other forms of inequality for the general social make-up. A short passage from Clinton’s concession speech after the 2016 Presidential Election summarizes her belief in female power and leadership, which, in spite of current obstacles and setbacks, will prevail:

Finally, I am so grateful for our country and for all it has given to me. I count my blessings every single day that I am an American. And I still believe as deeply as I ever have that if we stand together and work together with respect for our differences, strength in our convictions and love for this nation, our best days are still ahead of us. Because, you know—you know, I believe we are stronger together and we will go forward together. And you should never, ever regret fighting for that. (Clinton, “Read”)
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