Roosevelt University

WHY DIPLOMACY NEEDS TO BE MORE FEMINIST: THE CREATION OF A NEW APPROACH TO POLITICAL MEDIATION

A Thesis Submitted to

the Faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences

in Candidacy For the Degree of

Master of Arts

in Women's and Gender Studies

by

Nela Taskovska

Chicago, Illinois

May 2013

www.manaraa.com

UMI Number: 1537063

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS
The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript
and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed,
a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI 1537063

Published by ProQuest LLC (2013). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.
All rights reserved. This work is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

www.manaraa.com

Acknowledgments

This Master's project combines my passions for both politics and gender analysis and it represents the most gratifying and positively transformational experience of my professional and academic career. This amazing journey of extensive research and genuine curiosity for the spheres of political mediation and feminism has allowed me to achieve a form of personal maturity and a sense of self-definition as a scholar. And I am proud to say that I share my academic accomplishments with the most amazing group of professors and family members that have given me constant encouragement and unconditional support. Without their valuable concern, friendship, advice, professional mentorship and guidance this project would have still remained a discussion question scribbled on the margins of my class notes.

First and foremost, I want to acknowledge Ellen O'Brien, the Director of the Women's and Gender Studies Program at Roosevelt University, who believed in my capabilities and gave me an opportunity to enter the program at a crucial moment in my career—while I was still back home in Macedonia contemplating the direction of my educational goals. I am forever indebted to her for not only changing the course of my professional life for the better but for making me a part of an amazing community of WGS professionals that have been my great inspiration.

I am infinitely thankful to my thesis chair Ann Brigham for being so enthusiastic and supportive at every single meeting we had and for giving me direction while my ideas and thoughts were still in the initial stages. I thank her for all the detailed comments, the sincere advice, great dedication and interest for my work and for her invaluable personal encouragement throughout my writing and research process of this thesis. Without her professional expertise and guidance this experience would have not been as powerful and exciting. I want to thank professor Jeffrey Edwards for contributing tremendously to the political aspect of this thesis and for suggesting great research materials as well as providing valuable feedback to my final draft. I also want to acknowledge Marjorie Jolles, whose passion for teaching and tremendous knowledge on feminism has not only been motivational and inspiring but has provided me with an epistemic basis to write this thesis.

I am extremely grateful to Bethany Barratt for always being so flexible and understanding when I needed to prioritize writing my thesis and I appreciate her constant concern and encouragement throughout this entire process.

I especially want to thank my advisor and academic mother from Purdue University Calumet, Meg Rincker, whose passion for gender politics encouraged me to pursue my graduate degree. I also want to acknowledge my academic family at the Departments of Political Science and Foreign Languages and Literatures at Purdue University Calumet, especially Marisa Garcia-Verdugo, Janet Navarro and Maribel Lopez, who were there every step of the way throughout my educational process, giving me advice, strength, and moral support when I needed it the most and for always believing in my ability and potential.

I express my immense gratitude to my mother Zorica for being the best life coach anyone could ever ask for. Without her unselfish sacrifices, loving advice and unconditional support to further pursue my dream of attending graduate school I would have never managed to finish this project. Thank you for being my rock and voice of reason in everything I do. To my father Kostadin, who put everything on hold so he could take on every responsibility while I focused completely on

www.manaraa.com

writing and researching for this thesis. Thank you for having patience and listening to my daily complaints, thank you for being not only my father but my best friend and the greatest roommate I could have ever wished for.

I want to acknowledge two people without whose love, support and concern I would have never completed my academic career. To my uncle John Taskovic, who not only graciously opened his house to me when I first came to Chicago but accepted me as his own daughter. Thank you Uncle John for helping me go through all of my challenging and difficult moments by teaching me the gift of laughter. I love you dearly. To my uncle Mikey Taskovski, for showing me the value of having a family that is unconditionally giving, compassionate and caring. Thank you for all the conversations that lifted my spirit and gave me motivation to write, thank you for the greatest moments we spent reminiscing about our hometown Skopje and for your gracious support that made me feel special and loved every day. I am forever indebted to you for all that you have done for me.

Finally, I dedicate this project to my grandfathers Boro Taskovski and Bosko Popovski, who taught me the meaning of life and gave me the greatest gift that I will forever cherish in their loving memory, the confidence to trust in myself and persevere. I hope I made you proud.

www.manaraa.com

Abstract

This project provides a feminist analysis on the sphere of political diplomacy by reassessing the canons of mediation and uniquely situating the types of feminism that can coexist within its traditional structure. This thesis considers the patriarchal foundation of diplomacy and the subsequent exclusion of a feminist approach to this highly relevant field. Furthermore, the case study of the most affluent female diplomat, Hillary Clinton, focuses on the effects of her hyper-visibility on the global political stage and the level of political autonomy she displays through her policy decisions. This project also answers the question of whether female diplomats need to assume masculine traits and become normalized within the state-centered system in order to progress in the mediating sphere. As a remedy to the androcentric structure of diplomacy, this study offers feminist methodologies that should be incorporated into the basis of diplomacy in order to advance its political platform.

www.manaraa.com

Table of Contents

www.manaraa.com

Section 1

Locating Feminism within the Basic Canons of Diplomacy

The relevance of diplomacy as a political field stems from its potency to carry out a national foreign policy and achieve stability and political progress primarily through means of peaceful negotiations. As an international statecraft with a long-standing tradition, diplomacy has represented the main political tool for resolving ethnic conflicts and genocide, and it has served as the dominant sphere for preserving the basis of political mediation through the virtues of strategic dialogue, political compromise, tactical bargaining and often times political extortion as well. Because of its political power to establish global networks and achieve international allegiances among distinct nations, diplomacy has been regarded as an influential method for creating power relations and reshaping the conduct of world politics. Many scholars and politicians have studied this field and have attempted to provide basic definitions for understanding how diplomacy functions and why it matters. The essential elements that shape diplomatic behavior include the dynamics of power-relations that delegate political compromise, national self-interest or state-centrism, the threat of military action, the capacity to negotiate material benefits and finally political dialogue.

The first thing we must recognize when it comes to the ideological basis of diplomacy is that the institutional framework of this field is extremely patriarchal, state-centered and heavily male-dominated. Colin Farrelly defines patriarchal hierarchies in simplest terms to mean a '"manifestation and institutionalization of male dominance over women and children in the family and the extension of male dominance over women in society in general'" (2). Translated into diplomatic behavior, this patriarchal ideology causes men to be the dominant actors, the ultimate political leaders and the only shapers of domestic and international foreign policy thus excluding marginal social members to gain authority or cease control in the political arena.

www.manaraa.com

When it comes to the sphere of diplomacy, its traditional patriarchal infrastructure already predetermines the political platform, the power relations and the organizational structure that would come to define the form of diplomatic behavior that takes place on international roundtables and in presidential cabinets. Operating under a state centered and patriarchal ideological base, the diplomatic sphere becomes automatically resistant towards any political standpoints that defy its policy agenda and challenge its organizational arrangement. This form of political isolation inevitably denies any feminist scholars or any kind of feminist representatives to enter the sphere of diplomacy and successfully incorporate their political views. From this, it only follows that with such a patriarchal and conventional configuration diplomacy comes to rely on a centralized political agenda that fails to include the political voices of marginal groups simultaneously failing to address matters of sex, gender and race in the conduct of international affairs. In essence, it would be appropriate to establish the notion that as long as diplomacy is driven by an elitist patriarchal foundation it will remain anti-feminist by default.

Therefore, my goal with this project is to directly challenge diplomacy's patriarchal establishment and provide an opportunity for the inception of a new feminist approach to political mediation. Furthermore, my aim is to question and redefine the state-centered, patriarchal basis of diplomatic behavior while attempting to improve the organizational structure of political mediation by incorporating elements of feminist methodology. As an area that is directly centered on international affairs and on resolution of global conflicts through means of dialogue, political bargaining, manipulation of power and preservation of national self-interest, diplomacy represents the most relevant political sphere in international relations. As an influential global phenomenon, diplomacy has the power to determine the outcome of ethnic

www.manaraa.com

wars and prevent possible genocide or international aggression. Hence, analyzing and evaluating this sphere from a feminist perspective is of essential value for the staging of world politics and for the incorporation of efficient feminist methodologies in political affairs. By performing this theoretical task, we are not only improving and modernizing the conduct of political mediation on a global scale but we are rather transforming the field of diplomatic behavior to become more politically conscious to social issues such as race, gender, sexuality and ethnicity.

Furthermore, representing not only an epistemological and theoretical force but also a political statement, feminism on the other hand is a unique sphere that possesses both the ability and magnitude to challenge the patriarchal basis of diplomacy and reconceptualize a new form of feminist mediation. Both feminism and diplomacy are political fields whose theoretical and practical merger can only yield positive results for the conduct of global affairs. Hence, my aim to consolidate these two fields of political knowledge production will offer a qualitative approach to global equality and political action while performing a deconstruction of a political arena that has traditionally lacked a feminist perspective on global issues such as economic instability, national insurgencies, or terrorism. And most importantly, this theoretical project will strive to elevate and preserve the significance of marginalized social members in international diplomacy by including their voices, experiences and political views on the international stage of global affairs.

My analysis is structured in three parts, each performing a detailed examination of diplomatic behavior and the policies of respective diplomatic representatives through a feminist line of inquiry. Some of the predominant questions that resurface in my theoretical investigation and guide my inquiry are the following: how do the goals of feminism align with or differ from the initial basis of conducting diplomacy; what particular elements from feminist theory can be

www.manaraa.com

incorporated into the field of international mediation in order to secure the implementation of essential human rights and finally, how can the feminist voice be incorporated through the practice of diplomacy into the global political world? These questions are extremely relevant for examining every aspect of diplomatic behavior, improving its political platform and ultimately constructing a new feminist approach to political negotiations. The first section of my analysis is focused on identifying the three canons of diplomatic behavior, the time period they were prevalent and their characterizing elements. In each canon of diplomatic behavior I present a type of feminism that could possibly be aligned with or function in accordance with the respective diplomatic canon. After providing an overview of the three types of diplomatic behavior, my second section is devoted to examining the case study of the most prominent female political diplomat of the 21st century, Hilary Clinton. Evaluating the political views of such an influential female leader while situating her foreign policy decisions within the respective diplomatic canon will allow us to answer the question of whether women as marginal members in the diplomatic field are allowed true freedom of opinion or become normalized under the traditional patriarchal basis of international affairs. And finally, my third section distinguishes specific feminist methodologies and incorporates them into the practice of diplomacy discussing their effects on the process of political compromise. I now begin my assessment of the diplomatic field with the most traditional form of conducting political mediation.

A.1 The Traditional Diplomatic Canon and Anti-feminism

The classic theoretical bases for interpreting the practice of diplomacy start with the foundational fathers of diplomatic thought such as Niccolo Machiavelli, Abraham de Wicquefort, Francois de Callieres, and Ernest Mason Satow. However, the inception of

www.manaraa.com

traditional diplomatic behavior is considered synonymous with the birth of political governments which would entail the time period when nation-states were beginning to practice the virtues of political negotiation, conciliation, economic exchange, war-making and treaty formation. There are two hypotheses on the origin of the nation- state. The first theory is supported by professor Jordan Branch who suggested that the first nation-states appeared in the 15th century as a direct result of advanced technological development in map-making and as a byproduct of the frequent exchange of material and political goods between different geographical territories (Branch 20-23). The second theory is advanced by modern political thinkers who argue that the first nation-state appeared in 19th century Europe due to an increase in political literacy and a desire to conduct political affairs in a more structured manner. Regardless of the time period of inception, both of these theories suggest that the practice of traditional diplomacy is codependent on state governments and national legislature.

Furthermore, Stuart Murray discusses how the traditional canon of diplomacy has remained "'statist,' 'state-centric or 'rationalist'" both in theory as in practice throughout most of the 19th and 20th century (28). Within this traditional view, diplomacy has been recognized as a "privileged domain" of political engagement where only "accredited state representatives are portrayed as the monopolistic gatekeepers of a sacrosanct historical tradition" (Murray 28). Hence, within such a rigid traditional formation, diplomacy has been fairly closed off to any kind of ideological interference from outside actors or marginal social members and has granted political authority only to corresponding national agents—the legally recognized state diplomats under each country's Ministry of Foreign Affairs. As a result, this traditional canon of diplomacy has undermined the jurisdiction of many non-partisan, non-governmental institutions that fully participate in protecting national interests. The exclusion of non-state actors from this political

المنارة للاستشارات
www.manaraa.com

arena has only reaffirmed the notion that governments maintain a powerful directive and political control over the national foreign policy and thereby mandate for the most part, the regulations under which state diplomats abide and execute political affairs.

The most relevant aspect of traditional diplomacy that represents a dominant concern for state governments is the preservation of values such as national self-determination, autonomy and capitalist development. According to authors Donna Lee and David Hudson "diplomacy is constituted by, and also constitutes, state sovereignty. State sovereignty, in turn, constitutes the anarchic systemic structures characterized by a separation of the domestic from the international, the economic from the political, and the private from the public" (354). With the latter stipulation in mind, diplomacy emerges as the most relevant governmental sphere responsible for the preservation of not only state sovereignty but the demarcation of state lines, and every element that constitutes an autonomous nation—its military, political power, and its economic dominion. In this regard, diplomacy becomes accredited as the main protector of the national political agenda (paradoxically the safeguard of state's military ventures do become included in the political platform of the traditional diplomatic canon even though diplomatic behavior is delegated to reinforcing peaceful instead of militant cooperation). Inevitably, the diplomatic practice becomes codependent on the national political atmosphere present in a particular historic moment. Within these rigorous traditional principles, diplomacy becomes subsumed within a form of "state parochialism" devoted to ensuring that the national goals and the ones of eminent political leaders are faithfully executed (Murray 29). Therefore, we can infer that the traditional forum of diplomacy is directly tied to, if not politically inter-reliant on, the platform of national leaders, the state's intermediate global interests and the embedded patriarchal ideology in practice.

المنارة للاستشارات
www.manaraa.com

Being defined by the ideals of patriarchal ideology and state institutionalism, traditional diplomatic behavior automatically becomes apprehensive and even hostile to the adoption or inclusion of any kind of feminist methodology and ideas of sexual equality in its foundational structure. Heidi Hartmann defines the rigid and impermeable basis of patriarchy as a, "set of social relations between men, which have a material base, and which, though hierarchical, establish or create interdependence and solidarity among men that enable them to dominate women" (300-301). Hartmann further states that, "Though patriarchy is hierarchical and men of different classes, races, or ethnic groups have different places in the patriarchy, they also are united in their shared relationship of dominance over their women" (300-301). Consequently, in a purely patriarchal environment, as the one in which traditional diplomacy operates, women or members from other marginal groups become subsumed under political male authority and experience systematic normalization. The ideological scheme of patriarchy that is rooted in traditional government—originating with the epic entitlement of the "Founding Fathers"—eliminates females from the politically accredited sector and remains hostile to women attaining any roles of social and cultural authority.

Moreover, after evaluating the structure of traditional diplomacy, it is inevitable to conclude that with its state-centric configuration this type of diplomatic behavior remains anti-feminist and pragmatically patriarchal. In this conventional, archaic canon of political mediation there is no room for the elevation of the voices of marginalized groups that could incorporate a feminist-standpoint into the international political stage. As traditional diplomacy continues to rely heavily on state interests, such as economic profitability, preservation of military dominion and international prominence, its main focus remains centered on the self-promotion of national governments. As such, traditional diplomacy gains an anti-feminist sentiment reserving

المنارة للاستشارات
www.manaraa.com

international policy as a strictly male-oriented sphere. And exactly from the latter domains of economic and political affluence, feminism remains shunned—it simply stagnates on the very marginality of political affairs losing the possibility of both domestic and international affirmation. When traditional diplomacy is governed and delegated by a privileged class of social elites, that design international politics and assign political agency to certain parties, it is hardly expected that women who echo the feminist ideal of sexual equality will gain any kind of political momentum. In these complex layers of institutional apparatus, feminism as an activist movement of epistemic quality remains secondary in the domain of both domestic governance and international relations.

Similarly, in the next section I discuss Henry Kissinger's diplomatic actions and policy regulations as a perfect example of a diplomat who fully incorporates the elements of traditional diplomacy into a global political stage. I label Kissinger as a pure traditionalist when it comes to executing diplomatic behavior because as a state leader he aspired to seize full control of the mediating process while exerting military action in specific political circumstances. Kissinger's faithful execution of patriarchal principles and his conventional diplomacy perfectly showcase the consequences that such political measures have on the incorporation of feminist voices in global affairs.

Henry Kissinger's Realpolitik and the Feminist Interference

Former U.S Secretary of State Henry Kissinger represents one of the most influential diplomats of the 20th century. Preserving American national security during the Vietnam War and delegating the world stage of international public policy in the 1970's, Kissinger has altered the foundations of global diplomacy in staggering ways. His vision for national statecraft included an ambitious model of political realism based on the preservation of power, not the balance of authority but rather the complete attainment of true political influence and national

www.manaraa.com

interest of the state apart from moral, ethical or religious ideologies. Kissinger's concept for the conduct of international affairs included placing public policy and foreign relations in the hands of conscious and rational state actors.

Mark Gismondi provides an astute analysis of Kissinger's realpolitik model stating how he "refuses to believe that the truly creative political actor would be ruled by either dystopian or liberal utopian aspirations … The true statesman, in other words, [according to Kissinger] must see the abyss for what it is and persevere despite its existence. History provides only data, not moral direction. Nor can moral direction come from God or any other transcendent source" (448-49). Gismondi further writes how Kissinger believed that, "Statesmen must create their own moral frameworks that, in the final analysis, cannot be subject to scrutiny by others" (448-49). Hence, safeguarding his political decisions by denunciation of moral judgment, Kissinger's realism rests on a rationalist foundation where sovereign states have the solemn authority to regulate political tensions with other nations and engage in a somewhat anarchic international stage where the main interest becomes the preservation of national welfare and safety. Kissinger's model for the conduct of political mediation is once again completely premised upon the preservation of the political interests of the national government in question. And within such a connotation, diplomatic behavior comes to represent a full political extension of the governmental platform that remains centralized, patriarchal and sexist in its core foundation.

One fundamentally embedded element in Kissinger's realpolitik is his ultimate disregard for the practice of political appeasement. The theoretical connotation of appeasement denotes diplomatic conciliation and avoidance of a political conflict oftentimes warfare by making pacifying dispensations to a possible political aggressor or an adversary state leader in the international sphere. As a mediating policy, political appeasement falls exactly within the

www.manaraa.com

directives of diplomatic negotiation. However, Kissinger adamantly rejected such a concept because he regarded it as equivalent to a policy of renunciation, a form of state failure to retain control and power of its national interest and sovereignty. Subsequently, Kissinger provided his justification to such a political conduit by stating, '"It is a mistake to assume that diplomacy can always settle international disputes if there is good faith and willingness to come to an agreement;' in a revolutionary situation 'each power will seem to its opponent to lack precisely these qualities'" (Kaplan 74).

Therefore, Kissinger's realism denounces much of appeasement tactics and adopts a bold, often times uncooperative and uncensored political rhetoric—following no precise rules, regulations or even specifically aligned strategies—under the political motive of preserving national interests and international affluence (Kaplan 77-78). As Robert Kaplan argues, Kissinger defined his realism as the "ability to see the truth behind moral pretensions" and the attainment of this political truth includes any form of political action to be implemented in the quest for national defense (77). Interestingly enough, Kissinger's profile of realpolitik does not aim to establish a clear cut separation between diplomacy and appeasement as peaceful negotiating methods versus the implementation of armed combat. Instead, he manages to broaden the sphere of political diplomacy to include armed conflict not as an opposing method but rather as a succinctly affordable option—as part of the foundational diplomatic scheme—if all else fails. Therefore, Kissinger manages to bridge two theoretical discourses that entail drastically oppositional elements. He allows diplomacy to extend its political boundaries and include the possibility of military power to infiltrate the field of public policy as a legitimate political action. Most certainly, the question that arises from such an abrupt political amalgamation of war, militarism and political appeasement is whether the field of political

www.manaraa.com

diplomacy becomes corrupted to the extent that it loses its most profound principle of negotiating courtesy—its powerful rhetoric of political comprise. If in Kissinger's public policy anything can be deemed fair game for the preservation of national interest and state sovereignty, we must raise the question of how far would state governments go to keep diplomacy altruistically state-centered and patriarchal? And if traditional diplomatic behavior can be justified at any cost, how would radical foreign policy measures, executed in the name of national interest, affect the incorporation of feminist voices within the sphere?

Since Kissinger proclaimed that statesmen must be blunt realists that discern and evaluate any political situation with utmost rational consciousness, there is no room for the pure idealist expectation that diplomatic negotiations can resolve any political conflict that arises internationally. The option of introducing and implementing militarism as a political response according to Kissinger can often times bring nations to a much more resolute and positive political outcome than the strict implementation of placatory diplomacy. Kissinger believed that pure political appeasement is nothing more than "the result of an inability to come to grips with a policy of unlimited objectives" thus entertaining the idea that armed conflict and deliberate military action can be a plausible political action in given international scenarios (Kaplan 74). Defiantly promoting the use of military action for the purpose of solidifying American strength and political superiority on the international stage, Kissinger took a drastic approach to diplomatic behavior, even at the cost of political retaliation, domestic dissatisfaction and international disapproval. Kaplan elaborates on Kissinger's political tendencies and uncalculated ventures by specifying how his, "unwillingness to quit Vietnam without first wreaking havoc and spilling blood…flowed to a significant extent from Kissinger's determination to avoid the

www.manaraa.com

slightest show of weakness, for which read appeasement… [he] regularly mixed violence and the threat of it with diplomacy, so that the diplomacy had credibility" (74).

Kissinger's amalgamation of oppositional concepts such as political realism, warfare and pacifying mediation allows for the theoretical solidification of diplomacy with the political ideal of national interest. Therefore, in Kissinger's scenario, we begin to view the diplomatic idealist tradition of maintaining international peace and humanitarian utopianism as a mere pretense for legitimizing power in order to safeguard national interests and affirm state's political superiority on international parameters. Although Kissinger's strategic implementation of realpolitik has been criticized by distinguished scholars and political agents, his conduct of American public affairs and international relations speaks to a relevant condition intrinsically tied to diplomatic behavior—the inherent limitations of American political power and the influence of domestic public policy on diplomacy. Thomas Schwartz states that the execution of political realism by Kissinger exposed the bureaucratic structure of American foreign policy and the true limitations of American superiority in the international sphere. Although Kissinger did test American power to its extreme when bombing Vietnam, challenging the Soviet Union, supporting the abhorrent political regime in Chile and meddling in the internal affairs of Syria. Schwartz states that Kissinger ultimately, "discovered that American foreign policy was fundamentally shaped and conditioned by domestic politics and the political culture of American exceptionalism. His attempt to move beyond these conditions and change them met with deep resistance and undermined the support for the foreign policy which he advocated" (139). Kissinger's vision of political realism is fundamental in uncovering the unification of domestic with foreign political conduct meaning that national sentiments on internal issues—such as economic instability,

www.manaraa.com

sexual inequality or even institutional racism—will inevitably transfer as imperative concepts in the execution of state diplomacy.

In order to answer the question of whether Kissinger's form of political diplomacy even allows for the possibility of a feminist interference or the incorporation of a feminist voice, we must identify the type of feminism that can exist within Kissinger's proposed political system. Conversely, what remains as a complex enigma is whether Kissinger's realism completely rejects the elements of feminist thought or perhaps there exists an opportunity for the peaceful coexistence and unification of realpolitik and feminism? That a sanctimonious marriage between these two ideological foundations—both representing dominant political forces—can be achieved in practice is an illusory supposition that requires an extreme dose of naiveté. Feminism as a political movement aims to dismantle the social status-quo under a platform of sexual and racial equality and Kissinger's realpolitik disregards any such social issues because it places the preservation of national interest as a political priority. The oppositional temperament of these two concepts becomes evident when we understand that feminism strives to remedy the systemic inadequacies when it comes to gender and race while Kissinger's realism aims to rely on the same systemic inadequacies to attain international prominence, political dominion and possibly material gains for the nation-state in question. In such a scenario, feminism as a political goal becomes detached from the national interest altogether. However, the grueling dilemma that arises when it comes to the concept of national interest is whether this political notion—varying in form and context among different states—is by default an anti-feminist constellation.

Jill Vickers discusses the concepts of feminism, nationalism and national interest stating how they seem to represent '"incompatible ideological positions within the European context"' (89). Similarly, scholar Ida Blom states how the preservation of a national interest is "marked by

www.manaraa.com

extreme aggressiveness and a tendency toward authoritarianism… ordering members of the nation in a well-disciplined pyramid with a leading elite at the top" (83-84). And within this latter notion lies the reason for the inherent hostility between the feminist movement and state-centrism—the very fact that women never truly became part of the leading political elite. They faithfully remained on the bottom row of the power pyramid that represented women's moral and political authority as irrelevant to the national interest. Hence, when Kissinger's realpolitik demands the rejection of a moral framework for the sake of preserving the rational political franchise that represents national sovereignty, feminism becomes eclipsed under the fatal and destructive wing of political snobbery that circulates power among a selective few. In retrospect, when it comes to uncovering the friction between feminism and state interest, it all begins when the theoretical connotation of the term "national interest" drastically loses focus from a vision of equality, well-being and autonomy for every citizen and transforms into a political euphemism synonymous to international supremacy, economic profitability for a privileged elite and militant preeminence.

Kissinger's strategic disavowal of political appeasement and his espousal of military action for the sake of not only safeguarding American national interest and sovereignty but uplifting national affluence and dignity on the global stage, finds itself in a state of complete opposition with the feminist agenda. It becomes rather palpable to discern that feminism with its ultimate goals of protecting "women's personal physical and psychological integrity ," obtaining "equal rights for women…in national decision making policies" and advancing "women's position on the labor market through wage improvements, [and] better education" fails to relate to any of the propagated values constituting Kissinger's political realism as they blatantly reject such valuable social policies of national interest and solely grip to the idea of political power and

www.manaraa.com

affluence (Blom 82-83). Restraining from the essentialist claim that women are inherently incapable of grasping a strategic compilation of militarism in diplomacy, the main aspect in which feminism and Kissinger's policy of anti-appeasement stand in opposition to one another is the final objective and calculated outcome for which such strategy is applied. If militant and coercive diplomacy as Kissinger clearly avowed through Vietnam is aimed simply for political pretensions, warfare profitability at the expense of innocent lives and the attainment of international dominion in public policy, feminism stands in direct opposition to such aggression and political manipulation.

B.1 The Inchoate or "Nascent" Canon and Nascent Diplomatic Feminism

As the practice of diplomacy becomes affected by emerging ethnic conflicts, expanding opinions on political agency and globalizing forces in the world, the traditional form of diplomatic behavior changes and transforms into a new type of innovative and decentralized political action. John Hoffman argues that what brings about the demise of statist canonical diplomacy is the very political realization that "the state itself is an incoherent institution, logically flawed and empirically contradictory" (526). Hoffman further notes that the state must be recognized as an "extraordinarily elusive institution… which claims a monopoly of legitimate force for a particular territory" (527). Once the state becomes recognized as a politically unstable and ideologically obscure structure, the value of traditional diplomacy that rests on the pillars of state action and authority is immediately brought under question. Moreover, Hoffman himself challenges the validity of formal diplomatic behavior and labels "diplomacy's linkage to the state as paradoxical and problematic" (526). These notions ultimately lead to attempts of reevaluating and detaching the diplomatic process from a close association with state politics. As a result of

www.manaraa.com

this theoretical questioning, we witness the emergence of a new fairly reconstructed form of diplomatic mediation.

Murray distinguishes this new contemporary canon of political mediation, arising as a direct contradiction and challenge to the traditional form of diplomatic descent in the beginning of the 20th century, and entitles it the Nascent School of Diplomacy. Murray writes, "This type of diplomacy has several synonyms: unofficial, unconventional, or track two diplomacy….Nascent scholars, view the state and its diplomacy as blocking change to a more pacific international relations system" (30). Similarly, the nascent canon represents a precursor to an evident political crisis in the traditionalist form of conducting international diplomacy. This political notion suggests the loss of state control and previous monopolization of the diplomatic branch by national governments. Therefore, the diplomatic field emerges as a valuable and powerful political avenue for conducting government affairs that is not static in nature but rather is permeable and has the power to reinvent itself. Consequently, instead of remaining codependent and strictly associated with state actors and governments, the practice of diplomacy experiences a transitioning move or an erosion of state-centrality. Ultimately, the locus of dependency in diplomatic behavior becomes shifted from the state to the globalizing political forces and the current political atmosphere. Murray further distinguishes the rise of a new nascent group of diplomatic scholars that "can be described as 'those who regard the state as an obstacle to world order'; to them, 'the development of an alternative diplomacy, embracing NGOs and transnational movements, offers the prospect of an international order transcending the state system'" (30).

It is exactly the rise of powerful non-state actors and non-governmental organizations actively involved in shaping international affairs that distinguishes this nascent canon of

www.manaraa.com

diplomacy as unconventional, partly-privatized or modern and yet still highly governmental and political. The presence of private agents and NGO's that become extremely involved in foreign policy issues providing a refreshed political outlook, contributes for the sphere of diplomacy to become open to reorganization and to possible inclusion of marginal social members. This inchoate form of diplomacy, provides an opportunity for not only a select group of privileged state representatives to engage in political caucusing but rather transforms traditional mediation into a highly democratic and representative form of diplomacy in the true sense of its meaning. In his discussion on the privatization of diplomacy—and with that national security—through the participation of non-state actors, author Brian Hocking introduces the concept of, "publicization of foreign policy—that is to say the growing emphasis on the need to engage in strategic public diplomacy" (149). Hocking further argues that "a growing emphasis on the significance of communication with publics… is preoccupying ministries of foreign affairs (MFAs) around the world [who recognize] the growing significance of image in world politics and the need to develop strategies for harnessing it in the interests of policy goals" (149). Attempting to retain the nemesis of a democratic configuration, national governments as Hocking suggests are becoming more receptive and open to the inclusion of non-state actors and NGO's in the direct conduct of international affairs. Respectively, such inclusions do reach a form of political limitation since national governments remain highly paranoid of private actors and outsiders meddling in internal affairs. However, the fact that the sphere of diplomacy is being expanded without controversial notoriety and much resistance from state governments, suggests that there is possible room for political shift of power within the closed cabinets of government officials that dictate diplomatic actions. As a result of such shifts, Hocking underlines how "this trend is

www.manaraa.com

eroding the distinction between the public and the private in the management of an area-external policy—which might be assumed to be highly resistant to such a process" (149).

Now that we have established the main principles of the inchoate diplomatic canon it is necessary to identify the type of feminism or feminist movement that can coexist alongside this particular political system of mediation. The question that arises when evaluating this new type of progressive diplomacy is whether this particular emerging structure allows for the inclusion of a feminist voice in politics. But most importantly, what lies at the center of our inquiry is what form does this type of feminism or feminist movement take in order to be included in the shaping of policy structure and what are its most significant elements. Subsequently, within the privatized structure of nascent diplomacy I situate an emergent feminist movement—that I entitle as nascent diplomatic feminism—that has the foundation and ability to successfully permeate the diplomatic sphere and reach an insider's position in the pinnacle of political action. I would define nascent diplomatic feminism as an independent political agenda that strives to permeate the political sphere of diplomacy and introduce relevant policy measures based on humanitarianism, sexual and racial equality, political egalitarianism of the sexes, and prioritization of global hunger and poverty issues that affect marginal members of societies.

Once present in the governmental arena this purely feminist agenda stagnates significantly due to heightened state censorship and political repression. Whilst state departments become more receptive to an inchoate, democratic diplomacy that acts as a rupture to political tradition, governments start engaging in a process of bureaucratic filtering retaining the power to alter, eliminate and reshape particular political ideologies introduced by nascent diplomacy. Evidently, the effects of such state expurgation and critical filtering on the feminist agenda are politically debilitating, allowing the feminist consciousness to be present in the governing arena

www.manaraa.com

but as a purely partisan content that loses its power to threaten current political hierarchies or alter sexual inequalities. A perfect example of this political position is when state governments, in order to fulfill a constitutional quota and attain legitimacy as democratic institutions, employ representatives of marginal groups (known as descriptive representation) but normalize and suppress their ideological views and subsequent political stances.

Therefore, in this political scenario where national governments portray a façade and act receptive to certain feminist ideologies, the nascent diplomatic feminist agenda becomes extremely filtered, politically coerced and empirically standardized to fit the political platform and interests of the state. Regardless of the fact that nascent diplomatic feminism becomes significantly altered when inside the governmental arena, we must not undermine the importance of this new form of feminist thought because it acts as a destabilizing force and as a social testament that the voices of feminist activists are relevant political factors in the diplomatic sphere. Although it becomes systematically normalized to fit the needs of political elites, nascent diplomatic feminism retains its foundational essence, providing political authority to the marginalized feminist voices. What the canon of nascent diplomacy allows for is the presence of a particular feminist agenda through the inclusion of a subsequent feminist NGO in governmental affairs (which if we recall was virtually non-existent in the traditional form of diplomatic behavior), but it censors all of its feminist elements that might challenge this diplomatic platform or have the power to question or dismantle its intact attachment to state politics. Therefore, nascent diplomatic feminism functions as a political ideology within nascent diplomacy that becomes synchronized with the goals of national governments and not opposed to the same. The sole fact however that feminism manages to take place in the conduct of diplomatic affairs—even as a normalized ideology—is an extremely relevant occurrence. We

www.manaraa.com

must recognize that feminist thought achieves its most significant political breakthrough with nascent diplomacy, preserving its strive for global recognition but losing its most important element for institutional transformation, marking this process as a bitter-sweet victory for feminism today and a big step forward from traditional diplomacy of the past.

C.1 The Modern Canon and Neo-Diplomatic Feminism

The modern canon of contemporary diplomacy—which is a fairly recent phenomenon of the 21st century—attempts to consolidate the political role of both state actors and NGO's and provide a uniform structure that will simultaneously follow the long withstanding diplomatic tradition but will remain open to the positive interference of new political agents. Consequently, I want to restrain from the assertion that in this new modern version of diplomacy, that can be found exercised by particular nations today, non-governmental agents become subdued within the national affairs and become transferred into the lobbying machinery causing them to lose their decentralized status. Although these organizations become highly involved in the political affairs of the nation, they still retain their status as NGO's, bi-partisan and individual contributors to the preservation of national security. In his essay on the role of non-state actors in the conduct of diplomatic affairs, Richard Langhorne writes that what actually determines the type of representational involvement by NGO's is the political gravity of the threatening crisis. "When crises seem to lie beyond the control of governments or the relevant intergovernmental organizations, 'nonstate' actors come to play significant roles. They appear … [as] non-governmental organizations, corporations, and intergovernmental organizations and they promise levels of efficiency and responsiveness that transcend the constraints of the state" (Langhorne 332). Several examples where non-state actors and respective NGO's intervened and took direct action in diplomacy was during the "immediate outbreak of violence or armed conflict, such as

www.manaraa.com

Bosnia, Kosovo, or Rwanda" or during the "complex humanitarian emergencies, such as combating the AIDS epidemic in Africa, or environmental catastrophes often compounded by chaos or war, as in Somalia" (Langhorne 335). All of these cases speak to the fact that even though NGO's do become an integral part in the conduct of international diplomacy, they maintain their status as bi-partisan institutions.

What truly becomes a political reality in the modern canon of diplomacy as John Kelley claims, is that the once politically sheltered and exclusively privileged sphere of national litigation and political mediation transforms into a "global public domain integrating social and technological networks to harness its developing diplomatic capabilities" (294). What we encounter in the new era for diplomacy is a definite division of political power, a shift of traditional authority and a slow but steady merger between the distinct NGO's who are a part of civil society and between the political elites who govern the nation. Twenty-first century modern diplomacy represents an affable rupture from traditional diplomatic descent, dedicated to disavowing the prominence of political elites and accepting fairly minimalistic state censorship. As Kelley suggests, the contemporary diplomatic canon "possesses an advantage in its agility, relies on grassroots mobilization, and highlights the relevance of policy entrepreneurs" (294). According to Murray "Currently, there are 191 states operating in the modern diplomatic environment" which speaks great volumes to the rapid progress modern diplomacy is encountering on a global scale (24-25).

Although diplomacy will remain a highly governmental sphere with an embedded theoretical foundation in international affairs and the nation-state will still stand as the center of diplomatic action, we can state that this political field is expanding into different directions. Therefore, diplomacy slowly ceases to represent a politically linear structure that preserves the

www.manaraa.com

national interest solely from the standpoint of a privileged elite class but rather becomes a hybridized product of postmodern political action. This hybridization of the diplomatic canon that emerges as a response to the intersectional character of global affairs provides a prospect for non-state actors to become policy shapers fusing the private nature of diplomacy with the public domain of societies. Contemporary diplomacy emerges as a cultural rectification for the political isolation and hostility practiced by the privileged political bourgeoisie. This political elite of the state has managed to create a deep social rupture between national constituents—instead of nurture equality—and has succeeded in embedding idioms such as political status and alienation of constituents' rights on the national agenda. Subsequently, modern political peacemaking comes to the rescue as a cultural remedy dedicated not only to preserving national sovereignty but to providing a political amalgamation and alliance between diverse national agents working towards a uniform goal.

As the political nature of modern diplomacy becomes linked to the national social apparatus, the possibility for the emergence of a new feminist momentum becomes an ever plausible reality. The contemporary configuration of twenty-first century diplomacy that delegates a new infrastructure of private/public relations and valorizes private agents as political connoisseurs ushers the way for a new stage of feminist fight that I have entitled accordingly as neo-diplomatic feminism. This type of a feminist movement that represents a progressive form of activism has the ability to reshape public policy and challenge the gender binaries by a method of political infiltration. This neo-diplomatic feminism—that can only be practiced in a national atmosphere where modern diplomacy is decentralized and yet politically attached to governments—relies on a grassroots campaign that becomes subsequently adopted and endorsed by the modern diplomatic canon. Through such a grassroots movement this type of feminist

www.manaraa.com

thought infiltrates its way into the political spectrum of governmental affairs. This form of feminism is unique because it operates on the basis of social feminist activism propagating for women's equal political and economic status. This feminist agenda remains strictly on the outskirts of the civic world detached from governmental bureaucracy until the moment it becomes acceded by the collective nature of modern diplomacy and becomes a direct threat to patriarchal hierarchies within the sphere of politics.

In this instance, feminist voices shift from being politically irrelevant subsidies, marginalized from the active sphere of national affairs, and become diplomatic forces, directly involved in representing the feminist standpoint in international roundtables. If within nascent diplomacy feminism had only representational value, was normalized and politically altered to fit the national interest, in modern diplomacy, neo-diplomatic feminism has the potential to reach its full activist goal of achieving racial and gender equality without experiencing any kind of political censorship. With the presumption that the modern diplomatic canon transforms into a "global public domain" as Kelley suggests, neo-diplomatic feminism easily penetrates through the foundation of diplomacy and enters into the realm of policy shaping and social structuring of political relations. Respectively, through this diplomatic structure feminists are allowed to corrode the epistemic basis, to intercept the political infrastructure of sexual inequality and exit the shadow of patriarchal authority emerging as true political reformers.

www.manaraa.com

Section 2

Where Are All the Women in Diplomacy?

Performing a feminist analysis on the political field of international diplomacy is a relevant theoretical task that could produce a more politically transparent and gender conscious way of conducting global affairs. Feminist scholar Marysia Zalewski writes, "by beginning with questions about women, gender, masculinity, femininity—questions not usually at the center of international political analysis—and by very closely analyzing the kinds of stories that emerge, feminism is an important theoretical resource in studying and creating knowledge about international politics" (40). Similarly, a feminist approach to diplomatic mediation can not only produce relevant epistemic knowledge about the adoption of foreign policy but it can also identify the political shortcomings and structural inadequacies of diplomacy that prevent the establishment of significant global allegiances. While I realize that feminism and female representation are not synonymous and do not necessarily align together, I still want to argue that the failure to allow female professionals in the conduct of political affairs shuts down any possibilities for the creation of a more feminist diplomacy. First, let us begin our feminist analysis by identifying the most problematic deficiencies and diplomacy's failure of allowing female professionals to become a part of the foreign civil service for decades at a time.

The institutional exclusion and systematic elimination of women from active participation in state governments has represented a common and highly uncontested pattern of political behavior around the world. The international political stage (including the spheres of diplomacy, foreign policy and legislature) has always represented a homogenous and sexists realm driven by ambitious and elitist males, whose professionalism and expertise have been the paradigms of an ultimate political leader. Similarly, the sphere of foreign policy has remained a politically sheltered and an exclusively privatized domain for the personal affirmation and

www.manaraa.com

professional bolstering of men's diplomatic careers. As a result, there persisted a staggering censorship on female political involvement especially in the area of foreign civil service throughout most of the 18th and 19th century national regiments. Female politicians did not only represent a threat to the already established patriarchal system and centralized political bureaucracy, but they were altogether deemed unfit for the highly delicate nature of national affairs. As such, women became completely eradicated from the governmental scene. State representatives made extreme efforts to tantalize the sphere of diplomacy so it remained unreceptive and explicitly hostile to any kind of female participation or leadership. Describing the legislative ban on women's involvement in the foreign service, that was finally lifted by the US State Department in 1971 (after immense political lobbying by feminist organizations), feminist scholar Cynthia Enloe underlines the most discriminatory clauses beginning with "the policy compelling foreign service women and secretaries to resign when they got married, the policy barring a woman with children from an overseas assignment, [and] the policy that prohibited even unmarried women professionals from being posted to any of the 'Iron Curtain' or Muslim countries" (116-117). Sexual discrimination and ultimate disqualification of female applicants from holding diplomatic posts became an embedded political agenda of not only the US government but of many international administrations.

Even after the ban on female diplomatic appointment was lifted, women in the United States continued to face the systematic antagonism, the blatant disapproval and personal discontent from their male counterparts. Even though the sexist and derogatory policies were eliminated from the US legislative system, women still experienced the discriminatory, unwelcoming and constraining atmosphere that discouraged and condemned their very presence in political affairs. According to Enloe the statistical data reaffirmed how "women remained a

www.manaraa.com

distinct minority in the US foreign service: 21.2 per cent, and a mere 5 per cent of senior officers. Of 133 Chiefs of Missions overseas, only nine were women, and a majority of them were political appointees rather than professional careerists" (117-118). Furthermore, when it came to the representation of racial or ethnic minorities, Enloe notes that, "In January 1981 there were no women of color in the senior foreign service; and women of color comprised a mere 2.5 per cent of all levels, including support workers" (118). To diversify the statistical comparative outlook from the US to Europe for instance, it is affirmed that "It took the United Kingdom 191 years to finally appoint the first female Head of Mission" and yet in "2010, women [still] fill only 21.8% of senior management positions from 260 diplomatic missions [in the UK]" (Rahman 1). In essence, such discomforting and alarming statistical data ultimately reasserts the notion that the American government (as well as many other nations that followed this example) performed a congressional genocide on female's political and diplomatic careers. Women's professional commitment and their qualified expertise in foreign policy were inextricably discarded and politically barred from entering the sphere of international mediation and foreign affairs. The very few females that managed to infiltrate their voices and gain momentum in international affairs at the time were either assigned to politically neutral states that ranked on the bottom of the strategic hierarchy of affiliation and importance or they were given posts with less responsibilities and policy-oriented assignments (Enloe 119). National governments caused a detrimental stagnation on female political leadership and thus completely discouraged women from attempting to pursue a career in state departments.

Fast forwarding to the 21st century we witness a slightly different politically scenario. The affluent names of female political diplomats such as Katherine Ashton from the UK, María Ángela Holguín from Colombia, Juliette Bonkoungou from Burkina Faso, Aksoltan Toreevna

www.manaraa.com

Ataeva from Turkmenistan, Stéphanie Allard-Gomez from Canada, Tzipi Livni from Israel and Asha-Rose Migiro from Tanzania appear to be taking center stage on international roundtables and in global politics. Such women have managed to diversify and strengthen the realm of diplomatic mediation with their extreme professionalism, expertise in human rights and remarkable work in foreign policy. Despite this evident improvement in female political participation and despite governmental efforts to bridge the gender gap in state departments, one question seems to linger unanswered in the background behind all the media attention on female diplomats, have women truly managed to break the "glass ceiling" when it comes to foreign policy and diplomacy? As diplomacy continues to represent the epitome of peacemaking and strategic national cooperation, have female diplomats managed to truly incorporate their respective political voices in the field or have they remained victims to the patriarchal basis of the diplomatic system? In essence, has diplomacy managed to create an illusion of female participation by parading a showcase of strong female leaders to satisfy the prerequisite and quota for political gender equality?

Although direct female participation does not automatically assure that a particular feminist ideology will be incorporated in political affairs, we must evaluate and revisit the question of whether women as representatives of a particular marginal group are allowed uncensored freedom of opinion and independence in decision-making when it comes to diplomatic mediation. Precisely, in order to answer such pending questions and asses if women posses the liberty and authority to perform independent political measures or if they simply become submerged within diplomacy's highly state-centralized and patriarchal structure, we need to focus on exact political scenarios and evaluate them with specificity. Since diplomacy represents a highly practical sphere that places emphasis on real-life political situations it is only

www.manaraa.com

natural that we strive to conduct a more inclusive and precise feminist evaluation of specific global conflicts preformed by particular diplomatic agents.

Disseminating and reassessing the essence of diplomatic mediation through a feminist perspective would be incomplete if we do not consider the individual actions and political performances of marginal members that have held a diplomatic post. Evaluating the experiences and political actions of female diplomats in particular, can produce a comprehensive and diverse discussion on how receptive this political field is to transformation and inclusion of disenfranchised groups. Although we witnessed in the previous section on the modern diplomatic canon that feminism is making progress and inroads into diplomacy by means of NGO's, we must question whether such progress is truly enough. Zalewski writes, "Investigating how gender functions through the figure of woman and the activities of women begins to illustrate the staggering significance of gender in the construction of and daily enactment of international politics" (41). Similarly, my particular aim in this section is to perform a detailed feminist examination on the political policies, the diplomatic performance and the public reception of one highly influential female figure that has left a notable mark in international diplomacy. I have selected former Secretary of State, Hillary Rodham Clinton, as the most affluent and contemporary political persona whose professional work and public image can testify to the level of political independence available to women performing the roles of state diplomats.

In particular, I have chosen Hillary Clinton as a perfect example of a female political leader who has been constantly identified and defined in relation to her husband and former US president Bill Clinton. An exploration of the relationship between her public image and her policy decisions will offer a window onto the issue of whether women have an already predefined role to fulfill when it comes to diplomacy and foreign affairs or do they in fact

www.manaraa.com

exercise a limited political independence with foreign policy measures. The political career of Hillary Clinton is an extremely relevant case study that can truly address whether female diplomats need to assume hyper-masculine traits in order to be fully accepted and successful in the game of political censorship and profiteering. But most importantly, evaluating Hillary's (and in my thesis I will be referring to Hillary Clinton by her first name in order to provide a needed emphasis and a separation between her political persona from the one of her husband Bill Clinton) political endeavors during a turbulent era of terror and crisis for American national stability (including the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq), can demonstrate how female political leaders operate within the dynamics of power-relations in diplomacy and whether they are able to navigate the patriarchal bureaucracy in order to fully advance their political ideas.

In the analysis that follows, I focus closely on the relevant policy measures adopted by Hillary and I situate her respective political actions and represented views within the previously discussed canons of diplomacy which will ultimately determine the type of feminist behavior she displays in diplomatic negotiations. Such a theoretical task will both answer the latter questions if successful female diplomats need to assume masculine traits in order to advance in political statesmanship and whether women as marginal members impose a substantive value to the diplomatic sphere by promoting the views and goals of the respective marginal group they associate with. Also such an analysis will respond to my initial feminist query: have women in international diplomacy been given provisional mandates so that national governments can sustain a political façade of gender equality and democracy. Thus, I evaluate Hillary Clinton on the basis of three accounts setting aside her political affiliations as a democratic candidate. First, taking into consideration her respective foreign policy decisions, I elaborate in which diplomatic canon can her political actions be situated accordingly. Second, I examine Hillary's level of

www.manaraa.com

visibility in the public eye or more specifically, I focus on whether her gender is under-emphasized or hyper-emphasized through social media. And lastly, judging by her public persona, I analyze if Hillary became normalized within the androcentric structure of diplomacy by displaying masculine traits.

A.2 The Case of Hilary Rodham Clinton – A Traditional or a Feminist Diplomat?

Dedicated to restoring the American influence and image abroad as the 67th Secretary of State (and the third female one), Hillary Clinton took on the political accountability of restructuring and delegating American foreign policy in an era marked by terrorist attacks, violent protests, an escalating ethnic crisis in the Middle East, and a time of extreme economic downfall and public debt. Assuming office on January 21st of 2009, Hillary has represented a fierce diplomatic strategist whose foreign policy agenda has echoed on global roundtables and on every international conference. Possessing the single most powerful responsibility of preserving American stability and national security, domestically and abroad, Hillary has managed to transform the sphere of diplomatic behavior and introduce new innovative negotiating strategies. As a diplomatic reformist who understands and takes into account the growing globalizing conditions and economic devaluations, Hillary has successfully altered political mediation to fit in accordance with the current global and political crisis. In a 2011 interview for the CNN, Hillary declared that the US must reposition its political agenda and must adopt a foreign policy that will be "shaped in boardrooms and on trading floors—as well as on battlefields." In several consecutive interviews for the CNN, Hillary urged for the need of adopting diplomatic approaches that will be equipped to respond to the growing global economic crisis. Extending the craft of political mediation for the purpose of improving global economies, Hillary states how her goal remains "updating U.S. foreign policy priorities to include economics 'every step

www.manaraa.com

of the way,' suggesting the United States should take a cue from the leaders of emerging powers like India and Brazil who put economics at the center of their foreign policies" (2011 CNN Report).

Furthermore, among the most notable foreign policy reforms that Hillary advanced is the First Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review: Leading through Civilian Power (QDDR). Issued in late 2010, this review introduced a new political entity in diplomacy entitled "the civilian" whose capabilities, social influence and professional accountability became central attributes for advancing national interest and stability. The goal of such diplomatic policy was to fully accentuate and utilize the political potential of the "the national civilian force." As such, "the civilian" was designed to contribute in eliminating the deficit of the US budget and providing a much needed cost-efficient way of negotiating political crises. Hillary herself described this new venture in diplomatic mediation stating, "How can we do better?...we will build up our civilian power: the combined force of civilians working together across the U.S. government to practice diplomacy, carry out development projects, and prevent and respond to crises" (http://www.state.gov/s/dmr qddr/). Hillary's main objective for the incorporation of such strategy was primarily to cut the expenditure and growing costs on preserving national security, domestically and abroad, but also to improve the diplomatic sector by including an array of experts that were previously excluded from governmental affairs. According to the initial description of the Review it is stated that, "The QDDR provides a blueprint for elevating American 'civilian power'...Leading through civilian power means directing and coordinating the resources of all America's civilian agencies to prevent and resolve conflicts; help countries lift themselves out of poverty into prosperous, stable, and democratic states; and build global coalitions to address global problems" (QDDR Original Review Document from the US State

www.manaraa.com

Department). These new civilian agencies mentioned in the QDDR function exactly as emerging NGO's that will have an opportunity to incorporate their political views and respective opinions into the diplomatic sphere. Such efforts to transform and create a more progressive diplomatic sphere, I would argue place Hillary in the inchoate or nascent diplomatic canon. Her focus on the immediate economic crisis and her effective response to the growing national debt with the adoption of a new diplomatic review that introduces "the civilian power" as a political remedy, perfectly correspond to the pillars of nascent diplomatic behavior. Such measures can also be accredited to the realization that the diplomatic power the US enjoyed by virtue of its economic prowess in the 20th century, was lagging behind that of China, and even Brazil, and required direct attention[1].

When it comes to addressing women's issues and promoting a humanitarian platform, Hillary has undertaken several political measures dedicated to the feminist cause. Although these particular action plans could not clearly distinguish whether Hillary can be labeled as a progressive feminist, they speak to the fact that Hillary has not eliminated or excluded the equal protection of women as a political cause of diplomacy. The first subject matter that has created much of an international controversy has been Hillary's ardent promotion of equal social status and human rights for the Afghan women. In an interview for *The Economist* on March 22nd of 2012 Hillary declared, "One of the reasons that I've made it a centerpiece of American foreign policy [referring to the campaign for the Afghan women] is that on every indicator one can measure—the economy, GDP growth, on education, on democratization, the suppression of women, their marginalization—their denial of basic rights means that the society as a whole fails to modernize, fails to progress." These expressed concerns on women's issues in Afghanistan seem politically legitimate and relevant, placing Hillary as a progressive female democrat who

[1] My thanks to Prof. Jeffrey Edwards for bringing this to my attention.

www.manaraa.com

gives absolute priority to the advancement of women's role in society. Until the moment she makes the following remark in the same interview: "In a time when we are facing economic challenges, the fact that many countries still refuse to unleash the economic potential of women is a problem. If you do, you'll create more consumers, you'll create more producers, you'll raise the GDP." With this last statement, I would argue that by conveniently pointing out how women's subsequent employment can produce a more beneficial economic outcome, Hillary positions women's worth in an equivalent relationship with their labor. In essence, she becomes politically contradictory by attempting to defend a particular feminist cause but only because it can remedy the public national debt. Echoing a rather capitalist and neo-liberalist sentiment, Hillary manages to both express her concern for female's unequal treatment—especially in the labor market—to only negate these real concerns later on by comparing women to mere subjects, who if involved in the social production process can cause a radical shift in national economies.

On the other hand, we witness Hillary's remarkable work on advancing the Global Hunger and Food Security Initiative together with President Obama that represents a well developed program for aiding third world countries expand their agricultural sector. This initiative focuses closely on stimulating small farmers and especially women to engage in the cultivation of their own crops. This strategy prioritizes and ensures that women and children receive the adequate nutrition and that their basic human needs are met with the assistance of their subsequent governments. The original document particularly underlines that, "Reducing hunger will set off a positive ripple effect across people's lives, communities, countries—even continents… Advancing agriculture-led growth helps rural farmers—who are the majority of the world's food insecure population—to grow more food to feed their families and sell more of their products in commercial markets" (http://www.state.gov/s/globalfoodsecurity/129952.htm).

www.manaraa.com

Realizing that the most affected subjects from starvation are predominantly women and children, Hillary has made a significant commitment to promote this initiative through means of international diplomacy. Such efforts establish her as a female leader who understands the needs of women and takes relevant steps to remedy social inadequacies. What truly matters at the end is that Hillary's contributions and devoted work to protecting women, improving their political status and preventing their mistreatment, brings forth a political message that women are relevant social entities not only for the improvement of national economies but for the cultural progression of societies. Having analyzed Hillary's relevant political strategies and subsequent foreign policy measures, I proceed with an examination of her political visibility in the public sphere and her expressed gender performativity.

In a comprehensive analysis on the social invisibility of female political leaders, Spike Peterson and Anne Runyan argue, "not only are there very few women 'at the top,' but even those who succeed in achieving positions of power remain largely gender-invisible in conventional accounts of how power works in the world" (78). This statement is extremely relevant to examine because what Peterson and Runyan are implying is that when eminent female politicians are rendered invisible they simply become insignificant subjects unworthy of notice which automatically assumes that they have no valuable contributions to offer. This systematic downsizing of female voices and reduced visibility of female leaders speaks to the fact that women are not rendered as significant players in world politics. This notion legitimizes and even strengthens the gender power hierarchy especially in diplomacy and places heightened emphasis on the successful male prodigy. Therefore, one might inevitably conclude that the invisibility of female political figures equals zero international attention which in turn yields

www.manaraa.com

negative outcomes for the women holding ambassadorial posts. However, when it comes to the public persona of Hillary Clinton we can witness quite the opposite pattern.

As a female diplomat in charge of American foreign policy, Hillary has been made hyper-visible to the point where her every political decision, every strategic move she undertook was highly publicized, reevaluated, scrutinized and heavily critiqued. Clinton's political and personal life have been on a rather rampant media display since the day she became first lady; however, the moment she advanced as a professional diplomat and secretary of state, she became the ultimate target of the public watch. As opposed to her male predecessors, Hillary's every political speech, every televised briefing from the White House and every comment she made in foreign countries was closely examined and deliberated not only by media reporters but by political analysts, fellow diplomats and White House colleagues. Hillary slowly became the star of American politics and international diplomacy. But we must ask, at what cost and for what purpose? This incessant media parade on Hillary's political life did not promise positive implications and yield affirmative attention on her persona. In fact, it caused the opposite effect; it was as if everyone expected Hilary to fail and to make a wrong political move that will define her professional career as an unsuccessful blunder for political stardom. One instance of such hyper-visibility (and with that extreme cynical criticism) that Hillary was subjected to was over her appearance in front of the Senate's Foreign Relations Committee discussing the Benghazi tragedy in Libya (a devastating attack on the American consulate in Benghazi, Libya on September 11, 2012 by a group of armed rebels protesting the release of a Hollywood film that they claimed disgraced the Islamic religion. US Ambassador Chris Stevens and three of his colleagues were killed in the attacks and American national security was put at risk).

www.manaraa.com

Her comments and emotional breakdown caused a rather controversial stir bringing tremendous media attention on her reaction. Some of the raw and uncensored media bashing read, '"What difference at this point does it make?!' That was the Hillary Clinton quote on everyone's lips this past weekend in Annapolis. Hillary's remark from her appearance the week before …wasn't being cited admiringly. Nor was it being used as a sign—or sigh—of despair about the political and social trends that cause conservatives to agonize so these days" (Hughes, US Weekly News). The article concluded with the words "No one was copying Hillary. They were mocking Hillary. For those attending, her remark was the apotheosis of self-serving cynicism and irresponsibility" (Hughes, US Weekly News). Such harsh political judgment reaffirms the notion that Hillary's every policy statement or even moment of emotional reaction receives utmost condemnation and prompts a particular commentary. Furthermore, all throughout Hillary's political office as Secretary of State she was exposed to extreme criticism and inconsiderate media scrutiny for her political actions. Such hyper-visibility on Hillary's private and professional life gained great momentum after her briefing on the Benghazi tragedy and simply escalated into a drastic level of media and political attack.

Columnist Stephen Lendman from the Journal on Military and Foreign Affairs unapologetically described Hillary's professional work in the February 2013 issue stating, "She's complicit in crimes of war and against humanity. She represents the worst of imperial arrogance. She's a reliable spear-carrier. Her outbursts reflect bullying and bluster, not diplomacy. She's contemptuous of rule of law principles. She scorns democracy. She's committed to war, not peace. She's unabashedly hawkish." Rarely has a male political figure been so publically ostracized and professionally attacked for simply attempting to serve his nation to the best of his abilities. Therefore, how can we define this extreme political inspection and constant media

www.manaraa.com

stalking of Hillary's political career? Why has her political persona been so rigorously supervised and reevaluated? In essence, what does this hyper-visibility of Hillary's policy decisions suggest about gender-consciousness in politics and what kind of effect does it produce in the conduct of diplomatic affairs?

Notions of gender consciousness and visibility have a rather paradoxical effect in foreign affairs and diplomacy. As socially marked identities women experience the double standard of political visibility in a rather negative connotation. Exploring the implications of gender transparency in the social realm, Ruth Simpson and Patricia Lewis argue "the link between normativity and in(visibility) suggests that men in particular have maintained their position of power partly because they represent the normative standard case. As we have seen, masculinity retains its power because it is opaque to analysis" (1263). They further argue, "However, the invisibility that men experience signifies not an absence or a 'weak presence' as in the case of women, but a 'strong presence' in that invisibility emanates from the transparency that accompanies the norm" (Simpson & Lewis 1263). Similarly, Hillary's hyper-visibility and permanent presence in the media discourse provides a distinct social commentary on the cultural anxiety of having a female political leader. If male diplomats represent the normative standard as Simpson and Lewis argue, and female invisibility in the political realm signifies either an uncontested absence or has no substantive importance at all, then we can deduct that Hillary's extreme media attention only speaks to a form of political and public insecurity nurtured from the fact that a woman is head of national foreign policy. This insecurity stems from the highly sexist and socially embedded perceptions that women are particularly unfit for political life especially when it comes to governing national security and adopting foreign policy. (Although I do realize this particular scenario becomes rather complex since Hillary Clinton seems to

www.manaraa.com

represent one of the leading candidates for the next presidential elections, nevertheless I do want to proceed with my argument since many female diplomats are indeed affected by the sexist social perceptions about women in politics).

Furthermore, one of the major concerns that appears as a result of gender binaries in political structures is the idea of competence. Scholars Marieke van den Brink and Lineke Stobbe state, "Competence is assessed more in terms of a fit (masculine) body than a bright mind. We could say that this image concurs with the hegemonic form of masculinity representing the most honored and desired appearance" (460). Therefore, when Hillary's political actions are being assessed by the media or by other political members she becomes judged and measured to this very exact principle of male competence. Her hyper-visibility reaffirms the notion that women diplomats need to be constantly supervised, watched and advised because of their inherent incompetency to independently and effectively perform political decisions. To be fair, Hillary's professional judgments and decision-making strategies have received appraisal and positive commentary as well, however, this hyper-visibility on her persona accentuates the political hesitancy to award powerful positions to females and the highly sexist perception that women do not possess a professional acumen for diplomatic mediation. From such an analysis it only follows that political elites and the normative media corporations will critique, analyze and disseminate every possible action, decision or political strategy that Hillary undertakes.

The brutish and uncensored statements that publicly humiliate and degrade Hillary's political persona suggest that female leaders can be easily subjected to unrestricted political bashing without any plausible consequences. Specifically, Simpson and Lewis argue, "To occupy the norm, the privileged position of 'One' is therefore to be invisible and to evade

www.manaraa.com

scrutiny and interrogation while the devalued 'Other' is problematized and made to embody difference…to be different from the majority is to be visible and categorically defined. Women are therefore defined by their gender and by femininity" (1263). Witnessing the extremely negative comments and attacks on Hillary's persona especially for her Benghazi briefing and on her overall professional decisions, we can clearly infer that she has not only been extremely problematized as Simpson and Lewis suggest but the very emphasis on her ineffective policy making has brought her entire intellect and professional capacities into question. Hillary's hyper-visibility is directly linked to her femininity and gender which in turn are used against her by the political structure. Female politicians, as we can witness in Hillary's case, gain extreme political attention not only for the sake of popularity but so they can enter in what I would entitle political surveillance. In this realm, characterized by extreme political transparency and constant media supervision, female diplomats become the ultimate targets of political backlash and scrutiny. The watchful public eye and the political elites eagerly await for that one wrong decision to be made on the part of the female diplomat so they can reassert the notion that women are simply not predisposed to manage political affairs.

This delicate hyper-visibility, that characterizes the political realm of surveillance, automatically positions female leaders to fail and commit even a small political error so they can be forced to exit the governmental sphere. And the very paradox in this entire political scenario is that it provides the illusion of gender equality in the sphere of diplomacy. Many would assume that such heightened attention on Hillary's political decisions simply means that she is being measured according to the same standards as many of her male counterparts or that she is receiving a much needed political momentum without the primary focus being on her gender. I deem such public perceptions completely legitimate but nevertheless completely fraud and

www.manaraa.com

misguiding. As opposed to her former male incumbents, Hillary's personality, her foreign policy judgments, her professional decisions, even her emotional reactions and fashion choices have been criticized and publicly attacked through the media in front of the eyes of the American nation. No former male secretary of state has received such unprofessionally degrading treatment nor has he been ruthlessly questioned even for his far worse foreign policy measures. Moreover, there has been no instances where a former male diplomat has been constantly defined and identified to the political success and career of his spouse as has Hillary nor has any male political figure been explicitly asked by a reporter what particular designer is his favorable choice for public appearances.

The fact remains clear, female political diplomats either remain tremendously invisible and irrelevant to the political elite and the public eye or they become subjected to extreme hyper-visibility. The effects of both political scenarios remain disadvantageous to the political careers of women even in the 21st century. Gender unfortunately remains the main social indicator that further marks every political movement and policy measure that women leaders adopt to only reaffirm stereotypical notions of their political incompetency and professional inadequacy not only in the sphere of political mediation but in the field of national politics altogether. The pattern of Hillary's hyper-visibility in the media sphere prompts a direct analysis on the question of gender consciousness in politics and the pressure that female leaders experience to advance in the game of political maneuvering. Moreover, the most relevant dilemma remains, what prompts female political leaders to assume masculine traits and what are the social and cultural implications of such behavior?

Before discussing Hillary's gender performance during her term as secretary of state it is rather essential that we establish the difference between the concepts of self-identification and

www.manaraa.com

public gender performativity. Scholar Ann McGinley distinguishes, "individual identities are not fixed, but are negotiated and performed. For example, a person negotiates between his sense of self or self-identity and his attributed identity, how others perceive him. In order to achieve certain reactions from others, an individual may perform identity in different ways" (711). For the purposes of my analysis we are solely going to focus on Hillary's displayed identity and public gender performance setting aside her personal self-identification or conception of self. Hillary's public image has always been synonyms to epithets of toughness, strength and durability. As a female diplomat she has shown less empathy and increased resilience and has exuded energy of strictness and remote emotionality which typically characterize as highly masculine traits. Defined as virtually "untouchable" by columnist Aaron David Miller from the Foreign Policy Journal and labeled as "the new Teflon secretary" by Chris Cillizza from the Washington Post, Hillary has left an unprecedented mark in foreign affairs as the second iron lady. Her policy decision-making shows an evident pattern of rigorous and strict diplomatic negotiations that are extremely dedicated to preserving the national interests. When it comes to Hillary's diplomatic strategies she almost blends in with the centralized and already pre-defined structure of diplomatic behavior that makes her virtually undistinguishable from her previous male colleagues. Hillary was unquestionably the most loyal team player to both the Obama administration and to the political structure she was part of, consciously crafting her policy decisions to match the needs of the national government and downplaying her political beliefs to create a pragmatic balance in political affairs. Reaffirming how Hillary seriously took the role of a political leader faithfully executing the traditional agenda of international diplomacy, Michael O'Hanlon writes, "When Obama had strong views, she did not publicly dissent or allow any distance to open between her position and that of her boss. She understood that secretaries of

www.manaraa.com

state carry out the foreign policy determined by the president and that little good can come from public disagreements" (1).

Enloe emphasizes the rigid and male-dominated sphere of international relations and the social perceptions that feed and entice sexist political hierarchies. She argues, "Many people, and especially women, are taught that international politics are too complex, too remote and too tough for the feminine mind to comprehend. If a Margaret Thatcher or a Jeanne Kirkpatrick slips through the cracks, it is presumably because she has learned to 'think like a man'" (197). I want to place emphasis on this exact notion of "thinking like a man" which ultimately implies that in order to achieve any kind of substantive presence and recognition in international diplomacy, female leaders have to succumb to a masculine gender performance. Thinking like a man in this political instance means thinking like the patriarchy or acting like the privileged male political elites. Such imposed political behavior gives women one inescapable and hardly advancing opportunity, the denial of their self-worth and feminine identity by forming a coalition with the very system that rejects their political presence. Thinking like a man in international diplomacy means that women need to suppress their emotions and embrace a structure that systematically denies their capabilities, questions their professional intelligence and causes them numerous obstacles in their quest for equal opportunity and success.

In examining Hillary Clinton's gender performativity and the coercive nature of the political system that has prompted her to suppress her unique style as a female diplomat and substitute it with a more andocentric approach to international diplomacy, I introduce in this discussion Michel Foucault's theory on the society of normalization. Foucault's idea of how this society functions relies on the concepts of constant surveillance, discipline and predetermined norms. When combined together, these normalizing techniques cause the individual that is part

www.manaraa.com

of the system to perform self-alienation and depreciation of its own needs, desires, wishes, political views or cultural opinions. This normalizing society functions in such a manner that it causes an implicit self-censorship among its constituents that they eventually commit to salient obedience. Foucault states, "These techniques and these discourses, to which the disciplines give rise invade the area of right so that the procedures of normalization come to be ever more constantly engaged in the colonization of those of law" (Foucault 107). Similarly, I would argue that the diplomatic sphere of international mediation represents exactly a political society of normalization. And such normalizing action occurs especially to its marginalized subjects and in our cause female diplomats such as Hillary Clinton. Combining the hyper-visibility and the mode of surveillance associated with Hillary's persona with the stereotypical biases that require females to assume masculine traits in order to somewhat advance in political affairs, foreign relations seem to closely mirror the atmosphere in Foucault's society of normalization. Through succumbing to the ideas and standards of the political system, female diplomats and especially Hillary in this scenario enter into a process of self-infringement and restriction in order to attain recognition and valorization. What essentially occurs to women diplomats in such a political environment of normalization is what I would entitle a "false system of exchange" where the political subjects involved are subconsciously forced to believe that if they attempt to blend in the preexisting patriarchal norms by denying their different standpoints they will be awarded in exchange with esteem and acceptance. However, it is very disheartening for female leaders to eventually acknowledge that there is no negotiation or balance with a political system that wants to attain full supremacy of foreign policy and diplomatic negotiations.

Discussing the double gender bias that has negatively affected Hillary's professional career, McGinley argues, "Clinton downplayed her femininity and emphasized her toughness in

www.manaraa.com

order to compensate for being a woman, and to earn respect for her competence and experience… By the same token, it is dangerous to do so because people do not like women who are too masculine" (717). She further concludes how "Hillary Clinton, therefore, found herself in a double bind: either act more feminine and be judged incompetent or act masculine and be considered unlikeable" (McGinley 717). This inescapable political labyrinth that female diplomats encounter places them in a tremendously problematic situation that will yield negative repercussions on their professional persona regardless of the choices they make. The deep-rooted social biases against successful female politicians automatically define what the role of women, who do manage to enter the realm of power-politics, will be like. As an intelligent and competent woman, Hillary managed to navigate the diplomatic bureaucracy incredibly well. However, if women do decide to participate in this powerful, self-replicating political system of gender bias they must altogether subsume their femininity and censor their independent political voices. And if their decision is to resist the normalizing nature of political diplomacy and pursue a career elsewhere they manage to reaffirm the gender stereotype that women do not possess the needed acumen for political life. Or the process of challenging stereotypical gender hierarchies must occur outside the realm of direct political action.

Altogether, we can state without a doubt that the political policies and relevant diplomatic strategies that Hillary has introduced into the sphere of international mediation (including The First Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review and The Global Hunger and Food Security Initiative) will be much valued and executed by future secretaries of state. Possessing qualities as both a progressive and a traditional diplomat, Hillary stands as a great example of a female leader who made a bold decision to face any obstacles and challenge the gender biases that women are incompetent to enter the privileged sphere of foreign relations. Unquestionably,

www.manaraa.com

Hillary proved that female diplomats can efficiently preserve national interests and stability by dealing with the most delicate international crises (including the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, the Arab Spring, the virtual political collapse of Egypt during the 2011 protests, the terror in Syria and the escalating political turmoil and attacks on the American consulate in Libya). Hillary Clinton will enter American history as a successful female diplomat who restored the American influence and political image abroad in a time when American credibility was experiencing a tremendous downfall after the Iraq war.

Hillary Clinton exits the political scene (or until the next presidential elections we have yet to see) leaving a legacy of potency, power, extreme devotion and capability behind her career as the third female US Secretary of State. While a new era begins for American foreign policy and political mediation, we are still faced with the same political hierarchies in diplomacy that confine and restrain the presence of females in the highest ranking senior positions. Acknowledging that one woman (or three in the history of the US that have held these diplomatic posts which seems highly paradoxical for a country that proclaims utmost gender equality and democracy) in political power cannot achieve the highest effects of reconceptualizing a more progressive diplomatic behavior, we must rely on the efforts of multiple feminists organizations and NGO's who are indirectly involved in political mediation. In the section that follows, I offer a wide-ranging analysis on the exact feminist methodologies that need to be incorporated into the sphere of diplomacy in order to produce more effective outcomes and transform this sphere into a gender conscious force—detached from political hierarchies and from the overwhelming influence of central governments.

www.manaraa.com

Section 3

Incorporating Feminist Methodology in the Practice of Diplomacy

The sphere of international diplomacy can be understood as a strategic political tool for facilitating global alliances among diverse nations while at the same time promoting values such as peace-building, compromise, cultural diversity, national self-interest and political profiteering as well. Since diplomacy has traditionally represented a patriarchal, male-dominated political practice, this field has rarely been associated or even linked to the teachings of feminist theory. As a result, both state diplomats and feminist activists have remained in a more indifferent rather than antagonistic relationship never attempting to merge or amalgamate their goals and strategies for achieving equal human rights. The subsequent lack of pertinent scholarship that either analyzes or attempts to ideologically merge and evaluate the goals of both feminism and diplomacy requires for a detailed and precise feminist examination of international affairs. Therefore, my objective in the following section is to expand, reconstruct and reconceptualize the sphere of international diplomacy by proposing the most efficient feminist methods that will empower feminists to press their agendas on the diplomatic process. I further argue how particular feminist methodologies need to become part of the diplomatic agenda in order to expand this political sphere in a gender-conscious direction. With such a practical and theoretical task we will be able to connect and merge the political objectives of diplomacy and feminism while bringing these two highly relevant spheres of cultural and political life closer together.

In a discussion on the most relevant feminist methodologies that can be applied to the sphere of political affairs, Brooke Ackerly and Jacqui True write, "the practices of skeptical scrutiny, inclusionary inquiry, explicitly choosing a deliberative moment, and conceptualizing the field as a collective…constitute our feminist theoretical method" (260). And it is precisely these outlined components of theoretical questioning, inquiry, skepticism and collectivism that

www.manaraa.com

add an element of feminist analysis in the arena of diplomatic mediation. Therefore, my aim is to exactly employ such feminist methods of inquiry in order to deconstruct traditional diplomatic behavior and create a more modern and feminist field of diplomatic negotiations. Similarly, the new feminist diplomacy that will emerge as a result of this theoretical collaboration will be equipped to uniquely answer and resolve upcoming political conflicts on gender inequality, sexual exploitation and racial inferiority. Furthermore, in her chapter on the exclusion of female leaders and feminist scholars from the active conduct of political affairs Zalewski states, "re-reading conventional narratives of international politics through feminism offers us different ways to think… about what is important and what is normal and how much work assumptions about the latter are doing" (34).

Reevaluating the sphere of international diplomacy and allowing the entrance of feminist voices will force state actors to conduct political affairs in a more decentralized manner, taking into account public opinion on global issues and understanding gender or racism as not only social problems but rather as significant political matters. For instance, when the Bush administration made the strategic political move to invade Iraq in 2003 and continue the war despite public disapproval (according to a Gallup poll the support of the American public for the Iraq war started drastically declining after "147 American military personnel were killed by insurgencies in April 2004" and by 2005 the public support fell to "below 50%") the American government created foreign policy based primarily on national self-interest and political profiteering (Holsti 13). However, if our political leaders at the time were open and considerate to a more decentralized and politically conscious way of conducting diplomatic negotiations with Iraq, perhaps we would have had a completely different political outcome and certainly less casualties. Zalewski argues that there are multiple positive results from positioning feminism

www.manaraa.com

inside the political processes of highly patriarchal and traditional political fields stating, "There are two results here we might note; one is that we get new, more complex images of what happens in international politics and thus what international politics is (about). Second, we get a better sense of how important women are in international politics—in so many ways—which really begs the question, how is it so easy to leave them out?" (35).

It is extremely relevant that a merger of feminist methods and diplomatic behavior occurs both in the theoretical and practical sense because diplomacy is the only political field that has the magnitude and capacity to reach global networks, to create alliances and relationships with diverse nations in need. As a political tool of compromise and strategic dialogue, diplomacy has been universally recognized and practiced extending its political influence from the most remote areas on the globe, ranging from the refugee camps of Dadaab, Kenya, the terror sites in Damascus, Syria and finally in the negotiating government chambers in Israel and Palestine. However, as much as diplomacy has been open to conquering different conflicts on diverse territories it has remained fairly closed and even pragmatically hostile to any kind of political or ideological interference. Feminist scholars Ackerly, Stern and True argue how "In a state-centric discipline that is notorious for its lack of self-reflection, developing feminist methodologies… have been major challenges" (1). Precisely because of this reason, our task of reassessing the diplomatic field from a feminist perspective becomes an even more relevant and necessary endeavor.

Therefore, in order to expand diplomacy's current realm of focus so it becomes more cognizant to issues of gender, religion, sexuality, race, femininity and masculinity, we must work on reconstructing this political field to include elements of feminist theory and methodology. Through such a complex but highly beneficial approach, feminism will have the opportunity to

www.manaraa.com

become a relevant political force on the international stage and gain a political momentum as well as global recognition. As a result, diplomacy will expand its state-centric and archaic platform by increasing its political affluence and transforming into an interdisciplinary political power. Therefore, I suggest that we focus our attention on examining and discussing the most relevant feminist methodologies that will create a new approach to political mediation and initiate a modern more progressive feminist diplomacy. After examining multiple feminist methodologies, I have selected the ones that I feel are most suitable to be incorporated into the diplomatic arena. The section that follows is a comprehensive analysis on the most applicable and significant elements of the four categories of feminist methods and theoretical concepts.

A.3 Descriptive and Substantive Feminist Representation

Descriptive Feminist Representation

In its original political context "descriptive representation" in government signifies the very physical presence of a member pertaining to a particular gender, ethnicity, race or other distinct social classification. The most problematic issue that resurfaces in global governments when it comes to equal political representation is the highly disproportionate percentage of male delegates as opposed to females. Such explicit political preference for the expertise and state leadership of male representatives places women politicians at the marginal outskirts of governmental and diplomatic affairs. According to the 2010 United Nations World's Women Press Release conducted by the UN Statistics Division, "becoming the Head of State or Head of Government remains elusive for women, with only 14 women in the world currently holding either position" (111). Similarly, only "one in six cabinet ministers is a woman" worldwide and "in just 23 countries do women comprise a critical mass—over 30 per cent— in the lower or single house of their national parliament" (111). While I do recognize that female representation

www.manaraa.com

does not automatically guarantee the advancement of a feminist standpoint, the systematic exclusion of females from the political sphere altogether suggests a rather problematic and frightening international pattern of male authority, leadership and complete possession of global affairs including highest representational statesmanship.

Likewise, the diplomatic field has been no exception to this androcentric descriptive representation with an alarming statistic of only seven highest-ranking female diplomats to the United Nations of 185 available posts to be filled. Henceforth, the most evident conclusion that can follow from such alarming statistical data is the far from reaffirming realization that if women's presence is physically lacking from every possible sphere of political governance then it is theoretically impossible that their voices, beliefs, judgments or political opinions will ever reach global recognition. In order to alter even the understated phrase that we live in a completely man's world, in the sections that follow I suggest a radical increase of female representatives and members of other marginal groups as the first step towards achieving gender equality in diplomacy. Similarly, Peterson and Runyan have argued for the importance of female participation in politics by stating how a, "1992 study by the UN Division for the Advancement of Women (UNDAW) determined that a 'critical mass' of about 30 to 35 percent women is necessary for women to confidently champion women's needs and priorities" (97). Through consideration of descriptive politics, I argue that nations will be able to secure a much needed gender or racial equilibrium on negotiating roundtables, in presidential cabinets, on diplomatic posts and in international parliaments.

In her essay on constructing a collective feminist approach to international politics, Laurel Weldon writes, "descriptive representation can enhance the articulation of minority-group perspective. When marginalized group members are able to speak for themselves they are better

www.manaraa.com

able to represent their views. Their presence also confers legitimacy on the proceedings" (75). Translated to the diplomatic sphere such statements would definitely imply a drastic increase in the number of not only female but other representatives from different social and cultural spheres that have previously been marginalized and excluded. These exact statements represent the foundational framework for understanding and interpreting descriptive feminist representation, meaning the very bodily presence of members of marginalized, underrepresented and disenfranchised groups in the conduct of political affairs. What truly characterizes this type of descriptive political representation as feminist is the specific requirement that disenfranchised social groups be allowed to directly engage in the decision-making process of their respective nations. Ultimately, what becomes the differentiating point between regular descriptive representation and the feminist one is that the latter does not only advocate that governmental institutions achieve a proportionate gender rate—where women comprise 50 percent of the employee pool in politics—but rather extends the focus on equal representation of members from different religious, ethnic and racial backgrounds. So instead of solely focusing that women gain a just political voice within the diplomatic sphere or other state areas, descriptive feminist representation requires that all marginal groups gain equal and unbiased opportunity to hold a governmental post.

Nevertheless, as Weldon underlines in her essay, what is relevant for descriptive politics is that it must not function as "mere tokenism" but rather "members of marginalized groups must be present in such numbers and contexts that they can discuss issues among themselves…and present a perspective that is critical of the dominant group" (76). I reaffirm Weldon's statements and further argue that when it comes to the sphere of international diplomacy descriptive presence represents a political policy in and of itself because although it might not guarantee that

www.manaraa.com

the voices of certain marginal members will receive great attention and a national momentum, it certainly does assure the fact that these marginal ideologies will decentralize the dominant political architecture of diplomacy. Furthermore, it is of great importance to emphasize once again that only proportionate representational numbers as well as presence, participation and direct inhabitance of political space by underrepresented groups can yield results and provide a political statement of inclusion to governments.

If the latter requirement is met, then descriptive feminist representation has the power to facilitate political and ideological shifts by directly challenging and opposing the dominant political views when marginalized members freely voice their opinions and collaborate together in order to eliminate social inequality. As trivial as descriptive feminism may sound, it is one of the key political components that creates precedence in the political design of national parliaments by automatically emphasizing that gender, race and ethnicity should matter in representational politics. The inclusion of marginalized entities within privileged governmental spheres does not function as a simple correction to a statistical negligence or a representational oversight in parliaments rather it represents a direct response to the systemic exclusion of women and other minorities from political and diplomatic leadership. Similarly, the value of descriptive feminist politics for the diplomatic field is unprecedented since diplomacy has traditionally been a male-dominated political hegemony for centuries. As a result, when the design of descriptive feminism is incorporated into the representational structure of diplomacy and when qualified women are not discriminated but welcomed to enter the sphere as state diplomats or ambassadorial candidates, the practice of diplomacy truly transforms into a more open and progressive political field.

www.manaraa.com

Before I continue to analyze the social and political benefits that descriptive representation can yield for democratic societies, I need to address one relatively significant concern when it comes to increasing the statistical numbers of female political representatives. Many scholars have posed the question of whether a radical incorporation of female politicians and female diplomats will necessarily produce any kind of effective political shifts when it comes to the androcentric structure of governmental affairs. Many have suggested that descriptive politics in fact would simply promote an illusory picture of social equality and democracy when it comes to national states and would in turn legitimize the sexist power politics currently in practice. Peterson and Runyan have argued that, "adding women as agents of state power certainly changes the position of women in world politics. But how much it changes the power of gender is a more complicated question" (106). They further conclude that "women's representation in formal politics will be insufficient to bring about positive change as long as masculinism privileges and pervades economic decision-making" (Peterson & Runyan 106). Although such a statement does contain validity especially when we consider that dominant masculinity guides the conduct of foreign policy (in the sense that diplomacy and much of political affairs are delegated by male leaders), what Peterson and Runyan fail to recognize is that women's direct presence in the midst of political action has the ability to challenge the core of the patriarchal system. When Peterson and Runyan state that descriptive feminist representation is insufficient in transforming the power of gender in political affairs, they are implicitly underestimating and devalorizing the power as well as the practical value of increased female representation. I challenge these views and instead assert that incorporating more female politicians and diplomats in political state structures not only opens room for the female

www.manaraa.com

perspective and expertise to gain impetus but it restructures the male-centered and patriarchal pillars of political affairs.

Furthermore, when state diplomats become receptive and open to the idea of allowing marginalized groups to participate in strategic negotiations and conflict resolution, there occurs a linear double effect in politics because as a result governments themselves simultaneously make a step forward to becoming more democratic political units. Descriptive feminist representation signifies progress towards achieving unification between the cultural, social and political worlds without excluding women or other racial identities from active participation in the diplomatic sphere. In her analysis on the political mechanism of state representation Sarah Childs states, "Unrepresentative political institutions are considered to be unjust, to lack legitimacy, to reveal a democratic deficit and to reduce the substantive representation of excluded groups" (1). Conversely, descriptive feminist representation allows for the inception of a different political picture based on social diversity; it grants governments a form of political self-actualization allowing them to achieve democratic affiliation and public appraisal. Levels of trust and popularity escalate among national constituents when they witness how the organizational structures of governments include distinct members of marginal social groups. And the only way to compel political governments to reinforce descriptive feminist politics into the representational design (as a norm that states must follow when assigning ambassadorial and diplomatic posts) is to treat this method as their national self-interest. Once descriptive feminist representation is enforced as part of the power dynamics and interest of the state, diplomacy can transform into a more collective enterprise.

www.manaraa.com

Substantive Feminist Representation

In order to avoid the possibility of descriptive feminist representation becoming mere political tokenism and in order to reassure that the presence of marginalized groups within governments reaches a greater political magnitude rather than the label of a simple statistical data, we must introduce a substantive feminist method within the context of political representation. Peterson and Runyan argue that as "long as women constitute only a token presence …it is unlikely that feminist goals can be effectively promoted. This is true whether or not the women (or men) advocate feminist objectives as part of their campaign commitments" (97). As a result, we can infer that descriptive feminist politics cannot firmly sustain its ideological influence on its own if detached from a more complex substantive segment. The most problematic aspect of descriptive politics is that marginalized groups would simply come to fulfill a certain statistical obligation so governments attain their status of legitimacy in the eyes of the public. Entering the political sphere of diplomacy as a result of a representational requirement does not automatically guarantee that one will have an independent political voice. Consequently, women or representatives of racial minorities often become subdued, silenced or even repressed by the dominant political ideology in practice and adhere to the already established norms without ever gaining the opportunity to challenge the state system. Diplomacy as an international field is no exception. We witnessed in the previous section how in order to sustain their esteemed political positions female diplomats—as Hilary Clinton—are required to assume masculine traits, adapt to the norms of patriarchal politics and implement the founding principles of traditional diplomacy in order to progress in the game of political maneuvering.

In her comprehensive study on descriptive representation in local governments, Childs argues, "The case for political presence is usually made on … the grounds of justice. Now rarely

www.manaraa.com

contested, the absence of, say, women or ethnic minority members from our political institutions is increasingly regarded as *prima facie* evidence of injustice" (7). She further states that, "in symbolic terms, the presence of the formerly excluded demonstrates that they are the equals of those who were previously included. *Contra* traditional understandings of symbolic representation, particular bodies need to be physically present to symbolize their equality and ability to govern" (Childs 7). Now the problem arises when state governments prevent the physical presence of marginal groups to escalate into active political participation and attempt to manipulate the actual freedom of speech and decision-making process of such members. Therefore, under these coercive circumstances, descriptive feminist representation becomes a political cover for governments providing an illusory image of political inclusion to the public while attempting to normalize the voices of women or other minorities within. Hence, when it comes to taking full advantage of descriptive feminist representation in the diplomatic sphere and in all governmental institutions one must ask, how do marginal members inside the political sphere detach themselves from the normalization process of patriarchal politics and elevate their concerns by challenging the dominant political ideology?

Substantive political representation—only when combined with descriptive politics—has the effect of forcing "revision on dominant conceptual schemas" and diversifying political dialogue by expanding the range of responsibility in diplomatic conduct (Weldon 77). The definition of substantive representation is quite empirical and transparent in meaning maintaining that women or other marginal groups act "in the interest of the represented, in a manner responsive to them" (Celis 97). According to Karen Celis, there are several components that distinguish the substantive design, "Firstly, it is about representative acts as opposed to, for instance, intentions or attitudes. Secondly, the results of these representative acts should be in the

www.manaraa.com

interest of the represented…women's interests and female citizens are central to the representative process" (97). And it is very important that we place needed emphasis on the value of "representative acts" because it signifies that when women or members from marginal groups act upon certain policy procedures they must rely on representing the interests, intentions, concerns or political views of the subsequent social group they identify with as opposed to solely focusing on their individual attitudes or political affiliations. I argue that substantive representation especially when applied to diplomatic dialogue must be a byproduct of collective opinions, political aspirations and goals of not only the individual holding a diplomatic post but of the entire social group one is representing.

Therefore, as a political term substantive representation demands that a particular political member entertain a conscious and independent stance securing the personal interests, beliefs, values and unbiased judgments of its respective social and cultural group. So for instance, in international diplomacy what would constitute substantive representation is not the mere presence of female diplomats in ambassadorial posts but rather active political leadership by females whose ideas, concerns and strategic proposals come at the center of diplomatic dialogue. And most importantly, all of the proposed ideas and respective policy decisions must faithfully execute the interests of the women's groups these female diplomats are representing. Also, women must be allowed an uncensored and equal opportunity to engage in political dialogue and their subsequent ideas and expertise should not be dismissed on the basis of racial, gender or other social prejudice. Any political case of ad hominem fallacy (a verbal political attack made on the basis of bigotry or biased judgment directly on the individual instead on the individual's argument or position) must be fully eliminated from diplomatic behavior in order for descriptive and substantive representation to become both unified and effective in practice.

المنارة للاستشارات
www.manaraa.com

Another major element that can possibly strengthen the purpose of substantive representation is when the subsequent grassroots organization of women actually holds its representatives accountable and in check so that their policy decisions fairly represent the interests of the group. Moreover, substantive representation should not be treated as a political privilege that members of a marginalized group are allowed to exercise and thereby protect their collective interests. Instead, such representation should be viewed as a political right for underprivileged members and women especially to not only fulfill a governmental quota when it comes to diplomatic posts but be heard, appreciated and taken seriously.

Nevertheless, what distinguishes substantive feminist representation as feminist is its bold, radically challenging and humanitarian political agenda that dominates the center stage of political action and always seems to question or negate the active political system in practice. What is unique about substantive feminist representation is that its marginal members, especially women, audaciously voice their political concerns that can be in direct opposition to the dominant patriarchal norms of conducting political affairs. Substantive feminism as a representational force is always deemed in ideological conflict with mainstream international diplomacy or traditional male-dominated political agencies. However problematic this ideological conflict may seem, it is rather the healthiest and politically desired outcome that possesses the very ability to deconstruct, dismantle, question, oppose and challenge all the dominant strategies in diplomacy that have practically defined this governmental sphere for decades. This very conflict allows for the inception of "crucial representative acts performed by women's policy agencies (and women's movements) with regard to the substantive representation of women" to further gender the "policy debate frames and policy decision content" and infiltrate "feminist policy feedback in policy implementation" (Celis 98). In short,

www.manaraa.com

this type of representational politics triggers a form of skepticism and brings into question how state diplomacy and state interests are defined in the first place. This occurrence is highly beneficial for the diplomatic field because it provides both state officials and diplomats with an opportunity to rethink and reevaluate the strategies they implement behind closed doors.

Furthermore, substantive feminist representation in diplomacy allows women and other marginal members to not only be "performing acts in favor of women (voting, introducing and supporting bills, speaking for women, broadening the political agenda, formulating women's interests, gendering debates and policy content, lobbying the state, feminist policy analysis and feedback)" but most importantly this type of representation allows diplomacy to become a politically transparent and culturally inclusive governmental sphere (Celis 101). Political transparency I argue, as a concept of extreme value for diplomatic mediation, becomes especially enabled through substantive feminism since the previously private political dialogue extends to the public sphere as marginal members collectively discuss, question, share and reevaluate foreign policy with their respective NGO's, social and cultural groups. Both descriptive and substantive feminist representation, when combined together, can cause a structural transformation in the diplomatic sphere by introducing a more progressive and gender conscious way of conducting political negotiations, balancing ethnic tensions and resolving terrorist insurgencies.

B.3 Deconstructive Feminist Standpoint

Global alliances and diplomatic strategies have relied on a state-centered, highly autocratic and self-replicating patriarchal politics that has remained ignorant and closed off—by means of independent choice—to issues of gender, racial discrimination and sexual inequality. Feminist standpoint theory, in its highest element, has the power to condemn the political

www.manaraa.com

concealment, utter disregard and devaluation of relevant social issues and inadvertently challenge the diplomatic monopoly of traditional politics. Taking the very basic definition of feminist standpoint as introduced by scholar Sandra Harding, we derive at the central function of this theory to act as both "explanatory and normative…as a way of empowering oppressed groups, of valuing their experiences, and of pointing toward a way to develop an 'oppositional consciousness'" (2). Harding further states, "a standpoint can not be thought of as an ascribed position with its different perspective that oppressed groups can claim automatically. Rather, a standpoint is an achievement, something for which oppressed groups must struggle, something that requires both science and politics" (8). Therefore, I suggest that by incorporating feminist standpoint theory in its foundational canon (not simply as an epistemological hypothesis but rather as a practical political strategy) the field of diplomacy will be able to restructure its political basis to include the experiences of socially marginalized groups. And in essence, who can better suggest strategies, resolutions and negotiating techniques to global problems of poverty, famine, religious turmoil, ethnic bloodshed and racial prejudice than the very oppressed who have directly suffered from the same social inequalities.

Similarly, when applied to the practice of diplomacy feminist standpoint must not remain as a mere theoretical occurrence with no practical applicability in world politics and international affairs. Instead, when being adopted into the foundational canon of diplomacy, I argue that feminist standpoint must be treated as "an agenda, not a particular theory or policy position" (Weldon 66). Furthermore, we must understand feminist standpoint as a political platform that "suggests problems, questions, and ideas, not worked-out answers, theories, or hypotheses" because only in this structure it can be pertinent and fully applicable to the political matters that preoccupy state diplomats (Weldon 66). In a similar fashion, when applying feminist standpoint

www.manaraa.com

to diplomatic issues, the results and implications that yield from this collaboration of ideas must be a collectively discussed and empirically theorized product. Therefore, when feminist standpoints are subsequently adopted by male diplomats they must be fully processed, examined and debated in active partnership with the respective members whose collective agendas are being deliberated. Only through such an interactive process can feminist standpoint reach its full effectiveness and applicability to different political situations. Additionally, "taking the perspective of the marginalized reveals the importance of legitimation processes, processes by which existing political structures are portrayed as just, natural and rational. It reveals the presence as well as the limits of coercive power in the everyday lives of those at the bottom of the hierarchy of power (Weldon 67).

And the very inclusion of feminist standpoint in diplomatic behavior allows exactly for this political field to gain extreme democratic legitimacy, global affirmation as a righteous, humanitarian and politically correct space in international affairs. By the mere adoption of feminist standpoint, diplomacy can transform from a highly sterile, incessantly static, state-centralized field—that employs privileged political diplomats to conduct world politics by promising peace and stability—to a publicly open, rational and truly diplomatic sphere. The very element of standpoint theory that allows for such a transformation to occur in the diplomatic sphere lies, as Kristina Rolin suggests, in the fact that, "unprivileged social positions are likely to generate perspectives that are 'less partial and less distorted' than perspectives generated by other social positions" (218). Furthermore, as Weldon underlines, the actual implementation of feminist standpoint in diplomacy will reveal that there are limitations and social boundaries to coercive political power. When the experiences and political opinions of marginal groups begin to occupy the main agenda of diplomatic mediation, a form of social empowerment can be

www.manaraa.com

witnessed. And this particular empowerment that Rolin defines as the "power understood as an individual's or a group's ability to act in spite of or in response to the power wielded over the individual or the group by others" is what exposes the very limitations to elitist power politics (220). Focusing on the perspectives of marginalized identities it is relevant to distinguish that feminist standpoint "does not focus on individual differences in viewpoint, but rather on issues, values, or styles of discourse, that inform a group perspective" (Weldon 65).

Moreover, Patricia Hill Collins further discusses another significant element of feminist standpoint stating that "to ignore power relations is simply to misread standpoint theory—its raison d'être, its continuing salience, and its ability to explain social inequality" (376). Subsequently, since power hierarchies define the very essence of international politics and state diplomacy, feminist standpoint theory has the ability to directly threaten the stability and dominance of the long-preserved political bureaucracy by exposing, disrupting and possibly redefining the meaning of power. It is highly significant to distinguish that feminist standpoints are not uniquely innate to every marginal social group as they do not arise by default but instead they come into existence as a direct result of a particular shared inequality or political oppression. Since feminist standpoints come into being exactly because governmental institutions redistribute political power within a select group of privileged political actors and disenfranchise other marginal members, these collective standpoints have the knowledge, authority and personal resilience to dismantle the political status-quo in national institutions.

Consequently, we must address one possible issue or theoretical fallacy that might arise from feminist standpoint when being incorporated into the diplomatic canon. In her discussion on feminist approaches to international relations, Weldon states, "asserting that groups share standpoints has raised charges of essentialism" (65). Misinterpretation of feminist standpoint as

www.manaraa.com

essentialist can be highly problematic for the diplomatic sphere as it would construct certain expectations that marginal groups and women in particular have a fundamental, natural predisposition to make the same political mistakes, ascertain equivalent political views and most importantly implement identical political strategies when it comes to global issues. This false presumption of essentialism will cause marginal members to be treated as a mere collective formation in political affairs rather than be valued as independent political actors who share the same social experiences but nevertheless possess diverse views and opinions on diplomatic matters. Weldon further analyzes this fallacious theoretical charge of essentialism by stating that if a particular marginal group shares a standpoint "does not suggest that each person in the group has the same opinions or values, or that anything shared derives from some fundamental group essence or nature" (Weldon 65). Instead, it is significant to remember that even feminist standpoints are constructed when individual members voice their respective concerns and opinions that later become collectively discussed and reaffirmed together by a shared experience. The argument of essentialism can be truly detrimental to the conduct of diplomatic mediation since it causes a form of political alienation towards marginal groups who become viewed as a collective threat to privileged political parties within the sphere. Such an occurrence only triggers antagonism and hostility among different social identities active in international affairs and fosters an atmosphere of divisiveness and political exclusion.

Therefore, in order to avoid the charge of essentialism in feminist standpoint, I suggest that we adopt a more politically ample and suitable version of this theory by simply adding a deconstructivist element in its basis. Deconstructivism as a theoretical component, introduced by French philosopher Jacque Derrida, is based on disintegration, deformation, fragmentation and breaking apart the traditional model of social norms and order (Balkin 1-3). The very theme of

www.manaraa.com

deconstruction disrupts the existence of normative definitions, of cultural constancy or traditionalism and implies a form of dissolution and reconceptualization of embedded social ideas and culturally accepted practices. Professor Jack Balkin identifies how deconstruction can be used to "attack categorical distinctions in law by showing that the justifications for the distinction undermine themselves, that categorical boundaries are unclear, or that these boundaries shift radically as they are placed in new contexts of judgment" (2). Similarly, for the purposes of my analysis I want to employ deconstructivism to both attack the patriarchal and categorical boundaries of traditional diplomatic behavior by blurring them altogether and to eradicate the possible accusation of essentialism as a permanent classification when it comes to feminist standpoint. When applying the element of deconstruction to create a new, more progressive form of feminist standpoint we are not only eliminating the illusion of essentialism it may create but we are ultimately negating the fact that women or other marginal groups can be even defined under any kind of social circumstances. Similarly, when fused with a deconstructivist element, feminist standpoint gains a much greater political value and becomes introduced in the sphere of international diplomacy as not a political theory comprised of different marginal ideologies but rather as a powerful mode of inquiry.

Discussing the complexity of classifying "women" as a collective social grouping Weldon writes, "some scholars have emphasized a strategy of deconstructing those dominant discourses to create space for oppositional or marginalized standpoints. This is a preferred strategy because of the difficulty of defining 'women' in the first place, not to mention the difficulty of discovering 'a women's standpoint'" (82). In essence, deconstructivism in feminist standpoint completely eliminates the emphasis on women as a marginal social group and refocuses the attention by treating them as equally powerful state subjects who should be solely

www.manaraa.com

judged based on their ideas, concerns and political expertise. Therefore, the categorization of the marginal group in feminist standpoint becomes an implicit incidence as implied with deconstructivism and what becomes truly elevated and emphasized in political negotiations is the argumentative stance of the group. In political terms, I argue that deconstructivism allows for social definition as a concept to become replaced and overridden by political position as an undertaken action. When translated to the diplomatic field such instance would mean that when the political platforms of marginal members become introduced in specific negotiating conflicts the ideas proposed will be judged on the basis of their accuracy and quality instead on which social identity has proposed them. Constantly emphasizing the marginalization of a particular social identity can truly cause a backlash and a certain form of antagonism among other members in the political field. Thus, incorporating a deconstructivist element that forces attention on the credibility of the party's argument instead on the social position of the party itself can be a truly positive strategy. A deconstructivist feminist standpoint is extremely relevant for the sphere of diplomacy because it both challenges and reforms its archaic, traditional structure introducing a more innovative political agenda to its foundational framework. Consequently, as a fairly synonymous concept to feminist standpoint theory, in the section that follows, I introduce a model of feminist ethics that when incorporated in international diplomacy provides complex levels of rationality, moral judgment, humanitarianism and political consciousness to this field.

C.3 Feminist Ethics in Diplomacy

The concept of moral ethical behavior represents a key component in diplomacy especially when conflict mediation is focused on politically sensitive issues such as religious turmoil, ethnic genocide, military insurgencies, terror or national coups. Ethics and diplomacy

www.manaraa.com

have existed as fairly synonymous concepts enhanced by epithets such as compromise, negotiation, political conciliation, respect, humanitarian action and partnership. Scholar Fiona Robinson identifies how "methodology in most normative IR is drawn from canonical 'western' ethics, which focuses exclusively on 'pure moral reflection,' abstracted from time, place, and context" (222). The origins of traditional western ethics as pioneered by philosopher Immanuel Kant have rested on the principle of moral duty as a self-inclined process of life. Furthermore, Kant strictly emphasized that such inherent morality is to rely on an individual raison d'être and is by no means based on particular observations, interpretations or scientific results. This particular element of Kant's canonical ethics is prone to cause limitations, misjudgments, oversights and most definitely conflict in the conduct of political diplomacy. If diplomats for instance solely rely on their moral psyche based on reason and instinct alone, they are most likely to perform political acts spontaneously, unconstructively and with no previous examination of the situation at stake. As some cases of failed diplomatic negotiations have shown (for instance, in the case during the 1999 Kosovo conflict when diplomatic dialogue between the US and Serbian president at the time Slobodan Milosevic failed, US authorities reverted to military action and NATO began the bombings of Serbia), western ethical theory—with its complete and utter disregard to methods of observation and estimate of political situations—can have detrimental consequences on diplomatic behavior. In its most positive case scenario, western ethics can produce a form of political chaos among state diplomats encouraging them to perform actions based on their unreliable moral judgments with a complete disregard for the conditions, time or given circumstances at hand.

Instead, the incorporation of a feminist ethics in diplomacy will allow for the elimination of a detached and isolationist form of conducting international mediation and will encourage

www.manaraa.com

state actors to engage in a collective decision-making process as an effort of mutual collaboration and respect. Robinson states, "one of the most important premises of feminist ethics is that… its analytical starting point is relational; more specifically, feminist ethics begins from a relational ontology, regarding individuals as existing in, and morality as arising out of, personal and social relations" (223). Values such as collectivism, partnership and social interactions represent main principles that define feminist ethics as a field of communal relativity and care. Robinson further argues how "the feminine sense of self is one of relatedness or connection to the world, while the basic masculine sense of self denies relation, or is 'separate'" (223). Accordingly, when it comes to the representational infrastructure of diplomacy, the main problem rests in the fact that being fairly male dominated the field tends to lack a form of communal connectedness or a social principle of attachment and remains isolationist in context.

What follows is an examination of this isolationist environment in diplomatic mediation and the consequences of such behavior on the adoption and implementation of effective political strategies. Subsequently, when transcribed to policy procedures or foreign affairs, state diplomats thus lacking the elements of feminist ethics perform political actions not in an interrelated or politically unified manner but rather each diplomat acts a separate political party responsible for the actions in its assigned ambassadorial post. Nevertheless, I want to refrain from the assertion that diplomats are by any means free agents or that they operate independently from the state apparatus. What I do want to argue is that diplomacy still remains dominated by a highly secluded, individualistic, anti-communal and disproportionately egotistical atmosphere when it comes to the relational politics among representatives inside the sphere. And of course, being shaped by the principles of traditional Kantian ethics only reaffirms the fact that when it comes to unanimity and political partnership, state diplomats are more likely to rely on their individual

www.manaraa.com

moral evaluations in performing political acts rather than exposing their doubts in a collaborative setting with others.

When state diplomats perform political actions in their respective diplomatic posts (as the nature of diplomatic behavior demands) they engage in an embedded form of western ethical behavior coupled with Emersonian transcendentalism, simply because diplomacy takes form in global international settings preventing all diplomats from the same nation to come together simultaneously. According to philosopher Ralph Waldo Emerson in order for an individual to achieve complete self-affirmation, reach ultimate personal authenticity and enhance its own intellectual productivity, one must engage in a form of comprehensive solitude removed from the cultural or political contract of life altogether (2-3). This illusive state of individual soul searching that promises an attainment of superfluous happiness and professional fulfillment requires that entities perform social abdication from the political and communal environment they initially belong to. Combined together, traditional ethics and Emersonian radical individualism offer the political entity an illusory independence, power-control and self-affirmation. Although such a political scenario may not sound terribly extreme and detrimental for some—since one might assume that politics is about the protection of national democracy and the interest of the people, so if state representatives neglect to form collegial relationships this may not harm the conduct of political affairs—for others, who engage in direct political action, the consequences of diplomatic isolationism are evident and severe.

When practiced together, Emersonian transcendentalism, as a misleading guidance to political success, alongside canonical ethics, that encourages a moral behavior without any sensitivity to political observation, can produce a radically egocentric, dystopian and negatively detached political figure. By offering a complete removal from the political community,

www.manaraa.com

traditional ethics can cause unfavorable consequences to the performance and quality of diplomatic behavior by adopting political acts that only represent the self-interest and moral judgment of individual state actors and do not adhere to the moral standards of the nation as a whole. If for instance the policy measures negotiated for the ethnic conflicts in Syria represent an individual product and not a unified diplomatic and state decision, the repercussions for such an act may be detrimental not only for the political stance of the nation involved but rather for the security and integrity of millions of citizens at stake. Diplomacy cannot and must not be practiced on the basis of individual rationalism and moral ethical isolationism. Diplomatic behavior should never be codependent on the self-knowledge and personal moral opinions on individual actors but should represent a byproduct of a communal discussion and a comprehensive decision-making process. The delicate nature of diplomacy requires that feminist ethical elements be incorporated into the theoretical and practical structure of this political field. By introducing a feminist ethics into diplomacy we are acknowledging that politics cannot be conducted under a premise of relational estrangement and personal self-elevation but rather in a manner of professional evaluation, compromise and collegial networking.

Furthermore, feminist ethics offers a rather integrated or communal perspective on conducting political affairs and relies on the principle that human beings are not only forced to interact and socialize together in order to produce more effective results but rather they are defined and constituted by cultural relationships. Therefore, feminist ethics promotes the view that individual self-actualization inescapably comes with the ability to become immersed in cultural networks that provide stability and support and not through social abdication or self-marginalization from the political environment that surrounds individuals. Similarly, international diplomacy as a political field, comprised of individual state actors, can only thrive

www.manaraa.com

if there exists a strong diplomatic network codependent on individual sharing, support, and exchange of political ideas. If diplomacy is to achieve its ultimate goal of preventing armed conflicts by the power of political dialogue, it must rely on a communal network of state diplomats who are willing to sacrifice their personal interests in order to achieve an integrated political platform. State diplomats must be released from their fears of losing their professional authenticity and individual voices because the only way they can establish a cohesive political agenda and gain an even stronger individual self-affirmation is exactly through investing in political partnerships among themselves.

Effective political actions in diplomacy can only be developed through a departure from individual egocentrism and self-interest and through a complete embracement of political dependencies in a communal setting. According to Robinson a feminist ethics of care and communality is "not about the application of a universal principle nor is it about a sentimental ideal. Rather it is a starting point for transforming the values and practices of international society…and a commitment to the creation of more humanly responsive institutions which can be shaped to embody expressive and communicative possibilities between actors on a global scale" (47-48). Henceforth, when imagining a more feminist diplomacy that relies on the principles of feminist ethics, diplomatic behavior would be based on a collectively unified decision-making process, on numerous collaborative meetings between state representatives, on a collective voting procedure when it comes to the adoption of foreign policy and finally, on a redesigned agenda that expands the meaning of national interest to include issues of gender and race. Feminist ethics allows diplomats to avoid political prejudice, to disregard initiatives for personal profiteering and self interest and to focus on creating a more politically just institutional structure.

www.manaraa.com

The elements of responsibility and humanity that illuminate the concept of feminist ethics allow for the elimination of gender and racial biases in the conduct of political diplomacy and introduce a new strategy of political sincerity into the field of diplomatic mediation. Furthermore, when incorporating feminist ethics in the basis of diplomacy, author Kimberly Hutchins underlines that the "response is not to abandon the universal terms of traditional moral theory, but to make them genuinely inclusive and universal" (68). Therefore, by introducing elements of feminist ethical value the main purpose is not to eradicate, negate and deny the validity or significance of traditional western ethics—that has shaped international political behavior—rather the idea is to reform and reconceptualize some of its hindering aspects that may have negative repercussions in the conduct of international diplomacy. Unifying together the collective spirit of feminist ethics with traditional morality—as detached from observation, spatial or other cultural factors—will produce a diplomacy that possesses independent and professional entities who willingly engage in productive discussions and social interactions with their respective colleagues. In such an environment, effective political decisions will be made collectively as the most politically apt propositions are heard and adopted from distinct individuals. In a political scenario where feminist ethical elements are combined with the basis of traditional canonical ethics, the practice of diplomatic mediation becomes a satisfying and politically beneficial procedure for every party involved and the sphere of diplomacy thrives as the epitome of moral judgment, collegial partnership, diverse collaboration and professionalism.

Nevertheless, an analysis of feminist ethics and its elements cannot be complete without addressing some of the possible concerns that can cause negative effects in the construction of diplomatic policy. According to Robinson, "even feminists worry that feminist ethics is likely to reify and valorize 'feminine' values such as passivity and dependence, rather than the qualities

www.manaraa.com

associated with rights-based or contractualist ethics such as rationality, autonomy, and independence" (225). Although such a statement can represent a legitimate concern for the conduct of diplomatic behavior, we must not forget that the main purpose of incorporating feminist ethics in this political field is not to undermine or demoralize the principles of traditional ethical study such as moral rationality and personal independence. Rather, the task is to strategically combine elements of feminist care, communal dependency, professional networking and collaborative decision-making to the already established and practiced principles of moral autonomy among state actors. Therefore, I want to challenge Robinsons's previous concern on the reification of passivity as a negative aspect of feminist ethics. Instead, I would argue that the concepts of dependency and passivity can be translated as listening techniques (a departure from their consolidated meaning as tools for social dialogue) which in turn can represent a very concrete and positive manifestation on the influence of these two concepts. Also, by consolidating and merging together both the possibility of a "feminine" dependency that might arise through feminist ethics with the values of extreme moral superiority and isolationism propagated by traditional ethics we can achieve an ultimate political equilibrium. In such a proposed scenario, diplomatic behavior will be based simultaneously on the conscious and independent rational reasoning of politicians who willingly partake in professional dialogue with their colleagues in order to achieve best possible results.

Hence, in this political atmosphere diplomats gain self-affirmation, personal recognition and professional autonomy only through being highly reliant and even dependent on their political unit as a whole. In such a regard, I would argue that the perceived "feminine" values of passivity and dependence become exempt from their negative connotation and transform into necessary prerequisites for state diplomats to achieve professional valorization—that can

www.manaraa.com

definitely not be attained if they act independently and with a dose of egocentric detachment from their social network. After all, the fear that feminist ethics will reify complacency and dependency as ultimate "feminine" traits is answered by Robinson herself when she states how the purpose of feminist morality is not to propagate "a particular set of substantive values or virtues associated with care…rather, feminist ethics is about taking a particular epistemological stance…which allows one to examine and interrogate the gendered nature of…'moral ontologies'" (226). Similarly, the idea of incorporating a feminist ethics in international diplomacy is to reinstate the fact that politics and diplomatic behavior cannot be based on the views, moral judgments and personal interests of independent entities but rather need to be embedded in a communal political setting where mutual dialogue and collaborative decision-making take political precedence. In essence, diplomacy and international affairs can most definitely thrive if state actors exude a proportionate dose of both dependency and passivity in their political networks.

www.manaraa.com

References:

Ackerly, Brooke, Maria Stern, and Jacqui True. “Feminist Methodologies for International Relations.” *Feminist Methodologies for International Relations*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2006. 1-15. Print.

Ackerly, Brooke, and Jacqui True. “Studying the Struggles and Wishes of the Age: Feminist Theoretical Methodology and Feminist Theoretical Methods.” *Feminist Methodologies for International Relations*. Ed. Brooke Ackerly, Maria Stern, and Jacqui True Cambridge, UK : Cambridge University Press, 2006. 241-260. Print.

Allhoff, Fritz. "What Are Applied Ethics?" *Science & Engineering Ethics* 17.1 (2011): 1-19. Print.

Balkin, Jack. “Deconstruction.” *Yale Law School Publishing*, 1995. Web. 10 Feb. 2013. <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/jbalkin/articles/deconessay.pdf>.

Bell, Coral. "Kissinger in Retrospect: The Diplomacy of Power-Concert?" *International Affairs* 53.2 (1977): 202-216. Print.

Blom, Ida. "International Trends: Feminism And Nationalism in the Early Twentieth Century: A Cross-Cultural Perspective." *Journal of Women's History* 7.4 (1995): 82-94. Print.

Branch, Jordan Nathaniel. “Mapping the Sovereign State: Technology, Authority, and Systemic Change.” *International Organization* 65.1 (2011): 1-36. Print.

Celis, Karen. "Substantive Representation of Women: What Is and Should It Be About?" *Journal of Comparative European Politics* 7.1 (2009): 95-113. Print.

Chasek, Pamela S. "Power Politics, Diplomacy and Role Playing: Simulating The UN Security Council's Response to Terrorism." *International Studies Perspectives* 6.1 (2005): 1-19. Print.

“Chapter 5: Power and Decision-Making.” UN Women Statistics Division Official Document.

www.manaraa.com

Web. 10 Feb. 2013. <http://unstats.un.org/unsd/demographic/products/Worldswomen/WW2010%20Report_by%20chapter(pdf)/Power%20and%20decision%20making.pdf>.

Childs, Sarah, and Philip Cowley. "The Politics of Local Presence: Is There a Case for Descriptive Representation?" *Political Studies* 59.1 (2011): 1-19. Print.

Collins, Patricia Hill. "Comment on Hekman's 'Truth and Method: Feminist Standpoint Theory Revisited': Where's the Power?"*Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 22.2 (1997): 375-381. Print.

Coutinho, Giovanni Charles. "Hillary Clinton as Secretary of State: A Comment." *The Diplomat of the Future*, 04 Feb. 2013. Web. 10 Feb. 2013. <http://diplomatofthefuture.blogspot.com/2013/02/hillary-clinton-as-secretary-of-state.html>.

Dougherty, Jill. "Clinton: US Must Put Economics at Center of Foreign Policy." *CNN Foreign Affairs*, 14 Oct. 2011. Web. 10 Feb. 2013. <http://www.cnn.com/2011/10/14/politics/economics-foreign-policy/index.html>.

Enloe, Cynthia. *Bananas, Beaches, and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics*. London: Pandora Press, 1989. Print.

Emerson, Ralph Waldo. "Self-Reliance." *The Complete Works of Ralph Waldo Emerson: Essays.* New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1904. 1-12. Print.

Farrelly, Colin. "Patriarchy and Historical Materialism." *Hypatia* 26.1 (2011): 1-21. Print.

Foucault, Michel. "Two Lectures." *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*. Ed. Colin Gordon. New York: Pantheon Books, 1980. 78-108. Print.

Gismondi, Mark. "Tragedy, Realism, and Postmodernity: Kulturpessimismus in the Theories of

www.manaraa.com

Max Weber, E.H. Carr, Hans J. Morgenthau, and Henry Kissinger." *Diplomacy & Statecraft* 15.3 (2004): 435-463. Print.

Griffin, Martin. "Narrative, Culture, and Diplomacy." *Journal of Arts Management, Law & Society* 38.4 (2009): 258-269. Print.

Hartmann, Heidi. "The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: Towards a More Progressive Union." *Feminist Theory: A Reader*. Ed. Wendy K. Kolmar and Frances Bartkowski. New York: McGraw Hill Publishing, 2010. 299-308. Print.

Harding, Sandra. "Introduction: Standpoint Theory as a Site of Political, Philosophic, and Scientific Debate." *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies*. New York and London: Routledge Press, 2004. 1-17. Print.

Hoffman, John. "Reconstructing Diplomacy." *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 5.4 (2003): 525–542. Print.

Hocking, Brian. "Privatizing Diplomacy?" *International Studies Perspectives* 5.2 (2004): 147-152. Print.

Holsti, Ole. "The United States." *Public Opinion and International Intervention: Lessons from the Iraq War*. Ed. Richard Sobel, Peter Furia and Bethany Barratt. Washington, D.C: Potomac Books, 2012. 11-35. Print.

Hughes, Philip. "Will Hillary Clinton Ever Pay for Her Benghazi Blunder?" *US News*, 4 Feb. 2013. Web. 10 Feb. 2013. <http://www.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/g-philip-hughes/2013/02/04/will-hillary-clinton-ever-pay-for-her-benghazi-blunder>.

Hutchings, Kimberly. "Ethics." *Gender Matters in Global Politics: A Feminist Introduction to International Relations*. Ed. Laura J. Shepherd. London and New York: Routledge Press, 2010. 61-73. Print.

www.manaraa.com

Kaplan, Robert D. "Kissinger, Metternich, and Realism." *Atlantic Monthly* 283.6 (1999): 72-82. Print.

Kelley, John Robert. "The New Diplomacy: Evolution of a Revolution." *Diplomacy & Statecraft* 21.2 (2010): 286-305. Print.

Keys, Barbara. "Congress, Kissinger, and the Origins of Human Rights Diplomacy." *Diplomatic History* 34.5 (2010): 823-851.Print.

Langhorne, Richard. "The Diplomacy of Non-State Actors." *Diplomacy & Statecraft* 16.2 (2005): 331-339. Print.

Lee, Donna, and David Hudson. "The Old and New Significance of Political Economy in Diplomacy." *Review of International Studies* 30.3 (2004): 343–360. Print.

Lendman, Stephen. "Hillary Clinton: Profile of Imperial Arrogance and Lawlessness." *Veterans Today: Military and Foreign Affairs Journal*, 5 Feb. 2013. Web. 10 Feb. 2013. <http://www.veteranstoday.com/2013/02/05/hillary-clinton-profile-of-imperial-arrogance-and-lawlessness/comment-page-1/>.

Lexington. "An Interview with Hillary Clinton." *The Economist*, 22 March 2012. Web. 10 Feb. 2013. <http://www.economist.com/blogs/lexington/2012/03/foreign-policy>.

McGinley, Ann C. "Hillary Clinton, Sarah Palin, and Michelle Obama: Performing Gender, Race, and Class on the Campaign Trail." *Denver University Law Review* 86.1 (2009): 709-725. Print.

Miller, David Aaron. "Untouchable: Why Hillary Clinton is the Teflon Secretary." *Foreign Policy*, 18 Dec. 2012. Web. 10 Feb. 2013. <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/12/17/untouchable>.

Murray, Stuart. "Consolidating the Gains Made in Diplomacy Studies: A Taxonomy."

www.manaraa.com

International Studies Perspectives 9.1 (2008): 22-39. Print.

O'Hanlon, Michael. "State and the Stateswoman: How Hillary Clinton Re-shaped U.S. Foreign Policy-But Not the World." *Foreign Affairs*, 29 Jan. 2013. Web. 10 Feb. 2013. <www.foreignaffairs.com>.

Peterson, Spike and Anne Sisson Runyan. *Global Gender Issues: Dilemmas in World Politics*. Boulder, CO and London: Westview Press, 1999. Print.

Rahman, Talyn. "Women in Diplomacy: An Assessment of British Female Ambassadors in Overcoming Gender Hierarchy, 1990-2010." *American Diplomacy*, April 2011. Web. 10 Feb. 2013. <http://www.unc.edu/depts/diplomat/item/2011/0104/comm/rahman_women.html>.

Robinson, Fiona. *Globalizing Care: Ethics, Feminist Theory and International Relations*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1999. Print.

Robinson, Fiona. "Methods of Feminist Normative Theory: A Political Ethics of Care for International Relations." *Feminist Methodologies for International Relations*. Ed. Brooke Ackerly, Maria Stern, and Jacqui True. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2006. 221-240. Print.

Rolin, Kristina. "Standpoint Theory as a Methodology for the Study of Power Relations." *Hypatia* 24.4 (2009): 218-226. Print.

Rosenthal, Cindy Simon. "The Role of Gender in Descriptive Representation." *Political Research Quarterly* 48.3 (1995): 599-611. Print.

Sarvary, Katalin. "Devaluing Diplomacy? A Critique of Alexander Wendt's Conception of Progress and Politics." *Journal of International Relations & Development* 4.4 (2001): 380-402. Print.

www.manaraa.com

Schwartz, Thomas A. "Henry Kissinger: Realism, Domestic Politics, and the Struggle Against Exceptionalism in American Foreign Policy." *Diplomacy & Statecraft* 22.1 (2011): 121-141. Print.

Sharp, Paul. "Herbert Butterfield, the English School and the Civilizing Virtues of Diplomacy." *International Affairs* 79.4 (2003): 855-878. Print.

Simpson, Ruth and Patricia Lewis. "An Investigation of Silence and a Scrutiny of Transparency: Re-examining Gender in Organization Literature through the Concepts of Voice and Visibility." *Human Relations* 58.10 (2005): 1253-1275. Print.

"The First Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review (QDDR): Leading through Civilian Power." *US Department of State Official Website*. Web. 10 Feb. 2013. <http://www.state.gov/s/dmr/qddr/>.

Van den Brink, Marieke, and Lineke Stobbe. "Doing Gender in Academic Education: The Paradox of Visibility." *Gender, Work & Organization* 16.4 (2009): 451-470. Print.

Vickers, Jill. "Bringing Nations In: Some Methodological and Conceptual Issues in Connecting Feminisms with Nationhood and Nationalisms." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 8.1 (2006): 84-109. Print.

Wängnerud, Lena. "Women in Parliaments: Descriptive and Substantive Representation." *Annual Review of Political Science* 12.1 (2009): 51-69. Print.

Weldon, Laurel. "Inclusion and Understanding: A Collective Methodology for Feminist International Relations." *Feminist Methodologies for International Relations*. Ed. Brooke Ackerly, Maria Stern, and Jacqui True Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2006. 62-87. Print.

Zalewski, Marysia. "Feminist International Relations: Making Sense." *Gender Matters in Global*

www.manaraa.com

Politics: A Feminist Introduction to International Relations. Ed. Laura J. Shepherd. London and New York: Routledge Press, 2010. 28-43. Print.

www.manaraa.com

Nela Taskovska holds a B.A. in Political Science from Purdue University Calumet and will be graduating with her M.A. in Women's and Gender Studies in May 2013. Nela is the graduate assistant for the Joseph Loundy Human Rights Project at RU and she recently completed her practicum at the Chicago Council on Global Affairs. She has held several international internships working with foreign delegations in the cabinet of the Macedonian Prime Minister and has been a project assistant at the US Agency for International Development in Skopje, Macedonia (USAID). Nela was the honorary recipient of the 2012 Charles David Hughes Scholarship for Community Service, awarded by the Community and Economic Development Association of Cook County in Chicago (CEDA). She has done extensive research on global human rights and political diplomacy and has been a delegate to the United Nations Model Conference representing the country of Macedonia on the issue of disarmament and gender justice. Nela has served as the formatting assistant to Bethany Barratt on the handbook for "Public Opinion and International Intervention: Lessons from the Iraq War" and she will be a published author with her first short introduction being incorporated into a sourcebook entitled "Human Rights in the Post 9/11 World."

www.manaraa.com