International Feminist Journal of Politics

ISSN: 1461-6742 (Print) 1468-4470 (Online) Journal homepage: https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rfjp20

The gender turn in diplomacy: a new research agenda

Karin Aggestam & Ann Towns

To cite this article: Karin Aggestam & Ann Towns (2019) The gender turn in diplomacy: a new research agenda, International Feminist Journal of Politics, 21:1, 9-28, DOI: 10.1080/14616742.2018.1483206

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/14616742.2018.1483206

Published online: 06 Jul 2018.

INTERNATIONAL FEMINIST JOURNAL OF POLITICS
2019, VOL. 21, NO. 1, 9–28
https://doi.org/10.1080/14616742.2018.1483206

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

The gender turn in diplomacy: a new research agenda

Karin Aggestam[a] and Ann Towns[b]

[a]Department of Political Science, Lund University, Lund, Sweden; [b]Department of Political Science, Gothenburg University, Göteborg, Sweden

ABSTRACT
This article argues that the (re-)constitution of diplomacy is intimately linked to gender and the practices of exclusion and inclusion of women and men over time. While the big debates in both academia and among practitioners concern the change and continuity of diplomacy in the last hundred years, gender has received scant, if any, attention. The overarching aim of this article is therefore to advance a new research agenda, which can spur future gender studies and contribute to rethinking diplomacy. It presents an original narrative about three distinct bodies of diplomatic scholarly work that focus on (1) diplomatic history; (2) descriptive representation; and (3) gendered institutions. We conclude that first there is a need to move out of Europe and North America to provide greater focus on Africa, Asia and Latin America. Second, there is a need to move beyond the descriptive single case studies towards more systematic comparisons, which can trace change in institutional gender dynamics over time. Ethnographic work can provide novel insights to gendered micro-processes and the daily mundane institutional practices. Third, as part of the gender turn in the field of diplomacy international feminist theory can generate significant theoretical contributions to the transformation of diplomacy.

KEYWORDS Diplomacy; gender; negotiation; practice; Women; Peace and Security

Introduction

Diplomacy has traditionally and formally been a domain reserved for men only. Starting in the 1920s, states and international organizations have gradually and often hesitantly begun to open up their institutions for women to partake in various diplomatic functions. A century later, men still remain grossly overrepresented in contemporary diplomacy. Eighty-five percent of the world's ambassadors were men in 2014 (Towns and Niklasson 2017),

CONTACT Karin Aggestam karin.aggestam@svet.lu.se Department of Political Science, Lund University, Lund, Sweden

and men constitute an even higher share of negotiators and chief mediators in peace negotiations (Aggestam and Svensson 2018).

The gradual opening up for women in diplomacy paralleled the widespread mobilization of women's international movements for gender equality (Garner 2013). In the 1990s, these efforts culminated in vibrant transnational coalitions of states, inter-governmental organizations (IGOs) and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), which actively pushed for wider inclusion of women in diplomacy and in many other international fora and arenas. Framing and situating gender equality as part of the wider concerns for peace and security, the United Nations (UN) Security Council adopted resolution 1325 on Women, Peace and Security (WPS) in the year 2000, a resolution which constitutes a significant milestone in the struggle for women's participation in diplomacy. A number of countries, such as Australia, Sweden, Canada and Norway, have even included the WPS agenda as part of their foreign policies, and taken on normative entrepreneurial leadership in the quest for greater inclusion of women in peace diplomacy (Aggestam and Bergman-Rosamond 2016; True 2016).

More recently, there have been some efforts to include transgender people in certain Foreign Service Organizations. For instance, the US Department of State under the Obama administration worked actively for the inclusion of transgender diplomats along with other members of the LGBT community (Bier 2014). In 2011, Robyn McCutcheon became the first diplomat to transition openly while posted at the US embassy in Bucharest, Romania. "Today, I'm just another woman in the Foreign Service, doing her job like everyone else," she stated in a recent *New York Times* interview (New York Times 2015).

Yet, despite these changes, scholarly work on gender and diplomacy is lagging behind, although the area is expanding as we will show below. To be sure, the subfield of diplomatic history has grown steadily in the last decade and a half. Recently, two new edited volumes by Cassidy (2017) and Aggestam and Towns (2018) have been published, which break new ground by focusing more on contemporary diplomacy and the policy-practice divide. Yet, there are still major lacunae in the field, leaving us with many queries about the gendered dynamics of diplomacy. Hence, the overarching aim of this article is three-fold: (1) to take stock of the ongoing scholarly studies on gender and diplomacy; (2) to identify where more research is needed; and (3) to advance a new research agenda on gender and diplomacy.

The article, which is conceptual and synthetic in nature, proceeds as follows. The first part addresses some of the major debates about change and continuity in diplomacy, noting the absence of gender sensitive perspectives in the core debates. We then take stock of three distinct bodies of scholarly work on gender and diplomacy that focus on (1) diplomatic history; (2)

descriptive representation; and (3) gendered institutions. The article concludes by suggesting an expansive interaction and cross-fertilization between feminist scholarship and diplomatic studies, as well as more systematic comparisons of gender dynamics over time.

Time for change – diplomacy in transition

Like all concepts, the notion of diplomacy is contested and subject to multiple interpretations; thus, making diplomacy "an inherently plural business" (Constantinou, Kerr, and Sharp 2016, 5). Yet, traditionally diplomats have been viewed as individuals authorized to represent a state in its relations with other states. This basic understanding has been complemented and challenged, as we will discuss below. For example, existing gender scholarship has helped unearth and highlight the critical support functions women have served while excluded from formal authorization as diplomats. As such, gender and feminist scholars strive to broaden, transform and rethink the understanding of diplomacy, for example, by overcoming the traditional demarcation between the domestic and the international (Enloe 1989). As a point of departure, we understand diplomacy basically as a set of assumptions, institutions and processes for managing international relations peacefully (Sharp 2009, 13).

The origin of diplomacy is unclear. Yet, diplomacy is often portrayed as an art based on tradition and historical precedents, which is practiced by an exclusive group of male diplomats with trained intuition (Berridge 2010). One central conundrum in the field, which has triggered drawn-out debates, is to what extent diplomacy is characterized by continuity and change. Are we witnessing a "new" form of diplomacy (transnational, multilateral, public, plural, political/democratic), which is distinct from "old" diplomacy (bilateral, secret, elitist/professionalized)? A related question is to what extent diplomacy has adapted its norms and practices to the altering and challenging contexts of globalization and transnational governance, including new and competing global actors?

As a way to conceptualize these major and complex transformations, diplomacy scholars have advanced a broad range of concepts. New terms such as public diplomacy (Melissen 2005), inter-societal diplomacy (Badie 2012), paradiplomacy (Tavares 2016), catalytic diplomacy (Hocking 1999) are now extensively in use as analytical lenses to assess empirically new diplomatic processes and practices. An additional line of argument is that the distinction between official and unofficial diplomacy is eroding. As state sovereignty is relaxed, diplomacy is less attributed to the state, and centers more on transnational issues and relations. Several scholars therefore argue that such a reconceptualization of diplomacy becomes more inclusive, bringing in a

broad range of non-state actors who help to open up new ways of global communication (Constantinou and Der Derian 2010).

Yet, core debates hardly pay any attention to gender as an analytical category or draw upon feminist theory as part of unpacking the changes, which are taking place in contemporary diplomatic practices. Furthermore, there is no gender sensitive lens adopted in most empirical case analyses, despite the recent historical male monopoly on diplomacy, the fact that the number of women in diplomacy has risen significantly in the past couple of decades, or the fact that openly non-binary and transgender persons are conspicuously absent from formal diplomacy. To begin with, we need to probe and broaden the analytical scope to study the interaction between various diplomatic tracks, commonly referred to as Track 1 (official diplomacy) and Track 2, 3 (unofficial/informal diplomacy). For instance, it is interesting to note that when peace negotiations are redesigned in such an inclusive way as to enable other diplomatic tracks, women are gaining presence and influence in the overall process. An illustrative case is the negotiations preceding the adoption of resolution 1325, which highlights the constructive interaction between different tracks of diplomacy. As Tryggestad (2018) points out, it was individual women and civil society organizations that laid the ground work for resolution 1325. Throughout the process, women's organizations mobilized "women-friendly-states" for normative, political and financial support of the WPS agenda. Moreover, the NGO Working Group on WPS is an umbrella organization of sixteen international women's and human rights organizations, which acted as a critical component during the 1325 negotiations, and later successfully pushed the UN Security Council to adopt additional resolutions on women's representation and participation (Tryggestad 2018; see also Shepherd 2017).

One would assume that the male-only character of formal diplomacy should have led to more gender analyses. How did formal diplomacy become an all-male institution? What kinds of masculinities have been at work? With more women in diplomacy and negotiations during the past two decades, there has been a small uptake in gender research. We delineate three expanding strands of research on gender and diplomacy, which we argue constitutes the gender turn in the field: diplomatic history, descriptive representation and gendered institutions. However, these have by and large developed in isolation, without engaging one another. The novel narrative developed below sets out the gender and diplomacy agenda that we hope will spur and generate more theoretical and empirical knowledge in the field.

Diplomatic history

The most developed literature on gender and diplomacy is undoubtedly that within diplomatic history, a thriving subfield of history (e.g., Dean 2001, 2012; Daybell 2011; Costigliola 2012; Jeffreys-Jones 1995; Hickman 1999;

Wood 2005, 2007; McCarthy 2009, 2014; Shibusawa 2012; Wilson 2012; Farias 2015; Kiddle 2015; Sluga and James 2016). Diplomatic history studies have primarily examined the active roles women have taken for centuries in European diplomacy. Studies of women's involvement in diplomatic activities of societies in other parts of the world are unfortunately still sparse. Some of these European histories take the form of biographies, following individual women and their diplomatic activities over time, while others study developments that occurred in briefer temporal contexts. Since women often did not have formal access to diplomatic positions, much of the diplomatic history scholarship takes as its point of departure the absence of women from formal diplomacy. These studies have then tended to show either that elite European women occasionally did serve formal diplomatic roles prior to the nineteenth century or that women exercised significant informal influence on diplomatic interactions.

By tracing the historical roots of women in European diplomacy, diplomatic history scholarship has shown conclusively that women's involvement in diplomatic activities is not a new phenomenon after all. In fact, women's immersion in diplomacy precedes their twentieth century roles as diplomats and diplomatic wives by several centuries. In fact, women occasionally served as diplomatic negotiators and were even appointed as ambassadors in Europe prior to the nineteenth century, before European bans emerged that prohibited women from holding formal state office (Towns 2010). An important volume edited by Sluga and James (2016) provides portraits of women's diplomatic engagement across western societies from the 1500s until today. The volume examines the many ways in which women have engaged in diplomacy and negotiation, beginning with a study of elite women's venture into the diplomatic circles of Renaissance Italy (James 2016). Women's involvement was helped by gender constructions that had not yet conceived of "women" as a unified sex. Ties to royal courts rather than sex were central for diplomatic interactions for many centuries, and in this function, elite women have participated extensively in diplomacy. In Elizabethan England, during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, women influenced the formal intelligence and diplomatic endeavors through gathering and distributing news (Daybell 2011). A fascinating study by Tischer (2001) centers on Renée du Bec-Crespin, Countess of Guébriant, who was formally appointed as ambassador to Poland in 1645, as one of few women to serve in the formal role of ambassador prior to the twentieth century.

Although women occasionally served in formal diplomatic roles, their informal involvement was more extensive. Several studies focus on the roles and influence of women on foreign relations during the reigns of French monarchs Louis XIV and Louis XV (e.g., Dade 2010; Bastian 2013; Hanotin 2014). Bastian's (2013) examination of early eighteenth century relations between Spain and France uses an exploration of the activities of two elite women – Françoise

d'Aubigné, Madame de Maintenon and wife of Louis XIV, and Marie-Anne de la Trémoille, Princesse des Ursins – in order to illustrate the involvement of women in diplomacy. Moving on to mid-eighteenth century France, Dade (2010) provides an in-depth examination of how Madame de Pompadour shaped foreign relations as one of Louis XV's closest advisors (see also Hanotin 2014; Mori 2015). These women had to maneuver a diplomatic context of elite, generally aristocratic, masculinities, which demanded skills such as dueling (Clark 1998; Kiddle 2015).

A number of historical studies have a more recent scope, focusing on twentieth century roles of women in diplomacy in Europe and North America, a period during which Foreign Service professionalized and moved away from the royal courts (e.g., Delaunay and Denéchère 2006; Roberts and He 2007). During the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, as the locus of diplomacy shifted to professionalized and bureaucratized Ministries of Foreign Affairs (MFAs), women were expressly and officially barred as a sex from holding diplomatic positions. Their primary influence then manifested primarily in relation to the informal institution of the diplomatic wife (e.g., Enloe 1989; Hickman 1999; Wood 2005; McCarthy 2009, 2014). With the official role of diplomat reserved for men, and preferably heterosexual elite men, the diplomatic wife came to fill important functions as facilitators of diplomatic interactions. They did so – and continue to do so – as hostesses of receptions and dinners, volunteers with connections in civil society and as sounding boards for their husbands. Since the role of a diplomatic wife places heavy demands on women who accompanied their husbands on their diplomatic postings, diplomatic wives have demanded recognition, services, compensation and pensions in a number of countries (Enloe 1989; Hickman 1999; Biltekin 2016).

There are also studies of twentieth century struggles of women to gain access to the formal roles of diplomacy and diplomatic careers, also limited to studies on Europe, North America and Australia (Calkin 1977; McGlen and Sarkees 1993, 62–66; Nash 2002; McCarthy 2009, 2014; Hughes 2010; Neumann 2012, ch 12; Wood 2005; Biltekin 2016). In one of few studies that reaches beyond Europe and North America, Farias (2015) studies the opening of the Brazilian Foreign Service to women. Interestingly, women were allowed into the Brazilian diplomatic career already in 1918, earlier than their sisters in countries such as the US or Sweden (see Table 1). Additional studies on other non-European MFAs would be important in order to establish where and when formal diplomatic positions first opened up for women.

Rich in detail and contextual complexity, these studies furthermore all focus on individual MFAs. There is thus not much work trying to look at broader international trends and patterns with respect to the entry of women into diplomacy. In a recent volume (Aggestam and Towns 2018), scholars provide analyses of MFAs in different parts of the world (Brazil, Japan,

Table 1. Year women were first allowed into the Foreign Service career.

1918	Brazil (then prohibited 1938–1954)
1920	United States
1932	Turkey (then prohibited 1934–1957)
1934	Denmark
1939	Norway
1945	France
1946	Great Britain
1947	Canada
1948	Sweden
1949	Japan

Sources: Aggestam and Towns 2018; Foreign & Commonwealth Office 2017; McCarthy and Southern 2017

Sweden, Turkey and the US), and a preliminary sketch of international trends and patterns in terms of when and where diplomatic careers were made available to women. The cases suggest that MFAs opened up the diplomatic career to women during the first half of the twentieth century. As Table 1 indicates, Brazil lifted the ban in 1918 and Sweden and Japan did so thirty years later, in 1948 and 1949 respectively. Both Brazil and Turkey reintroduced bans again from the 1930s until the 1950s, setting the integration of women into their MFAs back by decades. In Sweden, in contrast, women were let into the diplomatic career as late as in Japan and yet the Swedish MFA reached gender parity in the 1990s. Clearly, an increase in the number of women in diplomacy is not a simple matter of time.

Lifting the general ban on women in the Foreign Service was a crucial step for women seeking a diplomatic career, but many obstacles remained. In many cases, states put in place a ban on married women from serving as diplomats. Only single women were allowed to take the Foreign Service exams. If a woman diplomat decided to marry, she was thus forced to leave her diplomatic career. In the cases under scrutiny in our edited volume, these bans were not lifted until the late 1960s and early 1970s, as seen in Table 2. Interestingly, the Turkish MFA never instituted such a ban (Rumelili and Suleymanoglu-Kurum 2018). In her research on the Japanese MFA, Flowers (2018) has so far found no evidence of such a ban in Japan either. Additional studies on MFAs outside of Europe would help fill in the blanks and provide a fuller picture of the twentieth century global history of women in diplomacy.

Table 2. Year the "marriage ban" for female diplomats was lifted.

No ban	Turkey
No ban?	Japan
1966/1988	Brazil
1971	United States
Early 1970s	Sweden
1973	Great Britain

Sources: Aggestam and Towns 2018; Foreign & Commonwealth Office 2017.

In sum, existing scholarship demonstrates conclusively that European women did serve as formal diplomats and ambassadors prior to the nineteenth century. Such appointments were uncommon, but they did occur. More often, women influenced diplomacy informally as members of royal courts, relying on their roles as wives, lovers, friends, mothers, sisters or daughters. While not state officials, elite women with access to those in power nonetheless had multiple means of involving themselves in diplomacy, such as providing advice, collecting and passing on information or spreading gossip and disinformation. When diplomacy was professionalized and bureaucratized in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, women became expressly prohibited from holding official diplomatic positions. As part of this development, the "diplomatic wife" became institutionalized and her unpaid and formally unrecognized labor became important for the functioning of formal diplomacy. Finally, we know from the scholarship, that women have since fought both to remove the ban and subsequently the marriage ban from diplomacy as well as for the recognition and regulation of the work of diplomatic wives.

Much work still remains to be done, however, on gender and diplomatic history. For one, existing studies tend to take the case study form, with analyses that are rather limited in time and/or space. There are exceptionally few comparisons between cases, with little attempts to make more general claims about the history of women or gender and diplomacy across space and time. Our attempt here at piecing together a preliminary more general history of women in diplomacy is an effort to move diplomatic history beyond single cases. We believe much is gained by placing individual cases in a broader story, that knowing something about developments elsewhere (in other places or at other times) may enrich and deepen knowledge about the case at hand. What is more, telling a broader story is an end in itself, as macro-historical narratives with their attempts at periodization serve an important function both for understanding history and to set the stage for better theorization of that history.

Second, there is exceptionally little scholarship on sex/gender transgressions within diplomacy, including transgender diplomatic history. Gender historians have analyzed the gender mobility of Charles d'Èon, the French diplomat who negotiated the 1763 Treaty of Paris with England (Kates 1995; Clark 1998). D'Èon was assigned male at birth, presented as a man from 1728–1776, but dressed and identified as a woman until death in 1812, in the context of more fluid eighteenth century gender roles and boundaries. What other diplomats have challenged sex binaries historically? How did they do so, and with what effects? In what ways have sex binaries been policed and reproduced historically in diplomacy? Histories of sexuality in diplomacy are also sparse, with exceptionally little scholarship on lesbian, gay or bisexual diplomats (on the US, see e.g., Dean 2001, 2012; Johnson 2006). When and how did heterosexuality become organized into diplomacy?

Alternatively, when and how did homosexuality become named, policed and excluded from diplomacy? When and in which MFAs have bans on homosexuality been lifted, through what struggles and for what reasons?

In developing the study of gender and diplomatic history, there is furthermore a great need for histories on non-European diplomacy. Such studies are essential for their own sake, for comparisons to be made and in order to construct a more complete and less Eurocentric global narrative about developments concerning gender and diplomacy over time. With a more encompassing history, we could also move toward richer theorizations of how and why women, men, transgender or non-binary persons come to participate in or be shut out of diplomacy. Such theorizations would likely point to changing sex/gender constructions, constructions that have looked very different across time and space. In our view, tracing the movement of sex/gender ideas and practices as they relate to diplomacy, across borders and through time, would be a spectacularly interesting research endeavor.

Representation and the quest for inclusion

There is a persistent pattern of overrepresentation of men in diplomacy, a legacy of the past formal bans and exclusions of women, which we discussed above. At the same time, the gender make-up of diplomacy is changing and the number of women participating is increasing. For example, the MFAs in Sweden and the US have reached gender parity (of a 40/60 range of men and women) and the share of women in many other countries is increasing rapidly (Aggestam and Towns 2018). There are many insightful studies on descriptive and substantive representation of women by gender scholars. However, only recently have similar studies of the diplomatic domain emerged. We still have very little knowledge of where women and men are positioned and located in diplomacy. The few studies that exist have mainly focused on Europe and North America (McGlen and Sarkees 1993; Jeffreys-Jones 1995; Sjolander 2001) and confirm, not surprisingly, that the top diplomats in most cases are male. In the volume, *Gendering Diplomacy and International Negotiation* more comprehensive mappings are provided. A chapter reproducing a study by Towns and Niklasson (2017) shows that women globally hold 15 percent of the world's ambassador appointments, which is the top position for career diplomats and a coveted political appointment. Not one of these ambassadors are openly presented as non-binary. If we compare and look at senior negotiation positions, the number of women is even lower. An often-quoted study from UN Women (2012) reveals that women only constitute 9 percent of all negotiators, 2.5 percent of all chief mediators and 4 percent of signatories. Hence, it is primarily men who carry out the core negotiating activities, with women tending to participate as observers and public consultants, or in purely administrative

and supportive roles (Aharoni 2018; Paffenholz 2018). At the same time, Aggestam and Svensson (2018) demonstrate that there are also noticeable regional differences. For instance, in cases of peace mediators, the US, Nordic and African countries stand out by having significantly more women mediating than other regions, such as Asia.

Furthermore, there are similar patterns of overrepresentation of men in international organizations (Aggestam and Towns 2018). This reflects the gendered structures of diplomacy. Also in the European Council, women are systematically underrepresented in the negotiation committee system. Few women have been appointed to higher-level committees and to foreign policy areas. Not surprisingly, the share of women at the very top ministerial level is the lowest of all EU institutions (Naurin and Naurin 2018).

Yet, there are interesting deviant cases to consider where women have better representation in international institutions, which may be because male dominance is not as entrenched. For example, women constitute 60 percent of the Japanese delegations to the UN, although they only make up 3 percent of the Japanese ambassadors and 17 percent of diplomats overall (Flowers 2018). In the European Council, this pattern is also reflected among the newer member states, which tend to appoint a higher share of women as negotiators to the Council than their representation in the national parliaments (Naurin and Naurin 2018).

While research on gender and diplomatic representation has grown in recent years, many questions and areas remain to be studied. There is still a need for basic empirical mapping of the numbers of men and women as well as non-binary or gender-fluid persons in diplomacy in most MFAs of the world and in many international organizations and negotiation fora. Studies on how, where and when some MFAs have opened the doors (slightly) for openly transgender diplomats – with what effects on the numbers entering diplomacy – are still to be conducted. Such studies could begin with the US, where Robyn McCutcheon – as noted earlier – became the first diplomat to transition openly, while posted in Bucharest, in 2011. Three years earlier, in 2008, Dr Chloe Schwenke had been fired from a position with a United States Agency for International Aid (USAID) contractor when she announced her transition. She fought the discrimination, together with Gays and Lesbians in Foreign Affairs Agencies (GLIFAA), an NGO formed by State Department employees in 1992 to represent lesbians, gay, bisexual, and transgender personnel, their families and allies in the State Department and other foreign affairs offices of the US Government (New York Times 2015; GLIFAA 2018). In 2010, gender identity was subsequently included in non-discrimination statements at the State Department and USAID (New York Times 2015). A mapping of struggles and inclusions of transgender diplomats in MFAs and international organizations around the world would be fascinating, and

would open up space for additional interesting questions about the changing gender constructions and transformative practices in diplomacy.

The field is also ripe for studies of the contemporary representation of lesbian, gay and bisexual persons in diplomacy. For instance, how many openly gay ambassadors presently serve in the world? Given the growing global polarization around LGBT rights, what are the work conditions of LGBT diplomats in host countries that are largely hostile to homosexuality? The US appointed its first openly gay ambassador – James Hormel, posted to Luxembourg – in 1999 (Adams 2012). Since then, an additional six openly gay ambassadors have been appointed by the US, all of them white and male (Silva 2017; Wikipedia 2018).

Furthermore, as the opening for openly LGBT diplomats at the US State Department might suggest, there is great variation in the gender representation among institutions. What explains this variation? Why are (straight) men so much more over-represented in some diplomatic institutions than others? More systematic comparisons are needed to respond to such questions, focusing on domestic and international factors alike.

Many advocates of greater representation of women in diplomacy frame their advocacy in terms of the difference women will make to diplomacy in terms of efficiency. This is strikingly present in contemporary policy discourses, which tend to conflate gender and women, and build on essentialist assumptions that women are inherently peaceful (Palmiano 2014). Yet, we need to probe in-depth to what extent and in what ways diplomatic institutions accommodate differences – if any – that women may bring or demand? Does diplomatic practice and output remain largely the same, despite the influx of larger number of women? In the last few years, a number of interesting studies have been conducted, which assess the interplay between representation and output in peace negotiation and agreement. For instance, Bell (2015) identifies a growing trend to include gender provisions in peace negotiations and agreements since the launching of UN SCR 1325. In another comprehensive study, Paffenholz et al. (2016) have found a positive correlation where women have been able to exercise strong influence in the process and in the drafting of gender provisions in peace agreements. According to Stone's study (quoted in O'Reilly, Suilleabhain, and Paffenholz 2015) women's participation increases the chances that peace agreements will hold over time by 20–35 percent. Still, we need additional studies that shift focus from descriptive to substantive representation in diplomacy (Ellerby 2016).

The diplomatic infrastructure – a gendered institution

As diplomacy has been exclusively male for a long time, this has nurtured homosocial environments with particular forms of ingrained masculinity norms, scripts and practices. In such contexts, there are informal barriers at

play which both exclude and prevent others to act efficiently as diplomats. There is presently a strong interest among policy makers in the numerical representation of women, but much less attention is given to the gendered nature of diplomacy. This is somewhat of a paradox, which may stem partly from an underlying assumption that diplomatic norms and practices will become more gender equal or diverse simply by adding more women to the field.

While overcoming formal barriers are essential for women's and transgender persons' inclusion in diplomacy, we also need to probe the challenges and advantages men, women and transgender people face in everyday diplomatic practices. Feminist institutionalist scholarship provides insightful accounts by showing how gender operate in institutional structures, processes, practices and how femininity and masculinity are produced and reproduced (McGlen and Sarkees 1993; Duerst-Lahti and Kelly 1995; Waylen 2014).

In the scholarship on gender and diplomacy, the concept of institution is generally used in either of two central meanings: firstly, as formal organizations with clear goals and rules, stipulating chains of command and institutional positions with authorities and responsibilities; and secondly, as less formalized but yet persistent sets of relationships, practices or behavioral patterns. It is important to note that in this scholarship, institutions themselves, and not just the people working as diplomats, are approached as bearers of gender (Towns and Niklasson 2017). Furthermore, feminist institutional studies demonstrate that institutions in either sense of the term can be gendered. As such, institutions contain "collections of interrelated rules and routines that define appropriate actions in terms of relations between roles and situations" (March and Olsen 1989, 161). Gender thus conceived helps shape expectations and practices of individuals into relatively stable and predictable patterns.

Peace negotiations in particular are ingrained with masculinized norms of power, as they are strongly associated with security interests and military affairs. Hyper-securitization and "exceptional politics" are additional reasons for the polarization of gender roles and for the virtually exclusive presence of men at the negotiation table. Yet, there are still only a few studies which pay attention to the specific gendered structures and dynamics of peace negotiations (Waylen 2014; Aharoni 2018; Paffenholz 2018). In a recently conducted interview survey of more than fifty peacemakers, Aggestam (2018) analyses how gender operates within distinct institutional contexts and processual dynamics of peace negotiations. The results from the survey shows, for instance, how the WPS agenda is "ghettoized" during negotiations as something only of concern to women negotiators while discussions on masculinities are completely absent from the talks. So, there is an urgent need for more studies that probe how masculinities are expressed at the peace table and through gendered power? What are the relations of power between gendered subjects? In times of transitions from war to peace, what are the effects of masculinities in peace negotiations? While the number of studies are

growing, for instance, on militarized masculinities and conflict (Hearn 2003; Ashe and Harland 2014) there are still very few theoretical and empirical studies on masculinities and diplomatic negotiations.

Prior scholarship also shows that MFAs – institutions in the more formal sense – can productively be conceived of as gendered institutions. These institutions seem to contain predictable divisions of labor, including a familiar division of responsibilities and tasks among women and men, with women often ending up in support functions and in "soft" policy areas whereas men tend to cluster in "hard" policy areas and are overrepresented in leadership positions. Women's entry into diplomacy seems to have been marked by such divisions. For instance, Neumann (2012, 138) describes the entry of Norwegian women first into positions as typists and then into civil servant positions with "soft" portfolios. We also see such patterns in the US Department of State of the 1980s; the Civil Service was predominantly staffed by women, whereas the Foreign Service was predominantly occupied by men (McGlen and Sarkees 1993, 75–76).

Noting that the scholarship on gender in formal MFA institutions is not only small but also somewhat dated, the volume *Gendering Diplomacy* (Aggestam and Towns 2018) focuses on the contemporary location and position of women and men in various MFAs. In all cases under scrutiny, women continue to trail men in terms of where they are located in the institutional hierarchies. In some cases, the underrepresentation of women at the top is getting worse rather than better over time. Women are furthermore overrepresented in support functions. In the Turkish MFA, for instance, more women serve as consular and expert officers than as career diplomats (Rumelili and Suleymanoglu-Kurum 2018). In the Swedish MFA, women are still overrepresented in administrative units, despite an overall gender parity in the organization for almost two decades (Niklasson and Robertson 2018). To be sure, this is not to suggest that nothing has changed during the past two decades. Clearly, women are also rising in the ranks of career diplomacy and filling positions that were previously manned exclusively by men. But the pattern of women in support units and men in core functions remains striking. We still know nothing about what such patterns might look like for LGBT diplomats.

These differences – in hierarchy and division of labor – may diminish once the increasing numbers of women recruits make their way into international negotiations or through the Foreign Service career pipeline. However, institutional features are also at the core of the low levels of women in leadership and other top diplomatic positions. This is an area where more studies are required. For one, centrally located male networks may shape recruitment and career development – perhaps senior men are more likely to see, encourage and involve men as junior colleagues, making it easier for junior men than women to feel supported and encouraged to take steps to advance the career. Also, the issue of overt or subtle signaling to women that they are not suitable for diplomacy need to be analyzed further. Such signaling can have various

grounds: there may be fear that women cannot network effectively in male-dominated environments, fear that women cannot combine a demanding diplomatic career with marriage and parenthood, reluctance to place women in violent contexts, or ideas about women's inability to control their emotions or keep secrets. The emotional and psychological toll of sexual harassment, which usually disproportionately befalls women and transgender people, may be leading to less dedication to the diplomatic career or even to leaving the career altogether. As Svedberg (2018) points out, institutional gender norms about appropriate "male" and "female" behavior may be channeling women in some direction and men in others within diplomacy. Also, diplomacy generally is not well organized to enable the combination of work and family life, which is particularly damaging for women as they continue to shoulder more care responsibilities than men. Robust parental leave policies and childcare provision seem to be a necessary requirement, as is the increased participation of fathers in the care of children. However, unless career expectations change in diplomacy, leave policies may simultaneously hold women back if their careers suffer as a result of taking the leave offered.

Such institutional factors in diplomacy are yet to receive necessary scholarly attention. Ahead, we envision studies designed to probe these issues, including research that systematically compares institutions and negotiation settings, and traces change in institutional gender features over time. There is simultaneously a need for ethnographic studies of gender and diplomacy, richer scholarship contributed by analysts that enter the institutions to examine the life world, social interactions, understandings and practices of diplomats and negotiators. In one of very few diplomatic studies on gender that relies on ethnographic methods, Neumann (2008, 2012) provides a fascinating analysis of the gendered culture of the Norwegian MFA in the 2000s, highlighting the "inherent tension between the statuses 'women' and 'diplomat'" (2012, 162). He points to three distinctive masculinities operative in Western diplomacy: a numerically dominant petit bourgeois masculinity (diligent, rule-following), a hegemonic bourgeois masculinity (economically privileged, cultivated, intellectually independent) and the more unconventional trouble-maker (Neumann 2012, 153–159). This is the only study of masculinities among Foreign Service officials that we are aware of. More such studies, focusing on institutionalized masculinities and femininities along with additional institutional factors, including MFAs in Latin America, Africa and Asia and new peace negotiation settings would greatly enhance our understanding of the workings of gender in diplomacy.

Conclusion

This article argues that the (re-)constitution of diplomacy is intimately linked to gender and the practices of inclusion and exclusion of men, women, non-

binary and transgender individuals over time. While the big debates in both academia and among practitioners have concerned the change and continuity of diplomacy in the last hundred years, gender has received scant if any attention. The overarching purpose of this article has therefore been to advance a new research agenda in the field of diplomacy. By taking stock of existing gender research, we have advanced a new research agenda and suggested multiple ways in which such gender turn in the study of diplomacy may be furthered. By way of conclusion, we spell out a number of areas we find particularly ripe for research.

First, there is a marked and problematic Eurocentrism in the field. We need many more studies that move out of Europe and North America to provide greater focus on Africa, Asia and Latin America. Diplomatic history studies on the gender constructions that informed diplomacy among non-European societies, including the roles and positions of men, women and other sexes/genders in diplomacy, would be of great interest. Such studies are important in their own right, but they would also help to de-center Europe and North America. That said, such studies would also enrich studies of diplomacy in Europe and North America, as they would provide new points of contextualization and comparison.

Second, we need to move beyond descriptive single case studies towards more systematic comparison and even larger n-studies. For instance, scholarship of diplomatic history can benefit from more structure in terms of macro-histories with distinct periods and narratives that cover diverse national contexts over time. Such comprehensive stories serve an important function for understanding history, but also for laying the ground for theorizing specific historical periods. Moreover, scholarship on contemporary diplomatic institutions could stand to benefit from comparative studies as a way to advance generic knowledge about gender-institutional factors, processes and outcomes. Here we envision studies that more systematically compare institutional settings, such as negotiations, but also trace changes in institutional gender features over time. There is also a great need for more ethnographic studies of gendered micro-processes, including the gender norms, relations and identities at work in diplomatic institutions. With such an approach, novel insights may be gained about the daily mundane institutional practices that sustain gendered hierarchies and divisions of labor. An ethnographic approach can also help reveal low-grade resistances as well as the piece-meal changes that help move institutions in new directions. Methodologically, ethnographic approaches to diplomacy would certainly encounter difficulties, the question of access being a primary one. MFAs and embassies as well as negotiation sites have a tradition of secrecy, dealing with high politics and international affairs. We are nonetheless confident that creative gender scholars, armed with tools from recent

developments in institutional ethnography, would find ways to design and carry out ethnographic studies.

By simultaneously calling for large-n studies and ethnographic scholarship, we are not suggesting that such studies would necessarily be epistemologically compatible. There are furthermore clear limitations of each. Large-n studies, even the kind of "simple" mappings and process-tracings that we have advocated for, risk reducing complexity and removing contradictions in gender expressions and practices. Contextual ethnographies, on the other hand, risk missing shared themes across context in the search for rich and complex detail. In calling for both, we hope for a gender turn in diplomacy that is dynamic and in which gender scholars using different methodological and theoretical approaches engage and constructively challenge each other. The existing strands of study we have identified have largely developed independently of one another. A more robust field of study on gender and diplomacy should not only include cumulative knowledge, but also competing claims about gender in diplomacy.

Finally, while the study of diplomacy has generally been "resistant" to theorizing (Der Derian 1987, 91), international feminist theory can make significant contributions to the field by offering conceptual framework and empirical guidance to the analysis of the interplay between gender, power and diplomacy (Ackerly and True 2010). For instance, feminist institutionalist theory has proven useful to unpack the "black box" of peace negotiation (Waylen 2014, 495). As such, international feminist theory helps us to probe overarching normative questions how a transformative and inclusive diplomacy in theory and in practice may be advanced.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Funding

This work was supported by Knut och Alice Wallenbergs Stiftelse [grant number 252129202]; Riksbankens Jubileumsfond [grant number P14-0644:1].

Notes on contributors

Karin Aggestam is Pufendorf chair professor in political science, Lund University, visiting professor Monash University and honorary professor at University of Queensland. Some of her recent publications include *Gendering Diplomacy and International Negotiation* with A. Towns (2018, Palgrave) and *Swedish Feminist Foreign Policy in the Making* with A. Bergman-Rosamond (2016, Ethics and International Affairs).

Ann Towns is professor in political science at the University of Gothenburg and a Wallenberg Academy Fellow. She has a large research project on gender norms, practices

and hierarchies in diplomacy. Towns has edited *Gendering Diplomacy and International Negotiation* with K. Aggestam (Palgrave, 2018) and authored *Women and States: Norms and Hierarchies in International Society* (2010, Cambridge University Press).

References

Ackerly, Brooke, and Jacqui True. 2010. *Doing Feminist Research in Political & Social Science*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Adams, Guy. 2012. "My Secret Life: Jim Hormel, 79, Gay Rights Activisst." *The Independent*, January 28. http://www.independent.co.uk/news/people/profiles/my-secret-life-jim-hormel-79-gay-rights-activist-6294297.html.

Aggestam, Karin. 2018 (forthcoming). "Peace Negotiations and Peace Agreements." In *Oxford Handbook on Women, Peace and Security*, edited by Jacqui True, and Sara Davies. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Aggestam, Karin, and Annika Bergman-Rosamond. 2016. "Swedish Feminist Foreign Policy in the Making: Ethics, Politics, and Gender." *Ethics & International Affairs Journal*, 30: 323–334.

Aggestam, Karin, and Isak Svensson. 2018. "Where are the Women in Peace Mediation?" In *Gendering Diplomacy and International Negotiations*, edited by Karin Aggestam, and Ann Towns, 149–168. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

Aggestam, Karin, and Ann E. Towns. 2018. "Conclusion." In *Gendering Diplomacy and International Negotiation*, edited by Karin Aggestam and Ann E. Towns, 277–293. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Aggestam, Karin, and Ann Towns, eds. 2018. *Gendering Diplomacy and International Negotiations*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.

Aharoni, Sarai. 2018. "Diplomacy as Crisis: An Institutional Analysis of Gender and the Failure to Negotiate Peace in Israel." In *Gendering Diplomacy and International Negotiations*, edited by Karin Aggestam, and Ann Towns, 193–212. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

Ashe, Fidelma, and Ken Harland. 2014. "Troubling Masculinities: Changing Patterns of Violent Masculinities in a Society Emerging From Political Conflict." *Studies in Conflict and Terrrorism* 37 (9): 747–762.

Badie, Bertrand. 2012. "Transnationalizing Diplomacy and Global Governance." In *Diplomacy in a Globalizing World*, edited by Pauline Kerr, and Geoffrey Wiseman, 85–102. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bastian, Corina. 2013. *Verhandeln in Briefen: Frauen in der höfischen Diplomatie des frühen 18. Jahrhunderts*. 1. Auflage. Köln: Böhlau Köln.

Bell, Christine. 2015. *Text and Context: Evaluating Peace Agreements for Their 'Gender Perspectives'*. New York: UN Women.

Berridge, Geoffrey. 2010. *Diplomacy. Theory and Practice*. 4th ed. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Bier, Jeryl. 2014. "Kerrey: 'I'm Working Hard to … Have Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgender Ambassadors'." *The Weekly Standard*, June 23.

Biltekin, Nevra. 2016. *Servants of Diplomacy: the Making of Swedish Diplomats, 1905–1995*. Stockholm: Department of History.

Calkin, Homer. 1977. *Women in American Foreign Affairs*. Washington, DC: Department of State.

Clark, Anna. 1998. "The Chevalier d'Eon and Wilkes: Masculinity and Politics in the Eighteenth Century." *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 32 (1): 19–48.

Cassidy, Jennifer, ed. 2017. *Gender and Diplomacy*. London and New York: Routledge.

Constantinou, Costas, and James Der Derian. 2010. *Sustainable Diplomacies*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Constantinou, Costas, Pauline Kerr, and Pauline Sharp. 2016. *The Sage Handbook of Diplomacy*. London: Sage Publications.
Costigliola, Frank. 2012. "Pamela Churchill, Wartime London, and the Making of the Special Relationship." *Diplomatic History* 36 (4): 753–762.
Dade, Eva Kathrin. 2010. *Madame de Pompadour: die Mätresse und die Diplomatie*. Köln: Böhlau Verlag Köln Weimar.
Daybell, James. 2011. "Gender, Politics and Diplomacy; Women, News and Intelligence Networks in Elizabethan England." In *Diplomacy and Early Modern Culture*, edited by Robyn Adams, and Rosanna Cox, 101–119. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Dean, Robert. 2001. *Imperial Brotherhood: Gender and the Making of Cold war Foreign Policy*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
Dean, Robert. 2012. "The Personal and the Political: Gender and Sexuality in Diplomatic History." *Diplomatic History* 36 (4): 793–767.
Delaunay, Jean-Marc, and Yves Denéchère. 2006. *Femmes et relations internationales au XXe siècle*. Paris: Presses Sorbonne Nouvelle.
Der Derian, James. 1987. "Mediating Estrangement: a Theory for Diplomacy." *Review of International Studies* 13 (2): 91–110.
Duerst-Lahti, Georgia, and Rita Mae Kelly. 1995. "On Governance, Leadership and Gender." In *Gender Power, Leadership and Governance*, edited by Georgia Duerst-Lahti, and Rita Mae Kelly, 11–34. Ann Arbour, MI: University of Michigan Press.
Ellerby, Karen. 2016. "A Seat at the Table is not Enough: Understanding Women's Substantive Representation in Peace Processes." *Peacebuilding* 4 (2): 136–150.
Enloe, Cynthia. 1989. *Bananas, Beaches, and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Farias, Rogério de Souza. 2015. "Do you Wish her to Marry? The Admission of Women in Brazilian Professional Diplomacy (1918–1954)." The University of Chicago Latin American History Workshop.
Flowers, Petrice. 2018. "Women in Japan's Ministry of Foreign Affairs." In *Gendering Diplomacy and International Negotiations*, edited by Karin Aggestam and Ann Towns, 125–146. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
Foreign & Commonwealth Office. 2017. Working for FCO. https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/foreign-commonwealth-office/about/recruitment.
Garner, Karen. 2013. *Shaping a Woman's Global Agenda*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
GLIFAA. 2018. "History." GLIFAA website: https://glifaa.org/about/history/.
Hanotin, Guillaume. 2014. "Femmes et négociations diplomatiques entre France et Espagne au xviiie siècle." *Genre & Histoire*, no. 12–13 (January). http://genrehistoire.revues.org/1855.
Hearn, Jeff. 2003. *Military Masculinities*. Ann Arbour, MI: Prager Publishers.
Hickman, Katie. 1999. *Daughters of Britannia: The Lives and Times of Diplomatic Wives*. London: HarperCollins.
Hocking, Brian. 1999. "Catalytic Diplomacy: Beyond 'Newness' and "Decline"." In *Innovation in Diplomatic Practice. Studies in Diplomacy*, edited by Melissen Jan, 21–42. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
Hughes, Vivien. 2010. "Women, Gender, and Canadian Foreign Policy, 1909–2009." *British Journal of Canadian Studies* 23(2): 159–178.

James, Carolyn. 2016. "Women and Diplomacy in Renaissance Italy." In *Women, Diplomacy and International Politics Since 1500*, edited by Glenda Sluga, and Carolyn James, 13–29. London: Routledge.
Jeffreys-Jones, Rhodri. 1995. *Changing Differences: Women and the Shaping of American Foreign Policy, 1917–1994*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
Johnson, David K. 2006. *The Lavender Scare: The Cold War Persecution of Gays and Lesbians in the Federal Government*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
Kates, Gary. 1995. "The Transgender World of the Chevalier/Chevalière d'Eon." *The Journal of Modern History* 67 (3): 558–594.
Kiddle, Amelia. 2015. "In Mexico's Defense: Dueling, Diplomacy, Gender and Honor, 1876–1940." *Mexican Studies/Estudios Mexicanos* 31 (1): 22–47.
March, James, and Johan Olsen. 1989. *Rediscovering Institutions: The Organizational Basis of Politics*. New York: Free Press.
McCarthy, Helen. 2009. "Petticoat Diplomacy: The Admission of Women to the British Foreign Service, c. 1919–1946." *Twentieth Century British History* 20 (3): 285–321.
McCarthy, Helen. 2014. *Women of the World. The Rise of the Female Diplomat*. London: Bloomsbury.
McCarthy, Helen, and James Southern. 2017. "Women, Gender and Diplomacy: A Historical Survey." In *Gender and Diplomacy*, edited by Jennifer Cassidy, 15–31. London and New York: Routledge.
McGlen, Nancy E., and Meredith Reid Sarkees. 1993. *Women in Foreign Policy: The Insiders*. London: Routledge.
Melissen, Jan. 2005. *New Public Diplomacy*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Mori, Jennifer. 2015. "How Women Make Diplomacy: The British Embassy in Paris, 1815–1841." *Journal of Women's History* 27 (4): 137–59.
Nash, Philip. 2002. "'A Woman's Touch in Foreign Affairs'? The Career of Ambassador Frances E. Willis." *Diplomacy and Statecraft* 13 (2): 1–20.
Naurin, Daniel, and Elin Naurin. 2018. ""Descriptive Representation and Negotiation." In *Gendering Diplomacy and International Negotiations*, edited by Karin Aggestam, and Ann Towns, 213–238. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
Neumann, Iver B. 2008. "The Body of the Diplomat." *European Journal of International Relations* 14 (4): 671–95.
Neumann, Iver B. 2012. *At Home with the Diplomats: Inside a European Foreign Ministry*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
New York Times. 2015. "Robyn McCutcheon. Foreign Service Officer." *New York Times*, Accessed February 25, 2018. https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2015/opinion/transgender-today/stories/robyn-mccutcheon.
Niklasson, Birgitta, and Felicia Robertson. 2018. "The Swedish MFA: Ready to Live Up to Expectations?" In *Gendering Diplomacy and International Negotiations*, edited by Karin Aggestam, and Ann Towns, 65–86. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
O'Reilly, Marie, Andrea Suilleabhain, Thania Paffenholz. 2015. *Reimagining Peacemaking*. New York: International Peace Institute.
Paffenholz, Thania. 2018. "Women in Peace Negotiations." In *Gendering Diplomacy and International Negotiations*, edited by Karin Aggestam, and Ann Towns, 169–192. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
Paffenholz, T., N. Ross, S. Dixon, A.-L. Schlucter, and J. True. 2016. "Making Women Count-not Just Counting Women: Assessing Women's Inclusion and Influence on Peace Negotiations. *Report ITI*, UN Women, available at www.inclusivepeace.org.
Palmiano, Julia. 2014. "Fighting 'Feminist Fatigue'? Women and Peace Negotiations." *Working Paper*, no. 2. Swiss Peace.

Roberts, Priscilla Mary, and Peiqun He. 2007. *Bonds Across Borders: Women, China, and International Relations in the Modern World*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
Rumelili, Bahar, and Rahime Suleymanoglu-Kurum. 2018. "Women and Gender in Turkish Diplomacy: Historical Legacies and Current Patterns." In *Gendering Diplomacy and International Negotiations*, edited by Karin Aggestam, and Ann Towns, 87–106. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
Sharp, Paul. 2009. *Diplomatic Theory of International Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Shepherd, Laura. 2017. *Gender, UN and Peacebuilding*. Oxford: Oxford University Pres.
Shibusawa, Naoko. 2012. "The Lavender Scare and Empire: Rethinking Cold war Antigay Politics." *Diplomatic History* 36 (4): 723–752.
Silva, Christiana. 2017. "Trump Appoints First Openly Gay Ambassador to His Administration." *Newsweek*, October 26.
Sjolander, Claire Turenne. 2001. "Adding Women but Forgetting to Stir: Gender and Foreign Policy in the Mulroney Era." In *Diplomatic Departures: The Conservative Era in Canadian Foreign Policy, 1984–93*, edited by Nelson Michaud, and Kim Richard Nossal, 220–40. Vancouver: UBC Press.
Sluga, Glenda, and Carolyn James, eds. 2016. *Women, Diplomacy and International Politics Since 1500*. London: Routledge.
Svedberg, Erika. 2018. "East-West Negotiations." In *Gendering Diplomacy and International Negotiations*, edited by Karin Aggestam and Ann Towns, 259–276. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
Tavares, Rodrigo. 2016. *Paradiplomacy. Cities and States as Global Player*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Tischer, Anuschka. 2001. "Eine Französische Botschafterin in Polen 1645–1646." *L'Homme* 12 (2): 305–321.
Towns, Ann. 2010. *Women and States. Norms and Hierarchies in International Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Towns, Ann, and Birgitta Niklasson. 2017. "Gender, International Status, and Ambassador Appointments." *Foreign Policy Analysis* 13: 521–540.
True, Jacqui. 2016. *Gender and Foreign Policy. Australia in World Affairs. Navigating New International Disorders*. In Beeson, Mark and Hamieri, Shahar. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Tryggestad, Torunn. 2018. "Negotiations at the UN." In *Gendering Diplomacy and International Negotiations*, edited by Karin Aggestam and Ann Towns, 239–258. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
UN Women. 2012. Women's Participation in Peace Negotiations: Connection between Presence and Influence, Report available at un.women.org.
Waylen, Georgina. 2014. "A Seat at the Table – Is it Enough? Gender, Multiparty Negotiations, and Institutional Design in South Africa and Northern Ireland." *Politics & Gender* 10 (4): 495–523.
Wikipedia. 2018. "List of LGBT Ambassadors of the United States." Accessed February 25, 2018.https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_LGBT_ambassadors_of_the_United_States.
Wilson, Veronica. 2012. "'Now you are Alone:' Anticommunism, Gender, and the Cold war Myths of Hede Massing and Whittaker Chambers." *Diplomatic History* 36 (4): 699–722.
Wood, Molly M. 2005. "Diplomatic Wives: The Politics of Domesticity and the 'Social Game' in the US Foreign Service, 1905–1941." *Journal of Women's History* 31 (3): 505–530.
Wood, Molly M. 2007. "'Commanding Beauty' and 'Gentle Charm': American Women and Gender in the Early Twentieth-Century Foreign Service." *Diplomatic History* 31 (3): 505–530.