

William & Mary Journal of Race, Gender, and Social Justice

Volume 12 (2005-2006)
Issue 2 *William & Mary Journal of Women and
the Law: Symposium: Women and War*

Article 8

February 2006

Madam Secretary

Drury Stevenson

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.law.wm.edu/wmjowl>



Part of the [Law and Gender Commons](#), and the [Law and Politics Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Drury Stevenson, *Madam Secretary*, 12 Wm. & Mary J. Women & L. 467 (2006),
<https://scholarship.law.wm.edu/wmjowl/vol12/iss2/8>

Copyright c 2006 by the authors. This article is brought to you by the William & Mary Law School Scholarship Repository.

<https://scholarship.law.wm.edu/wmjowl>

MADAM SECRETARY

DRURY STEVENSON*

INTRODUCTION

Madeleine Albright's recently published memoirs¹ contain much of what one would expect from a departing U.S. secretary of state:² a mix of brass-tacks foreign policy, an insider's view of American national politics, some apologetics pertaining to the main criticism of the president who appointed her, and a bit of misty-eyed reminiscing and reflection on the contributions made by the author's life and work. On all of these points Albright does a wonderful job. Her book is balanced and fair (i.e., not distractingly partisan), insightful, and clear. The foreign policy discussion is informative yet selective enough to be accessible to the average educated reader; she focuses on the most significant issues and international hotspots. Clinton himself receives the type of mixed-feeling eulogy Ms. Albright is almost obligated to give, at least for public relations purposes. She pleasingly avoids the narcissism that characterizes so many other books of this genre. Somewhat surprisingly, the most troubling aspect of her autobiography is not her politics or views of America as the human-rights police for the rest of the world, but rather the implications of her book for feminist and women's concerns.

Schematically, the book begins with childhood memories of Albright's early years as a Czech immigrant in the Midwest.³ It progresses into a flowing narrative of her college years⁴ and the beginning of her political career, mostly working on unsuccessful Democratic presidential campaigns.⁵ The topic receiving the greatest

* Visiting Scholar, Yale Law School; Assistant Professor, South Texas College of Law.

1. MADELEINE ALBRIGHT, *MADAM SECRETARY: A MEMOIR* (2003).

2. Madeleine Korbelt Albright served as secretary of state under President Bill Clinton during his second term in office, succeeding Warren Christopher. She became the first female U.S. secretary of state in 1997. See *Senate Panel Gives Albright the OK*, USA TODAY, Jan. 21, 1997, at 9A. For official information, see U.S. State Department Archival Web Site, <http://www.secretary.state.gov> (last visited Nov. 8, 2005).

3. ALBRIGHT, *supra* note 1, at 21-30; see also ANN BLACKMAN, *SEASONS OF HER LIFE: A BIOGRAPHY OF MADELEINE KORBEL ALBRIGHT* 104-13 (1998).

4. ALBRIGHT, *supra* note 1, at 31-35; see also BLACKMAN, *supra* note 3, at 114-24 (discussing Madeleine Albright's years at Wellesley).

5. ALBRIGHT, *supra* note 1, at 65-76, 80. Madeleine Albright worked on and supported the presidential campaigns of Edmund S. Muskie, Walter Mondale, and Michael Dukakis. *Id.*

detail in this section is the story of meeting and marrying her husband, Joe Albright.⁶ This background history, presented mostly anecdotally, is followed by a detailed and interesting account of her years at the United Nations,⁷ which leads into a description of her appointment as secretary of state.⁸ Interspersed with subsequent lengthy sections on the Balkan crisis,⁹ North Korea,¹⁰ and the failed Israel-Palestinian negotiations¹¹ are accounts of her painful divorce¹² and her awkward relationship with the Clintons as a couple during the Monica Lewinsky scandal.¹³ Her book focuses on a selected group of topics rather than offering a historian's event-by-event descriptive record; it reads more like a popular book than a history. The concluding chapter describes cleaning out her office in the White House and leaving a friendly, welcoming note for Colin Powell¹⁴ and reminisces briefly about the legacy of her tenure under the Chief Executive.¹⁵

I. ACHIEVEMENT VERSUS ACCOMPLISHMENT

Madeleine Albright opens and closes her book referring to her accomplishments for the cause of women.¹⁶ In fact she cites few, if any, other accomplishments, unless one counts as an accomplishment the fact that some international crises came and went under her watch, as they do under every secretary of state.

Indeed, as secretary of state, she arguably reached a higher political office than any other woman in American history; perhaps the only higher positions would be president or vice-president.¹⁷ In that sense, her career was indeed a watershed. Albright speculates that future generations of young women now can have higher expectations for themselves and possess greater opportunities for

6. *Id.* at 36-47.

7. *Id.* at 127-212.

8. *Id.* at 223-24.

9. *Id.* at 177-93.

10. *Id.* at 455-72.

11. *Id.* at 288-318.

12. *Id.* at 94-99, 105-07.

13. *Id.* at 350, 355-57.

14. *Id.* at 508.

15. *Id.* at 499-512.

16. *Id.* at xi-xii, 510-11.

17. Of course, one could reasonably contend that being a Supreme Court justice is every bit as significant, and two women have attained this office; however, Albright does not focus on the achievements of other women who were her contemporaries, except for passing references.

their careers.¹⁸ Becoming secretary of state of the lone superpower is a significant achievement for anyone, and especially for a woman, Albright likely would say.

The phrase 'especially for a woman,' however, can have an implication that is either pejorative or self-deprecating, and this sense is reinforced after one reads through Albright's very well written account of her personal journey from being the daughter of Czech immigrant refugees,¹⁹ to her undergraduate years at Wellesley College,²⁰ culminating in the story of how she became an Albright.²¹

She sets up the story about meeting Joe Albright almost defensively,²² taking pains to make clear that she knew nothing about his background or family — to the point of making the reader wonder if the narrative is building up to some shocking or embarrassing disclosure. After, and only after, the couple had been in love for some time, Madeleine Korbelt learned that Joe Albright was a true blue-blood.²³ a nephew of the Guggenheims, son of an internationally acclaimed artist, and potential heir of one of the major newspapers his extended family owned.

Joe Albright was quite a catch for a girl in the world of the 1960s, and one realizes that the foregoing pages of 'Madeleine-in-love' are there partly to rebut any possible perception that she married for money or prestige. The story is convincing on this point; the romance is palpable enough that it makes the couple's eventual divorce after years of successful partnership and child rearing a complete surprise. Yet there is something bittersweet about the fact that even today a woman must fend off such insinuations, just because a man who found her charming coincidentally happened to be rich and well-to-do.

Young Madeleine married into privilege, though she insists it was through no fault of her own. The marriage served her well; she was introduced into a circle of influential people. She worked on Democratic presidential campaigns and made connections of her

18. ALBRIGHT, *supra* note 1, at 510-11 ("But the encounters that mean the most to me are with women of various ages who recognize the real me and come up to say thank you. I especially treasure the young women who say that my example has inspired them to raise their sights so that they now feel that serving as secretary of state or in even higher office is a realistic goal.").

19. *Id.* at 18-28.

20. *Id.* at 30.

21. *Id.* at 36-42.

22. *Id.* at 36.

23. *Id.* at 37-38; *see also* BLACKMAN, *supra* note 3, at 126-27.

own that supplemented her family ties.²⁴ She obtained a Ph.D. from Columbia University in Russian Studies²⁵ and worked in the Carter White House.²⁶ President Clinton appointed her to be ambassador to the United Nations during his first term²⁷ and promoted her to the cabinet post of secretary of state for his second term.²⁸ Albright clearly was qualified and ably carried out her duties. She brought an air of dignity to a White House that otherwise was racked with prurient scandals and accusations of rather adolescent misbehavior.

What is troubling is that Albright seems to view her most important 'accomplishment' to be the very fact that she was the first woman to become secretary of state, rather than any particular feats she performed while in this position. It would be one thing if she claimed to have saved the world from nuclear war, economic collapse, or even an incidence of genocide. No such laurels adorn her memoirs; such situations were simply handled or managed, concluding usually in frustration rather than triumph. Her only triumph seems to be her claimed contribution to the feminist cause, and it was accomplished, in part, by the unfortunately stereotyped road of marrying the right man. Again, she cannot be faulted for this aspect of her life, and she clearly was independently qualified for the position and competent throughout her tenure. Yet it seems to undermine the greatness of what she identifies as her primary life accomplishment, a feminist triumph. The fact that her contribution to feminism depended in part on her marriage to Joe Albright is ironic, and it is unfortunate to think that we have made so little progress that this would have to be the case. It is also unfortunate, though, that I find myself even thinking of it as an issue, recognizing that the voices of the old stereotypes still haunt,²⁹ even when there is no reason for them to remain audible in my mind. I am a fan of Madeleine Albright and believe that she was an excellent secretary of state, but slowly grasping the gender-bound trajectory of her career bothers me both objectively and subjectively.

24. ALBRIGHT, *supra* note 1, at 63-93.

25. *Id.* at 56.

26. Albright spent three years working at the National Security Council under the watchful eye of Carter's National Security Advisor, Zbigniew Brzezinski, an ardent Cold Warrior and her former graduate professor at Columbia. *Id.* at 57, 81-82.

27. *Id.* at 129-30; BLACKMAN, *supra* note 3, at 229-32.

28. ALBRIGHT, *supra* note 1, at 223-24; BLACKMAN, *supra* note 3, at 266-71. Upon the public announcement being made, Albright noted, "I only hope my heels can fill [Christopher's] shoes." ALBRIGHT, *supra* note 1, at 224.

29. See Kenneth I. Spenner & David L. Featherman, *Achievement Ambitions*, 4 ANN. REV. SOC. 373, 401 (1978) (discussing the conventional "mobility through marriage" view of women's achievement, (citing I.D. Chase, *A Comparison of Men's and Women's Intergenerational Mobility in the United States*, 40 AM. SOC. REV. 483 (1975))).

My unrest stems, in part, from the puzzle of achievement versus accomplishment.³⁰ This question is particularly confusing when celebrating successes of women or other historically subjugated groups.³¹ Achievements are remarkable things that we attain,

30. For a brief discussion of this distinction made by philosophers from Aristotle through Zeno Vendler and Anthony Kenny, see Daniel W. Graham, *States and Performances: Aristotle's Test*, 30 PHIL. Q. 117, 118-19 (1980). Graham's discussion, however, focuses mostly on Aristotle's Greek syntax and the subsequent commentaries, rather than the implications for evaluating the careers of public officials. See generally *id.* The philosopher Vendler himself emphasizes the different semantic traits of "accomplishment" verbal statements from "achievement" verbs; the former use more continuous-past-action verbs, for example, than the latter. See Zeno Vendler, *Verbs and Times*, 66 PHIL. REV. 143, 146-48 (1957).

Some sociologists see the distinction as a product of societal changes that affect the criteria for the development of self-esteem. See, e.g., David D. Franks & Joseph Marolla, *Efficacious Action and Social Approval as Interacting Dimensions of Self-Esteem: A Tentative Formulation Through Construct Validation*, 39 SOCIOMETRY 324, 338-39 (1976). The authors write:

White, for example, quotes the "marketing orientation" described by Fromm (1947) with its vast impersonal market, machine production, and business organizations which tend to shift the basis of self-esteem away from what accomplishes the objectives and towards how well one sells himself in the estimation of others [i.e., achievement]. Gouldner (1970) has also described social changes which shifted the focus away from autonomously given self-esteem inputs to inputs basically dependent on other people. Certainly bureaucracies, insofar as some of them tend toward appearance rather than task orientation, may encourage emphasis on outer self-esteem.

Id. (citing ERICH FROMM, *MAN FOR HIMSELF* (1947); ALVIN W. GOULDNER, *THE COMING CRISIS OF WESTERN SOCIOLOGY* (1970)).

Of course, "achievement" and "accomplishment" are sometimes used interchangeably, especially in cases where precise definitions of these terms are less significant. See, e.g., Richard A. Guzzo, *Types of Rewards, Cognitions, and Work Motivation*, 4 ACAD. MGMT. REV. 75, 77 (1979) (describing intrinsic, higher-order rewards as "feelings of accomplishment, feelings of achievement," (citing E.E. Lawler, *Job Design and Employee Motivation*, 22 PERSONNEL PSYCHOL. 426, 428 (1969))); Wagner A. Kamakura & Thomas P. Novak, *Value-System Segmentation: Exploring the Meaning of LOV*, 19 J. CONSUMER RES. 119, 120-21 (1992) (defining the internal value of "achievement" as being comprised of social recognition as well as a feeling of "accomplishment"); Roslyn Arlin Mickelson, *Why Does Jane Read and Write So Well? The Anomaly of Women's Achievement*, 62 SOC. EDUC. 47 (1989) (discussing the puzzle of exemplary female academic performance where rewards for such accomplishments or achievements are hindered by sexism in society); Thomas A. Wright & Douglas G. Bonett, *The Contribution of Burnout to Work Performance*, 18 J. ORG. BEHAV. 491, 494 (1997) ("The third burnout dimension, diminished personal accomplishment, denotes a decline in one's personal feelings of competence and successful work achievement.").

31. For a survey of recent sociological literature on gender and achievement ambitions, see Spenner & Featherman, *supra* note 29, at 395-401. A psychological study on managerial "burnout" factors concluded that men and women in management experienced similar feelings about "personal achievement," but their stress levels were different, corresponding to their level of position; men were more likely to find top management stressful than women, while women were more likely to find non-managerial positions stressful. See Grace M. H. Pretty, Mary E. McCarthy & Victor M.

like titles and positions. Accomplishments could be defined as remarkable things we actually do.³²

Achievements contain an element of exclusion; part of what makes them remarkable is that many people do not receive them, whether they are higher education degrees, certain awards, or positions—including political offices. Whether appointed or elected, people in positions of power were selected from a field of possible candidates. Of course, achievement usually includes some element of merit as well, recognizing either effort or ability. Merit, however, almost always works in tandem with its conceptual opposite, *favor*, when eligibility considerations are at issue, which makes assessing the true meaning or value of achievement complicated.³³ Good achievements are partly creditable to the established decision makers, those already holding power, who identify and select candidates for positions, titles, and awards. Others function as patrons as they give recommendations, provide good references, offer tips about special opportunities, and supply moral and financial support.³⁴

Accomplishments, on the other hand, are what we do, not what we win or what we become. They are the unique contributions we make to the world. Of course, accomplishments usually draw on our efforts and abilities, but they are different from achievements because they create merit rather than acknowledge it. Accomplishments are tricky because many triumphs constitute another's failure, defeat, or loss; most victories are subject to criticism or question as to their true value or significance. In addition, every triumph involves legions of unrecognized and unremembered individuals who contributed to the feat in some way. Like achievements, accomplishments sometimes utilize privilege. Privilege or status attracts helpers and makes

Cantano, *Psychological Environments and Burnout: Gender Considerations Within the Corporation*, 13 J. ORG. BEHAV. 701, 708 (1992).

32. Vendler notes in a digression that one odd semantic difference between accomplishments and achievements in speech is that the former are actions where the helping verb "can" is added or removed without much change in meaning, while achievement related verbs are drastically affected by the presence of "can" or "could." Vendler, *supra* note 30, at 148-49 (using as an example the semantic equivalency of "I can believe it," with "I believe it").

33. Luck, providence, or fortune also lurk in the background of all achievements, manifested especially through the opportunities afforded some individuals but not others. The transcendent or mysterious nature of such benefits, however, make their distribution inscrutable.

34. For a discussion of the "matrix of significant others" who influence one's achievements and preceding ambitions for achievement, see Spenner & Featherman, *supra* note 29, at 391-94, exploring the roles these individuals play and the different sets of influential individuals that tend to affect adolescents depending upon gender or race.

success in a venture more likely, but for some reason privilege does not seem to undermine the significance of an accomplishment as much as it undermines the value of an achievement. A queen who inherited her throne is still praiseworthy if she leads her country to prosperity, averts national disaster, or eliminates inequalities, but she can hardly brag about the fact that she became queen if this was determined by birth. 'Became president' is a less remarkable epitaph on a tombstone than 'brought democracy to the Arab world,' 'forged lasting peace in the Balkans,' or 'ushered in unprecedented economic growth' (all of which seem far off at the moment). The last three hypothetical accomplishments, however, necessarily would depend in part on the resolve of the citizenry, the actions of the legislature, and the support of the executive cabinet and staff. Even so, each of these would constitute a credible moniker that one's life had been valuable or significant, at least more so than 'attained a powerful position.'

Applying this distinction to Madeleine Albright's book forces the unfortunate conclusion that her purported greatest accomplishment was rather an achievement. Albright implies that the history of excluding women from high government posts in itself transforms an achievement into an accomplishment, because it opens new doors for others.³⁵ This idea is interesting, and it may be a valid point that achievements attained by members of disadvantaged groups automatically count as accomplishments.³⁶ The paradox, then, would lie in this special category of accomplishments, where merit looks not at the past or present efforts or abilities of the individual, but instead toward the future. It is an achievement that opens the possibility for accomplishments in the regular sense of the word by other members of the identified group.³⁷

35. Admittedly, Albright's 'achievement' resulted in large part from her political activity, although it is not clear how much of her volunteer work for Democratic campaigns flowed from a feminist ideology as opposed to a liberal one. Interestingly, studies in the 1970s and 1980s indicated that moderate feminism was more likely to generate political participation than more extreme versions and was more likely to make the difference of political participation or nonparticipation for minority women than for nonminority women. See, e.g., Susan Ann Kay, *Feminist Ideology, Race, and Political Participation: A Second Look*, 38 W. POL. Q. 476 (1985).

36. An assertion along these lines is made by Spenner & Featherman: "To the extent that female achievement orientations are sex-role based, one might conclude that they will only approximate the male pattern when the mitigating effects of conventional attributions about achievement are breeched [sic] or reformulated." Spenner & Featherman, *supra* note 29, at 399.

37. An older article asserts that business executives find their sense of accomplishment in the level that they achieve, which seems to recognize the conceptual difference between the two, but it notes that certain individuals substitute one for the other. See Roland J. Pellegrin & Charles H. Coates, *Executives and Supervisors*:

II. ALL THE PRESIDENT'S WOMEN

While Albright seems to short-shrift her female peers in the White House, she cannot avoid discussing the two other women who dominated the news coverage during Clinton's presidency: Hillary and Monica. Bill Clinton's name came to be associated with Monica nearly as much as 'Samson' with 'Delilah.' Samson's original wife, who dies before Delilah enters the biblical story, remains nameless in history; we know only that both she and Delilah were "Philistine girls."³⁸ Clinton's wife, in contrast, may make a bid for the White House in a few years and still has a chance to make a greater mark on history than her husband.

Hillary Clinton was certainly in a different position regarding the Monica fiasco than Madeleine Albright,³⁹ but their brief descriptions of their feelings about it at the time are strikingly similar. Both women published their memoirs within a year of each other,⁴⁰ and society expected both to offer some comment on how it felt to be women who were close to the president as the scandal unraveled.⁴¹ Both offer a comment just long enough to be substantive but short enough to give the air of being discreet.⁴² Both describe feelings ranging from anger to embarrassment to pity, followed by a terse statement of principled disapproval, and then a calculated decision to stand by the president for the sake of the greater good, despite the sense of personal betrayal.⁴³ From a traditional chauvinistic

Contrasting Definitions of Career Success, 1 ADMIN. SCI. Q. 506, 512 (1957).

38. *Judges* 16:4-18. "Delilah" in the original language, interestingly, is associated with something like 'weakness' or 'personal flaw,' as in, 'I know I have a problem.' See *id.*

39. ALBRIGHT, *supra* note 1, at 357. ("In any case I felt no sense of personal grievance. The President had not betrayed me; he had betrayed the First Lady and it was up to Hillary, not the cabinet, to deal with that.")

40. Hillary Clinton's book *Living History* was published in 2003, the same year Madeleine Albright published *Madam Secretary*. See generally HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON, *LIVING HISTORY* (2003).

41. ALBRIGHT, *supra* note 1, at 355 ("The press had a special interest in what the President would say to Donna Shalala [Secretary of Health and Human Services] and to me. We were the two women from the cabinet who had defended him in front of television cameras the last time the full cabinet had met, back in January.")

42. See ALBRIGHT, *supra* note 1, at 354-57; CLINTON, *supra* note 40, at 465-70.

43. See ALBRIGHT, *supra* note 1, at 354-57; CLINTON, *supra* note 40, at 466. For example, Hillary Clinton writes:

I could hardly breathe. Gulping for air, I started crying and yelling at him, "What do you mean? What are you saying? Why did you lie to me?"

I was furious and getting more so by the second. He just stood there saying over and over again, "I'm sorry. I'm so sorry. I was trying to protect you and Chelsea." I couldn't believe what I was hearing. Up until now I only thought that he'd been foolish for paying attention to the young woman and

approach, both offered the perfect response for a woman close to the power source: emotional enough to be authentically feminine, lest Hillary or Madeleine appear overly cold-blooded, masculine, or Reno-like,⁴⁴ but still distinctively able to subordinate her emotions to principle when making important decisions, lest they support the hysterical female stereotype. Able to be womanly at heart but to still do the proper, 'manly,' rational thing under stress, each attempts to allay the fears of those who fear women in power. Other women's accounts of the scandal, most notably Monica Lewinsky, rambled through the ordeal in a more stereotypically gossipy, impressionistic, and cathartic manner.⁴⁵ The succinct, balanced treatment by the former first lady and the secretary of state seem almost contrived in contrast, designed to reassure those who still have nagging doubts about women in power.

It is unfortunate that women still are politically obligated to promise not to make decisions based on emotion or intuition. It is especially troubling in comparison with a president who expediently blamed his transgressions on flaws like a problematic sex drive or suppressed anger — the explanation he offered Madeleine Albright and Donna Shalala in a private cabinet meeting.⁴⁶ President Clinton, with too much passion, interestingly, approached foreign policy and human rights essentially as a reactionary — so shocked by abuses that he could not help but take action, as characterized approvingly by Albright. He surely would not have recovered politically from the Monica scandal as well as he did if his explanation instead had been an appeal to the economist's rational choice model ('I derive greater utility from sex than from restraint or abstinence'). Albright is free to offer this on his behalf, however, without negative repercussion; given her own painful experience with a philandering husband, she

was convinced that he was being railroaded. I couldn't believe he would do anything to endanger our marriage and our family. I was dumbfounded, heartbroken and outraged that I'd believed him at all.

. . . . I desperately needed someone to talk to so I called a friend who was also a counselor to seek guidance. This was the most devastating, shocking and hurtful experience of my life. I could not figure out what to do, but I knew I had to find a calm place in my heart and mind to sort out my feelings.

CLINTON, *supra* note 40, at 466.

44. For a rather strange but thought-provoking sociological discussion of Hillary Clinton's image problems in this regard, see Jeannie B. Thomas, *Dumb Blondes, Dan Quayle, and Hillary Clinton: Gender, Sexuality, and Stupidity in Jokes*, 110 J. AM. FOLKLORE 277, 298-306 (1997).

45. See generally ANDREW MORTON, *MONICA'S STORY* (1999).

46. ALBRIGHT, *supra* note 1, at 355 ("Then he said that the reason he had done it was that he had been in a rage for the past four and a half years. He had been a good actor and had put on a smile but had been angry throughout.")

"learned . . . not to be surprised when a man lies about sex."⁴⁷ This is not a mere double standard, but rather opposite standards. Women in power are expected to project an image of remarkable self-control and wisdom, despite the silliness going on around them, while men in power can excuse their most notorious failings by appealing to a pure lack of self-control or too much stifled emotion.⁴⁸

In the end, one of Albright's real accomplishments, as opposed to the achievement of her office in the White House, was her ability to function as a foil to President Clinton at his worst moments. Where his escapades seemed puerile, Albright appeared eminently mature and serious; where the president appeared impulsive, she was unwaveringly principled; where he lapsed from debonair into casual, she remained stately. Through her an otherwise besmirched White House retained some air of dignity. Facing political undulations or even repeated embarrassments is part of the life of any cabinet member, in any administration, but in this Albright excelled.⁴⁹

III. FOREIGN POLICY, FROM THE HEART

Albright offers an insider's view of the great foreign policy events of her term: the Balkan crisis,⁵⁰ Iraq's inter-bellum antics,⁵¹ the

47. *Id.* at 357.

48. In a fascinating psycho-sociological study of the history of the American presidency (ending with Ronald Reagan) and the correlation between personal charisma and presidential effectiveness, a group of researchers demonstrated, among other things, that the need for a sense of personal achievement is actually inversely proportional to effectiveness as president. Robert J. House, William D. Sprangler & James Woycke, *Personality and Charisma in the U.S. Presidency: A Psychological Theory of Leader Effectiveness*, 36 ADMIN. SCI. Q. 364 (1991). The less a president feels concerned about such matters, the more charismatic the leadership style will be, and the more effective the president will be in times of crisis or in making major decisions. *See id.* This theory raises two interesting questions. First, one wonders whether Albright's strange confusion of accomplishments with achievement reflects a stronger or weaker need on her part for a personal sense of achievement. Did she have trouble identifying her actual accomplishments because such thinking was unusual for her or, conversely, because she was so focused on achievement that she could not separate the concept from accomplishment? The second question or possible inquiry is the extent to which such traits reflect that of the Clinton administration in general; to what extent was President Clinton himself obsessed with a need for personal achievement? A third question, contingent on the answer to the second, would be whether President Clinton himself fits the pattern observed by the researchers — that effective leadership requires, in part, a lower emphasis on personal feelings of achievement.

49. For a discussion of the relationship between ambition to fulfill perceived roles and achievement, see generally Spenner & Featherman, *supra* note 29.

50. ALBRIGHT, *supra* note 1, at 177-93.

51. *Id.* at 272-87.

languished Israeli-Palestinian negotiations,⁵² North Korea's bizarre posturing,⁵³ and the then-mysterious threat of Al-Qaeda.⁵⁴ The selection of topics corresponds to the amount of media attention on these areas, whether at the time, or as part of more recent retrospective scrutiny. Readers are probably most interested in events they have seen in the news, and to this extent Albright's focus will satisfy many in her audience. Missing, however, are other equally important events like the foreign currency crisis that created global economic upheaval in the same period. It would also have been enriching to glean insights into lesser-known areas of global politics; Albright certainly possesses wide-ranging information that the rest of us would find educational. For example, prescient views into the current Cypriot unification battles, civil unrest in Malaysia and Indonesia, and the ongoing turmoil in Congo and Burundi would have constituted valuable additions to her book. Similarly, more academic questions like the proper ownership of the Faroe Islands, which are currently claimed by Denmark, to the consternation of the islanders, who identify more closely with Iceland, or the interesting chain of illegal migration of Haitians to the Dominican Republic, and of Dominicans to Puerto Rico, and so on, might have found elucidation from someone with Albright's vantage point, but this opportunity was missed. Albright likely would not have spent as many pages on Al-Qaeda or North Korea had these two receded into the pages of history after President Clinton left office, instead of taking on their truly apocalyptic significance under the next administration. Other second-tier conflicts from the Clinton era could easily become the next global quagmire; unfortunately, Albright's book will not furnish insights to policymakers at that time because she focuses only on issues that are currently newsworthy. On the Clinton administration's foreign policy failures, she is simultaneously contrite and defensive.⁵⁵

52. *Id.* at 288-318.

53. *Id.* at 455-72.

54. *Id.* at 361-77.

55. Arguably, the Clinton administration's most profound foreign policy debacles were its failure to act in the Rwandan genocide and its failure to adequately confront the Taliban in Afghanistan.

In Rwanda, between April and June 2004, while the world looked on, 800,000 Tutsi perished at the hands of their Hutu compatriots. *Rwanda: How the Genocide Happened*, BBC NEWS, Apr. 1, 2004, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/africa/1288230.stm>.

Albright acknowledges remorse over U.S. inaction, noting in her memoirs: "My deepest regret from my years in public service is the failure of the United States and the international community to act sooner to halt those crimes." ALBRIGHT, *supra* note 1, at 147. Nonetheless, she unconvincingly argues that a lack of information prevented policymakers from understanding the extent of the Rwandan horror. She writes:

As I look back . . . , I am struck by the lack of information about the killing

An interesting, but clearly unintended, feature of the book is its confirmation of the theory that President Clinton's policy decisions, though sometimes fortuitous, were driven by a type of intuitive, moral impulsiveness that is consistent with his more notorious exploits. Henry Kissinger has criticized Clinton for constantly going with his gut in foreign affairs, embarking on moral crusades to right every wrong rather than developing a consistent policy to identify and protect America's interests.⁵⁶ Albright described Clinton's

that had begun against unarmed Rwandan civilians Many Western embassies had been evacuated Dallaire [the Commander of the U.N. Peacekeeping Force in Rwanda (UNAMIR)] was making dire reports to UN Headquarters, but the oral summaries provided to the Security Council lacked detail and failed to convey the full dimensions of the disaster.

ALBRIGHT, *supra* note 1, at 149. Among the "dire reports," *id.*, made by Lt. Gen. Dallaire was an infamous fax he sent to U.N. headquarters in January 1994, explaining in detail that a high ranking Hutu informant had warned him that "[s]ince UNAMIR mandate [the informant] has been ordered to register all Tutsis in Kigali He suspects it is for their extermination. The example he gave was that in 20 minutes his personnel could kill up to 1000 Tutsis." WILLIAM SHAWCROSS, *DELIVER US FROM EVIL* 130 (2000) (quoting Roméo Dallaire).

In Afghanistan, the Taliban declared a virtual war on women, preventing girls from attending school, women from attending work, and both from venturing outside the home without a male relative. ALBRIGHT, *supra* note 1, at 363. Given Albright's accomplishment as the first female secretary of state, one would have expected a strong advocate when confronted with such injustices. In her first year as secretary of state, Albright met with a group of female Afghan refugees in Pakistan. Albright assured the women of the United States's support, and the next day she harshly denounced the Taliban. "Publicly I said with accuracy, if not diplomacy, 'We are opposed to the Taliban because of . . . their despicable treatment of women and children and their general lack of respect for human dignity.'" *Id.* Despite these words, more than one and one-half years of American inaction followed, and when the administration finally signed an executive order, it offered the Taliban recognition in return for bin Ladin and, quite remarkably, never mentioned the abysmal treatment of women. Exec. Order No. 13,129, 64 Fed. Reg. 36,759 (July 7, 1999).

56. See HENRY KISSINGER, *DOES AMERICA NEED A FOREIGN POLICY?: TOWARD A DIPLOMACY FOR THE 21ST CENTURY* 251-52 (2001). Kissinger's ideal is the latter approach, in which he also sees the Clinton administration as failing. *Id.* Kissinger complains that this haphazard, sentimental foreign policy approach was unprecedented in recent American history:

The new dispensation in foreign policy combined a rejection of history with a turning away from traditional notions of security and geopolitics. Explicitly suggesting that America's failings were a contributing cause of the Cold War, implying that most international tensions were social in origin and that diplomacy should therefore concentrate on the so-called soft — that is, nonstrategic — issues, it expressed an unconcealed disdain for much of what had been accomplished in the half-century following the Second World War.

Id. Kissinger goes on to portray Clinton's humanitarian idealism in foreign affairs as unsustainable:

The new doctrine of humanitarian intervention asserts that humane convictions are so integral a part of the American tradition that both treasure and, in the extreme, lives must be risked to vindicate them

decision-making process about foreign interventions along similar lines, but approvingly, as one might expect.⁵⁷ This is not to say that intervention in the Balkans, for example, was unwarranted, but only that Clinton based his decisions on moral passions rather than cool calculations, and his passion got him into trouble on other occasions. This description presents the real irony of President Clinton: The president most associated with immorality in recent memory was overly sensitive to conscience in policy matters. On the surface, this contradiction seems simple, but the two behaviors have a common basis: emotional decision-making.

CONCLUSION

Given that the book is a memoir, Albright's own assessment of the worth of her life and career take on particular significance. On

anywhere in the world. No other nation has ever advanced such goals, which risk maneuvering the United States and its allies into the role of world policeman.

Id. at 253.

Other commentators have similarly criticized President Clinton for his apparently inconsistent and quixotic foreign policy. *See, e.g.*, Richard N. Haass, *Fatal Distraction: Bill Clinton's Foreign Policy*, 108 FOREIGN POL'Y 112, 112-13 (1997) ("President Bill Clinton's foreign policy is less easy to define. . . . [I]t lacks a general framework."); Linda B. Miller, *The Clinton Years: Reinventing US Foreign Policy?*, 70 INT'L AFF. 621, 630 (1994) ("If lack of vision, vague goals and ineffectual means are among the most frequently voiced criticisms of the Clinton administration's foreign policy, a third accusation often follows. It is that the White House has allowed places of less importance or conflicts of lesser magnitude to overshadow the more significant issues resulting from the end of the Cold War in Europe.").

57. For an interesting psychological analysis of Clinton's foreign policy approach that also depicts his inconsistencies in a positive light (i.e., more adaptive), see Stephen G. Walker, Mark Schafer & Michael D. Young, *Presidential Operational Codes and Foreign Policy Conflicts in the Post-Cold War World*, 43 J. CONFLICT RESOL. 610 (1999). The authors describe their findings as follows:

[T]he Clinton administration's conflict response is more intense [than the previous administration's] in response to the opponent's conflict moves and less intense in response to the opponent's cooperation moves. . . . The pattern of moves by the United States under Bush's leadership is less cooperative and less flexible — choosing a course of action, sticking with it, and disregarding the opponent's machinations to alter the process no matter what. On the other hand, the Clinton administration is more cooperative and more flexible — responding more to both friendly and hostile moves by the opponent. These differences between administrations are sharper in more asymmetrical conflict situations.

Id. at 621-22. The authors draw no conclusions about which policy approach better achieves national goals but instead focus on a description of behavioral patterns over time. For a study discussing the similarities and differences between ideological and emotional ("symbolic") foreign policy approaches, predating the end of the Cold War, see Peter Hansen & Nikolaj Petersen, *Motivational Bases of Foreign Policy Attitudes and Behavior: An Empirical Analysis*, 22 INT'L STUD. Q. 49, 51-54 (1978).

this point the book opens a conundrum about the interplay between achievement and accomplishment and the unique significance each of these takes on when the individual is a woman in power. As an author, Albright does not seem aware of the philosophical problem with claiming one's primary accomplishment as becoming the first female secretary of state. She seems painfully aware of the wrinkle that her marriage to Joe Albright introduces into her asserted accomplishment, yet it seems less of an unresolved issue for the current social debate than the achievement/accomplishment dichotomy itself. 'Madam Secretary' may indeed have paved the way for 'Madam President.' The question that could be discussed in the meantime, and which has received very little attention so far, is whether 'Madam President' will deserve praise merely for being a Madam, or for what the Madam manages to do with the opportunities her position provides.

Albright's memoirs are undeniably well written, informative, and thought provoking. The book would make a smart addition to any personal library. Her characterizations of President Clinton reflect the views of an admirer but could provide fodder for his critics — perhaps more significant criticism in the long run than his moral lapses sensationalized in the media while he was in office. Albright's discussion of the scandal itself offers little that is new, but it is interesting in that the messages between the lines say more about Albright herself than her president.