



**Women's Foreign Policy Group
Author Series Event
September 11, 2007
Washington, DC**

Dr. Priscilla Roberts

Associate Professor of History, Honorary Director of the Centre for American Studies,
University of Hong Kong (Co-editor)

Ambassador Julia Chang Bloch

President, US-China Education Trust (Author of the chapter on Women in Diplomacy)

***Bonds Across Borders:
Women, China, and International Relations in the Modern World***

Patricia Ellis: Good evening and welcome everyone. This is the first program of our fall season, it's part of our Author Series. We have a number of new people here tonight. What the Women's Foreign Policy Group is all about is promoting global engagement, women's leadership, and women's voices. The main way we do that is through our international issues programs focusing on all different issues, from Iraq to UN issues, whatever the issues du jour are. We also have a State Department Series and an Embassy Series. Our last speakers in our State Department Series were Henrietta Holsman Fore and Ellen Sauerbrey. For our Embassy Series we have had the Ambassador of Colombia and a number of others. So stand by for a lot of exciting programs coming up. But one of our favorite series is the Author Series. We keep finding more and more wonderful books written by women, and we want to highlight them and highlight their contributions.

Tonight it is a special pleasure for me to introduce Julia Chang Bloch, one of our speakers, who wrote a chapter in this book. Ambassador Bloch and I were co-founders of the Women's Foreign Policy Group. We're friends; she was my partner in crime before she went off to become the first Asian-American ambassador when she was assigned to Nepal. She previously worked in many posts in the U.S. government: USIA, USAID, the Peace Corps, and on the Hill in the Senate. She also worked at Bank of America, and was President of the U.S.-Japan Foundation. So if we talk about a role model and woman leader, here she is. We're really lucky to have her with us tonight.

Julia is now President of the U.S.-China Education Trust. She is a distinguished fellow and lecturer at Fudan University. Julia will introduce Dr. Priscilla Roberts, the editor of the book, and will talk briefly about her chapter on women in diplomacy. Before I turn it over to Julia, I would like to introduce two of our Board members here with us tonight, Donna Constantinople and Gail Leftwich Kitch. I'm glad to see them. So without further ado, please join me in welcoming Ambassador Julia Chang Bloch.

Ambassador Julia Chang Bloch: Good evening Pat. Thank you for that introduction. Actually, my head is still in Beijing because I returned just the night before. In any case it really is my pleasure to introduce Dr. Priscilla Roberts. Priscilla and I go back a long way, almost ten years, when we were first introduced at Peking University by one of our colleagues and friends. Since then Priscilla and I have

collaborated on many, many ventures. This is of course including the 2003 Fudan University workshop that is the genesis for this book and also was the first meeting on the role of women in international affairs in China. This was all accomplished because of Priscilla's tremendous organizing capabilities. But this book, *Bonds Across Borders: Women, China and International Relations in the Modern World*, is a perfect vehicle, as Pat pointed out, for the Women's Foreign Policy Group. I would be remiss if I didn't recognize immediately Linda Yarr who also has a chapter, in fact the last chapter in the book, so I hope Linda, that you will also join us in this discussion.

Without Priscilla, I can absolutely tell you that there would be no book. Priscilla is one of those rare academics who is also a doer. I hope there are no other academics in here. She has edited and written more books than I have time to recite tonight. And we have now worked on a score of projects in Hong Kong and throughout China, but this is only our second program in the United States, and the second book program. If it weren't for Priscilla I don't think I would be involved in any book programs. But in any case, the first one was at the University of Maryland on her book on the Beijing Diaries of David Bruce. David Bruce was America's first — maybe Ambassador would be the right word — who established the liaison office in Beijing in 1973. And it was also Priscilla who really got me to write a paper for the Fudan workshop. I'm one of those practitioners who is always loathe to put pen to paper. But Priscilla is quite persuasive. I also felt the workshop theme was very good.

I still remember, quite vividly, and I think I have some colleagues here, Ambassador Aurelia Brazeal, Ambassador Sylvia Stanfield, I quite vividly remember when diplomacy was a white, Anglo-Saxon, Ivy League, male, preserve. And as my chapter points out it was not until 1933 when women were admitted in appreciable numbers to diplomatic services. Until the 1970's, women had to choose between marriage and the diplomatic service. If you got married, you were out. Women today are still generally assigned to lesser posts. Just as blacks are still being sent to traditionally black posts, and Hispanics to the Spanish speaking world.

Of course Asian-Americans were nowhere to be seen until 1989, and I repeat 1989, when I was appointed, as Pat said, the first Asian-American ambassador in U.S. history. Now 1933 may be history but, as I look around the room here, everyone here was certainly born by 1989. So, what I am describing — the situation and context of our diplomatic service — is not history. It is still a fact of life. And when Pat and I co-founded the Women's Foreign Policy Group, one of the reasons was precisely to promote the role of women in diplomacy. So in my chapter I cite the pioneer 1998 WFPG study of women in international affairs. With two Board members here, Donna Constantinople and Gail Leftwich Kitch, let me really stress I think it is time to update that important study.

Ms. Ellis: Which we really want to do, we want to look at the next generation.

Ambassador Bloch: There really has been too little research and writing on this important issue. Lam, who is joining U.S.-China Education Trust shortly and helped me with updating my chapter, can attest to the fact that we found very little real research material and information on the subject. Lam helped me because I said, "I'm done with this chapter. I'm just not going to work on it any more."

But with *Bonds Across Borders*, Priscilla, who received her B.A. and Ph. D from King's College Cambridge University, has made a substantial contribution to this job. As Associate Professor of History and Director of the Center of American Studies at the University of Hong Kong, she also has been a pioneer in bringing together Chinese, American, and European scholars, bringing these disparate groups together on publications like this one that will enlighten the public on issues ranging from the U.S. war in Vietnam and the Cold War, to U.S.-China relations. Priscilla is really unbelievable in the

breadth of her academic research capabilities and experience. I really have never worked with or met a true academic like Priscilla. So without further ado, Dr. Roberts.

Dr. Priscilla Roberts: I feel the only thing I can do now is ask for Julia to perhaps write my obituary. I couldn't ask for a better writer. Thank you very much Julia.

I have to say however, that the book which I am going to be talking about today, *Bonds Across Borders*, is certainly not the product of just one person. It would be nice if all of our twenty contributors to this volume, not just three of us, could be here tonight, but I'm afraid that we're scattered across several continents. I'm particularly sorry that my co-editor He Peiqun of Fudan University, who actually did most of the hard donkey work on running the workshop which this book developed out of, can't be here tonight to share the kudos of finally bringing out this book. It was a fairly long and rocky road to publication for us. Then I had a lucky break and a publisher was terribly interested so we started a jet propelled effort to get it out.

I'm going to say a little bit about the conference that this volume grew out of. It was held at Fudan University at Shanghai in October of 2003 at the Center of American Studies where Julia has a visiting position. When she is not in Washington, you might well find her ensconced in Fudan. She's very much an important figure there. It brought together quite a wide range of people: academics from China, from Hong Kong, from the United States and from Europe, together with several diplomatic practitioners, Ambassador Bloch in particular, and two Chinese ladies, Madame Song Yimin, who had been a researcher and held various positions in the foreign ministry, and Kitty Xia Yongfang, a very ebullient lady who had helped welcome President Nixon to Shanghai in the early 1970's and who is in the foreign affairs bureaucracy of the city rather than in the foreign office.

But the idea was to bring together both the academics who write about foreign affairs and the diplomats of various kinds who actually practice it, to see what they had to say to each other. The whole field of women and international relations is still very much a developing one in the West. The book and conference actually grew out of a suggestion by the then head of the Department of International Politics at Fudan University, Professor Zhu Mingquan, who said we want to do more about women and international relations. I have four women in my department, can't we think of something that we would be able to do that would give a push toward the development of teaching and research on women in international relations at Fudan? Well, I thought and said, "How about a conference," and being very crafty and not wanting to do all the donkey work running the conference, I said, "Wouldn't you like to hold it at Fudan University?"

The Ford Foundation is very much interested in developing studies of women in China. So we went along to the Foundation and asked for a grant. It almost didn't happen at all because it was supposed to be held in May 2003 and along came something called SARS, which completely closed down China and Hong Kong to international travel for two or three months and right in the middle of those two or three months was May 2003. So we nearly got SARS-ed, but instead we decided to move it to October. We lost one or two people but picked up one or two people. We finally managed to hold what was a rather lively meeting at Fudan University. It is interesting perhaps to note that at the conference there were several men who gave papers that are included in the book. I was doing my statistics earlier, five of the chapters are by men, that's twenty-five percent of the chapters.

We did have a number of men taking part in the conference, but they were all Western men. The older Chinese academics looked on it benignly as one of those things that happens, apart from Professor Zhu Mingquan who actually pushed for it to happen. The Deputy Director of the center opened it by

reminding us of Mao's saying that women hold up one half of the sky. But no Chinese man gave a paper and many of them seemed to find the whole topic rather threatening. We were, however, all very keen to come back with what we were told was one of the blessings of Shanghai, the Shanghai man. Shanghai women are very smart, very tough, they have very high-flying jobs. They tend to collect men who are very good at cooking, laundry, and giving moral support to the ladies in their lives. And so all of us Western women were asking where we could perhaps get one of these.

However, I haven't yet got my Shanghai man, I'm afraid to say. I did finally get a book out of it. We were trying to do several things at the same time. It's a broad field so we were trying to mix both theoretical perspectives and case studies to get comparative insights into the role of women in international relations. There are several chapters in this book which talk not only about what it is like, used to be like, for women in the diplomatic services of the United States and Europe, but also a paper or two by Chinese contributors comparing the contribution of women in China's diplomatic service with those in the U.S. and the West, more generally.

What's very interesting is just how many points of comparison there are. One finds that in terms of the history of women in China's diplomatic service, it's been extremely similar to that of women in the U.S. or British or Swedish diplomatic services. They, until recently, lagged behind men. As with U.S. ambassadors, they tend to be appointed to the smaller and less prestigious embassies. If they are married, then their careers tended to be subordinated to those of their husbands. For example, wives could not serve in the same embassies as their husbands but had to play "tag-along." There's a great deal of that in this book.

Moving to the field of theory, scholars in the West are still looking at the whole field of women and international relations. Rosemary Foot of St. Antony's College, Oxford University, came out for this conference and wrote a very stimulating paper on women and gender in international relations asking questions rather than answering them. I think that is what most of the theoretical papers in this volume are doing. Again what was very interesting were the points of similarity between the debates that are going on about the role of women in international relations in China and the West.

Some of the most stimulating papers here are actually by some of the younger Chinese scholars who are commenting on Western theorists and trying to see what comparisons, what conclusions they themselves can draw to such questions as: "Are women intrinsically more peace-loving than men, or are they just the same as men in terms of how they conduct international relations?" Similarly papers asked, "Is it in fact a male-dominated discipline, the whole field of international relations, and have women something special to add to that?"

I received from one scholar, a very young scholar, Qiu Fang, a rather ecstatic e-mail saying it was her first publication, and that she never thought that she was going to get something published, let alone in a book by an English press. She did a very interesting paper suggesting that for centuries, all thinking at the theoretical level on international relations has been dominated by masculine perspectives going right back to Machiavelli and Hobbes. These tend to emphasize zero sum realist perspectives, exclusion, and the strict boundaries of the nation state, and that women tend to be much more empathetic and inclusive and cooperative in their approach to international relations thinking.

Another young scholar, Hu Chuanrong, took very strong issue with the perspective that women are inherently more peaceful or peace-loving and suggested that while women may not necessarily be driving the tanks or manning the machine guns, they are playing just as important roles behind the front line. Without women's efforts, wars wouldn't take place.

Other Chinese scholars took the more traditional line which I think was quite popular among feminists a century ago in the West. That is, the more women you have in international relations, the more peace-loving they are going to be because basically women are nicer, they bring up the children, and so they are less interested in war than men. So we didn't reach any conclusions, but we got a lot of debates rolling, which I hope are going on in China at the moment.

Linda Yarr as well as Rosemary Foot pointed out that women are disproportionately the victims of violence in the international sphere. In war many of those who suffer the most are women, especially with modern warfare where there are no real boundaries between the front lines and civilian competence. Women are, if anything, disproportionately represented among refugees and the victims of violence and they often get worse treatment than male refugees. In fact, Julia, in your chapter you told a story about when you were with USAID you had to go and get special treatment for women refugees because they were not allowed, for example, to pick up food or other things that they needed. A male representative had to go and get that for them until Julia changed that.

There were certainly some chapters on the formal diplomatic roles of women. Joan Hoff, whose name some of you may know, a very distinguished historian now retired but still extremely prolific, gave a paper on Madeleine Albright. By the time we actually got the books to the printers, Condoleezza Rice had become the second female U.S. Secretary of State. So she has updated it so that it discusses America's two female Secretaries of State and draws comparisons between the two of them and also looks at how they function in comparison to men. Joan Hoff suggested that despite the very fact that they were women, Albright and Rice enjoyed a certain kind of high visibility, almost superstar status. They still faced very real difficulties in being taken seriously by male colleagues or in functioning effectively. She suggested that Albright was very much excluded from Clinton's inner foreign policy-making circles. I don't know if that is true or not, but it is certainly the line she is taking. Condoleezza Rice, the verdict was still out on, but she did suggest that Condoleezza Rice took a very much "help me" role to George W. Bush and played second fiddle to him. She was also treated badly by some of the battling male egos, such as that of Donald Rumsfeld, within the Bush administration.

My co-editor He Peiqun, in writing on international organizations, rather suggested that women are confined to a ghetto of what are considered to be issues that are appropriate for women: humanitarian, educational and social, and that they are kept out of what are considered the more serious fields: arms control and the making of war and peace, for example. Though, to be fair, Joan Hoff wasn't pointing out how very keen Madeleine Albright was to show that she was just as tough as the boys and to intervene in the Balkans.

Another question that we sought to address in this book was, "What was the diplomatic role of women?" and not just through state departments and embassies. There's been a lot of work coming out in recent years suggesting that women often play diplomatic roles that are not necessarily formal diplomatic roles. They're often at the interface of international contacts in other capacities. We have quite a number of case studies in this book. The political scientist Cynthia Enloe in a book called *Bananas, Beaches, and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics* asked a rather famous question if you are an international scholar. She asked, "Where are all the women in international relations?" She answered that they were not necessarily holding official posts, but you found them as diplomatic wives, you found them working on military bases, you found them as missionaries, you found them in business, and as teachers. They were in a wide variety of roles that are often not thought of as traditional diplomatic roles.

Quite a few of these chapters focus on women who were not specifically diplomats, but who nonetheless played important diplomatic roles. One of the ways in which women for centuries have been involved in diplomatic work is by birth or by marriage. It's common place that female rulers in the past have usually gotten to where they were because they inherited power, sometimes from a spouse, sometimes because they were an only daughter and had no brothers. Sometimes, as with the Hapsburg Arch Duchesses who were regents of the Netherlands for nearly 50 years in the 16th century because they were standing in for a father or a brother or a nephew, were ruling part of his far-flung domain. Many women also served as regents for young sons. The Empress Dowager in China is one of the more famous examples of those. Often in the 20th century when women have taken up political roles, they have been carrying the torch passed to them by a dead husband or occasionally, like with Indira Gandhi, by a father.

Women have also functioned as diplomatic wives at least since the 18th century. There's a rather good book called *Daughters of Britannia* on British diplomatic spouses in particular, which I recommend to you if you haven't read it. They also sometimes represented their husbands. I was rather pleased when I found this picture of Madame Chang Kai-shek and Eleanor Roosevelt for the cover, not least because I didn't have to pay anything — it was out of copyright — but also since I was looking for something which showed fairly recognizable women. I wanted a Western woman and a Chinese — or at least an Asian — woman who played important diplomatic roles.

Eleanor — apart from such context she had as first lady with foreign diplomats and foreign visitors, such as Madame Chang Kai-shek on this occasion — went on to serve in the United Nations. Madame Chang Kai-shek played an important role as an interpreter for her husband's regime to the West. She spoke fluent English. She was very well connected in the United States. She studied at Wellesley College. He didn't have a word of English so he was very dependent on his wife to represent him, particularly in the United States, and also to some extent in Britain. Though I think Winston Churchill used to shudder when she was mentioned. She was perhaps not quite as successful in charming him as she was in getting her message across in the U.S.

Meanwhile, in China and in Hong Kong, Madame Sun Yat-sen, her sister, picked up the torch left by her husband and became, to some extent, the acceptable face of leftism for the British government in Hong Kong when she was living there in the 1930's and working on aid to China. She also, more broadly, became one of the acceptable faces of leftism on a much broader international scale, and very much became an asset for the Communist Party even though she never formally joined it. She was an honored figure until the end of her life.

Women have played other roles than those given to them by marriage. They have been social activists. There's a chapter on the peace movement, the U.S. peace movement of the early 20th century, particularly focusing on Jane Addams. It was actually written by a former Chinese student of mine. There's another chapter by one of my colleagues at Hong Kong on a woman called Clara Haslewood, whom you've probably never heard of at all. She was the wife of a British official in Hong Kong who spearheaded the campaign to outlaw the status of female bondservants in Hong Kong. He puts that in the broader international diplomatic context of the time. He also suggests that Clara Haslewood was very much culture-bound and didn't necessarily understand much about China, but that she was able to appeal particular trends in international humanitarian thinking at that time and was part of a broader network of social activism in which women were very much concerned throughout the 20th century. This was an area where women's efforts were particularly important in the earlier part of the 20th century because they had fewer other political outlets.

We have several chapters on Western women as missionaries in China. Three of my male colleagues had missionaries in the family as parents, or grandparents, or in one case as a great aunt by marriage. These women were often very strong characters who played what can be thought of as an international diplomatic role in that they would often be perhaps the only Western women who the Chinese, at that time, encountered in any kind of close proximity. Some of the women stayed in China for decades. They wrote back home, published newsletters, they came back on lecture tours, often raising money for further missionary enterprises in China. So they served to present China — to Americans, to the British, to Canadians - who otherwise would probably have known less about China than they did.

One of them even acted as an intermediary between the people of a town that had, I think, been taken, first by the Communists or the warlords, and then the Guomindang came back in. The townspeople were terrified that the town was going to be sacked by the Guomindang troops, that they would loot and rape and pillage. So Dr. Charlotte Bacon, a medical missionary, came along and grabbed the stirrup of the commanding officer's horse and pleaded for the townspeople. The officer said "Guomindang troops don't do that sort of thing," so she said, "Great, prove it." Whether there were such other episodes, we really don't know. Here we see women acting as intermediaries between cultures in a wide variety of nontraditional ways. How important those diplomatic interactions were is perhaps difficult to gauge. One can certainly see that women did have what was sometimes their own special role to play.

There is some work here on journalists and writers such as Emily Hahn, Gwen Dew, Teresa Norton, again interpreting cultures to each other. Two of those were doing so during the 1930's and World War II. Teresa Norton has been working in Hong Kong in the 1990's and the 2000's. One of my colleagues in Hong Kong used them as mirrors through which to understand cultural interactions. Finishing up, we had several chapters discussing the roles of contemporary women in diplomacy and what they can contribute to international relations as teachers, as lawyers, as businessmen, as community activists and how this in one way or another often changes the women involved as well as the communities in which they are working. We finished off with a call to arms by Linda Yarr encouraging women to help each other and collaborate across borders to ensure that women's concerns are properly represented in international relations and to give each other a leg up, which I suppose is one of the purposes of this group that I am speaking to tonight.

Ms. Ellis: Thank you so much. We're going to open it up for questions, and I'm going to lead it off. I have a question about what the two of you feel are the real obstacles today to women achieving real leadership with power and influence, not just getting positions. Do you see it as different in China and the U.S., or do you see these things as parallel?

Ambassador Bloch: I think one of the remaining constraints has to do with women ourselves. I think throughout the book there's mention of women having to choose between marriage and their careers. I think Madeleine Albright is a clear case because she has publicly said in her interviews and her biography that she would have given up her career to save her marriage because she was devastated that her husband left her for a younger woman. She said it outright. I think women have always faced this dilemma, and I can honestly say here that, had I had children, I don't think I would have done all that I have done in my life.

Now, in terms of real power, I think that has to do with tradition, with customary practice and entrenched attitudes that are very difficult to change. And I think it is universal, not something that is only in Asia or America. I think it will take centuries to change those mindsets. I think I alluded to the fact, and there are other practitioners here, who have faced this. As Priscilla mentioned, there is the position and the inner circle. I think partly because our global leaders have been male, there are some

females, but again it's a comfort zone. I think I mentioned that certainly my generation, for us to be successful as women, as we rose up in the ranks we had to make our male colleagues and leaders comfortable. We always had to make sure that they did not feel threatened. This discomfort means that the leaders, the boss — he is not going to ask you to go golfing or go drinking afterwards or carousing. It's very hard for women, no matter how hard they try to be a buddy within the inner circle. I guess Condoleezza Rice has maybe achieved this status as a friend. I mean she is actually a buddy of the President, but to what end, at what expense?

Ms. Ellis: Could you bring women's confidence into your response because there is the outside attitude, but what about the attitudes of women towards themselves?

Ambassador Bloch: That's what I tried to say at the very beginning. The problem is also with ourselves, and that's what I meant. There are lots of young people here and I think the younger generation may be different than mine. Women have been socialized into certain roles, and certainly in China it's a much more submissive girl, although the revolution or liberation, depending on where you stand, has certainly given women in China today many more opportunities and options. Nonetheless, traditional attitudes and customs die hard.

Dr. Roberts: I think you're right that there is a difference in generations. For the most part younger men tend to be, certainly in the West, rather more comfortable with women who are going out and doing things than an older generation was. Having said that, there are many exceptions to both these rules. I can think of highly supportive older men who have encouraged me to go out and do things, to go do exactly what I pleased and what interests me and who don't feel threatened by intelligent women. And there are certain younger men who do. I would say that in China they are perhaps a generation two behind, despite "women holding up half the sky." Years ago I was at one of the university campuses in Quanzhou, and I learned the week before they had had a debate in the student's union. Because jobs were short for graduates when they got out of university, they were debating whether women should go back to the kitchen. Almost unanimously the men voted yes.

As I said, it was one of the older professors at Fudan who came up with the topic for the workshop and it seemed to be the younger academic and postgraduate students who were made rather nervous discussing the subject of women in international relations and saw it as a threat. When you're actually working somewhere, I suppose a woman has to steer a fine line between not scaring the chaps too much and not being too submissive so that they take you seriously. And there are some men who just won't bother to take you seriously no matter what you do. I remember one of my Chinese colleagues. I didn't particularly like his trying to stare down my cleavage all the time and pat my hand, but what I particularly objected to was that he didn't realize that I'm actually quite smart and had some good ideas. I might have at least let him pat my hand occasionally if he had listened to what I had to say. On the other hand, to be regarded as simply a sex object, not even an intelligent sex object, was taking it too far.

Donna Constantinople: On that note, I wanted to ask a question, following up on Pat's point on influence and power. It seems as though one linkage is economic strength. To what extent do you feel, in the papers that have come out in the book, that economic power will begin to transform opinions among decision makers about women's ability to achieve success in their various fields? While I think there is a bias among academic women, the question is if they have economic power, if they are running businesses, if they start to ascend in those areas, will that begin to make a difference?

Dr. Roberts: I don't know if there is a great deal about economic status of women per se in here, although perhaps it is there by implication. I would imagine that that would make quite a difference.

Whenever women have the power of the purse, that makes a difference. I wonder if China's one child policy is not going to make a substantial difference as well because there is this big gender imbalance in favor of males, which means that women are now a scarce commodity in China and therefore, one hopes, to be valued more. In quite a lot of families, in the academic families I know, the parents are so proud of their high-achieving only daughter who is studying medicine at Harvard or science at Princeton. They're really pushing these girls just as if they were the only son and heir and are just as proud of them as they would be of boys. I think that this generation of women is going to have the confidence to fight for recognition in their own fields. It's not just that they're holding down good salaries, but they're going to have more prestige and status with all the resources that have been put into them.

Ambassador Bloch: Actually, in Asia women do generally control the purse for the home. Throughout Asia, husbands turn over their salaries for the women to manage. In public, the women might be quite submissive, but behind the scenes — in the Philippines and Southeast Asia particularly — the women often call the shots because they do control the purse in the home. As for China, I think it is much easier for women to achieve economic power than it is for women to achieve political power. Women are often much more practical and they're very good business women. The Chinese women are very business savvy and business orientated. In the younger and hip generation in Shanghai for example, often the women earn more money than the husbands to allow the men, for example, to continue to be professors while the women are doing the business.

Ms. Constantinople: This economic power that you see emerging among these younger women, do you think that one thing begins to lead to the other?

Ambassador Bloch: In those relationships they're quite equal, much more so, because money is power. It's like the Wild West of the United States. Things are going on that are quite unbelievable in the business/commercial sector. In China, hierarchy is very much alive and well and if you come from the high cadre families, whether you are male or female, you are making a lot of money. Donna, you're right. Money is power. Money buys power.

Heather Risley: My name is Heather Risley, and I work on issues regarding corporate ethics and the international public sector. My question is related to a theory that I've heard that because the history of foreign relations has been more or less constructed by men, there's an actual language that has taken on specific male characteristics, and for women to really succeed, either economically or politically or socially, and have real power, they have to adapt to those kind of characteristics to be successful. For example, a lot of people love Hillary Clinton and a lot of people don't like her, but she certainly has a reputation for taking a more aggressive stance that some people describe as being more male. Yet, she's been quite successful in that way and some people have criticized her for that. Could you maybe speak a bit to how women can navigate the field of power and whether it is necessary for women to take on stereotypical male characteristics in order to succeed or whether they can remain true to their instincts?

Dr. Roberts: Joan Hoff, in her chapter, talked quite a bit about what she termed "male-ization" of successful women. She was referring to Madeleine Albright and also to such almost stereotypical ladies such as Margaret Thatcher, Golda Meir, and Indira Gandhi, the ones who often got the label as the only man in the cabinet because they were seen as so much tougher than the boys. I think that is certainly a strategy that some women adopt. It's not so much "if you can't beat them join them" as it is "if you can beat them terrify them." I think a lot of women know that if they absolutely jump up and down, you can get an awful lot of men scared of you very quickly if they think that you're tough or have the capacity to be tough. I think that Margaret Thatcher certainly played to that stereotype. She had a reputation for

terrorizing all the men in her cabinet, when she wasn't mothering them of course, basically being the English nanny writ large. It's certainly one strategy that women play.

It's also true, however, that behavior that would not seem particularly unusual in a man sometimes leads men to say, "Oh my God, she's tough, she's hard." That same behavior in a man would not be worthy of comment or would certainly be thought of as, "Ah yes, well he's assertive, he states his case, he stands up for himself." That same behavior in a woman would be, "My God, she's shrill, she's aggressive." Yes that's right, you've probably heard all of these. Someone like Condoleezza Rice, who is much less threatening to masculine egos, is just employing another strategy. I think it's how far one is prepared to go to adapt to a masculine comfort zone as opposed to getting them just so scared that you get your own way.

Ambassador Bloch: Let me make a comment about what Priscilla said that I think is absolutely correct, about how certain characteristics in a male might seem quite normal and in a woman might seem quite extraordinary. I think one of the problems is that we all have to work in systems. The Foreign Service is one of the most and longstanding intractable systems. I sat on many promotion boards and I have seen graphically the patent discrimination in reviewing evaluations for promotions. The two ambassadors in here can chime in. They probably have had much more experience than I. Where a woman is described as ambitious, that's a negative, but if a man is described as ambitious, he has initiative. Where a woman can be described as being assertive, instead it's interpreted that she is aggressive and that in a woman is a negative. In a man it's a good characteristic because it means he's goal-oriented and he gets things done.

I've seen these interpretations on these boards. A man might get promoted for exactly what a woman is being demoted for. And this is systemic and I don't know how you would change the system. Therefore it is not surprising, the "male-ization" of women within these services. How do you get ahead? That is a calculation for every officer.

I found your comment about Condoleezza Rice quite strange. Do you think she is less threatening? Maybe that's true because she dresses better than Madeleine Albright. In comparing the records, I would say that Condoleezza Rice has run the State Department and has led the foreign policy of the United States in a much more non-feminist way than Madeleine Albright, because Madeleine Albright at least tried. She at least talked about issues that are important to women in international relations. This is something that I see in the research on Condoleezza's record. She has almost never even spoken a word about women's roles and women's issues in international affairs, even when she unveiled her transformational diplomacy. I think it was only in the question and answer period that women and gender came up. She might have mentioned it once.

Ambassador Aurelia Brazeal: In my view, I agree with what Ambassador Bloch said about evaluations but I attribute that to the mass culture of America, not something that is completely unique to the State Department. I do remember being described in a State Department evaluation as aggressive, so I unaggressively went to my boss and said, "Are you trying to be helpful, or are you trying to be critical?" Perhaps because I was being unaggressive, he said that he was trying to be helpful. So I tried to rewrite that section but I think it's seen as less negative, so I think it is simply a matter of women having to have what I call a lack of tone deafness. Women have to understand that there are certain words that are appropriated negatively in one instance and positively in another. I think that makes you a better diplomat because when you are looking at the subtext in your own country, you are a little more attuned to the subtext in other cultures and to what is going around you. But I think that mass culture in America has tried to push women back, if I may say so because I just got back. Right now the

commoditization of women, as well as who cares what Britney Spears and Paris Hilton are doing. And it's news! We're supposed to be blonde bimbos, excuse my language. I don't understand it and yet there's a sort of apathy and passiveness in mass America of, "Well, yes I guess that's how we're supposed to be," and I find it interesting.

Deborah McCarthy: My name is Deborah McCarthy. I think that now, at least in our system in the West, women are at the table when it comes to foreign policy. There may be a cost to doing it, in terms of family and children, but that is a personal choice. I'm struck, as I make a list here of people I've known over the years I've been in the Foreign Service and where they are and what a great difference there has been. There has been a cost for some but not for all. There have been some pretty interesting positions in their career paths. As I have served in a lot of places, I've found when you go out and looked for women who are involved in international affairs, not just in their foreign ministries, it's amazing how many women are involved. But they are not visible. It's not as public. Whether it's groups of women-run media or large businesses in France or groups of women in Haiti, they're often in positions as judges and lawmakers but they're not always at the table in their own countries. But they could be if they associate with certain international groups.

And once in awhile the feminine wile does work. I'll give you an example. The former Foreign Minister of Paraguay, in a totally male-dominated society, came in a fairly difficult part of a negotiation. She came in wearing this little Chanel suit and she was perfumed to the nines. I knew her and she was really good. She went around and kissed every man around the table, and after she left the room, we got down to business and we got the job done. It works on occasion.

Comment: When you look at a country like Canada, which has far fewer women in any significant role in international business and international foreign policy, with the exception that they had one prime minister who was a female not too long ago, I think we've come far, with or without a female Secretary of State.

Ambassador Aurelia Brazeal: Because of our lawsuits.

Comment: Our ambassador to the Philippines is a woman, our ambassador to NATO is a woman, we don't have Paris, London, or Rome — we're still missing those.

Ambassador Sylvia Stanfield: There are constraints on women in foreign affairs in the State Department, but there are also certain advantages. I served in an Islamic country where there are divisions, so the women may be on one side and the men on another, but as a woman you can talk to people on both sides. As a diplomat you're representing your country, so males have to respect you, but you also get another aspect that is denied to male colleagues who sometimes can't cross that divide. There are still other constraints, like the old boys network. They take care of each other. Women have to learn to network more. While the State Department has made strides in trying to be more family friendly, and I know a number of women whose spouses come with them, I find that often the posts are more sympathetic to accommodate the male spouse. They will go out and take great pains to find a position for him if he wants to work overseas, more so than they would do for a woman. We still have a long way to go.

Mary Oakes Smith: My name is Mary Oakes Smith. I've worked for 30 years with the World Bank and I can sympathize with Julia Chang Bloch, because when I joined the bank they did not have professional women. I came in as an assistant economist from USAID and I was told that I could not be a professional because women were not professionals. It wasn't until a year later when McNamara was

President and evaluated all the women that I got a call that told me I could now go to the executive dining room because I was now a professional. So that just goes to show you that we've been fighting the same battle. What is your definition of real power? We've defined power as political, economic, and as being in the inner circle. There are many women who have important positions around the world, and I could give examples. I think there is a role that women have played, it hasn't been recognized.

Emilia Rodriguez-Stein: My name is Emilia Rodriguez-Stein and I work for the Inter-America Foundation. We do international development in Latin America and the Caribbean. As a mother of two young college graduate ladies and a mentor of many students trying to do international development, what should I tell them if they want to become ambassadors like the fine women we have here? How should I mentor them to grow up to become ambassadors?

Ms. Ellis: And speaking of mentoring, in Linda's chapter she mentioned the importance of mentoring. I don't know if it goes on in China in the way it has become important here.

Dr. Roberts: I think I'd say be stubborn and not give up.

Ambassador Bloch: I would say believe in yourself. But you wanted to ask the other question about power. I think I was responding to international relations and what you were talking about could be part of international relations. I was defining power in a more traditional sense. The definition of power within the international relations sector really comes down to decision making and being able to impact and decide the foreign policies of your country.

Linda Yarr: I just received a report which was put out by the organization Catalyst that studies women's advancement in the business world. It has a great title. It says, "You're damned if you do and doomed if you don't." I think it really does take more than one individual to move forward and I guess I was referring to the fact that, although numbers alone are not sufficient, it's not enough to count on how many million there are because it matters who these women are. Do Condoleezza Rice or Margaret Thatcher bring other women with them or don't they? It also matters how they act in positions of power and how their examples answer questions like, "do I want to be like that?" I think that organizations like the Women's Foreign Policy Group and all of these associations that bring these issues to the floor are critically important to getting a dialogue out about what it takes to advance women into positions of decision-making and power

Ms. Ellis: Thank you very much Linda. I think we really owe a debt of gratitude to our two speakers today, Dr. Priscilla Roberts and Ambassador Julia Chang Bloch. Before you applaud I just wanted to mention: we have not done a program on China in a very long time and our next program is also about China with another author, Dr. Susan Shirk. She just wrote a new book *China, Fragile Superpower: How China's Internal Politics Could Derail Its Peaceful Rise*. She will be here on October 4th so we hope you can all join us. Now a big round of applause for Ambassador Julia Chang Bloch and Dr. Priscilla Roberts.