

The Commons: Puget Sound Journal of Politics

Volume 1 | Issue 2

Article 1

March 2021

Pop Rocks and Persistence: Finding the Women in U.S. Foreign Policy and National Security

Lily Hoak

University of Puget Sound

Follow this and additional works at: <https://soundideas.pugetsound.edu/thecommons>



Part of the [American Politics Commons](#), [Defense and Security Studies Commons](#), [International Relations Commons](#), [Military and Veterans Studies Commons](#), and the [Terrorism Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hoak, Lily (2021) "Pop Rocks and Persistence: Finding the Women in U.S. Foreign Policy and National Security," *The Commons: Puget Sound Journal of Politics*: Vol. 1 : Iss. 2 , Article 1.

Available at: <https://soundideas.pugetsound.edu/thecommons/vol1/iss2/1>

This Primary and secondary research papers is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Publications at Sound Ideas. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Commons: Puget Sound Journal of Politics by an authorized editor of Sound Ideas. For more information, please contact soundideas@pugetsound.edu.

POP ROCKS AND PERSISTENCE

FINDING THE WOMEN IN U.S. FOREIGN POLICY AND NATIONAL SECURITY

LILY HOAK

One hundred years after the ratification of the 19th Amendment, women in the United States continue to face societal and institutionalized biases that can undermine the success of women everywhere. This is especially true when it comes to leadership in the U.S. government. While the number of women serving in state and federal legislatures has increased, the number of women leaders in the foreign policy and national security enterprise continues to be lacking. As I progressed in my International Relations degree, I realized that I was most frequently learning about men, from men. I then asked: where are the women in U.S. foreign policy and national security (FP/NS)? Over the last three months, I have interviewed fifteen women from various FP/NS backgrounds and degrees of experience to understand their time in the field and how their identities as women have impacted their work. The decades-old networks of aging, white men who have held, and continue to hold, the majority of positions across the foreign policy establishment have created a culture where women must work harder than their male counterparts work in order to advance. In addition, almost all of these women reported casual sexism and discrimination in the workplace. While increasing support from male and female career service members and mentors has helped increase the number of women in FP/NS, the fraternal cultures of the FP/NS institutions have engendered and enabled underrepresentation of women in the field. Such representation is necessary so that decision-makers in FP/NS are more informed and are better representative of the country that they serve.

METHOD

In order to better understand the field of and the fraternal cultures within FP/NS in the United States, I interviewed fifteen women from across various agencies and institutions. In these interviews, I asked a set of questions that focused on their backgrounds, careers, and personal thoughts and experiences as women in FP/NS. I also asked for their thoughts on the future of women in FP/NS and advice for young women entering the field. In analyzing their answers, I identified several themes that were consistent across all of the interviews. The results will be explained below. The women were selected in no particular order, as I was put in contact with some of the interviewees through the others with whom I had spoken. Their names have been replaced with pseudonyms to ensure their anonymity. Interviews have been edited for clarity.

DIVERSE VOICES MATTER

Agencies that are made up of entirely or almost all male staff members are not representative of the populations that they serve and protect. This is often the case all around the world where governments are making policy choices. One of the most shining examples of this is in peace negotiations. One study that examined “eighty-two peace agreements in forty-two armed conflicts between 1989 and 2011 concluded that peace agreements with women are associated with ‘durable peace’” and that agreements “signed by women show a higher number of provisions aimed at political reform and implementation.”¹ Yet, women are still being left out when negotiations are conferred. Many women also believe that they bring their own unique skills to diplomacy and foreign policy. Denmark’s Ambassador to the United States Lone Dencker Wisborg has said that “men are focused on winning and women are focused on getting things done.”² Former Hungarian Ambassador to the U.S. Reka Szermerkenyi has stated that “women have a more natural talent for approaching conflict compared to men, but a combination of men and women is hugely important, because in many cases, what is missing is an ability to smooth things together.”³ Including people of diverse backgrounds means including diverse perspectives on issues and widening the window of possibility for progress in any given field.

EXPERIENCES: THEN

The experiences of women in the field of FP/NS since the early 1970’s paint an illuminating picture for women’s place in the establishment. One woman, Laura, is a former Ambassador and Deputy Chief of Mission and has worked in the field for over thirty years. Her career highlights the changes over time. When she started, women could not get the language training that they needed and were essentially excluded from posts in the Middle East and most of Asia. She says that what women were told repeatedly that “[they] couldn’t, [they] couldn’t, [they] couldn’t.”⁴ One of her early bosses, who she referred to as the “jerk of all jerks”, was unhappy that he had been assigned a woman. When she arrived at the post, he escorted her to her new office, which turned out to include a fridge, coffee pot, and a hot plate. He had literally put her in the kitchen. He then proceeded to exclude her from all meetings and assign her no work. Luckily, the other men in the office tried to include her, and she sought out work on her own. Eventually, the Ambassador heard her story after she requested a transfer and the ‘jerk’ was asked to retire.

Later on in her career and at a new post, Laura continued to face workplace discrimination and harassment. She detailed one experience in

which she was sexually harassed while wearing a Diane von Furstenberg wrap dress (she made a note of telling me this detail). A senior official stopped to chat with her and then, as an apparent joke, pulled on the tie of her dress to undo it. Laura told herself to just let it go but informed her boss of the incident. Her boss asked her if she wanted him to say anything and she said that she would think of an appropriate response later. She said that, some time after the incident had occurred, the offender was in her section and that she had some Pop Rocks. She asked if he had ever had them and when he said no, she offered him some. She explained that you were supposed to eat the entire pack at once, in an apparent effort to embarrass him. Soon, Pop Rocks were fizzing out of his nose. While this was certainly an unconventional response, it was one way that this woman found to handle an offensive and ridiculous act from her work colleague. Another story she relayed to me was not specifically about her, but rather about former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright. Laura detailed an encounter between Albright and former Ambassador Richard Holbrooke at a panel. Holbrooke reportedly “mansplained” to Albright the entire time, despite the fact that she was more senior than he was and had held a cabinet position.

Another woman I spoke with, Katherine, has a background in national security. She was raised by female professors and, after completing her undergraduate degree, worked for a national security scholar, which sparked her interest in defense policy. After graduate school, she worked under a top military advisor for six years. During that time, like most of the people I interviewed, she was one of the only women at her place of employment. She was also the only civilian staff member. This meant that she was not in “competition” with the military officers for possible promotions. She said that “what we were doing mattered too much” to have her gender impact their work. While she did not identify specific incidents of discrimination, she did cite an experience in which sexist assumptions were made of her. She stated that, while she was an official representative, one man assumed that she was a secretary at a meeting. This is something that multiple women have attested to have happened to them. With this, she stated there was “general creepy, predatory behavior.” This sort of behavior, in comparison to something like the Pop Rocks incident, indicates the broader, cultural problems that breed in male-dominated institutions. However, Katherine said the institution itself was looking out for her more broadly and that she “joined at the crest of diversifying the field.”⁵ She said that she had help from her male colleagues, who mitigated the impact of gender-based discrimination from select individuals. With this, she said that her “experience is markedly different because, for [her], being a woman has been a marginal advantage” due to the various mentors and programs she was able to have and access

¹ Sloan Susan. *A Seat at the Table: Women, Diplomacy, and Lessons for the World* (New Degree Press, 2020), 63

³ *Ibid.*, 99

⁴ Zoom Interview with the Author, 17 June 2020

² *Ibid.*, 276

⁵ Phone Interview with the Author, 28 June 2020

because of her gender.⁶ As she rose in the ranks and took on supervisory positions, she knew that people would not make assumptions or asperse her based on or because of her gender. She said her experience in these leadership positions, especially one that involved her working under a top military advisor, taught her how to unflinchingly deal with incidents of bias and to develop a thick skin. Despite her comparatively positive experience, she acknowledged that most of her young female friends have had poorer experiences in FP/NS.

One more woman that I interviewed, Juliet, began her career before 2000. Juliet said that “things she had to contend with are no longer acceptable today.” Throughout her education in FP/NS, there were hardly any female role models or professors. Her field of expertise, Russia/USSR, was largely dominated by men, despite the fact that the USSR had a larger contingent of women. The nuclear weapons and arms control sectors were predominantly male, filled with “generations of men who think that any hard power or military or armed services/weapons are always male.” Juliet said that, because of this assumption, “many people felt that women would feel uncomfortable negotiating with force rather than diplomacy.”⁷

EXPERIENCES: NOW

Many of the women that I spoke with who entered the field more recently have seen a lot of growth and increased diversity. While there have been more women at the forefront of US foreign policy—like Madeleine Albright, Condoleezza Rice, and Hillary Clinton—there has been a less visible but no less important increase in the lower ranks. Still, many also face similar discrimination as the women did before them.

Jane has worked in several sub-sects of government, including the Marine Corps. When she joined the military, there were mostly male senior officers and no female mentors in the Marines. With this, there were structural barriers in place, like women being barred from combat (until 2015). These barriers prevented advancement for many female service members. In response to this, women found loopholes, like the Lioness and Female Engagement Teams (FETs) which allowed them to go into combat zones for a maximum of forty-four days. She also described, like other military members I spoke with, the sexual harassment issues and inappropriate actions of senior officers. When she was given a rare opportunity to head into a combat zone, the men stationed there assumed that she was going to be male. A senior officer, apparently shocked, “said no straight out” to her being assigned to this position (he was eventually promoted). She said that, at first, the military is an equalizer because everyone enters at the same level, but that the balance of

power soon becomes increasingly unequal because advancement to higher-rank positions is predicated on past lengthy, usually lifelong military experience. These positions often self-select for men not only because of sheer military experience that is expected, but also because these positions allow for little time outside of work to attend to domestic duties or childcare obligations. Women who achieve these positions are often either childless, married to other officers of similar ranks, or are in relationships in which there is more shared responsibility. When Jane transitioned to work as a civilian in the Pentagon, her “male coworkers assumed that I didn’t know anything about the military.” Working in this environment became “emotionally exhausting” and that the hyper-masculine culture has made her regret “not sticking up for women all of the time.”⁸

Claire also served in the U.S. Armed Forces. She has dealt with sexism and harassment in the military since she joined ROTC in high school. During her initial training in the military, a superior officer sexually harassed her. To avoid being harassed again, she attempted to complete part of her training early. She said that she did “the right thing by not reporting.”⁹ Claire also has had to deal with microaggressions at work, especially in her current position at an agency in which she is one of only a few Black employees. She states that there is a sense of people wondering, “why does this Black girl have this job?” She stated that there are also male subordinates who regularly contradict female superiors, “even when [they] would be dead wrong, like completely wrong.” Claire cited an incident of this behavior that occurred during a joint-department meeting with a senior military officer. A woman tried to tell a colonel that her office needed something different than what was in the plan and that he “essentially told her to ‘stay in her lane.’” When the man called on another male officer, who had the same suggestion as the woman did, the colonel took his point. Claire remarked that “basically, what she said wasn’t valid until a white man said it.” Claire pointed out that there is no formal mechanism or process in place to report these micro-aggressions. Claire also shared that a male co-worker had told her that he had noticed that women would bond in the hallways “even if they didn’t know each other” and would give one another “looks” in response to behavior by “some straight up assholes.” She said that he thought that there was a “unwritten rule of friendship between the women.” Like Jane, she was thankful for her time in the service, but “was sick of it” towards the end. When she worked with female engagement teams, her boss asked, “What about home life?” during a briefing. Claire responded by saying, “Well, I’m single. . . and I don’t have a husband” and that this officer basically sounded like an Afghan man. When she was leaving, he “knew he had put his foot in it” and requested that she not tell anyone about their conversation.

⁶ Phone Interview with the Author, 28 June 2020

⁷ Zoom Interview with the Author, 25 June 2020

⁸ Zoom Interview with the Author, 29 June 2020

⁹ Zoom Interview with the Author, 10 July 2020

Another Army officer, Morgan, described similar situations that happened in the late 90s and early 2000s. She said when she was in the lower ranks, she always had to be “on the lookout” for sexual predators. Although this was less necessary when she was older, she would still occasionally find herself in potentially dangerous situations with male colleagues.¹⁰ Prior to her active duty, she attended West Point several years after women were first allowed entry into the Academy. She said that a friend, who was in West Point’s first class, had to deal with far more blatant aggression and threats to her physical safety than she had to. Morgan said that this demonstrated how having women there before you can make a difference in how accommodating a male-dominated environment can be for women. In her chosen specialty, there were institutional biases and barriers that perpetuated women’s exclusion from combat. Women were not allowed to be certified in certain modes of transport, purely because these modes of transport had a weapon attached to them. While senior personnel were well aware of the issue, they were more inclined to see why “certain races were drawn towards certain sections that had less room for advancement, which made it feel like the race issue overshadowed the gender one” when, really, both issues were of great concern. While working for one senior office, she said that the officials “had a chip on their shoulder about gender questions.” In meetings, she described how, as a woman, “[she] sat back and listened” in order to have her voice heard. She also “had to be more active than [her] male colleagues” because she was never going to be called on or asked a question.¹¹

Elle also worked in the defense sector, but was not a member of the military. After receiving a fellowship, she chose to start work in an especially male-dominated part of the Department of Defense, despite being female and significantly younger than a majority of the military staff employed there. Elle said that being younger in this position “had a bigger impact” on her job than being a woman. However, Elle admitted that she still had to face “additional discrimination.”¹² She stated that her appearance as a blonde woman who did not wear the unofficial black or navy suit that most women wore made her stand out even more. However, Elle said that, when she spoke, her colleagues understood her and that this deterred greater bias against her.

There was also “low-grade sexual harassment and plenty of inappropriate comments,” including men making advances at her at work. She picked her battles, like Laura did, because if she “got upset all the time, it would wear [her] down.” Around this time, Elle was also working with international networks. She said that she faced more gender concerns when abroad. Once, while traveling in Eastern Europe with a young Black Army officer, she said that they

drew a lot of stares, which was somewhat off-putting. After a military site tour, her coworker said he was scared that others were going to try to grab her hair and “drag [her] out behind the building.”¹³ While Elle was traveling in the Middle East, she said that her blonde hair garnered a lot of attention and attracted a large crowd of young men, who surrounded her and took pictures. These stories show the heightened significance of physical safety for women in the field. Later in her career, after transitioning back to public service, she noticed that many of her friends who had been with her during her initial fellowship had left government service. She said that her female colleagues’ withdrawal from government service can likely be attributed to an issue that I had not considered at the outset of this project: the struggle to balance work and home life as a woman. Several mothers who I spoke with discussed how difficult it was to start and raise a family with the demands and constraints of their time-consuming, taxing careers. Elle explained that “maternity leave” (she requested that air quotes be used here) is practically non-existent. Elle said that, when she was pregnant with her twins, she had to save enough sick and vacation time to take care of her newborns: she, therefore, could not take any time off during her pregnancy. This is the way most women get enough time off to stay home after having children. When her twins were born several weeks early, she realized that she needed more time off than she had initially anticipated. Elle described being in a panic, both over her babies’ welfare and over her job security, while on the phone with a human resources representative while still in her hospital room. The unwillingness of this field to create more flexible approaches for maternity and paternity leave places unnecessary restraints on women’s careers.

Leslie, like Morgan and Katherine, has worked in the field since the 1990s, but has yet to work directly for a female boss. The majority-male, mostly male-run networks meant that advancement within the workplace was predicated on one’s ability to engage with one’s male superiors. Leslie said that she developed habits to make herself more comfortable in and compatible with that environment. She said that a graduate school professor once told her to read the sports section every day so she would have something to discuss with her male colleagues at work. She also described having to verbally “elbow her way in” by interrupting, physically taking up space, and being more aggressive and assertive. When she received a new job as a political appointee, her boss “had to gently counsel” her to not interrupt people, which Leslie found “ironic.” She said that one department in her office had a more blatantly hostile culture due to its military components. Leslie said that more people had a chip on their shoulder (an oft-used phrase by most of the women I interviewed) about women working there. One anecdote that she shared was about how a group of

¹⁰ Zoom Interview with the Author, 8 July 2020

¹² Phone Interview with the Author, 10 August 2020

¹¹ Zoom Interview with the Author, 8 July 2020

¹³ Phone Interview with the Author, 10 August 2020

Another Army officer, Morgan, described similar situations that happened in the late 90s and early 2000s. She said when she was in the lower ranks, she always had to be “on the lookout” for sexual predators. Although this was less necessary when she was older, she would still occasionally find herself in potentially dangerous situations with male colleagues.¹⁰ Prior to her active duty, she attended West Point several years after women were first allowed entry into the Academy. She said that a friend, who was in West Point’s first class, had to deal with far more blatant aggression and threats to her physical safety than she had to. Morgan said that this demonstrated how having women there before you can make a difference in how accommodating a male-dominated environment can be for women. In her chosen specialty, there were institutional biases and barriers that perpetuated women’s exclusion from combat. Women were not allowed to be certified in certain modes of transport, purely because these modes of transport had a weapon attached to them. While senior personnel were well aware of the issue, they were more inclined to see why “certain races were drawn towards certain sections that had less room for advancement, which made it feel like the race issue overshadowed the gender one” when, really, both issues were of great concern. While working for one senior office, she said that the officials “had a chip on their shoulder about gender questions.” In meetings, she described how, as a woman, “[she] sat back and listened” in order to have her voice heard. She also “had to be more active than [her] male colleagues” because she was never going to be called on or asked a question.¹¹

Elle also worked in the defense sector, but was not a member of the military. After receiving a fellowship, she chose to start work in an especially male-dominated part of the Department of Defense, despite being female and significantly younger than a majority of the military staff employed there. Elle said that being younger in this position “had a bigger impact” on her job than being a woman. However, Elle admitted that she still had to face “additional discrimination.”¹² She stated that her appearance as a blonde woman who did not wear the unofficial black or navy suit that most women wore made her stand out even more. However, Elle said that, when she spoke, her colleagues understood her and that this deterred greater bias against her.

There was also “low-grade sexual harassment and plenty of inappropriate comments,” including men making advances at her at work. She picked her battles, like Laura did, because if she “got upset all the time, it would wear [her] down.” Around this time, Elle was also working with international networks. She said that she faced more gender concerns when abroad. Once, while traveling in Eastern Europe with a young Black Army officer, she said that they

drew a lot of stares, which was somewhat off-putting. After a military site tour, her coworker said he was scared that others were going to try to grab her hair and “drag [her] out behind the building.”¹³ While Elle was traveling in the Middle East, she said that her blonde hair garnered a lot of attention and attracted a large crowd of young men, who surrounded her and took pictures. These stories show the heightened significance of physical safety for women in the field. Later in her career, after transitioning back to public service, she noticed that many of her friends who had been with her during her initial fellowship had left government service. She said that her female colleagues’ withdrawal from government service can likely be attributed to an issue that I had not considered at the outset of this project: the struggle to balance work and home life as a woman. Several mothers who I spoke with discussed how difficult it was to start and raise a family with the demands and constraints of their time-consuming, taxing careers. Elle explained that “maternity leave” (she requested that air quotes be used here) is practically non-existent. Elle said that, when she was pregnant with her twins, she had to save enough sick and vacation time to take care of her newborns: she, therefore, could not take any time off during her pregnancy. This is the way most women get enough time off to stay home after having children. When her twins were born several weeks early, she realized that she needed more time off than she had initially anticipated. Elle described being in a panic, both over her babies’ welfare and over her job security, while on the phone with a human resources representative while still in her hospital room. The unwillingness of this field to create more flexible approaches for maternity and paternity leave places unnecessary restraints on women’s careers.

Leslie, like Morgan and Katherine, has worked in the field since the 1990s, but has yet to work directly for a female boss. The majority-male, mostly male-run networks meant that advancement within the workplace was predicated on one’s ability to engage with one’s male superiors. Leslie said that she developed habits to make herself more comfortable in and compatible with that environment. She said that a graduate school professor once told her to read the sports section every day so she would have something to discuss with her male colleagues at work. She also described having to verbally “elbow her way in” by interrupting, physically taking up space, and being more aggressive and assertive. When she received a new job as a political appointee, her boss “had to gently counsel” her to not interrupt people, which Leslie found “ironic.” She said that one department in her office had a more blatantly hostile culture due to its military components. Leslie said that more people had a chip on their shoulder (an oft-used phrase by most of the women I interviewed) about women working there. One anecdote that she shared was about how a group of

¹⁰ Zoom Interview with the Author, 8 July 2020

¹² Phone Interview with the Author, 10 August 2020

¹¹ Zoom Interview with the Author, 8 July 2020

¹³ Phone Interview with the Author, 10 August 2020

of gender and age bias that is not seen nearly as often with men early in their careers in FP/NS.

Sylvia, who works in the same office as Hadley does, has had very similar experiences. While in school studying business, she and her female classmates were instructed in what they should wear for work and how to present themselves within a “very narrow box of femininity.”²⁰ Later at an unpaid internship, she said that four out of the six interns were women, but that the men were given every substantive task while the administrative tasks were “evenly” divided among the female interns. More recently, at an event that she helped organize, a male senior official said to her and her female coworkers that he had “a fiery wife just like them.” Another co-worker, Maddie, experienced much of the same things. She said that, at meetings, men are able to drag on while women tend to speak much more concisely. She said that this is because they do not want to speak too much or be cut off, and that the men are generally the people who interrupt. This is similar to Morgan’s efforts to be included in meetings and Leslie’s learned ability to elbow into conversations.

The experiences of women throughout the last thirty years demonstrate what has and has not changed over the generations. While some women described individual bias and casual discrimination or harassment, other women described a broader, institutional bias. The existence of this duality in women’s experiences indicates that being a woman in FP/NS in the United States comes with its own forms of discrimination and impediments.

MENTORSHIP

For most of the women I interviewed, there were not a lot of women present in their early education and careers who were senior enough to be female mentors for them. This is especially true of women in graduate school before the 1990’s. The lack of female mentors exacerbated the old boys’ networks by leaving women with only male mentors to help and teach them. Leslie described how the “network... explains a lot of disparity”, making it “imperative on men to expand their networks outside of other men.”²¹ When she was coming up in the field, there were only men. But, in the last five or ten years, she has been able “to *not* ignore female voices.”²² Katherine described how, during the 1980’s, FP/NS had few “prominent women.” But, a self-described outlier, she was raised by female professors and became interested in the subject after working for a female national security scholar after college. Her story shows that women being in leadership positions opens up opportunities for other women, “provid[ing] a cascade effect.” This is true outside of the United States as well. Laura shared that, while serving abroad,

she approached ministry officials complaining about the amount of press coverage she received compared to that given to other US officials. In response, an official said, “You don’t get it, do you? We don’t have women role models in high positions in our country.” Laura heard this as, “tag, you’re it.”²³ While she was stationed in the country, the country ended up appointing several women to high-level positions.

However, in the face of a male-dominated mentor pool, almost everyone who I interviewed cited the importance of male mentors and allies in supporting their work and career advancement. Maddie stated that progress cannot be achieved alone, saying that “we need white male allies to help. . . it’s not enough to just say that there’s inequality.”²⁴ When “men join the chorus of voices advocating for the importance of women’s issues”, other men are more likely to pay attention and take these issues seriously.²⁵ For all of the men who were discriminatory and toxic, there were men who worked to support and advance these women’s careers. Laura said that, “for every jerk I had to deal with, there were five guys who were on our side” and that, when she was placed at a controversial post for a woman at the time, her male superiors wanted her to succeed.”²⁶ Her time working “in the kitchen” as a result of one man’s petty anger was mitigated by the rest of the men in the office who made sure to bring her with them to meetings. Additionally, after the head of the mission heard her story, the aforementioned “jerk” was sent back to Washington where he was forced to retire. For the women who served in the military, most described how their male bosses were “on the lookout for increased diversity” both for gender and race.²⁷ One of Jane’s commanding officers appreciated her research and candor, and was very helpful in supporting her advancement. On the civilian side, Katherine’s career was furthered early on when Colin Powell brought her on as staff, which ensured that she was treated with respect. She also felt that the institution was looking out for her more broadly. Due to the assistance and support from male peers and mentors, women have been able to gradually expand their networks and reach new heights in their careers.

An increase in networking between women has also played an important role in promoting women’s entry into and empowerment within the FP/NS establishment. This became more notable under Secretaries of State Madeleine Albright and Hillary Clinton. When Albright first started working for the State Department, she began intentionally creating networks of women to expand the opportunities and connections that were so prominent in the male-sphere. Prior to her nomination, she described the male networks as being traceable to

²⁰ Zoom Interview with the Author, 25 June 2020

²² Phone Interview with the Author, 15 July 2020

²¹ Phone Interview with the Author, 15 July 2020

²³ Zoom Interview with Author, 17 June 2020

²⁶ Zoom Interview with Author, 17 June 2020

²⁴ Zoom Interview with the Author, 25 June 2020

²⁷ Zoom Interview with the Author, 8 July 2020

²⁵ Hudson Valerie and Patricia Leidl. *The Hillary Doctrine: Sex and American Foreign Policy* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2015), 281

Hoak: Finding the Women in U.S. Foreign Policy and National Security

ties forged as early as prep school or college, later in entry-level positions in law firms, or on Capitol Hill. Washington women also have networks, but until recently these networks were primarily social or philanthropic. Men focused on power. Women focused on everything but power.

After her appointment, Albright noted that “diplomatic leadership was so long the domain of men that Henry Kissinger told an audience in 1997 that he wanted to welcome her to the ‘fraternity’ of Secretaries of State and she responded, ‘Henry, I hate to tell you, but it’s not a fraternity anymore.’”²⁸ After Albright’s tenure, Condoleezza Rice and then Hillary Clinton were appointed to the position. During her time as Secretary of State, Clinton brought women’s and girls’ security, long a relatively minor aspect of US foreign policy, to the forefront of U.S. national security. This shift was a monumental achievement for the rights of women and girls all over the world and placed a reinvigorated emphasis on women’s empowerment on the domestic front, especially in the institutions creating and producing foreign policy and security. Her appointment has had many effects on the gender disparity in the field. While Clinton was in office, twenty five women were appointed as ambassadors, a historic first. A woman at the top, especially a lifelong women’s advocate like Hillary Clinton, made it “easier for a president to pick a woman ambassador for Washington.”²⁹ In the U.S., “more than half of new recruits for the US Foreign Service and 20 percent of the chiefs of mission [were] women.”³⁰ With both male allies helping to pave the way for women and with women occupying positions at the highest levels of power, women have been able to better achieve their full potential and become prominent voices in the field.

²⁸ Bashevkin Sylvia, *Women as Foreign Policy Leaders: National Security and Gender Politics in Superpower America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2018), 14

³⁰ Hudson Valerie and Patricia Leidl. *The Hillary Doctrine: Sex and American Foreign Policy*, 57

²⁹ *Ibid.*