

Gender in US Politics

Hantong Li¹

¹Wellesley High School

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses the impact of gender stereotypes on American female politicians. To demonstrate this problem, the paper will start by examining the struggles that female politicians face in their political careers because of their gender, focusing on their campaign strategies, political image, etc. This paper will then use the political life of Democratic candidate Hillary Clinton as a more specific example of the impact of gender bias. The “double bind” that Clinton has faced as a woman and a politician has negatively impacted her political campaigns. Gender stereotypes have also conditioned the media and the public’s response to her. Through focusing on the “evolutions” of Clinton’s political strategies throughout her career, this paper argues that Hillary Clinton has always grappled with gender stereotypes. However, even when she addressed criticisms that she faced in the past, she still failed to meet voters’ demands.

Introduction: Gender Stereotypes in American Politics and the Political Career of Hillary Clinton

The United States’ political field has never been an equal platform for both men and women, as evidenced by the domination of male incumbents in the political field. This phenomenon is verifiable in the earliest years of American politics, into the present day. Historically, women were largely excluded from political participation in the US until the second half of the 20th century. During the past decades, although the number of female politicians has increased significantly, women are still dramatically outnumbered by men. This is particularly true of higher-level offices, such as the offices of president and vice president. Recent scholarship on gender and political access suggests that this is largely due to the negative stereotypes that persist about female politicians in American society, in the media, and in the political arena.

Hillary Clinton’s more than forty years of political experience reflects this lingering problem. Her career as a public figure, from the First Lady of Arkansas to when she became the first female Democratic nominee in the 2016 presidential election, has been hindered by gender stereotypes and bias against female politicians. As a woman searching for power, Clinton has had to balance voters’ expectations regarding her gender with their assumptions that the characteristics of a powerful political leader are “masculine” traits.¹ Because of this “double bind” Clinton has been criticized for insufficiently showcasing one side of her identity or the other. Despite actively reflecting on her past campaigns and changing elements of her political presentation that was deemed unacceptable and unqualifying by some voters, even up to the 2016 election Clinton still grappled with the public’s expectations on her identity as a woman with power.

General Features of Gender Stereotyping and Their Constraints on Female Politicians

For much of U.S history, both men and women have been characterized with different traits and capabilities that are based on their social roles. However, such stereotypes have been impacted by the power imbalance between men and

women. Traditionally, women have been seen as taking the role of the homemakers, and accordingly have had less social, economic, and political power than men. Men, on the other hand have benefited from being earners and having more economic and political power.² As a result, the different social roles and degrees of power that men and women in the US experienced have translated into “a set of beliefs about the competence and traits” of each respective group, or gender stereotypes.³ Gender stereotyping is defined as “ideas and beliefs about what women and men are like, what abilities they possess, and what behaviors and activities are appropriate for each.”⁴ For instance, women are expected to be “more compassionate and gentle.”⁵ On the other hand, men are valued for being “tougher and more aggressive.”⁶ These gender stereotypes then impact the expectations that people have about men and women. While such gender stereotypes impose constraints on both men and women alike, they are especially limiting to the latter group when it comes to men and women’s access to power.

While women have had increased participation in US politics in recent years, researchers highlight how their underrepresentation in politics as largely due to the impact of gender stereotypes, in particular those that pose a “double bind” to women. Marilyn Frye, in chapter “Oppression” of her work *The Politics of Reality: Essays in Feminist Theory*, defines “double bind” as “situations in which options are reduced to a very few and all of them expose one to penalty, censure or deprivation.”⁷ Frye explains that “double bind” is a typical feature that oppressed people, such as women, experience. For example, both women who engage in and refrain from sexual activities with the opposite sex are criticized. Frye writes that if a woman is sexually active, she could easily be perceived as easy and loose. In contrast, women who refrain from such activities are subject to constant harassment by men, who, if they are rejected, might label those women as “‘frigid,’ ‘uptight,’ ‘man-hater.’”⁸ This example that Frye presents demonstrates the conflicting expectations people have about women’s behaviors. Despite supposedly having two options, women are doomed to be condemned regardless of their decisions.

This “double bind” is particularly salient in the experiences of women in politics as voters carry gender stereotypes of men and women to how they perceive male and female politicians. This includes candidates’ political images, their assumed political expertise, etc. One issue is that the traits that are typically associated with female politicians contrast sharply with what voters expect of a powerful leader. This double bind, as Karrin Anderson summarizes, is due to “disjunction between the demands of femininity and social definitions of competence and leadership.”⁹ Thus, women in power have to adopt both “masculine” and “feminine” traits to be seen as societal acceptable, to fulfill the social expectations of a woman and those of a typical political candidate.

Female politicians are also seen as less competitive than their male counterparts because of gender stereotypes that define them as weak. This obstacle has impacted the roles of women throughout U.S political history. According to Kathleen Dolan, the exclusion of women from politics was due to “widespread beliefs that they did not possess the requisite skills and abilities to be successful in politics.”¹⁰ She also writes that “politics were seen as corrosive and antithetical to women’s nature.”¹¹ Due to gender stereotypes that tend to associate women with powerlessness and softness, female politicians are assumed to lack qualities needed for successful political leaders.

Even today when more women are actively participating in the political field and overcoming the stereotypes, gender continues to play a role in political campaigns, particularly that of high-powered roles such as the President. For example, Anderson remarks that in Elizabeth Dole’s run for the President, her gender was emphasized by the media to play upon voters’ fear of having a woman to lead the country. This demonstrates, according to Anderson, that “although women are making strides in other realms of public governance, the U.S presidency remains a bastion of masculinity.”¹² In addition to skepticism about women’s ability to lead, voters also hold assumptions about female politicians’ competency and interest in political issues related to their gender roles. Such assumptions reinforce the differences between male and female politicians. By associating female politicians with “feminine” political strategies that they are expected to practice, voters highlight their assumption that women are less qualified to become successful leaders than male politicians. For instance, female candidates are expected to be more adept at policies such as “handling social issues and holding down government spending.”¹³ Because traditionally, women are expected to be housewives and skilled in taking care of the family, this led to the conclusion about all female politicians that they should be familiar with handling political domestic issues as well.¹⁴ Gender stereotype perpetuate the imbalance between the

number of male and female incumbents because voters do not associate female candidates with political traits that are considered to be necessary for a leader. The options of female candidates' campaign strategies are limited as those who practice such stereotypes might be perceived as uncompetitive and those who do not might be considered as "unfeminine." Women in politics struggle to push back against these enduring stereotypes and prove they are qualified to lead.

Male candidates, on the other hand, are less constrained by gendered assumptions about their political abilities because they are stereotyped as possessing "masculine" attributions that voters favor. This is perhaps due to long-established gender roles that encouraged men to participate in politics. Thus, regardless of their abilities, voters perceive men as more qualified candidates. As a result, jobs that require leadership are associated with traits that are connected to masculinity, and "feminine" traits are less valued, particularly positions in the national level.¹⁵ Male politicians are also linked with political abilities that would portray them as more powerful. For example, they are assumed to be "more effective at dealing with military and trade issues."¹⁶ This is largely because men are traditionally granted higher social power than women; they are expected to take a more active role in political participation, which leads to the assumption about their familiarity and their competency with foreign and domestic issues that require leadership and good judgment. Thus, male candidates are considered to be more qualified than their female counterparts because of these gendered attributions regarding men and women.

As a result of societal expectations that favor "masculine" traits in the political field, women running for the office confront a "double bind" regarding their political image. Female politicians have to possess the requisite "masculine" traits to counter stereotypes about their lack of governing skills; they also have to adopt the "feminine" traits to indicate they are aware of their gender identity. However, traits that people expect of a leader conflict with what people expect of a woman: adopting one set of gendered traits leads to the violation of another. In order to meet both expectations, female candidates have to find "a balance between agentic, masculine behavior and communal feminine behavior."¹⁷ Though, if one side is insufficiently showcased, female candidates are subject to negative judgments on their candidacy. Those who emphasize their ability to lead by adopting traits of their male counterparts are subject to criticism about whether they are "good women." Meanwhile, female candidates who downplay their "masculine" side and portray a traditionally "feminine" persona are subject to skepticism about their candidacy.

Gender stereotypes limit female candidates' political strategies because they have to avoid appearing overly "masculine" or "feminine." This "double bind" reduces their campaign decisions only to those that meet the demand of voters. For example, as Dolan observes, "campaign strategists often advise women candidates to avoid negative advertising and attack ads, since a negative approach is inconsistent with public stereotypes of women as 'nicer' than men."¹⁸ When attacked in political ads by a competing political candidate, female politicians must decide whether to defend themselves or risk damaging their own branding. A fear is that they might be perceived as too aggressive and therefore not "female" enough. However, if they do not address their critiques, voters might view them as weak and unable to respond to political pressure.

Female politicians are also more severely attacked and judged based upon their physical qualities. This is due to the way that voters assess women based more on how they look rather than what they do. Gender stereotypes reduce women to people who only matters because of their physical presentation. When Christine Quinn ran for the mayor of New York in 2013, her voice and identity indirectly led to her loss. John A. Catsimatidis, a Republican candidate expressed disapproval on her voice by commenting, "Nice lady, but if I have to listen to that voice for four years, I'll die."¹⁹ People identified her with qualities such as "drive, ambition, toughness," all considered the so-called masculine traits; most importantly, some voters did not like her simply because she was openly lesbian, which all contradicted with the image of a conventional women.²⁰ Quinn's political advisors and her girlfriend Diana L. Taylor all advised her to change her political persona and physical presentation to what was more socially acceptable. However, Quinn was resistant to making a change because she was determined not to let her gender and identity be a central part of her campaign. She said, "'I don't get up in the morning thinking about how I'll approach this as a woman or a lesbian; I think about the issues.'"²¹ Ultimately, she lost the election, losing the initial lead and eventually trailing behind male politician Bill de Blasio.

This example demonstrates how Christine Quinn was trapped by gender stereotypes that posed a “double bind” to her campaign. When she was unwilling to conform to voters’ expectations, she faced the risk of losing the election. However, if she listened, she was compromising her beliefs that she should focus on her competence and accomplishments instead of her identity. Though Quinn successfully preserved her identity, the consequences of her masculinity was clear; as Gloria Steinem, a supporter of Christine Quinn concluded, “If you are tough enough to run New York City, you’re too tough to be considered acceptably feminine.”²² American society, at that time, did not accept a female politician with multiple unconventional labels.

Women running for political office also face more invasive questions than men about their personal lives from the media, who tend focus on the issue of family. The public is more concerned about their personal and family lives rather than the political issues that are part of their campaign platforms. By way of example, the following case of Kelly Ayotte demonstrates how female politicians are expected to handle their family roles. In 2010, Kelly Ayotte, when running for an open U.S Senate seat, had to respond to such concerns. In an interview, Ayotte was asked whether she was able to balance the time she spent on the political field and her time with her family so that she could be a good mother to her two children.²³ US voters expect female candidates to acknowledge their traditional social role in a family household even when they are active in politics. Though a personal and un-politically related question, female candidates are expected to be able to speak to how they juggle both the traditional roles ascribed to women, as wives and mothers, and their professional responsibilities. As a woman with a family, the media was concerned about whether Ayotte could fulfill her role as a public servant and as the mother of two young children.

Even female politicians who are single and childless are asked this similar set of questions regarding their personal lives. There are often interrogation about women’s decisions about having or not having a family, and their work in politics for families. In this same year, when running for the governor of Oklahoma, Jari Askins was asked whether she could understand the welfare and concerns of average Oklahoma family based on her experience as a single, childless woman.²⁴ Though Askins claimed Oklahoma’s continuing budget challenge was the main reason why she decided to run for the office, the media still questioned about her ability to handle family issues.²⁵ The public seemed to think that family related issues should be prioritized in Askins’s political campaign simply because she is a woman. And, because of her experience as a single, childless woman, the media was critical of her ability to best support and protect families in Oklahoma. Both examples show that the public often expect female politicians, whether they are single, to only care about issues relating to the family or the household economy. This shows a twofold problem: those with family are expected to show that they are committed to their family, which can be seen to undermine their desire to lead a life devoted to public office. In contrary, those do not have a family are seen to be lacking the experience needed to care for and fight for the families of others.

On the other hand, women running for office have to anticipate criticism about them being unfit for office because of their assumed “weakness” in politics, whereas male candidates do not have such concerns because voters do not associate them with such qualities. To demonstrate to the public that they are qualified and able to handle responsibilities of political office, women who are politicians are obligated to highlight their “masculine” sides. Common strategies of showcasing such leadership qualities include emphasizing one’s toughness and decisiveness in campaigns. Dolan concludes that “women appeared in their own campaign ads more often than men, dressed professionally, emphasized their positions on policies, and worked to present themselves as possessing competence and leadership.”²⁶ Female candidates also tend to highlight their competency in handling political issues such as trade or military spending. For example, Hillary Clinton’s request to serve on the Senate Armed Services was a strategic move to demonstrate that she could handle military issues.²⁷ In addition, during Diane Feinstein’s campaign for governor of California in 1990, she evoked her political experience that she served as the President of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors when two of its members, Mayor George Moscone and Supervisor Harvey Milk, were assassinated. Dolan argues that this was a way for Feinstein to “demonstrate her leadership and strength in a chaotic time,” meaning she was able to remain composed and make critical decisions during a crisis.²⁸ These examples showcase that while male candidates seem to inherit the ability to lead, and have to “prove us wrong by messing up,” female candidates have to

“prove us wrong by doing the job well.”²⁹ Because of these preconceptions about the role of women, female politicians face additional challenges that male politicians do not experience during their political career.

The Impact of Gender Stereotypes on Hillary Clinton’s Career

With this backdrop in mind, Hillary Clinton’s more than four-decade-long political career, perhaps best, reflects challenges that female politicians face as a result of gender stereotypes. Long known for being “tough” and “elitist,” Hillary Clinton’s lack of “feminine” traits has been targeted by voters and the media throughout her life as a public figure from 1979 to the present day.³⁰ She has been constantly judged through the lens of gender stereotypes regarding her marriage and family life, her physical appearance, speech, and dress, and also her political decisions. To address gender bias, Hillary Clinton has to compromise her feminist ideals and adopt political strategies that conform to what American society expects of a woman in political office.

As will be demonstrated, Hillary Clinton’s two campaigns for the office of US President in 2008 and 2016 presents how she worked to balance the so-called feminine and masculine traits in her branding and political messaging. A comparison of Clinton’s campaign strategies in these two elections and when she was the First Lady reflects how her campaign learned from past mistakes. The 2016 campaign strategy was more proactive in demonstrating that Clinton was able to play both the role of a “woman” (as conforming to gender bias of this role in US society) and to be a powerful and decisive political leader (traits, often ascribed the men in political office). However, despite being experienced and a qualified candidate for this office, gender bias still hindered her path to political victory. Gender bias hampered her presidential campaigns, more recently to Republican candidate Donald Trump in the 2016 presidential election.

Gender Bias and the Evolution of Hillary Clinton’s Name

One critical issue that plagued Clinton’s political life has been her use of her maiden name, Rodham, her husband’s last name, Clinton, and even her first name, Hilary. The first controversy surrounding her name choice involved her retention of her maiden name when Bill Clinton was the Governor of Arkansas. After marrying to Bill Clinton for ten years, Clinton kept her maiden name, Rodham, which she described as a decision to “preserve my pre-Bill identity.”³¹ Her decision, however, as Clinton recounted in her autobiography, provoked many voters who thought that she should adopt her husband’s last name. Ultimately, Clinton viewed this issue as a main reason why her husband lost election for the office of the governor of Arkansas in 1980. She writes: “When he lost, and I heard over and over that my name--my name! ---had played a part, I was heartsick that I might have inadvertently hurt my husband and let down his team... So I added “Clinton” to Hillary Rodham.”³² In order to meet voters’ expectations, Clinton compromised: she still kept her name Hillary Rodham yet she added Bill Clinton’s last name. Her new political identify was now: Hilary Rodham Clinton. As Michael Kruse of the *Politico Magazine* writes, “For her own career, she wanted to be Hillary Rodham. For her husband’s career, she had to be Hillary [Rodham] Clinton.”³³ Ultimately, Hillary Clinton chose to balance between her feminist ideals, her husband’s career and her family. Her choice seemed to have positively impacted her husband’s second campaign for the Governor of Arkansas. When Bill Clinton ran again in 1982, announcing that his wife would now go by Hillary Rodham Clinton, he won. It cannot be concluded that the name played the definitive role in this outcome; however, it certainly played an important role in their messaging to voters about their relationship and Clinton’s willingness to accommodate the expectations of voters.

During this episode in Clinton’s political life, it is clear that gender bias played an important role in her decision to change her name. Hillary Clinton’s maiden name led to her husband’s loss because it was considered unconventional for a married woman, especially the wife of a politician. It was in “violation” of societal norms about the relationship between husbands and wives. In marital relationships in the US, “a woman [has] to be identified in relationship to a man,” and her subordination to her husband is more valued than her qualifications or what she does.³⁴

A woman adopting the last name of her husband is an indication that she has changed from a “woman” to a “wife,” which signals the transformation of her social role, yet, men are not subject to his change in identity after marriage.³⁵ When Hillary Clinton chose to go by her maiden name, she demonstrated independence from her husband. Hillary Clinton chose not to be defined as a subordinate to her husband or to his political career; to the contrary, she took an active role in Bill Clinton’s political team. To voters, however, her self-identification as a career-oriented person, a woman, wife, and feminist were at odds with the ideal of a socially conventional woman, who should play a more supporting role to her husband.

For a woman, keeping her surname after marriage can influence people’s perceptions toward both her and her husband, and often negatively. Hillary Clinton’s maiden was deemed socially unacceptable because of its “masculine” and “feminine” evocations. Research has shown that when women keep their maiden name after marriage, people tend to associate both partners in the relationship with traits that are non-traditional. People view women keeping their surnames as closer to “masculine” traits typically associated with men, such as “ambitious,” “power-wielding,” and “assertive.”³⁶ On the other hand, their husbands are perceived as less powerful, possessing “feminine” traits that are typically assigned to women. Thus, Clinton’s decision to keep her maiden name after marriage impacted her political identity and that of her husband.

Clinton Developing Her Name as Part of Her Political Strategy

After recognizing how her name influenced voters’ perceptions of her and her husband in 1980, Clinton became savvy about how to adapt her name to the current political climate. When she ran as the presidential candidate in 2008, she ran as Hillary Clinton; when she became the Secretary of State in 2009, she used the name Hillary Rodham Clinton. Janell Ross summarized her evolving name as part of her political strategy: when “a more traditional naming pattern might be a matter of protocol of politically advantageous---capable of helping her play down the traits for which she is most often criticized---she is Hillary Clinton”; when “there was no risk of voter backlash, she’s Hillary Rodham Clinton.”³⁷ In other words, Clinton’s name was not neutral but was an important part of her political branding.

The controversy around Clinton’s last name is more prominent from the lens of the double bind that women who are politicians face. During the 2016 Presidential Election, Clinton used her first name in an unique way to distance herself from her husband’s political career. Hillary Clinton presented herself as just “Hillary” on her campaign website.³⁸ Voters and medias also called her by her first name rather than with her last name.³⁹ There are several reasons behind the rebranding of Clinton’s persona as “Hilary” rather than Hilary Rodham Clinton or Hilary Clinton. Hillary Clinton’s decision to drop her middle and last name was an intentional strategy to present her as more approachable. Calling a presidential candidate by his or her last name is not a common practice, as it often suggests disrespect and patronization.⁴⁰ Erik Sherman writes, by referring to herself as “Hillary,” Clinton hoped to “[create] the aura of a regular person – a friend,” which would help counter the prolonged history of her being perceived as “distant and secretive and elitist.”⁴¹ By using her first name, Clinton was “trying to be more friendly, congenial” and to counter claims that “she was too stiff in 2008.”⁴² This analysis is corroborated by sociolinguist Robin Lakoff’s work “Language and Woman’s Place.” Lakoff argues that referring to a woman by her first name implies familiarity, equality, and perhaps superiority with the addressee.⁴³ In other words, referring to the candidate by her first name “Hillary” was a strategy to counter her previous overly “masculine,” or professional political persona. “Hillary” made herself look more approachable and personable to her audience; this image, also, conformed more to traits of comfort and familiarity that are often associated with traits of a female family member or a friend. Clinton’s emphasis on her warmth enabled her to play up her femininity without abandoning her toughness on political issues.

By using the name “Hillary,” Clinton’s campaign team also sought to distance her from Bill Clinton’s negative legacy. By self-identifying by her first name, in her official branding, Hillary Clinton positioned herself as an independent politician. Rachel Weingarten argues that the use of “Hillary” ensured people could refer to the candidate without each time evoking ties to her husband Bill Clinton, who contributed to Hillary Clinton’s unpopularity as a candidate because of the allegations against him regarding sexual misconduct.⁴⁴ As people often connect Hillary

Clinton negatively with her husband's affairs, referring her by her first name alone could minimize the associations with the scandal. Moreover, this strategy also portrayed her as a more independent female candidate whose identity is not given "by virtue of their relationship with the men," as what the surname Clinton might suggest.⁴⁵ Hillary Clinton's strategy to go by her first name expressed her feminist ideals in much the same way that her maiden name did in the 1980s, yet in perhaps a more socially acceptable way.

However, going by "Hillary" alone also resulted in attacks about whether her political strategy was appropriate. Many voters considered addressing her by her first name as showing a lack of respect for the political office that she was aspiring to hold. John Mosier of New York City openly expressed that this practice is dismissive to Clinton: "I think it generally cheapens the image of the candidate."⁴⁶ Moreover, others believed calling a woman by her first name reflects a more serious problem about gender. Laura F. Edwards, a professor at Duke University who studies gender, argues "all this gets to the point that women had no public identities of their own."⁴⁷ Women who keep their surnames are still defined in relation to men, either their fathers or husbands, while those who drop their surnames indicates their independence. Hillary Clinton, as a female politician living under gaze of voters, had to balance being perceived a more traditional woman and self-identifying with her husband's last name, or being connected to scandals connected to his political career. She ultimately chose to redefine herself politically, by de-emphasizing her last name, Clinton. The path that she chose, however, was seen as breaking with tradition and opened her to a new range of critiques.

Gender Stereotypes and Social Subordination

The example of the controversy surrounding Clinton's name offers a narrower case study for the way in which gender bias has impacted her political life. This gender bias also impacted her entire political strategy when she became a politician in her own right, following Bill Clinton's presidency. Firstly, gender stereotypes influenced Hillary Clinton's role as First Lady during her husband Bill Clinton's early political career. As discussed, Hilary Clinton's feminist values were at odds with the voters' expectation of how the wife of a politician should behave.

When Bill Clinton ran for President in 1992, Hillary Clinton continued her professional life as a lawyer. Voters and the media raised concerns about Clinton's ability to be a supported spouse and a mother, and balance her professional life. In short, she deviated from social expectations about the role of a wife of a politician and this resulted in negative press. At the primaries, Bill Clinton's political opponent Jerry Brown attacked accused Bill Clinton for "funneling money through his wife's law firm for state business."⁴⁸ His accusation drew attention to Hillary Clinton's job as a lawyer, which was unconventional comparing to other first ladies. To defend for her independence and rights, Hilary Clinton pushed back: "I suppose I could have stayed home and baked cookies and had teas, but what I decided to do was to fulfill my profession, which I entered before my husband was in public life."⁴⁹ Hillary Clinton said this to advocate for women's rights to pursue their career after marriage; her argument was that women have no obligations to give up their careers, but can and should be able to be ambitious and successful at their chosen professions. However, her remark aroused outrage. Many perceived Clinton's retort as an insult against American mothers and traditional values about the role of women in the family.

In the letter section of the April 20, 1992, edition of the Time Magazine, American women openly expressed their rage. Voter June Connerton of Princeton wrote: "If I ever entertained the idea of voting for Bill Clinton, the smug bitchiness of his wife's comment has nipped that notion in the bud."⁵⁰ Unfortunately, she was not the only one. Homemakers like Cindy Berg of La Crosse added: "I resent the implication that those of us who stay at home just bake cookies. We hardly have the time!"⁵¹ These reactions suggest that holding feminist values and being independent were seen as contradicting with the expectations of traditional women, especially for a public figure. Hillary Clinton's controversial comments also raise the issue of whether it was appropriate for a woman to continue pursue her career after marriage: Clinton's role in her relationship with Bill Clinton was questioned. Though ultimately, Bill Clinton was still elected as the 42nd President of the United States, Hillary Clinton's baking cookie comment continues to haunt to her even today. For instance, the *Family Circle* magazine launched the presidential cookie competition

after Clinton's baking cookie comment in 1992, in which it published cookie recipes from the candidates' wives.⁵² In 2016, Bill Clinton was even asked to share his chocolate cookie recipe when Hillary Clinton won a major political party.⁵³ Nearly thirty-five years after her comment, Clinton still had to justify how she worked to balance her family and her professional and political life.

Hillary Clinton Adopted a More "Masculine" Persona to Avoid Attacks

Gender stereotypes continued to haunt Clinton's career even when she became a candidate herself and learned from her mistakes. As a politician striving for power, Clinton became more adept at balancing her feminist ideals with meeting voters' expectations of what it means to be a woman and a strong leader. Her political success was therefore contingent on how she grappled with the "double bind." Clinton and her campaign team primarily focused addressing the gender stereotype that view women as weak leaders, intentionally branding her as a tough politician who possess so-called "masculine" traits of confidence, directness, and a tough attitude. Clinton, consequently, downplayed her identity as a wife and a mother. Prior to the 2008 election, an anonymous Republican insider in a survey even called her "a man among boys," pointing out her manlike political persona.⁵⁴ During the 2008 campaign, she was even described by Governor Mike Easley of North Carolina as someone "who makes Rocky Balboa look like a pansy."⁵⁵

However, Clinton was perhaps too successful. Her political ambitions faced setbacks because her "masculine" image contradicted with what voters associate with a traditional role of women. In her autobiography *What Happened* Clinton discusses the challenge in balancing voter expectations about the role of women and the qualities of a leader: "[I]t's not customary to have women lead or even engage in the rough-and-tumble of politics... So when it happens, it often doesn't feel quite right."⁵⁶ Women lack the role models in politics, thus when Clinton appeared to be unconventional and to present herself as a confident leader, those who adhered to a traditional view of women pushed back against it. Such voters and media personalities and even politicians described her as being inauthentic, calculating, secretive, and guarded.⁵⁷

Gender Bias and Hillary Clinton's Composure

Despite experiencing setbacks prior to the 2008 presidential election, Hillary Clinton did not step away from building her "masculine" persona. Rather than avoiding from being perceived as calculating or guarded, Clinton and her campaign team continued to portray her as a tough candidate. Her strategy was in fact successful: showcasing her strength. According to a poll in the May of 2008, voters equalized Clinton's toughness to that of Arizona's Senator John McCain, a veteran and a prisoner of North Vietnam for almost six years who was tortured but refused to submit.⁵⁸ To achieve this, Clinton worked to hide her emotions to keep a calm and confident composure, a strategy she described as her suit of armor.⁵⁹ Before 2008, she had never let go of her emotions, not to mention crying in the public. Yet, due to her overly-composed persona, voters also wanted to see more of Clinton's human, "feminine" side. Her coldness was the target of voters' attack. Clinton wrote that she remembered being asked by medias and voters over and over about "Who are you really?" and "What is she hiding?"⁶⁰ The tough and strong image that Clinton built contradicted with her identity as a woman, who are assumed to be sympathetic with other people's experiences and thus tend to show her emotion more often.

Though voters longed wanted Hillary Clinton to show her softer, "feminine" side, when the moment came, many still deemed her image as inconsistent with what is expected of a woman in politics. People's perceptions of Hillary Clinton came to a turning point when she teared up on the eve of the primary on January 7th 2008 at a New Hampshire coffee shop. She was surrounded by a group of reporters and voters, and one woman asked her how she managed to keep "upbeat" and "wonderful."⁶¹ Clinton responded with her eyes growing red and a shaky voice that it was not easy but she believed it was the "right thing to do" and would continue to fight for the nation.⁶² Longed known for being cold and distant, Clinton's tears suddenly grabbed all the attention. Many voters claimed that it humanized her, making her appear more vulnerable and more appealing; a voter from Newington, after seeing Clinton showing

her tears, commented that “‘It got me. I wanted to see who the real Hillary was. That was real.’”⁶³ On one hand, Hillary Clinton’s display of emotions offset her lack of “feminine” traits.

However, her moment also hurt her political persona---she was seen as lacking strength to lead the country. Rather than acknowledging that Clinton had shown her “feminine” side, critics equated her show of emotions as a sign of weakness. A supporter of then-candidate-Obama wrote to the *New York Times* that Clinton did not qualify for Presidency, “‘If she is breaking down now, before winning her party’s nomination, then how would she act under pressure as president?’”⁶⁴ During the election, Clinton was “forced” to present herself as emotionally stable despite learning from the past that she could be seen as “unfeminine” and a distant figure. Initially, her qualification was measured through what others expect of a woman, in which she was seen as unconventional because she hesitated to show her emotions. However, when she did show her emotions, her candidacy was undermined because her qualification was measured through the expectation of a composed political leader. As seen from this example of the double-bind, an emotionally stable female politician is not “female” enough, yet a female politician who does show her emotions is not “male” enough.

Furthermore, some characterized this teary moment as a calculated part of Clinton’s political strategy. Many argued that it was con, that she intended to tear up to counter previous criticisms about her lack of emotions. For instance, William Kristol, the editor of the *Weekly Standard* and the *Times’s* newest Op-Ed columnist, believed that Hillary Clinton “pretended to cry.”⁶⁵ The medias held biased viewpoints as well: an article from *The New Yorker* described the interview as planned “with a group of ‘undecided voters’” and *Newsweek* characterized the question as “designed to woo undecided voters.”⁶⁶ Whether Clinton truly intended to cry remained unknown, but such skepticism were never held toward male politicians.⁶⁷ These comments also undermine a woman’s image more than to that of a man. The perception of calculating challenges how people typically perceive women as honest individuals but do not challenge the perceptions of men.

Voters held a double bind regarding Hillary Clinton’s image that constrained her strategies. On one hand, if Clinton controlled her emotions to avoid appearing too weak to handle the job of a President, voters criticized her as fake and cold. On the other hand, if Clinton appeared emotional, voters perceived it as a sign of her inability to handle important decisions, and others even argued that her emotions were part of her political strategy. Clinton’s insufficient femininity never ceased to influence her political campaign. Even in the 2016 Presidential Election, voters still focused on her image. For instance, *Newsweek* and *Washington Post’s* headlines published in 2015 and 2016 read, “Hillary Should Play Up Her Feminine Side” and “Is She Likeable Enough.”⁶⁸ In addition to overcoming concerns about her qualification, which the “masculine” traits represented, she also had to balance her image through adopting the “feminine” traits, a challenge that only women who are politicians face.

Clinton Intentionally Showcased Her Military Skills to Avoid Attacks

During the 2008 election, Hillary Clinton’s attempt to show her military strength was also attacked because of the clash between her political image and gender stereotypes of a woman. When Clinton was still the Senator of New York, in 2002, she voted for the US to authorize war on Iraq to prevent terrorism. The war resulted in thousands of deaths on both sides, and in 2004, the Bush administration acknowledged that Iraq did not have any ties to WMDs nor Al-Qaida; yet she was slow to change her position on the invasion of Iraq. Clinton insisted it was “the right vote,” and that she didn’t “regret giving the President authority.”⁶⁹ Taking advantage of her show of military weakness during the election, many of her political opponents hammered on her decision and played upon her “mistake” as a way to undermine her campaign. As *The Atlantic* reported, her political opponent Bernie Sanders attacked Clinton “for her lack of ‘judgment’ when it came to what he characterized as the most important foreign-policy decision of a generation.”⁷⁰ This issue also raised concerns among voters about her ability to make decisions. According to a poll from August 2007, 81% of Democratic voters also said the war was a mistake, meaning the majority of Democratic voters held a political view in contrary of that of Hillary Clinton.⁷¹ In response, Clinton apologized during the election: “I made it very clear that I made a mistake, plain and simple.”⁷² Though Clinton did not explain her decision in any way

gender-related, Susan Carroll suggested that “Clinton campaign operatives appeared to be aware of gender stereotypes and to have constructed the campaign in part to counter these stereotypes.”⁷³ Carroll refers to gender stereotypes of women being weak on military issues, Carroll explained, if Clinton renounced her decision, she could easily come across as being weak and indecisive.⁷⁴ In other words, Hillary Clinton was concerned that she would be seen as lacking the requisite skills of a political leader. Hillary Clinton’s military decision in 2002 and the criticisms in the 2008 election about her vote reflect the double bind that faces female politicians. If she did not authorize the war in Iraq, she would be seen as lacking military skills, what voters generally perceive of female politicians. However, when Clinton changed her position, as did other politicians in the aftermath of this war, she was accused of being incapable of making correct decisions that a qualified US President should be able to.

Conclusion

This study examined gender bias in the US in the current political field. Female candidates tend to face greater challenges in their political careers than their male counterparts because of gender stereotypes. Each gender group is associated with distinct qualities: men are assumed to possess “masculine” traits, which are connected by many to competence and leadership; women are associated with “feminine” traits, which are seen in opposition to the characteristics of a strong political leader. As a consequence, men are seen by many to be more suited to political office than women politicians. And yet, women who highlight their “masculine” traits are criticized for not being model women. For this reason, women grapple with a “double bind” when they run for political office. They must demonstrate that they possess both “masculine” and “feminine” traits in order to win voters’ support. This constraint undermines female candidates’ path to power as they have to align their campaigns in accordance with such gender stereotypes.

The political career of Democratic politician Hillary Clinton especially demonstrates the double bind that women who are politicians experience in the political arena. Throughout her career as a public figure, Clinton faced extensive attacks from voters about how her political image was not in concordance with what they wanted to see in a woman or a political figure. Even with her more than forty years of political experience, Clinton still grappled with the constructs of gender in her political campaigns for the office of president. The double bind that Clinton had to balance her “masculine” and “feminine” qualities influenced her political strategies and voters’ perceptions of her. By actively reflecting upon and improving on her past “mistakes,” Clinton worked to portray herself as a qualified leader. As demonstrated through the evolutions of her campaign strategies, Clinton and her campaign strategists worked to balance her so-called masculine and feminine qualities. However, she still failed to meet voters’ expectations. She lost both the 2008 and 2016 presidential elections, in spite of being an experienced politician. Although Hillary Clinton did not lose simply because of her gender, being a woman certainly damaged her chances of winning in both 2008 and 2016.

Bibliography

Alexander, Deborah, and Kristi Anderson. “Gender as a Factor in the Attribution of Leadership Traits.” *Sage Publications, Inc.* 46, no. 3 (1993): 527–45. <https://doi.org/10.2307/448946>.

Anderson, Karrin Vasby. “From Spouses to Candidates: Hillary Rodham Clinton, Elizabeth Dole, and the Gendered Office of U.S. President.” *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 5, no. 1 (2002): 105–32. <https://doi.org/10.1353/rap.2002.0001>.

Barford, Vanessa. “Why Is Hillary Clinton Leaving out ‘Rodham’?” *BBC News*, November 21, 2015, sec. Magazine. <https://www.bbc.com/news/magazine-34847708>.

- Beauchamp, Scott. "What Has Clinton Actually Learned from Her Iraq 'Mistake'?" *The Atlantic*, September 8, 2016. <https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2016/09/clinton-iraq-bush-war-hussein-wmd-senate/499160/>.
- Breslau, Karen. "Hillary Clinton's Emotional Moment." *Newsweek*, January 6, 2008. <https://www.newsweek.com/hillary-clintons-emotional-moment-87141>.
- Bump, Philip. "Hillary Clinton Tackles the Resurrected Debate over Democratic 'Toughness.'" *The Atlantic*, March 6, 2014. <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2014/03/hillary-clinton-tackles-resurrected-debate-over-democratic-toughness/358882/>.
- Carroll, Susan J. "Reflections on Gender and Hillary Clinton's Presidential Campaign: The Good, the Bad, and the Misogynic." *Political & Gender* 5, no. 1 (2009): 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1743923X09000014>.
- CNN. "Hillary Clinton: No Regret on Iraq Vote." CNN, April 21, 2004. <https://www.cnn.com/2004/ALLPOLITICS/04/21/iraq.hillary/>.
- Cunha, Darlena. "Why Hillary Clinton's Warmth Should Not Matter." *Time*, February 2, 2016. <https://time.com/4202747/hillary-clinton-likability/>.
- Dolan, Kathleen. "Candidate Sex and Gender Stereotypes in American Elections." In *When Does Gender Matter?: Women Candidates and Gender Stereotypes in American Elections*, 1–17. Oxford Scholarship Online, 2014.
- Dolan, Kathleen. "Studying Gender Stereotypes and Women Candidates." In *When Does Gender Matter?: Women Candidates and Gender Stereotypes in American Elections*, 18–48. Oxford Scholarship Online, 2014.
- Erasmus, Estelle. "Hillary Should Play up Her Feminine Side." *Newsweek*, November 4, 2015. <https://www.newsweek.com/hillary-should-play-her-feminine-side-390584>.
- Frye, Marilyn. "Oppression." In *The Politics of Reality: Essays in Feminist Theory*. Trumansburg, NY: Crossing Press, 1983.
- Hertzberg, Hendrik. "Hillary's Tears on the Campaign Trail." *The New Yorker*, January 14, 2008. <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2008/01/21/second-those-emotions>.
- Hillary Rodham Clinton. *What Happened*. New York: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks, 2018.
- Huddy, Leonie, and Nayda Terkildsen. "Gender Stereotypes and the Perception of Male and Female Candidates." *American Journal of Political Science* 37, no. 1 (1993): 119–47. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2111526>.
- Jalalzai, Farida. "A Comparative Assessment of Hillary Clinton's 2016 Presidential Race." *Socius: Sociological Research for a Dynamic World* 4 (January 1, 2018): 119–47. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2378023117732441>.

- Kantor, Jodi, and Kate Taylor. "In Quinn's Loss, Questions about Role of Gender and Sexuality (Published 2013)." *The New York Times*, September 12, 2013, sec. New York. <https://www.nytimes.com/2013/09/12/nyregion/in-quinn-loss-questions-about-role-of-gender-and-sexuality.html>.
- Kantor, Jodi. "A Show of Emotion That Reverberated beyond the Campaign (Published 2008)." *The New York Times*, January 9, 2008, sec. U.S. <https://www.nytimes.com/2008/01/09/us/politics/09moment.html>.
- Kaufner, David, and Shawn Parry-Giles. "Why Do so Many Believe Hillary Clinton Is Inauthentic?" *The Conversation*, October 30, 2016. <https://theconversation.com/why-do-so-many-believe-hillary-clinton-is-inauthentic-67302>.
- Keith, Tamara. "Cooked up after a Hillary Clinton Gaffe, the First Spouse Cookie Battle Is Back." *Wbur*, August 18, 2016. <https://www.wbur.org/npr/490478924/cooked-up-after-a-hillary-clinton-gaffe-the-first-spouse-cookie-battle-is-back>.
- Kruse, Michael. "The TV Interview That Haunts Hillary Clinton." *Politico Magazine*, September 23, 2016. <https://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2016/09/hillary-clinton-2016-60-minutes-1992-214275>.
- Kumar, Anita. "What's in a Name? 'Hillary' by Any Other Name Would Still Be Controversial." *McClatchy Washington Bureau*, April 7, 2015. <https://www.mcclatchydc.com/news/politics-government/election/article24782737.html>.
- Lakoff, Robin. "Language and Woman's Place." *Language in Society* 2, no. 1 (1973): 45–80. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4166707>.
- McGuigan, Patrick B. "Jari Askins Says She's 'Focused on Oklahoma' and Ready to Lead." *Capitol Beat OK*, September 24, 2010. <https://capitolbeatok.worldsecurerest.com/reports/jari-askins-says-she-s-focused-on-oklahoma-and-ready-to-lead>.
- PBS. "Nightline Transcript: Making Hillary Clinton an Issue." PBS, March 26, 1992. <https://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/clinton/etc/03261992.html>.
- Prokop, Andrew. "7 Charts That Explain Why Hillary Clinton Lost in 2008 — and Why She's Winning in 2016." *Vox*, February 20, 2015. <https://www.vox.com/2015/2/20/8062125/hillary-clinton-lost-2008>.
- Reiheld, Alison. "All the Difference in the World: Gender and the 2016 Election." *Kennedy Institute of Ethics Journal*, July 20, 2017. <https://kiej.georgetown.edu/difference-world-gender-2016-election/>.
- Ross, Janell. "The Complicated History behind Hillary Clinton's Evolving Name." *Washington Post*, July 25, 2015. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2015/11/19/the-fascinating-history-of-when-hillary-clinton-has-chosen-to-use-her-maiden-name/>.
- Science Daily. "What Does It Mean for the Husband When His Wife Keeps Her Own Surname?" *ScienceDaily*, November 21, 2017. <https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2017/11/171121121449.htm>.

Sheehan, Eleanor. "People Freaked out over This Comment Hillary Clinton Made in 1992." Popsugar News, August 19, 2016. <https://www.popsugar.com/news/Hillary-Clinton-Baking-Cookies-Comment-42252587>.

Sherman, Erik. "Hillary Clinton's Brilliant Branding Strategy." Inc, November 2, 2016. <https://www.inc.com/erik-sherman/hillary-clintons-brilliant-branding-strategy.html>.

White, Daniel. "A Brief History of the Clinton Family's Chocolate-Cookies." Time, August 19, 2016. <https://time.com/4459173/hillary-bill-clinton-cookies-history/>.

Zunes, Stephen. "Clinton's Iraq War Vote Still Appalls." The Progressive Magazine, April 14, 2016. <https://progressive.org/op-eds/clinton-s-iraq-war-vote-still-appalls/>.

¹ The terms feminine and masculine are used with paratheses to indicate that they are socially constructed.

² Kathleen Dolan, "Studying Gender Stereotypes and Women Candidates," in *When Does Gender Matter?: Women Candidates and Gender Stereotypes in American Elections* (Oxford Scholarship Online, 2014), 22.

³ Dolan, "Studying Gender Stereotypes," 23.

⁴ Dolan, "Studying Gender Stereotypes," 22.

⁵ Leonie Huddy and Nayda Terkildsen, "Gender Stereotypes and the Perception of Male and Female Candidates," *American Journal of Political Science* 37, no. 1 (1993): 121, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2111526>.

⁶ Huddy and Terkildsen, "Gender Stereotypes," 121.

⁷ Marilyn Frye, "Oppression," in *The Politics of Reality: Essays in Feminist Theory* (Trumansburg, NY: Crossing Press, 1983), 2.

⁸ Frye, "Oppression," 3.

⁹ Karrin Vasby. Anderson, "From Spouses to Candidates: Hillary Rodham Clinton, Elizabeth Dole, and the Gendered Office of U.S. President," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 5, no. 1 (2002): 107, <https://doi.org/10.1353/rap.2002.0001>.

¹⁰ Dolan, "Studying Gender Stereotypes," 19.

¹¹ Dolan, "Studying Gender Stereotypes," 19.

¹² Anderson, "From Spouses to Candidates," 107.

¹³ Deborah Alexander and Kristi Anderson, "Gender as a Factor in the Attribution of Leadership Traits," *Political Research Quarterly* 46, no. 3 (1993): 530.

¹⁴ Dolan, "Studying Gender Stereotypes," 22-23.

-
- ¹⁵ Dolan, “Studying Gender Stereotypes,” 20.
- ¹⁶ Alexander and Anderson, “Gender as a Factor,” 530.
- ¹⁷ Susan J. Carroll, “Reflections on Gender and Hillary Clinton’s Presidential Campaign: The Good, the Bad, and the Misogynic,” *Political & Gender* 5, no. 1 (2009): 4-5, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1743923X09000014>; Dolan, “Studying Gender Stereotypes,” 6.
- ¹⁸ Kathleen Dolan, “Candidate Sex and Gender Stereotypes in American Elections,” in *When Does Gender Matter?: Women Candidates and Gender Stereotypes in American Elections* (Oxford Scholarship Online, 2014), 10.
- ¹⁹ Jodi Kantor and Kate Taylor, “In Quinn’s Loss, Questions about Role of Gender and Sexuality (Published 2013),” *The New York Times*, September 12, 2013, sec. New York, <https://www.nytimes.com/2013/09/12/nyregion/in-quinn-loss-questions-about-role-of-gender-and-sexuality.html>.
- ²⁰ Kantor and Taylor, “Role of Gender and Sexuality.”
- ²¹ Kantor and Taylor, “Role of Gender and Sexuality.”
- ²² Kantor and Taylor, “Role of Gender and Sexuality.”
- ²³ Dolan, “Candidate Sex,” 2.
- ²⁴ Dolan, “Candidate Sex,” 2.
- ²⁵ Patrick B. McGuigan, “Jari Askins Says She’s ‘focused on Oklahoma’ and Ready to Lead,” *Capitol Beat OK*, September 24, 2010, [https://capitolbeatok.worldsecure.com/reports/jari-askins-says-s-focused-on-oklahoma-and-ready-to-lead](https://capitolbeatok.worldsecure.com/reports/jari-askins-says-she-s-focused-on-oklahoma-and-ready-to-lead).
- ²⁶ Dolan, “Studying Gender Stereotypes,” 28.
- ²⁷ Dolan, “Studying Gender Stereotypes,” 28.
- ²⁸ Dolan, “Studying Gender Stereotypes,” 28.
- ²⁹ Darlena Cunha, “Why Hillary Clinton’s Warmth Should Not Matter,” *Time*, February 2, 2016, <https://time.com/4202747/hillary-clinton-likability/>.
- ³⁰ Hillary Clinton has been the First Lady of Arkansas (1979-1981, 1983-1992), First Lady of the United States (1993-2001). She served as a New York Senator (2001-2009) and as a US Secretary of State (2009-2013). She also ran for the office of the President in the 2008 and 2016 presidential elections.
- ³¹ Hillary Rodham Clinton, *What Happened* (New York: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks, 2018), 118.
- ³² Clinton, *What Happened*, 118.

³³ Michael Kruse, “The TV Interview That Haunts Hillary Clinton,” *Politico Magazine*, September 23, 2016, <https://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2016/09/hillary-clinton-2016-60-minutes-1992-214275>.

³⁴ Robin Lakoff, “Language and Woman’s Place,” *Language in Society* 2, no. 1 (1973): 66, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4166707>.

³⁵ Lakoff, “Language and Woman’s Place,” 67.

³⁶ Science Daily, “What Does It Mean for the Husband When His Wife Keeps Her Own Surname?,” *ScienceDaily*, November 21, 2017, <https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2017/11/171121121449.htm>.

³⁷ Janell Ross, “The Complicated History behind Hillary Clinton’s Evolving Name,” *Washington Post*, July 25, 2015, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2015/11/19/the-fascinating-history-of-when-hillary-clinton-has-chosen-to-use-her-maiden-name/>.

³⁸ Vanessa Barford, “Why Is Hillary Clinton Leaving out ‘Rodham’?,” *BBC News*, November 21, 2015, sec. Magazine, <https://www.bbc.com/news/magazine-34847708>.

³⁹ Erik Sherman, “Hillary Clinton’s Brilliant Branding Strategy,” *Inc*, November 2, 2016, <https://www.inc.com/erik-sherman/hillary-clintons-brilliant-branding-strategy.html>.

⁴⁰ Lakoff, “Language and Woman’s Place,” 71.

⁴¹ Sherman, “Branding Strategy.”

⁴² Barford, “Leaving out ‘Rodham’.”

⁴³ Lakoff, “Language and Woman’s Place,” 70.

⁴⁴ Sherman, “Brilliant Branding Strategy”; Farida Jalalzai, “A Comparative Assessment of Hillary Clinton’s 2016 Presidential Race,” *Socius: Sociological Research for a Dynamic World* 4 (January 1, 2018): 7, <https://doi.org/10.1177/237802311773244>;

⁴⁵ Lakoff, “Language and Woman’s Place,” 68.

⁴⁶ Anita Kumar, “What’s in a Name? ‘Hillary’ by Any Other Name Would Still Be Controversial,” *McClatchy Washington Bureau*, April 7, 2015, <https://www.mcclatchydc.com/news/politics-government/election/article24782737.html>.

⁴⁷ Kumar, “What’s in a Name?”

⁴⁸ PBS, “Nightline Transcript: Making Hillary Clinton an Issue,” *PBS*, March 26, 1992, <https://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/clinton/etc/03261992.html>.

⁴⁹ Eleanor Sheehan, “People Freaked Out Over This Comment Hillary Clinton Made in 1992,” *Popsugar News*, August 19, 2016, <https://www.popsugar.com/news/Hillary-Clinton-Baking-Cookies-Comment-42252587>.

-
- ⁵⁰ Daniel White, “A Brief History of the Clinton Family’s Chocolate-Cookies,” *Time*, August 19, 2016, <https://time.com/4459173/hillary-bill-clinton-cookies-history/>; Sheehan, “People Freaked Out.”
- ⁵¹ White, “Clinton Family’s Chocolate-Cookies.”
- ⁵² Tamara Keith, “Cooked up after a Hillary Clinton Gaffe, the First Spouse Cookie Battle Is Back,” *Wbur*, August 18, 2016, <https://www.wbur.org/npr/490478924/cooked-up-after-a-hillary-clinton-gaffe-the-first-spouse-cookie-battle-is-back>.
- ⁵³ Sheehan, “People Freaked Out.”
- ⁵⁴ Cunha, “Hillary Clinton’s Warmth.”
- ⁵⁵ Carroll, “Reflections on Gender,” 8.
- ⁵⁶ Clinton, *What Happened*, 121.
- ⁵⁷ David Kaufer and Shawn Parry-Giles, “Why Do so Many Believe Hillary Clinton Is Inauthentic?” *The Conversation*, October 30, 2016, <https://theconversation.com/why-do-so-many-believe-hillary-clinton-is-inauthentic-67302>.
- ⁵⁸ Philip Bump, “Hillary Clinton Tackles the Resurrected Debate Over Democratic ‘Toughness,’” *The Atlantic*, March 6, 2014, <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2014/03/hillary-clinton-tackles-resurrected-debate-over-democratic-toughness/358882/>.
- ⁵⁹ Clinton, *What Happened*, 18.
- ⁶⁰ Clinton, *What Happened*, 121-122.
- ⁶¹ Hendrik Hertzberg, “Hillary’s Tears on the Campaign Trail,” *The New Yorker*, January 14, 2008, <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2008/01/21/second-those-emotions>.
- ⁶² Hertzberg, “Hillary’s Tears.”
- ⁶³ Karen Breslau, “Hillary Clinton’s Emotional Moment,” *Newsweek*, January 6, 2008, <https://www.newsweek.com/hillary-clintons-emotional-moment-87141>.
- ⁶⁴ Jodi Kantor, “A Show of Emotion That Reverberated Beyond the Campaign (Published 2008),” *The New York Times*, January 9, 2008, sec. U.S., <https://www.nytimes.com/2008/01/09/us/politics/09moment.html>.
- ⁶⁵ Hertzberg, “Hillary’s Tears.”
- ⁶⁶ Hertzberg, “Hillary’s Tears;” Breslau, “Hillary Clinton’s Emotional Moment.”
- ⁶⁷ Hertzberg, “Hillary’s Tears.”
- ⁶⁸ Estelle Erasmus, “Hillary Should Play Up Her Feminine Side,” *Newsweek*, November 4, 2015, <https://www.newsweek.com/hillary-should-play-her-feminine-side-390584>; Alison Reiheld, “All the Difference in

the World: Gender and the 2016 Election,” *Kennedy Institute of Ethics Journal*, July 20, 2017, <https://kiej.georgetown.edu/difference-world-gender-2016-election/>;

⁶⁹ Stephen Zunes, “Clinton’s Iraq War Vote Still Appalls,” *The Progressive Magazine*, April 14, 2016, <https://progressive.org/op-eds/clinton-s-iraq-war-vote-still-appalls/>; CNN, “Hillary Clinton: No Regret on Iraq Vote,” *CNN*, April 21, 2004, <https://www.cnn.com/2004/ALLPOLITICS/04/21/iraq.hillary/>.

⁷⁰ Scott Beauchamp, “What Has Clinton Actually Learned From Her Iraq ‘Mistake’?,” *The Atlantic*, September 8, 2016, <https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2016/09/clinton-iraq-bush-war-hussein-wmd-senate/499160/>.

⁷¹ Andrew Prokop, “7 Charts That Explain Why Hillary Clinton Lost in 2008— and Why She’s Winning in 2016,” *Vox*, February 20, 2015, <https://www.vox.com/2015/2/20/8062125/hillary-clinton-lost-2008>.

⁷² Beauchamp, “Iraq ‘Mistake’.”

⁷³ Carroll, “Reflections on Gender,” 10.

⁷⁴ Carroll, “Reflections on Gender,” 9.